

SENATE—Monday, February 2, 1987

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BOB GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of Florida.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour. In whose eyes a reprobate is condemned; but he honoureth them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved. (Psalm 15)

Gracious Lord, help us to take seriously thy word and live in its light in Jesus' name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under standing order of the Senate, the majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia, is now recognized.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for the afternoon is as follows:

After the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there will be two 5-minute orders for the recognition of Messrs. PROXMIER and HUMPHREY.

Following those two orders, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business, not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m. today. Senators will be permitted to speak up to 5 minutes each during that period for the transaction of morning business.

There will then be a 1-hour period allowed for the debate on the waiver.

The highway bill, S. 387, will come up today, and there will be a vote on Senate Resolution 85, the budget waiver for the highway bill. There will be a rollcall vote on the budget waiver, the rollcall vote having already been ordered. Then the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the highway bill. Amendments thereto will be in order.

It is not the intention of the leadership to stay in late this evening. It is expected that debate will ensue this afternoon. Hopefully, someone will call up an amendment. There could be a vote on an amendment today. But in any event there will be at least one rollcall vote this afternoon.

Consideration will continue on tomorrow with respect to the highway bill and throughout the week as long as required to complete action on the highway bill.

Later in the week, it is hoped that the Senate can proceed to take up the appliance energy efficiency standard bill, S. 83. That bill has been reported out of the Energy Committee, Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, the chairman of that committee, wants very much to complete action on that bill this week before the Senate goes out for the Lincoln Day recess. Action was taken last year on a similar bill and there should not be much controversy about the bill.

The House will in all likelihood, vote tomorrow on the override of the President's veto of the clean water bill. That being the case, and I expect the House to override the veto, the Senate then will, on Wednesday or Thursday, vote to override the Presidential veto. It is my intention to have that vote on Wednesday if at all possible. The distinguished Republican leader and I will discuss that later today. Then, Mr. President, there will be further action, if necessary, on House Joint Resolution 102, the homeless appropriations measure.

So, Mr. President, there will be rollcall votes today—one for sure—and rollcall votes daily throughout the remainder of this week until the highway bill is completed and action on the energy appliance measure is completed, and this would include the vote on the override of the President's veto of the clean water bill.

Other legislation and/or nominations will be taken up as cleared. The Senate may be in into the evening one or more days this week, but I am not talking about the late evening. I do not want any late evenings.

I would hope that the Senate could complete all of its work on the high-

way bill, the energy appliance bill, and the other measures by the close of business Thursday. If that is the case, then the Senate would not be in on Friday. But if the work is not done by the close of business on Thursday—and I do not mean to stay in until midnight or 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning to complete it—I am saying if the business is not completed at a reasonable hour on Thursday, then the Senate will be in session on Friday, and Senators should plan their schedules accordingly.

I believe we can complete that work without staying in into the late evening during any day this week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the distinguished Republican leader under the standing order be reserved until he wishes to utilize it during the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will be glad to desist for a moment if the Chair would like to have a message from the House. Otherwise, I do have a statement I would like to proceed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may proceed with his statement.

Mr. BYRD. The Chair would prefer that I proceed. Very well.

AVIATION SAFETY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last week I appeared before the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and made a statement with respect to the narrowing margin of safety and the increasing number of incursions and near misses in our daily aviation travels.

I spoke of the fact that Congress last year, on October 18, enacted legislation to create an Aviation Safety Commission. The President was to have appointed that Commission within 30 days after the enactment of the legislation. The enactment on October 18 occurred. November 18 went by, December 18 went by, January 18 went by, and no Commission has yet been appointed.

In my visit to the White House last week, when invited by the President to come down and meet with the joint leadership with respect to the agenda, I brought this matter up with the President. He assured me that the appointments would occur in the very near future.

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

I hope, Mr. President, that, indeed, that Commission will be appointed in the very near future. There is much work to do. The safety of airline travel is very much in the balance. I have been fearful that the FAA, which has two mandates under the law—one, that it promote civil aviation; two, that it promote safety in air travel—I have been fearful that the wearing of those two hats may put the Federal Aviation Administration in a difficult position at times.

So it seems to me that the appointment of a Commission, an independent Commission, here would be the right thing to do—a Commission that can independently evaluate this whole matter, take a look at the FAA, take a look at the effects of deregulation, and, hopefully, report back to the President and to the Congress based on its evaluations and investigations and studies.

I think this would inure to the safety of the American people who travel by commuters, who travel by major commercial airlines and also by private aircraft. I think we owe it to the American people to get on with the appointment of this Commission, let it do its work, let us see what its report says and take action accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which I made before the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to which I alluded earlier be printed in the RECORD, as well as a letter from Capt. Lloyd W. Barry, senior vice president of United Airlines, dated December 5, 1986, and an article entitled "Be Careful Out There."

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 29, 1987

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the other members of the subcommittee who worked with me last year to enact the Aviation Safety Commission Act. I think we all felt that the Commission would provide a needed and effective response to the growing concern about the diminishing margin of safety in our airways system.

I wish I could report to you today that the Commission was preparing to begin the third month of its review of aviation safety issues. I cannot. The President has yet to appoint the Commission, which I think most of us had hoped would accomplish for civil aviation what the Rogers Commission had accomplished for the Space Program in the wake of the *Challenger* disaster.

The law requires that these appointments be made within 30 days of enactment, which occurred over 3 months ago. Despite assurances by the White House that the names of the Commission members would be forthcoming 2 weeks ago, I have heard nothing from the administration. I can only assume that this administration simply does not

share our concern regarding the seriousness of the aviation safety issue. I find that regrettable. Air safety is not a partisan issue. There can be no partisanship when it comes to Government providing for the safety of its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, the administration claims that 1986 was one of the safest years for U.S. air travel. It points to the fact that not a single fatality was recorded involving any of the large American commercial airlines. That, however, is little solace to the 67 persons killed in the collision last August 31st of an Aeromexico jetliner and a private plane; nor is it comfort to the 15 persons killed on the ground as the planes plunged into a suburb of Los Angeles.

National Transportation Safety Board Chairman Jim Burnett has pointed out that "one year does not a trend make." And the tragic record supports his view. In contrast to last year, 1985 was one of the worst years in aviation history, with 23 accidents and 526 fatalities involving U.S. carriers. And 1987 has already produced 2 mid-air collisions causing 16 deaths.

Waiting to count the number of fatalities seems to me to be shortsighted. Airline accidents are unforgiving; it is incumbent upon us to develop strategies that help us prevent their occurrence. We must begin by recognizing that the Nation faces a deteriorating margin of safety in air travel.

The administration, in the person of the Federal Aviation Administration, says it "can't deal with somebody claiming that 'the margin of safety' has decreased," and that "no one has ever defined what 'margin of safety' is, let alone figured out how to measure it."

Mr. Chairman, you and I know, the members of this subcommittee know, and frankly, the administration knows that "margin of safety" is not an elusive concept.

"Margin of safety" defines the ability to manage our airways system in a way that minimizes the chances of an accident occurring. As a result of deregulation, the dramatic increase in the number of airlines and airline flights, and the loss of 11,400 controllers in the wake of President Reagan firing striking controllers after the 1981 strike, aviation safety considerations have been seriously compromised.

We can measure the extent of that compromise. The FAA, for example, announced on January 9, 1987, that an average of more than 2 near-misses per day were reported in 1986. More than 40 percent of those incidents involved at least one commercial aircraft. Of the 828 near miss reports received by the FAA, 141 incidents involved planes which flew within 100 feet of each other. Aircraft came within 500 feet of each other in more than half of the total reported incidents.

Unfortunately, these reports may only represent the "tip of the iceberg." In a December 5, 1986, letter to his fellow airmen, Capt. Lloyd W. Barry, senior vice president for flight operations at United Airlines, wrote: ". . . I am becoming increasingly concerned about the ever present threat of midair collision. The very real hazard of a midair collision must be acknowledged by each and every one of us. The trend is indisputable. Within the last 12 months United crews have averaged 6.3 near misses per month."

Last July, I presented to this subcommittee an analysis of historical data that demonstrates a strong, statistically significant relationship between the volume of air traffic—as measured by the number of commer-

cial departures—and the number of safety incidents—that is, near misses in the air and near misses on the ground, the latter being so-called surface operational errors.

What does this mean for the future? According to the FAA, air traffic is expected to increase at a rate of 7 to 10 percent a year over the next decade. If the recent correlation between traffic volume and the number of incidents continues, we can expect a steady increase in the number of safety incidents.

Mr. Chairman, that trend is unacceptable. If we are going to continue increasing air traffic and avoid a commensurate increase in safety incidents, we must improve the margin of safety. That will require resolving a number of fundamental issues:

First, what are the staffing requirements needed to maintain the air traffic control system? The President's budget calls for increasing the controller work force by 225 positions in FY 1988. However, even with that increase, there would still be 3,700 fewer full performance controllers than in August 1981, before the controller strike.

Second, what needs to be done to prevent system failures caused by the sheer increase in the volume of air traffic? For example, the 9020 computer, used to assist controllers in monitoring air traffic, was out of service at the Denver Air Route Traffic Control Center from January 8 to January 20 of this year, a total of 12 days, as a result of overloading the computer capacity. Consequently, there were numerous delays and the center had to control air traffic without a backup system for the entire time.

Third, what effect is the "hub and spoke" system having on aviation safety? For example, at Boston's Logan Airport—one of the 39 Hub airports—23 flights are scheduled to depart between 9 a.m. and 9:06 a.m. At Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, 117 flights are scheduled to take off between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. Within a 50-minute period just after noon every day at Lambert St. Louis International Airport, 43 TWA jets are scheduled to land and 35 minutes later the same 43 planes are scheduled to start taking off.

The FAA projects that the number of aircraft operations will increase an average of 35 percent over the next 15 years at the 28 major Hubs. These Hubs are becoming overwhelmed by the growth in commercial traffic.

Fourth, what impact is deregulation having on the safety and adequacy of service to outlying and rural areas? Because of the combination of "HUB" expansion and FAA service consolidation efforts, for example, West Virginia will have 4 airway facilities maintenance offices reduced to one. Only one maintenance office will be available to provide computers, radar, and communications technical support for the entire State.

And fifth, given the enormity of the projected growth in air traffic and the number of airlines, FAA's resources will become stretched even thinner. Can, and should, the FAA continue to function in that setting as both a promoter for and a regulator of the aviation industry?

Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the many issues that need to be addressed. Without the benefit of an independent and thorough evaluation, most of these issues may never be resolved.

Nineteen eighty-seven is but one month old. Yet already there have been two mid-air collisions with 16 fatalities. The growing stress on the aviation safety system is cause

for concern. Without prompt action by the administration to name the members of the Aviation Safety Commission, enabling it to begin its vital and overdue work, that concern can only increase and the margin of safety will become even slimmer. I hope the American people will not be required to endure that outcome.

UNITED AIRLINES,
December 5, 1986.

DEAR FELLOW AIRMAN: I consider the United pilots to be the most highly trained and capable pilots in this industry. We also fly excellent aircraft equipment, and this combined with an outstanding and dedicated maintenance team results in safe and reliable air transportation of our customers and crewmembers alike.

We have enjoyed an enviable safety record over the last several years, but I am becoming increasingly concerned about the ever present threat of a midair collision. The very real hazard of a midair collision must be acknowledged by each and everyone of us. The trend is indisputable. Within the last 12 months United crews have averaged 6.3 near misses per month. Any of these incidents could have resulted in a catastrophe had it not been for the professional skill of our pilots or, in some cases, just plain good luck.

There are many detriments to good outside visual scanning. For example, it is my belief that modern technology can lead us into some traps that can create an environment for a midair collision. We all want to be the best of the best and in an effort to obtain absolute precision we may concentrate our scan on the instrument panel to the detriment of our visual scan. The computers and integrated flight director/autopilot systems on our newer aircraft can lead us into the cockpit when we are hand flying the aircraft. The same systems, however, when used with an autopilot can actually enhance your ability for visual scanning. Another deterrent to good outside visual scanning is caused when ATC issues last minute runway changes for landing. We have all been led down that garden path, scrambling for approach plates at the last and worst possible time. These are "setups" for pilots and can easily result in crewmembers not clearing the airspace ahead of them.

I know by now you get my point! I am deeply concerned about a midair collision occurrence at United Airlines. We are putting more and more airplanes in the air using the same old airspace, and the "see and avoid" rule has never been more important. Just as we say in an emergency, "Someone must fly the airplane!", we had better all start developing the philosophy of "Someone must be looking outside for traffic!". This issue has to take priority with each and everyone of us.

Review your own attitude and habit patterns and discuss methods to ensure the best possible chance of not becoming a midair statistic. I will address this in the next issue of the "COCKPIT", but felt I could not wait that long to share my concern. I believe that midair collisions are the single greatest threat to our safety in the skies today.

In the September Safety Information Bulletin (86-8) on this subject, Dave Simmon referred you to the 16-minute video tape on midair collisions. It is an excellent review and I highly recommend it.

Please think about this and share your thoughts with each other.

Sincerely,

LLOYD W. BARRY.

[From Time, Jan. 27, 1987]

"BE CAREFUL OUT THERE"

The Northwest DC-10 was speeding toward takeoff at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport when the warning came from the flight engineer: "There's a whale on the runway!" Another Northwest wide-bodied DC-10 has just left a taxiway and poked its nose into the path of the oncoming plane. "I see it," replied the amazingly cool captain of the departing aircraft. He abruptly jerked his jumbo jet into the air. His wing cleared the fuselage of the crossing plane by a mere 50 ft. There were 501 people on the two jets. They had barely avoided what would have been the world's second worst air disaster, akin to the 1977 collision of two Boeing 747s that killed 582 people on a fog-shrouded runway at Tenerife in the Canary Islands.

What went wrong under clear skies at Minneapolis last March 31? Two air-traffic controllers, sitting side by side in the terminal tower, each failed to realize what the other had done. One had cleared the taxiing plane to cross the runway. The other had told the second plane to roll toward takeoff.

Whether on the ground or in the air, the high-speed collision of two aircraft is every pilot's worst fear. Yet each day in the U.S. the worry grows. "Near midairs," the safety experts' term for when two planes come dangerously close to each other in the air, are increasing at an alarming rate: 311 in 1982, 475 in 1983, 589 in 1984, 777 in 1985, at least 812 in 1986. Commercial airliners were involved in 35% of the 1986 incidents. What the air-travel industry too gently calls "runway incursions" are also on the rise: 102 in 1985 and an estimated 112 last year.

"Hell, every week that goes by, it's almost accepted as a common event, a near midair!" complains Captain Hank Duffy, the outspoken head of the 39,000-member Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA). Says Duffy: "Near midairs, runway incursions, delays—every indicator in the system says that we're hanging by our fingernails."

In a candid memo to United Airlines pilots last month, Captain Lloyd W. Barry, United's senior vice president for flight operations warned "I am increasingly concerned about the ever present threat of a midair collision. Within the last twelve months, United crews have averaged 6.3 near-misses per month. Any of these incidents could have resulted in a catastrophe had it not been for the professional skill of our pilots or, in some cases, just plain good luck."

The close calls in the sky are by far the most worrisome trend in the nation's overburdened, understaffed air-safety system. The chilling reality of what can happen when luck turns sour was illustrated last Aug. 31 over Cerritos, Calif., when an Aeroméxico DC-9 and a private Piper aircraft collided in the congested "birdcage" of controlled airspace around Los Angeles International Airport, killing 82 people. Many aviation experts like Duffy fear that what is still one of the safest air-transportation systems in the world is slipping dangerously as air traffic grows relentlessly through the unfettered competition of deregulation. The experts voice three major concerns:

"There are not enough controllers, and too many of them have a low experience level," claims John Galipault, president of the Aviation Safety Institute, a private

foundation in Ohio. The number of controllers is down from 16,300 to 14,700 since President Reagan fired striking members of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO) in 1981; more significantly, only 62% of them are qualified at "full performance level," vs. 80% before the strike. United Airlines Captain Mel Hoagland declares bluntly, "The air-traffic-control system is at the ragged edge of coming unraveled for lack of fully qualified controllers."

"We have a lessening of the experience level of flight crews," contends Jim Burnett, chairman of the highly respected National Transportation Safety Board, which investigates civil aviation accidents. The number of hours the average airline pilot has spent in jetliners has dropped from 2,234 in 1983 to 818 in 1985. "The demand for pilots is high, and the supply is going down," observes NTSB member John Lauber. "The carriers are getting closer to the FAA minimum training standards."

Some of the most economically troubled airlines are deferring maintenance whenever possible, and a few have been heavily fined by the FAA for violating safety standards. The impact of these varied trends, says Patricia Goldman, vice chairman of the NTSB, is that there is a "narrowed margin of safety."

Most of the critics cite the 1978 deregulation of airline competition as the villain in this erosion of confidence in the system. While deregulation has reduced fares and opened air travel to enormous numbers of new passengers, the era of do-or-die rate-cutting competition has pressured carriers to slash costs and take risks. No one claims that safety rules have been relaxed. Indeed, the vast majority of controllers, pilots and federal inspectors are working hard and competently to avoid accidents. But, says Jerome Lederer, founder of the private Flight Safety Foundation, "from now on the problem will be to discern who is obeying the rules. When passenger safety vs. profits is involved, these are questions of conscience." One pilot, speaking anonymously, sums up what he perceives as the all too common attitude in airline executive suites: "It's a business. Make the buck and take the chance."

Yet all the gloom overlooks an important bottom-line statistic: 1986 was among the safest ever for U.S. air travel. There was not a single fatality among the large American carriers even though they flew a record 6.2 million flights. That is a remarkable turnaround from the previous year, which set a worldwide high of 1,835 airline fatalities, 526 of them on U.S. carriers. For all of civil aviation, including airline, business and private flying, 1985 was dismal: 2,773 accidents that caused 1,231 deaths in the U.S. alone. For 1986 the number of U.S. accidents fell to an estimated 2,580, with 860 fatalities.

To Donald Engen, the Federal Aviation administrator, this reversal in fatalities is what really matters in air safety. "I can't deal with somebody claiming that 'the margin of safety has decreased,'" says Engen. "I deal with real facts, the accidents in hundreds of thousands of hours flown. These rates are continuing to go down. It happened in 1986 because we made it happen." Indeed, the number of fatal accidents in U.S. civil aviation in 1986 was 1.09 for each 100,000 hours flown, a decrease from 1.2 in the year before.

The FAA's vigilance in policing shoddy maintenance practices led the Government agency to ground 61 commuter and air-taxi

carriers for varying periods (some permanently) in 1986, as well as 60 the year before. It is most spectacular gesture, the FAA in March fined Eastern Air Lines \$9.5 million for 78,372 alleged safety and maintenance violations. Pan Am has been jolted by FAA fines of \$2 million, while American was assessed \$1.5 million.

Not everyone agrees, however, that the decrease in fatalities last year stemmed from better management by the FAA or anyone else. "Our emphasis on safe operations has given us an incredible skein of good luck," observes William Jackman, vice president of the Air Transport Association, the airlines' trade group. "We've got to be the luckiest industry in the world."

And while ALPA's Duffy views Engen as "one of the best administrators we have ever worked with," he disagrees with the FAA boss on a key point. "You don't judge how the system is operating by the number of accidents," Duffy says. "The indicators predict where the accidents are going. When you are having more near midairs, well, it's just a matter of time before two planes will slam together, as they did at Cerritos."

The most severe critics of the air safety system are the airline pilots, who, it has often been noted, are the first to arrive at the scene of an air accident. A survey of ALPA's members in September showed not only that midair collisions are the pilots' biggest concern but that 66% of them feel that the problems of air-traffic control are more serious than the public realizes. In the opinion of 43% of pilots, deregulation has had an adverse effect on airline safety. Declares Pilot David Linsley, a 20-year veteran at United: "The system is not as safe as it used to be, not as safe as it should be, not as safe as it could be and not as safe as it will be—or the pilots will shut it down."

American Flight 557 approached Chicago's O'Hare on Oct. 31. As it descended from 10,000 ft., a single-engine Cessna suddenly appeared ahead of it and passed just 300 ft. below and a mile to one side. Snapped the startled American pilot: "Center, did you just have an aircraft pass us in the opposite direction?" Controller: "I have an old track I don't see . . . there, target's back up now. I'm sorry about that." Pilot: "Well, that was very, very close."

Certainly, one reason for the increase in near midairs is that air traffic has soared under deregulation. Flying accounts for nearly 90% of all interstate travel; the annual number of airline passengers has jumped from 292 million in 1978 to 415 million last year. The number of airlines, including cargo, express mail and charter service, increased from 150 to about 400, and the roster of passenger carriers grew by 97 (to 157). The FAA offers another explanation for the rising number of near midairs: its reporting system has improved. In 1983 the FAA began installing what controllers and pilots call a "snitch" alarm system. Aircraft now move across a controller's green radar screen as a blip of light in the middle of a round white "halo" or "doughnut," representing an area that has a diameter of five miles. The aim of the controllers is to "keep green" between the doughnuts. Whenever two circles begin to intersect, indicating that two planes have violated the horizontal separation standard of five miles, an alarm sounds, the doughnuts flash and a teletype clacks out the incriminating data. The controller must file a report on the incident, as must the pilot if he is suspected of being at fault. Anyone found responsible can be suspended from duty.

The automatic snitch may make it appear that the skies are growing more dangerous because more reports are being filed. In the past, say some pilots, regional offices of the FAA often failed to pass near-miss reports along to Washington because they wanted to tell their bosses only what headquarters wanted to hear: that the system is safe.

Critics counter that the FAA's stricter reporting system may just be catching up to the frightening reality in the skies. Moreover, the FAA has loosened another requirement: until 1985 planes that passed within 1,000 ft. of each other vertically were considered too close, and the incident had to be reported; now the vertical-separation standard is just 500 ft. Under an accurate system, this change should produce fewer, not more, close-call reports. Some pilots object to this reduction in the near-miss distance, noting that if two airliners are six miles apart but head toward each other at 550 m.p.h., they could collide in 20 seconds.

There are indications that some controllers may be cheating the snitch system to avoid the burden of paperwork and explanations. The FAA investigated a near miss on Feb. 16 between a Sky West Airlines flight and a private Beech Bonanza near Santa Barbara, Calif. The planes had come within five miles, but the snitch was not triggered. The investigators discovered that a controller had dropped the Bonanza from his screen in the belief that there was no real chance of a collision despite the proximity of the two aircraft. This action, reported the FAA, "disabled the computer's ability to recognize the conflict."

Some pilots object to the snitch alarm as a superfluous electronic Big Brother, but few approve of controllers defeating the system. Charges a veteran American Airlines captain: "Dropping a plane from the screen is playing fast and loose with human life to avoid being pinpointed for a mistake. It's unconscionable."

Such self-protective steps presumably are rare, but there is little doubt that the nation's air controllers are straining to handle their workload. A survey by the Government's General Accounting Office last March produced some disturbing findings: an overwhelming 91% of controllers complained that the system does not have enough qualified controllers, 70% reported that they handle more traffic in peak periods than they should be required to accept, 69% claimed that their heavy workloads adversely affect air safety. In the fiscal year before the 1981 strike, controllers put in 377,000 hours of overtime; in 1985 they worked an extra 908,000 hours.

Moreover, the controllers are not optimistic about the immediate future. More than half rated the quality of training for new controllers as either "less than adequate" or "poor." The GAO discovered that the top of the controller hierarchy is aging and restive. Of 450 supervisors in the survey, 75% said they hope to retire within a year. "A lot of us are tired, over-worked, stressed and demoralized," explained one veteran.

Some of the rank-and-file controllers have started procedures to establish a new union to replace PATCO, which was smashed in the 1981 strike. The Administration's dismissal of 11,500 strikers, although politically popular, is still hotly argued from a safety standpoint. Claims Ray Brown, an ALPA executive and air-safety consultant, about the Administration: "Instead of listening to the message, it killed the messenger. Now the message has resurfaced because the new people are expressing the same problems."

One example of the manpower problem is the situation at the Chicago Air Route Traffic Control Center in Aurora, Ill., which handles an airspace that includes O'Hare, one of the world's busiest airports. On paper, the center has more controllers than its authorized strength of 350. But only 183 have reached full-performance-level status. Where it was once standard for controllers to be at their positions for only four of the eight hours in a shift, the norm at Aurora is now six. Coupled with mandatory overtime, this pace, contends one Aurora controller, "is burning most of us out."

The ATC computer systems, many of them 20 years old, are also burning out. The Aurora control center lost a backup computer on Aug. 3, and while it was being repaired, the main computer went down for nearly four minutes on Aug. 4 and for an hour on Aug. 5. A control center in Albuquerque was knocked out for 40 minutes on Nov. 6. The busy Washington center lost all its radar and computers for 20 minutes on Nov. 29. When this happens, pilots have no choice but to fall back on "see and avoid" flying practices. But that is sometimes difficult to do today's instrument-filled "glass cockpits," which require pilots to keep their heads down much of the time. Flights are diverted to open airports and long delays develop. At the New York area radar facility on Long Island—which controls Kennedy, La Guardia and Newark airports—one controller says, there is "some sort of equipment breakdown two or three times a month" during which "everybody scrambles into high gear."

The pressure on controllers can vary from place to place. A few in low-traffic regions or in centers that are adequately staffed contend that they fight boredom rather than stress. That was not at all true of a frantic controller at the Los Angeles center at Palmdale, who, according to one airline captain, announced on a smoggy day: "There is more traffic than I can point out to you. Please be careful out there."

While relations between controllers and pilots usually remain professionally courteous, there are subtle tensions between the two groups. Christine West, a controller hired just after the strike, works in the New York radar-control facility. West is proud that "we do pretty close to twice the amount of work with half the staffing we had before the strike." But she is critical of many pilots. "We have their lives in our hands, but they relate to us like we were the enemy," she says. "It can be stressful when you're taking insults on a frequency and you have to be professional and cannot explain your reasons for doing something."

Keith Morris, another controller at the same center, complains that pilots talk too often on their radios and do not listen carefully to the controllers. When any pilot close to a control center presses his mike button, it blocks other nearby flight crews from hearing the controller. "It is not unusual to sit on a radar position and have a pilot respond that he's blocked over and over again," says Morris. "Radio discipline has become atrocious."

Pilots have beefs about the controllers. Contends Duffy: "Our pilots make calls to controllers and nobody answers. You can tell when one is under strain when his supervisor comes in and overrides him. More controllers are making errors. They are often fatigued. We just don't want to be handled by tired controllers." The basic problem, in the view of Delta Airlines Pilot

Joseph Dorsey, is that "there are too many new people on both ends of that radio."

On Sept. 23, 1985, a Henson Airlines Beech commuter plane missed Shenandoah Valley Airport in Virginia by six miles as it tried to land through clouds and fog. The crash killed the two crew members and all 12 passengers. The NTSB investigation blamed navigational errors by the crew. But it cited a list of contributing factors: the cockpit was so noisy that the captain and first officer had either to shout or to use hand signals to communicate; both were relatively inexperienced; and Henson's training in its aircraft, which have differing instrument layouts, was inadequate. The crew members, who had flown together only twice before, were undergoing personal tensions that may have created stress. The captain, 27, was about to be married and was awaiting a job interview with Eastern Air Lines; the first officer, 26, had been with Henson only two months, duty that took her away from her husband, and she was planning further examination of a lump in one breast.

Veteran airline pilots may be even more critical of the lack of experience among some of their younger flying brethren (and, increasingly, sisters). A generation of crack pilots trained in military transport and combat aircraft is fading into retirement. According to the Aviation Safety Institute, only 40% of today's pilots came out of the military. Yet the demand for more top-rated airline pilots keeps rising. Their ranks, which have been growing steadily during the past few years, now number greater than 81,000. More pilots and fewer fully qualified controllers, says a senior captain at United, is a "prescription for catastrophe."

The expanding number of pilots is exacting a price at some airlines, especially the feeders, which are requiring less experience and lower qualifications than they did in the past. Newcomers are being promoted from the flight engineer's chair to the right-hand seat (the first officer's) and then to the left seat (the captain's) after logging fewer flying hours. "The apprenticeship system doesn't exist anymore," claims ALPA's Duffy. Three major airlines—United, American and Piedmont—are for the first time hiring pilots who are past the age of 50.

In the tight market, pilots searching for higher pay often jump from the smaller to the larger airlines and from one type of aircraft to another. Crews have less time to learn to work together. Caught at the bottom of this turnover spiral are the commuter airlines. Henson Airlines, based in Salisbury, Md., for example, lost 54 of its 195 pilots in 1985.

"The place where you are going to see the system break down first is the commuter airline," says Pete Pedigrew, a captain with Pacific Southwest. Tony Levier, an industry-safety expert, is in agreement. "A lot of these airlines are operating on shoestrings. They may meet the FAA regulations on paper but not in reality." On some commuter flights, both cockpit seats may be occupied by inexperienced officers. That, too, observes John Lauber of NTSB, "can be a lethal combination."

On the large airliners, passengers have another reason to be uneasy. After studying 30 cockpit flight-crew members, Dr. Martin Moore-Ede, a professor at the Harvard Medical School, discovered that on long high-altitude flights, the cockpit crew is sometimes asleep. The pilots, copilots and navigators

he interviewed admitted that they have either nodded off on the job or had to struggle not to do so an average of 16 times a month. This usually happens sometime between 4 and 5 in the morning. In other research, Moore-Ede discovered an incident in which a transcontinental flight missed its Los Angeles destination and flew 100 miles over the Pacific because everyone up front had fallen asleep. Controllers awakened them by sounding chimes in the cockpit. NTSB's Lauber confirms that napping occurs and suggests that the problem could be eased if regulations banning all sleeping could be relaxed to permit snoozing by one officer at a time during a high-altitude flight.

A mechanic at O'Hare found a damaged duct on a DC-9's engine in April and reported it to his supervisor that it would pose a fire hazard if the engine overheated. The supervisor nonetheless cleared the aircraft to take off for Pittsburgh. The horrified mechanic called FAA but could not reach an official before the plane left Chicago. In Pittsburgh, FAA grounded the aircraft while the engine was replaced. The pilot had not been warned that he was flying with a potential fire problem.

In the complex world of aviation technology, equipment can and does fail. Still, insists FAA Chief Donald Engen, "any accident, when you dig in, always comes back to human beings. Accidents just don't happen—they are caused." Airlines need a skilled force of mechanics and technicians to maintain their incredibly complex aircraft. A Boeing 747, for example, contains 4.5 million removable parts, 135 miles of electrical wires and more than a mile of hydraulic tubing. The major airlines are spending as much as or more than before on maintenance of their fleets. But to deal with any carrier that lacks the will or money to meet the Government's stiff standards, FAA must have enough inspectors to scare the corner cutters and punish the violators. Yet while the volume of traffic has exploded, the Reagan Administration's early budget cutting produced a reduction in the number of FAA inspectors from 1,748 to 1,494. Only in the past three years has the force been rebuilt to its present 1,813 inspectors.

NTSB Chairman Burnett contends, furthermore, that FAA inspectors too often develop a cozy relationship with the airlines they are assigned to monitor. Inspectors and airlines, says Burnett, go through a "choreographed dance." One example: Eastern had a string of problems with missing O rings on engines in its L-1011 jumbos that caused seven forced landings. At a hearing on the problem, Burnett asked the top FAA inspector watching Eastern whether he ever checked the airline's maintenance procedures. No, said the inspector, but he had discussed the problem with Eastern's vice president for maintenance. Burnett's acid response: "Vice presidents don't put on O rings."

The Eastern violations became so numerous because each flight with a claimed maintenance problem counts separately. One Eastern plane flew five years before the airline repaired a landing-gear-assembly link that had been the subject of an FAA warning. Only when the gear failed on a landing at Norfolk, Va., was a fix made. FAA also cited Eastern for placing tape over a 4-in crack in the leading edge of a horizontal stabilizer and making 156 flights in that condition. Most of the violations, however, appear to have involved the failure to docu-

ment procedures that differed from standard practice, although not necessarily compromising safety.

Pinched airlines tend to defer repairs on items that do not require immediate grounding of a plane. One pilot admitted that he flew his jet even though in his cockpit 14 red tags were hanging from parts on which needed maintenance work had been deferred. While this may be legal, John Galipault of the Aviation Safety Institute insists that one airline assigns mechanics to fly in what repairmen call "hanger queens," airlines that develop frequent problems. When a minor ailment arises, the flying mechanic "signs off" on the paperwork needed to permit the plane to keep operating, even though no repair is done.

The pressure to keep the multimillion-dollar jets and their paying passengers moving is high at most airlines. Contends Galipault: "People in this business are asked or told to do things they know are not only wrong but dangerous. Then they have to ask themselves whether to sell out and save their job or risk it for what they know is right and safe. For too many, the choice appears to be difficult."

The crash at Reno of a Galaxy Airlines Electra that killed 70 people, many of them fans returning to Minneapolis from the 1985 Super Bowl game in San Francisco, turned out to be a horror story of multiple mistakes. NTSB investigators found that on the ground at Reno, the headsets between the ground supervisor and the cockpit did not work, so hand signals were used. After the pilot started two engines, a ground handler discovered that she could not disconnect an air hose used in the starts. The supervisor began frantically signaling the pilots to stop so the hose could be freed. Distracted, the ground crew failed to close a small (8½ in. by 11 in.) access door at the hose connection. The crew neglected to run through the required checklist before takeoff. They heard a thumping noise during takeoff, but despite published warnings about this possibility, they did not realize the door was loose.

Trying to determine if the racket came from an engine problem, the captain reduced power on all four engines, although it would have been safer to check one of them at a time. The loss of speed took the Electra close to its stall point, but the first officer was not monitoring airspeed and altitude as he should have been. The plane stalled and struck the ground. The NTSB criticized the lack of crew coordination and concluded dryly, "The captain attempted both to determine the cause of the vibration and fly the airplane simultaneously, which he was unable to do." In fact, the open door would not have been a hazard if the sound had been properly diagnosed.

What should be done to restore the safety margins? The controller shortage offers only one relatively quick fix: rehire more of the fired PATCO controllers. Many have not found comparable-paying jobs and would be eager to get back at their consoles. But FAA Chief Engen, reflecting the Administration's position, says, "No way." According to the GAO survey, 60% of the current controllers and 85% of their supervisors oppose such a move, though a majority of those at some of the busiest traffic centers say they would have no objection. In fact, about 500 of the less militant PATCO members have been quietly rehired. Many airline pilots would like to see more of the former controllers brought back "with a wink and a nod" to strengthen the system.

The pilots argue that the fired PATCO members bear few grudges against the recently hired people. "All this animosity is the rhetoric of 1981 and 1982," argues Jim Holtsclaw, manager of the FAA facility in Los Angeles.

Congress last year approved a request by Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole for funds to add 1,000 new controllers over two years. Dole claims, with little support, that the "system was way overstaffed before the strike" and that new "air-flow" procedures have made it possible for fewer controllers to handle more flights safely.

The air-flow plan has indeed reduced the number of aircraft stacked in the skies in bad weather around major airports. Instead, the delays are taken in "gate holds" on the ground, planes are not allowed to leave until they have a chance to land promptly at their next stop. This prudent procedure caused more than 70,000 holiday travelers around the nation to be delayed last week when fog closed Atlanta's Hartsfield International Airport, a major airline hub. While the air-flow controls may annoy passengers eager to get going on their trips, pilots and controllers prefer it to in-air stacking because it leaves fewer airborne planes to worry about.

As fuel costs have gone down and delays have increased, however, the airlines are pushing to get their planes aloft closer to schedule. They want more departure and arrival routes established so that more of the sky space is utilized. They would also like to reduce the 15-mile minimum spacing between following airliners so that more traffic can be moved in the same time. Planes heading toward a landing at 220 m.p.h. thus are about four minutes apart.

Most safety experts argue that the already strained system is not able to accommodate either more stacking, closer flying or more routes to be controlled. But the FAA seems ready to bow to some of the airline pressure. The agency's regional traffic managers expect to meet in February, and may consider a ten-mile interval in time for the summer season.

The need for more FAA inspectors is obvious. In the view of Jim Burnett, it may even be more important for FAA inspectors to develop a new attitude toward their work. "They must take a more aggressive position," he says. Specifically, Burnett would like to see more spot inspections to detect any cheating on-maintenance rules.

The NTSB has also urged the FAA to require pilots and copilots on commuter airlines to be checked more frequently on their instrument flying. The safety board urges faster development of a program to provide flight simulators to train these pilots and asks that the commuter carriers be required to provide at least one experienced pilot on each flight, rather than have two newcomers work together. No single move, however, could ease the worries of pilots and passengers alike more than installing collision-warning devices on airplanes. After years of indecision and delay, the FAA is finally moving to put such a system in place.

Safety experts advocate such short-term and relatively inexpensive improvements as clearer runway markings, tighter control over carry-on luggage that can hurl about a cabin in a crash landing, and greater fire resistance in airline cabin fabrics.

The FAA's Engen says the country urgently needs more airports and runways. But airport expansion around many major cities is almost prohibitively expensive and politically difficult if, indeed, suitable land can be found. This seems mostly a dream.

More modestly, the FAA is starting to install new computers at its en-route control centers. It has also proposed a \$24 billion long-term airport and air-traffic control modernization program. Where the money will come from has not been decided. The FAA's critics want the agency to use some of the \$8 billion that has accumulated in an aviation trust fund, which comes mainly from an 8% tax on all airline tickets. This reservoir of cash has been hoarded by the Administration to keep the federal deficit from looking worse than it is.

Though final Administration and congressional approval of the modernization plan remains uncertain, the need is clear. The expansion of air travel will continue relentlessly; domestic airline traffic is expected to grow by 5% in each of the next four years. Unless more steps are taken soon to remedy the serious shortcomings in the nation's air-traffic system, the recent good luck of millions of sky travelers could run out.

(By Ed Magnuson. Reported by Jerry Hannifin/Washington and Lee Griggs/Chicago, with other bureaus.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the minority leader is recognized.

BICENTENNIAL MINUTE

FEBRUARY 2, 1890: SENATE INVESTIGATES LEAKS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 97 years ago this month, in February 1890, an unusual special Senate committee was created. That panel had the responsibility of interrogating every Member of the Senate to determine who was leaking information to the press about the Senate's executive sessions. Although the Senate had opened its legislative sessions to the public in 1794, it had continued to debate all executive business—treaties and nominations—behind closed doors.

Enterprising newspaper correspondents had little trouble reconstructing what went on in these secret sessions. In the parlance of the time, every reporter "had his own Senator." That is, smart reporters cultivated good relations with at least one Senator, who in turn would provide a reasonable accounting of what was said, what votes were cast. As soon as the doors were opened after an executive session, reporters sought out their sources, compiled their stories, and filed their dispatches for the next day's papers.

In 1890, Senator James Dolph of Oregon became vexed over the repeated leakage of supposedly secret information concerning treaties. At Dolph's instigation, the Senate created a special committee, which he chaired, to uncover the source of the leaks. First the committee called newsmen, who naturally refused to divulge their sources. Then it summoned the Senators themselves. The New York Times reported how the Senate pages scattered throughout the Capitol, calling individual Senators to the committee

to give testimony. Not surprisingly, no Senator admitted to leaking secret session information. The Senate "smelling committee," as the press dubbed it, came to a frustrating end, no wiser than when it started: Leaks continued as before. It would take another 40 years before the Senate abolished, for the most part, its secret executive sessions, and held all of its debate in public.

JUDGE HARRY WILFRED FISHER—100 YEARS YOUNG

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this past weekend I had the pleasure of returning to my home State to celebrate the 126th anniversary of Kansas.

Republicans from every corner of the State use this festive occasion to meet in Topeka to participate in "Kansas Day" activities. An annual event where we renew old acquaintances and honor the good work of dedicated Kansans.

It was a special treat this year to salute an old friend and a Kansas legend: He is Judge Harry Fisher, who on January 29 celebrated his 100th birthday! Still active and sharp, he is an inspiration to all of us. Think of it: When he was born, Kansas was only 26 years old! No doubt about it, there is not much Kansas history Judge Fisher did not witness *firsthand*: From Alf Landon to Dwight Eisenhower, from William Allan White to our present Republican Governor, Mike Hayden.

In fact, on this past Saturday, Judge Fisher called on Alf Landon, Alf Landon being a youngster; he is only 99. They had a very good visit—the 100-year-old Judge Fisher and the 99-year-old former Governor, Alf Landon. They talked about a lot of things in the past. Their hearing is not as good as it once was, so they probably talked a little louder than they did 30 or 40 years ago. It was a great picture that appeared in the Topeka Capital and the Kansas City Star of these two outstanding men and what they had to say about the past.

Judge Fisher also spoke to the Kansas Day celebration that evening. It was a remarkable speech. He went right to the platform, made a very nice statement, had a lot of fun, talked a little about 1988. It was certainly an inspiration to all of us.

Judge Fisher first served as county attorney for Linn County, then practiced law in Fort Scott; he was next appointed to a State bankruptcy court, won election to the State legislature in 1933, and then served 20 years as a distinguished district court judge. He remains a wellspring of wisdom; and he still drives his own car.

In fact, in his visit with Alf Landon, Senator KASSEBAUM's father, he showed Alf Landon his driver's licence,

and I understand that Alf wondered why he cannot get one. If Judge Fisher has one at 100, he ought to have one at 99. I do not know how that came out. In any event, it was an indication of the current events they were discussing.

I know that the people of Kansas, and his countless hometown admirers in Fort Scott, join me in saluting this great Kansan, Judge Fisher, on reaching a very special milestone. We can all learn from his birthday declaration: "It's one thing to be 100 years old, and another to be a useful citizen." I think that says it all.

Tonight, the Fort Scott Chamber of Commerce will honor this outstanding American. I know that we all wish him well.

Mr. President, I also wish to state, as a matter of personal reference, that we also had the opportunity to meet again a friend of the presiding officer, former Senator Frank Carlson, who was in attendance Saturday night.

He said:

The first thing I want you to do is to convey my best wishes to my great friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Senator JOHN STENNIS.

Former Senator Carlson, 93 years of age, was also honored at our Topeka, KS, festivities, for a record of service that has been unmatched for service to the Nation: a Member of the House, a U.S. Senator. No one else in Kansas has had that record.

I know that the Presiding Officer [Mr. STENNIS] is proud of his good friend, former Senator Carlson, who started the prayer breakfast in the Senate many years ago.

RELEASE GERALD SEIB

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, we feel anew a sense of outrage today as yet another American has been snatched off the streets and is being held against his will, this time in Tehran.

He is Gerald Seib, a reporter for the Wall Street Journal, and a native Kansan from Hays. Judging from reports, there is absolutely no reason why this journalist should be detained. He is a fully credentialed, working journalist—and a darn good one according to his colleagues.

Unfortunately, the Iranian Government has not responded to the urgent and legitimate questions that the State Department—and the Seib family—are asking. So today we send this message to Tehran—loud and clear: Release Gerald Seib now—immediately and unconditionally—so that he can rejoin his wife and family.

Until that time, I urge my colleagues to follow the wishes of Gerald's father, Richard, who said this morning in Hays that "we just have to pray to God * * * appeal to everybody to pray with us."

We will pray—and we will continue to keep the pressure on Tehran, until it admits its terrible blunder and releases Gerald Seib.

LET'S OPEN OUR EYES TO ANC TERRORISM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week, Senator WALLOP and I sought immediate Senate action on a resolution dealing with the meeting between Secretary of State Shultz and African National Congress [ANC] leader Oliver Tambo. The resolution urged the Secretary to put at the top of his agenda for the meeting a demand that the ANC discontinue the use of terror tactics and renounce terrorism as a political weapon.

One major newspaper subsequently published an inaccurate and misleading editorial criticizing my support of the resolution. What concerns me about the editorial is not so much that it misrepresented my position, though it did. What disturbs me most is that it revealed a surprising and dangerous unawareness, or unconcern, about ANC terrorism.

Let us be clear what we are talking about. While he was here, Mr. Tambo kept talking about armed struggle. I am not talking about armed struggle by an oppressed people to win their rights. I am not talking about the legitimate right of a people to defend themselves when attacked. I am talking about terrorism—the use of violence against wholly innocent people, to force them into accepting your political program.

Let me also be clear about this. In saying that the ANC uses terrorism, I do not deny that whites use it, too, in South Africa, against blacks, including many in the ANC.

But that does not change the fact, or mitigate the horror, of the widespread and open—in fact, I can truly say, almost boastful—use of terrorism by the ANC.

I would like to put three recent newspaper articles on the subject of ANC terrorism into the Record this morning.

The first is a column from today's Washington Post, written by former Ambassador to the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick. In her column, Ambassador Kirkpatrick makes clear her strong opposition to the "nondemocratic, violent apartheid system" in South Africa. But she stresses her equal opposition to the nondemocratic, violent policies of the ANC, which offer not an end to bloodshed and oppression in South Africa, but merely its continuation in another guise. As usual, Ambassador Kirkpatrick's column should be must reading for all of us concerned about South Africa.

The second item I want to cite is a column written by Boston University President John Silber for the New

York Times late last year. I commend the entire column to my colleagues, but this morning I want to read just one short excerpt, a direct quote from one of the ANC's most prominent members, Winnie Mandela, wife of long-jailed ANC leader Nelson Mandela.

These are Mrs. Mandela's words to an ANC gathering last year:

Together, hand in hand with our boxes of matches and our "necklaces," we shall liberate this country.

I believe we all know that the "necklace" Mrs. Mandela refers to is not a piece of ANC decorative jewelry, but a gasoline-soaked tire, placed around a political opponent's neck, and then set afire.

The other item I would like to put in the RECORD is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal last week, just prior to the Shultz-Tambo meeting. Again, while urging my colleagues to read the entire editorial, let me quote just one brief section:

"Earlier this month * * * the French News Service * * * published an interview with * * * the ANC's military commander, in which he said the ANC considered white farmers to be legitimate targets. In New York last week, Mr. Tambo himself said that the killing of white civilians will have the beneficial effect of getting white people 'used to bleeding'."

Mr. President, these are not quotes from BOB DOLE. They are from the most prominent leaders of the ANC: Oliver Tambo, Winnie Mandela, and the rest. They are not a figment of my imagination. They are a part of the record, and a part of the tragic reality of South Africa.

White terrorism against blacks is part of that record, too, and an important cause of the problems of South Africa. But ANC terrorism—whether against whites or other blacks—cannot for that reason be justified or excused. ANC terrorism can never be part of the solution we want for South Africa.

Mr. President, if there is one thing on which all Americans agree, it is this: We abhor terrorism, and we will fight it wherever it appears. We launch air strikes against Qadhafi because of his support for terrorism; we refuse to negotiate with the PLO because of its embrace of terrorism; we are disturbed that the Iran initiative may have sent the wrong message about our terrorism policy.

Absolute, consistent opposition to terrorism; absolute, consistent refusal to negotiate with terrorists, until they renounce their use of terror; that is the American policy. And it is the right policy.

As right for southern Africa as for any other place in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the three articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1987]

THE SINISTER OLIVER TAMBO

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

When Oliver Tambo came to Washington last week to meet with Secretary of State George Shultz and speak to selected audiences about the African National Congress' "armed struggle" in South Africa, some American officials and supporters hoped he would disavow violence. Instead, Tambo, president of the ANC, offered an unembarrassed, unapologetic explanation of why the ANC intended to "intensify the arms struggle" until it envelops and destroys the whole of South Africa's "apartheid system," and why Americans should support the ANC in this effort.

The ANC, said Tambo, waged a nonviolent struggle against apartheid for 50 years and made no progress. Progress came only after it turned into "armed struggle" 20 years ago, he said.

"How can it be said we should use only constitutional means in our struggle, when all resistance is illegal and we have no way to change the brutal realities of the racist regime?" he asked. How can Americans ask South African blacks to accept the situation and surrender? he added. During his comments, Tambo cited the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence and the Founding Fathers to support "armed struggle" against a closed system. It was an argument tailor-made for Americans.

Almost all Americans agree with Tambo's indictment of apartheid and the violence it does to those who live under it. It is easy for Americans to understand why a movement that is banned would resort to force against the offending government and easy to share Tambo's outrage against a system in which one race (white) gets most of what there is to get, while everyone else divides what is left. But does this mean that Tambo's cause is our cause?

Is the ANC the political and moral equivalent of the Green Mountain Boys or the American revolutionary forces? Is Oliver Tambo the political and moral equivalent of Sam Adams or George Washington? Or is he the moral and political equivalent of Robespierre or Lenin or Daniel Ortega? What kind of government would Tambo establish in a post-apartheid South Africa—a democracy with freedom for all, or a one-party dictatorship with freedom for none?

One sees quickly that this slight, quiet black man does not resemble George Washington or Sam Adams or Martin Luther King Jr. or Jesse Jackson. Nor does he sound like any American political leader—black or white. He looks and sounds like a theoretician, a tactician of revolution. Years of forced exile have made him an underground leader of an underground organization. Perhaps this is why he discusses "armed struggle" in the detached fashion of those for whom flesh and blood opponents have long since become abstractions. Perhaps it is why he so coolly plans the total destruction of a society in which he has not lived for more than 25 years.

Tambo does not call for equal rights, or equal opportunity or equal power. He calls for the total destruction of the existing society. No part of the apartheid system he says is to be left intact. No reform can render it tolerable. "Apartheid either is or is not. And it must not be," he said.

One would think he could make common cause readily with all others who hate apartheid and institutionalized racism. That turns out not to be the case. Tambo and the ANC have redefined the key categories. "Opposing apartheid" has been redefined to mean opposing apartheid the ANC way—with violence and with the object of an ANC victory and an ANC state.

How can one take seriously Tambo's commitment to establish a democracy with rights for all when attacks on black opponents have become a regular feature of ANC tactics? How can one take seriously Tambo's commitment to democracy when blacks who use different means to end apartheid and seek a differently configured democratic government are considered "objective" supporters of apartheid?

Chief M.G. Buthelezi has opposed apartheid all his life and today opposes the various half-measures of the South African government, yet; he is described by Tambo as "the principal spokesman for apartheid in South Africa." Buthelezi, Tambo charges, is guilty of an unforgivable ideological deviation. He supports "ethnicity" and "tribalism," which Tambo says: "plays into the hands of the enemy." This is presumably the reason that more than 100 of Buthelezi's followers have been burned and hacked to death, and he himself targeted for assassination.

Supporting "ethnicity" is not the only "crime" for which a black opponent may be defined as an "objective" supporter of apartheid. Hundreds of blacks outside other ANC or Buthelezi's Inkatha movement have been "executed" in black-on-black violence. Jonas Savimbi, the black nationalist leader of Angola's freedom fighters, was denounced in Washington by Tambo as a "surrogate of the apartheid system," though Savimbi is hardly a proponent of white supremacy.

In Tambo's political world, racism and tolerance of opposition turn out to mean something different from what we think they do. Violence used against black opponents turns out to have nothing in common with the force used by American revolutionaries against British troops. And the struggle in South Africa turns out not just to be a struggle against apartheid.

Oliver Tambo asked his U.S. audience not to view the struggle in South Africa "through an East-West prism." He first should have made the request to his supporters, who unfurled a banner from the balcony of the hall in which he spoke. It said: "The struggle continues from Nicaragua to South Africa: Victory to the ANC."

I wonder what they meant by that?

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1986]

IN SOUTH AFRICA, BLACK LENINISM

(By John R. Silber)

BOSTON.—Congress battled President Reagan and won legislation to impose sanctions against South Africa in hopes of ending apartheid. But if we are genuinely concerned about helping South Africans to achieve racial justice without creating large-scale bloodshed, economic deprivation and political oppression, we must now face squarely the nature of an organization widely regarded as the legitimate voice of black South African protest: the African National Congress.

The view of the A.N.C. as the South African equivalent of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s Southern Christian Leadership Conference is a tragic mistake. In recent decades, the A.N.C. has become domi-

nated by leaders voicing strident Leninism, an ideology they have sought to implement by terrorism and murder—largely against blacks, so far.

Consider recent statements by various A.N.C. leaders. About two months ago, "Radio Freedom," the A.N.C.'s Ethiopia-based station, carried a statement from Joe Modine, commander of the military wing of the A.N.C., that makes quite clear the organization's terrorist orientation. Black South Africans, he said, should "organize themselves into groups, and policemen should be ambushed and their weapons taken; bombs and petrol bombs should be made from locally available materials." The people should "identify collaborators and enemy agents and deal with them."

It is important to remember that the police he talked about are, mostly, blacks, as are the "collaborators"—the A.N.C.'s characterization of blacks who oppose its program. The method of "dealing with" such "collaborators" is to place rubber tires soaked in gasoline over their heads and set them alight. The devices are known as a "necklaces."

Lest one thinks such tactics are approved only by extremists within the military wing of the A.N.C. listen to Winnie Mandela, wife of the jailed former A.N.C. leader, Nelson Mandela, who spoke at Muncieville on April 13: "Together, hand in hand with our boxes of matches and our necklaces, we shall liberate this country."

Mrs. Mandela is sometimes compared to Coretta Scott King. Her Muncieville statement demonstrates the monstrous inaccuracy of the comparison.

The ruthlessness of the A.N.C. is perhaps best demonstrated by Johnny Makatini, the organization's representative at the United Nations, who recently said that "if there were only four million of us left after the revolution, that would be better than the present situation." He alludes here with indifference to the possibility of deaths of 17 million South African blacks. This cruel and cold-blooded indifference to suffering and death is incompatible with Dr. King's deeply humane vision. Mr. Makatini is prepared to destroy black South Africa in order to save it.

These statements foreshadow the sort of government the A.N.C. would install once in power. They who strive to rule through terror usually rule by terror.

Moses Mabhida, as A.N.C. executive council member, put the organization on record in support of the most brutal tactics: "We express our full solidarity with the Afghanistan People's Democratic Party—we fully understand and support the timely assistance of the Soviet Union."

This is not mere casual support for the Soviet Union. The African National Congress has been perfectly frank about the economic and political policies it would adopt if in power. Mrs. Mandela was quoted by Pravda as saying: "The Soviet Union is the torchbearer for all our hopes and aspirations. In Soviet Russia, genuine power of the people has been transformed from dreams into reality."

The best that can be said about this statement is that it reflects a terribly dangerous naivete. The worst is that Mrs. Mandela wishes to impose on fellow South Africans a dictatorship as brutal as that imposed by Moscow on the Ethiopians and the Afghans.

A Soviet-style dictatorship would deny basic human rights to South Africans of all colors and destroy what is now the most dynamic economy in Africa, creating in its

place an economy like those that keep the rest of Africa in desperate poverty and drive millions of blacks to seek work in South Africa.

When Americans demand that the South African Government share power with the African National Congress, they demand power-sharing with an organization committed to terror, oppression and poverty. The blacks of South Africa will not find a better life under an A.N.C. dictatorship. We would be better advised to support the claims of proved democratic opponents of apartheid, such as Chief Mangosuthu Gatscha Buthelezi, leader of six million Zulus, and Bishop Isaac Mokoena, leader of millions of blacks in the Reformed Independent Church Association. In this direction alone lies hope

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 1987]

THE REAL ANC STANDS UP

This week, the African National Congress takes center stage in Washington as Secretary of State George Shultz holds his first meeting with ANC President Oliver Tambo. It is ironic that this meeting should come so shortly after the nation has celebrated the late Martin Luther King's birthday.

The Rev. King's legacy is that of seeking and achieving political change through peaceful struggle. He always spoke out against violence, even after his followers had been beaten—and some even killed—by white racists. Mr. Tambo speaks for a group that wages a campaign of terror against not only whites but also blacks who have nothing to do with the gross injustices of apartheid.

Earlier this month the State Department congratulated Mr. Tambo for renouncing the use of violence against civilian targets during ceremonies marking the ANC's 75th anniversary. A day later, the French news service Agence France-Presse published an interview with Joe Modise, the ANC's military commander, in which he said the ANC considered white farmers to be legitimate targets. In New York last week, Mr. Tambo himself said that the killing of white civilians will have the beneficial effect of getting white people "used to bleeding." A State Department desk officer calls such comments "disturbing" and evidence that there is "no unity of opinion in the ANC."

We are hard put to see how the State Department can believe that the achievement of a stable post-apartheid society will be aided by lending credence to the idea that the fragmented ANC speaks for South Africa's 20 million blacks. Undersecretary of State Michael Armacost nonetheless enhanced this unfortunate argument last month when he said: "The purpose [of the Shultz-Tambo meeting] is not to legitimize a military movement, but to facilitate a dialogue between the government of South Africa and the legitimate voice of the black community."

In the absence of free elections, it is impossible to know who the authentic leaders of South Africa's blacks are. All the more reason for the U.S. to promote constructive blacks such as Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, the leader of six million Zulus, and Bishop Isaac Mokoena, the head of the one-million-member Reformed Independent Churches.

Mr. Buthelezi, a former member of the ANC, has a long record of opposition to apartheid. His eloquent, sustained efforts to achieve a primarily political transition away from apartheid surely reflect more closely the spirit of the Rev. King than the ANC's frequent resort to terror against fellow

blacks. It is ironic that in this country, a man such as Buthelezi is often blithely dismissed as irrelevant.

State Department officials believe that through regular contact with the ANC, it can be weaned away from the influence of the South African Communist Party. Yet the State Department's own report last month to Congress on the ANC admits that confirmed and suspected members of the SACP make up "roughly half the 30 members" of the ANC's National Executive Council.

A report by the London-based Institute for the Study of Terrorism details the ANC's links with the SACP. Lord Chalfont, a minister of state in the British foreign office during the 1964-70 British Labor government, concluded that the report "indicates, if the ANC has its way, it will be a one-party Communist-dominated state; and like most regimes which gain power by terror it is likely to perpetuate itself by the same means."

Encouragement of what democratic elements exist in a group such as the ANC is always desirable, but the U.S. has a poor record of playing this card. The last time the U.S. put its chips on the side of a similar "broad-based" revolutionary movement it wound up with a Marxist state that practices a campaign of subversion against its neighbors, aided by Havana and Moscow. That country is Nicaragua.

The State Department's strategy is the same old dry hole. In dealing with revolutionaries, the first question is: Who has the guns? The ANC receives \$80 million a year in military aid from the Soviets. Its military chief of staff is Joe Slovo, the Lithuanian-born chairman of the South African Communist Party. If black ANC nationalists, such as Mr. Tambo, ever seriously attempted to curb communist influence in the organization, the result would surely be bloody conflict with the likes of only Mr. Slovo left standing.

What little is known of the ANC's internal structure points in one direction. Bartholomew Hlapane, who was a member of both the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party and the ANC's National Executive Committee, defected from the ANC. In 1982, he came to the U.S. and testified on the ANC's composition before the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism.

He said: "No major decision could be taken by the ANC without the concurrence and approval of the Central Committee of the SA Communist Party. Most major developments were in fact initiated by the Central Committee. The military wing of the ANC was the brainchild of the SACP." Shortly after Mr. Hlapane returned to South Africa, ANC gunmen broke into his home, murdered him and crippled two of his children.

The U.S. opposition to apartheid has shifted into the hands of advocates of abrupt, radical change. They support the pullout of U.S. businesses, resulting in sudden job loss for blacks and primary support for Mr. Tambo's ANC, which condones political murder. On Wednesday Sec. Shultz will become a participant in this process. It is to be hoped that all these people will make certain that what rises from the ashes of apartheid is not something even more oppressive to the human spirit.

Mr. DOLE. I just suggest that apartheid is wrong. But I also suggest that terrorism is wrong. I do not care who may practice it.

I would hope that we can look at this objectively, and those of us who have concerns about Mr. Tambo, I hope we can continue to raise our voices in an effort to bring an end to terrorism on all sides in South Africa.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is now recognized for 5 minutes.

YES, THE TIME FOR GLOOM AND DOOM HAS COME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the fiscal year 1986, the first year the Gramm-Rudman deficit-reduction bill was in full effect, what happened to the deficit? Did the Congress meet the Gramm-Rudman target of a deficit of \$172 billion? No; the Congress failed to hit the target. It failed by a whopping \$50 billion. How does the situation look for the current 1987 fiscal year? We are now 4 months into the 1987 fiscal year. The administration—although always optimistic—acknowledges that there is now no chance the Congress can meet the Gramm-Rudman 1987 goal of a \$144-billion-dollar deficit. But they are still optimistic. This time their optimism persuades them that the Congress will only exceed the goal by \$30 billion. They tell us the deficit will come in for the full 1987 fiscal year at about \$174 billion. Is this realistic? No; indeed. The first fiscal quarter of 1987 is already history. It started on October 1, 1986. It ended on December 31, 1986. During that quarter the growth of the economy was only slightly more than half the pace the administration had estimated for the full fiscal year. It came in at a feeble 1.7 percent rate. During that quarter what was the Federal fiscal deficit? It was a whopping \$63 billion. For that one-fourth of the fiscal year. What does that tell us about the prospects for the fiscal deficit for the entire fiscal 1987 year? It tells us that if the economy follows the same track in relationship to the first quarter growth in 1987 that it did last year, the fiscal deficit will be roughly \$200 billion in 1987. It will miss its target by about \$50 billion again.

Now keep in mind, Mr. President, this is not a recession economy. This is a recovering economy. We are now in the fifth year of one of the longest economic recoveries in American history. The huge deficits should be pushing economic growth ahead at a record pace. That's not all. There's more. The fiscal deficits are accompanied by the easiest and most expansive monetary policy on record. With this fiscal and monetary combination the economy

should be growing by leaps and bounds. Is it? No; it was limping along at a pathetic 1.7 percent in the last quarter. The economy should be speeding ahead at a 5 percent or 6 percent rate with this kind of fiscal and monetary stimulus. So, what's wrong? A few years ago we had a persuasive alibi. The dollar had risen sharply. It had zoomed ahead especially in relationship to the Japanese yen and the German mark. But not now. Both the yen and the mark have strengthened to the point where the dollar is lower now than at any time in the past 10 years. This should bring big export expansion to American industry. It should sharply lower imports. By now our trade balance should be greatly improved. But is it? No; our enormously adverse balance of trade continues. We are exporting more jobs now than ever before. We are also exporting economic growth as never before.

So, why not be honest about our economic situation? Let us cut out the nonsense. We are not reducing the deficit. Gramm-Rudman is not working. The economy staggers feebly along. We have tried the most stimulative fiscal policy in peacetime American history. We have had back to back to back to back super deficits at or near \$200 billion for 5 successive years. A few years ago, no economic stimulus fanatic hyped to the gills on wild dreams of Keynesian stimulus could have imagined such a super stimulus. Well, we have got it. And last year the Fed more than played its part with an explosive 17 percent growth in the M-1 money supply. And what is the result? Accelerating economic growth? No; the economy has slowed to a crawl.

So, what do we do if and when our economy moves into recession? The answer whether we plan it or not would be at least a \$300 billion or more likely a \$400 or \$500 billion deficit. Such a deficit would not be part of a recovery plan. The mammoth deficit would be an automatic reaction to recession. Revenues would fall. Without any tax cut the drop in personal and corporate income would torpedo tax collections. Without any change by the Congress in spending, welfare costs would climb. Unemployment compensation would explode. Could monetary policy help? No way. We have already pushed that as far as it will go.

The next recession will be devastating for another reason. This country's corporations are in debt as never before. So are millions of its citizens. Debt—corporate and private in relationship to income—is at an alltime high. Savings are at an alltime low. The Federal Government has exhausted its ability to borrow its way out of the next recession. So have many American corporations. So have millions of American citizens.

Is this a statement of gloom and doom? It sure is. It is something else. It is a statement of truth about our economic status. The first and most painful step toward a responsible and reasonable national economic policy is to recognize the truth. Sure this truth is gloomy. It measures how long a journey we have to travel to economic responsibility. It also measures how urgently it is for us to start traveling that road. And now.

TOM LOFTUS ON THE JOY OF LEGISLATING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our State is blessed with a remarkable young speaker of the State assembly. He is not only extraordinarily bright and articulate, he is a master at working out that most essential of legislative challenges: compromises that will win a majority and become workable and constructive laws. In other words, he is a superlative legislator.

Recently, this young man delivered a speech to the Wisconsin State assembly on the occasion of his becoming speaker of our State assembly for the third time. I call this speech to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. Senate because it is a remarkable happy evocation of the joys of legislating. This speech applies as well to those of us who are serving in the U.S. Senate as well as those who serve in the Wisconsin Legislature.

Let me deliver one brief paragraph from this remarkable speech. Listen:

This Chamber is your arena where, as representatives of 50,000 people each, you will do battle. It is a place of both logic and emotion, high dudgeon and friendly humor. It is humans at their best and every gradation below their best. It's a fishbowl of democracy . . . It is like the Assembly at Athens in its Golden Age. Indeed we are the heirs of Solon who set the reforms in motion for democracy to flourish in the time of Pericles.

Mr. President, that young man's name is Tom Loftus. One way or another, I predict you will hear more about him—a lot more in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech upon election as speaker of the State assembly be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE ASSEMBLY SPEAKER
TOM LOFTUS

Thank you. I consider it a privilege and an honor to be chosen by you to be the Speaker for a third term.

No legislator in Wisconsin history has served more than three terms as Speaker.

My colleagues know of my love for this house. For those of you who are now being called freshmen, you will find this a great place to be and a tough place to leave.

This Chamber is your arena where, as representatives of 50,000 people each, you will do battle. It is a place of both logic and emotion, high dudgeon and friendly humor. It is humans at their best and every gradation

below their best. It's a fishbowl for democracy.

It is, as you will hear me say on occasion, like the Assembly at Athens in its Golden Age.

Indeed, we are the heirs of Solon who set the reforms in motion for democracy to flourish in the time of Pericles.

Solon was that rare individual at the right place in the right time. He forged the consensus that kept together a society on the verge of disintegration.

Solon was a redistribute-the-wealth kind of guy who went for half a loaf. Conservatives thought he went too far, radicals criticized him for not going far enough.

He got away with a graduated income tax based on property wealth and let more people participate in the fledgling democracy. He said the Athenians didn't get the best laws, but they got the best laws the conflicting groups and interests at that time could be persuaded to accept.

When he had the opportunity to become a permanent dictator, he refused, saying that dictatorship was "a very fair spot, but there was no way down from it."

Solon clipped the power of the Senate a bit and invigorated the Assembly, letting a more representative group serve in that body.

In the Golden Age the Assembly was the place to be. The Senate was in decline and Pericles was very much a man of the people.

The Assembly was much like the annual meeting. All who were eligible were members.

Each session opened with a sacrifice of a pig to Zeus.

The member who proposed new legislation is responsible for it. If it turns out bad, he may be fined, disenfranchised, or put to death. A way of discouraging hasty legislation that our new majority leader is proposing that we adopt.

A historian described the Assembly this way:

"Only trained orators avail themselves of the right to speak, for the Assembly is a difficult audience. It laughs at mispronunciations, protests aloud at digressions, expresses its approval with shouts, whistling and clapping of hands, and, if it strongly disapproves, makes such a din that the speaker is compelled to leave the rostrum."

The upper house is described as "above the Assembly in dignity, inferior to it in power."

So we are lucky, but our colleagues from history, from Solon to Jefferson, and from Milt Lorman to Harvey Dueholm, have set for us high standards.

This session, let's work on walking in their footsteps, before we break new paths.

This session, let's do more listening to people, other than ourselves, who have something to say.

I will send presently letters to all those of both parties thinking of running for President to drop by and address us when they are in Wisconsin. I will also invite others who have something to say to speak to us and I solicit your suggestions.

This session let's defend the Legislature as a beloved institution and pledge not to criticize it unfairly for personal gain. This session we will continue to work to be an equal branch of government. However, we have a new Governor, he is Governor of all the people, we only need one Governor, and there is no need for me, especially me, or others, to try to do his job for him.

We will try to make our disagreement with him and among ourselves as civilized as

possible so we can accept agreement with grace rather than surprise.

And this session I hope you join me in making this a special two years for our children.

We have in our grasp the potential to pass laws that will help a generation reach their full potential. We can help to make newborns healthy; we can help those at risk with their early education; we can help working parents by making their life of both work and raising kids more do-able; we can help educate about the danger of drugs; we can have good grade schools, good high schools and we can have a university waiting for them that is both academically sound and affordable; and we can do our part to help make sure there will be jobs available when they get out of high school, vocational college or the university.

It's a great day in the State Assembly. I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, December 27 marked the seventh anniversary of the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. These have been nightmarish years for Afghanistan, bringing a genocidal holocaust to the people of that nation. In addition, the invasion and occupation have altered the geopolitical contours of Southeast Asia.

Pakistan is now threatened. Once, Afghanistan provided a buffer between Pakistan and the Soviet Empire. Now, 120,000 Soviet troops armed with the most modern weaponry are waging war in Afghanistan, much of it very near Pakistan's border. The buffer is gone.

For more than a century, first the czar and then the Soviets, have sought to gain a port on the Indian Ocean. In testimony before the Congressional Task Force on Afghanistan, former U.S. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick put the contemporary situation into historical perspective, saying, "the Soviet goal in Afghanistan is effective incorporation of Afghanistan and achievement of a warm water port and geopolitical access to Iran and Pakistan."

How serious are Soviet intentions in Southwest Asia? One measure is the length of the war: 7 years—longer than the Soviet's war against Hitler. Another measure is the level of violence: the war in Afghanistan has killed at least a million Afghans, most of them noncombatants. It has driven more than a third of the nation into exile in Pakistan and Iran.

Pakistan, for its part has shown great courage and statesmanship in opposing the Soviet rape of her neighbor. For her efforts, Pakistan has been threatened and bullied by the Kremlin. In March 1986, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Peck, addressing the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, characterized the situation this way: "Harsh Soviet threats aimed at undermining Pakistan's sense of security continued throughout the year as well. Confident of our support, Pakistan has remained steadfast despite these threats, refusing to recognize the Soviet controlled regime in Kabul or to acquiesce in the continuing Soviet efforts to subjugate the Afghan people."

In an escalating campaign of intimidation, the KGB and its counterpart in the Soviet puppet regime in Kabul have directed terrorist attacks against civilians in Pakistan. Pakistani villages have been shelled from Afghanistan. And the Soviets and their puppets in Kabul have launched an increasing number of air attacks on villages and refugee camps inside Pakistan. In 1985, there were 251 such attacks. In 1986, the number rose to 757, more than double, more in fact than triple the air attacks launched against Pakistan from inside Afghanistan. According to congressional testimony, some of those attacks were flown by Soviet pilots whose aircraft were painted in Afghan markings.

But Pakistan has stood her ground courageously. And in standing as a bulwark against Soviet imperialism, Pakistan stands not only in defense of her own security but that of all nations who value independence. All such nations owe a great debt to the people and Government of Pakistan, and it is a debt which cannot be discharged by words alone. That is why the United States has offered Pakistan a program of economic and military assistance over the next 6 years. The Congress must understand the increasingly important role Pakistan plays in Southwest Asia, and ensure the program is enacted as requested by President Reagan.

Because of the importance of the region, the Soviet Union must not underestimate our commitment to Pakistan's security. That is why, for its part, Congress must pass expeditiously the program of assistance. That is why, for its part, the executive must repeatedly and clearly state this Nation's obligations to Pakistan. To quote Secretary of State Shultz from his remarks before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "It is vital that we help ensure the security of Pakistan in the face of Soviet intimidation."

As background, I point out that Pakistan and the United States signed a bilateral security agreement in 1959, which binds the United States to con-

sult with Pakistan in the event of aggression. Article I of the agreement states: "The Government of Pakistan is determined to resist aggression. In case of aggression against Pakistan, the Government of the United States of America, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, will take such appropriate action, including the use of armed forces, as may be mutually agreed upon and as is envisaged in the joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East, in order to assist the Government of Pakistan at its request."

As further background, the joint resolution to promote peace and stability was signed in 1957, and states: "The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism."

As a measure of its support for Pakistan's security in the face of Soviet designs on Pakistan's territory, the United States is completing delivery in fiscal year 1987 of a 6-year program of economic and military assistance. Agreement has been reached for a larger follow-on program, and the administration has forwarded a request to the Congress where hearings will soon begin. I urge my colleagues to consider the request in the context of the real and present danger to Pakistan which has arisen out of that country's courageous and principled stand against Soviet imperialism.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 3:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

The Chair now recognizes the Senators from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY relating to the introduction of legislation are printed later in the RECORD under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROBERT GATES TO BE DIRECTOR, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we have learned the sad news that William Casey is stepping down as the Director of Central Intelligence Agency, although it is not perhaps surprising since he has undergone medical care that requires a longer convalescence than would permit a continuation of his position as DCI and permit his absence from that position for such an extended time. The President has indicated he will appoint Mr. Robert Gates, the present Deputy, as the new Director.

I would rise simply to note that in 1984, as the period of our terms as chairman and vice chairman respectively of the Senate Intelligence Committee drew to a close, Barry Goldwater, our beloved friend of so many years in this Chamber, and I jointly introduced a bill that provided that henceforth the Director of CIA should be a person who has been a career civilian or military intelligence officer.

It was our thought that the problems of political associations in the directorship worked to the disadvantage of the community and, indeed, ultimately and often to the disadvantage of the President who needs as much as possible an absolutely neutral career adviser in that post.

The choice of Mr. Gates is the choice of such a person. I welcome that.

I would note that although Senator Goldwater has, of course, left, on the first day of this 100th Congress I introduced S. 43, the identical bill, indicating nothing more than we felt two things had happened: One, the time had come that there was a large number of career intelligence officers, both civilian and military, from which one could choose such a director.

This was not the case in 1947 when the Defense Act of that year established the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency.

From time to time we have had career officers. Rear Adm. Roscoe Hillen Koepter was such an officer, a very distinguished one, the very first one in such an agency. Rather surprisingly, though you might think it would move the other way, at first the very political persons would have come in because of the absence of career officers, and then later more career officers.

Of late, we have seen more political than career officers in that position. I do not think that this always served the best interests of the intelligence

community, nor did my colleague, Chairman Barry Goldwater. So, to see this come about, to see come about a development that we had thought might be necessary to legislate, is welcome.

It is also, perhaps, suggesting that the legislation is, even so, in order. You might suggest that the President himself has reached a not dissimilar conclusion for the purposes, of course, of only this one appointment; but it might indicate a general movement of opinion in the executive branch not different from that which was expressed here by Senator Goldwater and myself.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for his courtesy in giving me the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota seeks recognition.

The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield a couple of minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania who I suspect has some special references.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for yielding.

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I take the floor at this moment to comment on the Penn State University football team, the national champions, who were honored earlier today in a ceremony in the White House and who a few moments ago were honored in a ceremony in Dirksen 192, Mr. President, the room where you preside as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

They are an outstanding group of young men. They are here today in the presence of their coach, Mr. Joe Paterno, and president of the university, Dr. Bryce Jordan.

Penn State is a tribute not only to the State of Pennsylvania but to the United States of America as an outstanding football team. They achieved the national championship under great pressure, having played last year in the Orange Bowl and having lost in a very difficult game to the University of Oklahoma. Penn State took on the University of Miami this year in the most exciting game ever played in collegiate football, and Penn State emerged victorious.

With that football excellence, they have also maintained a very high level of academic achievement where Coach Paterno and Penn State University have stressed academic excellence, as President Reagan said earlier today, preparation not only for football but preparation for life.

So, it is a distinct pleasure that I note the ceremony today earlier at the

White House, the ceremony earlier today in Dirksen 192 and commendation for this great national championship football team.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We thank you for your fine message.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Thank you very much.

I wish I could have equal time. I think it will take several years for me to do that.

I did look up to the gallery. We are not supposed to make references to the gallery, but I can recall only one more impressive sight than that team and that was when we had 16 sumo wrestlers up there as the guests of our colleagues from Hawaii at that time.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT GATES AS DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today as we learn that our intelligence community and America is experiencing a changing of the guard. Mr. William Casey, who has been Director of Central Intelligence since 1981, who may have been the longest serving Director of Central Intelligence had it not been for his recent illness, has resigned from that position.

Since Bill Casey entered the hospital last December for removal of a brain tumor, we have all prayed for a swift and complete recovery. We are told that Mr. Casey is progressing well since his surgery; for that we are all thankful.

Mr. Casey became the Director of Central Intelligence at a time when more was demanded of the intelligence community of this country than ever before. The Director became the major player in such areas as counterterrorism and drug interdiction in addition to the normal intelligence requirements. He did not, as some insist, solicit this business. It was delivered because of the special and unique capacity of the intelligence community under Bill Casey's leadership. Technological advances continued at a rapid pace. The requirements for timely and accurate intelligence increased while collection of such intelligence has become increasingly difficult and resources are more constrained than ever.

My membership on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence spanned all of Bill Casey's tenure as DCI. From his initial appointment until less than 1 month ago, I witnessed his stewardship of our intelligence community first hand. I saw many successes that others will not and cannot see, successes that would have not been possible without the

diligence and commitment of his effort. The agreement between the executive and legislative branches on the need for a national intelligence strategy, which lays out requirements and goals for intelligence policy, was a striking success. The quality of analysis within the CIA has improved substantially under Casey's tenure. When I first came to the Select Committee on Intelligence in 1978, we were discussing how to avoid intelligence failures such as those experienced in analyzing events in the Shah's Iran and Somoza's Nicaragua. We have not had comparable failures under Mr. Casey.

Bill Casey deserves much credit for his leadership of the intelligence community during a dynamic and complex 6 years. Under his leadership, morale throughout the intelligence community is far better now than when he took over. Through his tireless support of the people who are our most precious intelligence asset, Bill Casey rekindled a sense of pride in those who have dedicated their lives to the intelligence profession. Through his patient and painstaking work, he restored the national and international credibility of our intelligence agencies.

Bill Casey earned my respect for his performance as DCI. As our intelligence community moves toward the 21st century, his contributions will continue to make a substantial mark. I am sure I speak for many when I voice my hope that his recovery will continue to proceed rapidly and we look forward to his future contributions in American public life.

President Reagan accepted DCI Casey's resignation with regret and quickly moved to nominate Robert Gates as Mr. Casey's successor. Robert Gates first joined the CIA 20 years ago; his confirmation as DCI would make him the first CIA career official to hold that position in over a decade. Mr. Gates has been acting DCI during Casey's absence; he has been Deputy Director of Central Intelligence since April 1986. Bob Gates was confirmed for that post while I was chairman of Select Committee on Intelligence. At his confirmation hearing, I pointed out the major strength he brought to the position of DDCI: His ability to state the facts as he knew them regardless of the political environment. That is an essential quality in any professional intelligence officer. Bob Gates has handled his responsibilities well, demonstrating commitment, integrity, and ability.

As I was convinced that Bob Gates was an excellent choice for Deputy Director last April, today I am convinced that he will be an effective Director of Central Intelligence. At the helm of one of the most sensitive positions in Government, Bob Gates will assume the responsibilities for guiding at a time when his ability to ensure its ac-

countability to Congress, and to the American people is most important.

I wish him the best during the nomination process, and trust he will be confirmed without delay. I am pleased to offer my congratulations to Bob Gates for his nomination, to the President for his thoughtfulness in making the recommendation, and look forward to Mr. Gates' meeting of the challenges facing U.S. intelligence in the late 1980's.

Mr. President, I thank you and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague and friend from Minnesota in welcoming the President's nomination of Mr. Gates to be the Director of Central Intelligence.

As I remarked earlier, toward the end of the period which Senator Goldwater served as chairman and I served as vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, we jointly introduced legislation that provided that this position, Director of Intelligence, should be given to a career civilian or military intelligence officer. I reintroduced this legislation on the first day of this Congress. It reflected our judgment of what was best for the intelligence community and, in the end, of course, the only criterion could be what best served the President and the Congress, as well.

The tendency in recent Presidencies—and it goes a long way back—to turn to political advisers to direct a basically nonpolitical organization has not been effective. I do not think it has served the President.

So, I welcome the President's decision to turn to the career service. I found him extraordinarily able and dedicated, and a man who has risen at an early age to phenomenal heights, to what is a large bureaucracy and necessity.

I think the confidence which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has expressed would be shared by any of us who has worked with Mr. Gates and certainly is shared by me. I am happy to see, once again, we are in convergent views in matters of this kind.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALT BINDING LEGISLATION

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, last Thursday, I joined with three of my

colleagues in introducing legislation to compel the administration to stay within the numerical limits on nuclear launchers of the SALT Treaty, as long as the Soviets do the same. I strongly believe it is in our own national security interest to stay within these limits.

For over 3 years, many of us in Congress have explicitly urged the President to continue respecting the weapons ceilings of SALT, a policy he himself initiated in 1982. That policy still makes sense.

Because of it, both the United States and the Soviet Union have stayed under the limit of 820 land-based multiple warhead missiles, 1,200 total missiles with multiple warheads, and 1,320 MIRV'd missiles and cruise missile carrying bombers. Both sides kept a lid on the arms race.

Last November, the United States deployed its 131st B-52 bomber with cruise missiles, without dismantling an older Poseidon submarine, as we had done three times before to stay within SALT.

This action, which took us over the 1,320 launcher limit, is a mistake that will diminish American security, risks a multibillion-dollar arms race, and make our objective of nuclear arms reduction more distant than ever.

Mr. President, let me put it simply: Exceeding this heretofore mutually observed limit endangers our security because it throws open the door to a new nuclear arms race that America cannot win. The Soviets are much better positioned to break out of the SALT ceilings than we are.

The Soviets stand just two missiles short of the 820 launcher ceiling on land-based missiles. They have a new missile, the SS-24, waiting in the wings. The Soviets are just 30 launchers shy of the 1,200 launcher ceiling on multiple-warhead missiles. They have two new submarines, with 36 launchers, ready for sea trials this summer.

The Soviets have two current ICBM production lines, two missile submarine lines, two bomber lines, and vigorous development programs. And, even if they do not build more launchers, they could deploy thousands of additional warheads on their inventory of existing launchers, for example, by using the capacity of their enormous SS-18 missiles.

The Congressional Research Service estimates that in an all-out race, the Soviets could add 24,000 warheads to their forces by 1995, while we could add only 14,000. There are various scenarios, various estimates of how we would fare in a new arms race with the Soviets. In every case, in the short run, we lose.

The President himself has observed that the Soviets have an advantage in a new arms race. That Soviet edge has not disappeared. I think we would be

foolish to give them a chance to exploit it.

I have no doubt that the United States, could, eventually, match any Soviet nuclear buildup. But we would spend tens of billions of dollars to do so. Our security would be no better than when we started. In the meantime it would be far worse than now.

Even without an all-out effort, the Soviets could build up their numbers as negotiating leverage. We would pay dearly to get them back to where they stand today.

I am deeply concerned about Soviet violations of SALT. Their SS-25 missile is a forbidden second new type of ICBM. But we have the perfect response to that. We are beginning the development of our Midgetman small ICBM, which is our second new ICBM since the last SALT treaty.

The Midgetman shows the Soviets they cannot violate a treaty without paying a price. It also contributes to our security.

I, like all Americans, want to see a new treaty that reduces the bloated nuclear arsenals of both sides. Throwing away the SALT ceilings, the only brake we now have on the superpower arms race, will not bring us closer to that goal. Abandoning the SALT ceilings will make the goal arms reduction more distant than ever.

A new treaty reducing nuclear arms is in our national security interest. In an arms race with the Soviets everybody loses.

The legislation we introduced last week will help us avoid an accelerated arms race. This legislation preserves the basis for the arms control breakthrough we all so anxiously await.

ADMIRAL CROWE TESTIFIES ON PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 1988 AND 1989 BUDGET REQUEST FOR DEFENSE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, last Tuesday the Budget Committee heard testimony from Secretary Weinberger and Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr., Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the President's fiscal year 1988 and 1989 budget request for defense.

I think most members of the committee were impressed, as I was, by the thoughtful, cogent and authoritative testimony presented by Admiral Crowe. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Crowe's opening statement be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, which I recommend each of my colleagues read and study.

Admiral Crowe summarized our national security policies: To preserve the independence, freedom of action, and territorial integrity of the United States; to support the United States and allied vital interest abroad; and to encourage an international order in

which our freedoms and democratic institutions can prosper.

He pointed out that although the world has changed drastically in the last 40 years, these policies have not. His testimony goes on to point out other policies we have developed to implement these objectives and how these are translated into our military strategy. It discusses the trends in the military balance in some detail and explains how the President's budget was prepared to maintain our edge in certain areas and to improve our capability in other areas.

Admiral Crowe describes an East-West balance that is in our favor—but only by the thinnest of margins. He outlined a number of trends which he said were of "serious concern" to our military leaders. Admiral Crowe, like the President, does not call for massive new spending on defense—but rather that we simply settle down and formulate a consistent rational approach to our national security with stable and adequate long-term funding for defense. The "roller-coaster" funding that the Congress has provided is the reason that the defense program has been wasteful and that rebuilding it has been expensive.

I commend Admiral Crowe for his testimony. I am sure my colleagues will get as much out of it as I did.

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

STATEMENT OF ADM. WILLIAM J. CROWE, JR.,
USN, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF
STAFF BEFORE THE SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today and report on the overall condition of our military establishment.

A considerable amount of water has passed under the legislative bridge since my testimony on the FY 1987 budget. In that budget the Congress chose to cut the President's defense request dramatically and for the second year in a row to legislate negative growth in our appropriations. Throughout this process I heard a great deal about the "fiscal" and "political" realities that dictated such action, but all too little about the "military" realities we face. This year I believe it is imperative to go back to fundamentals, i.e., to review the strategic landscape and to consider the "military" realities carefully before deciding what resources will be committed to our defense over the next two years. In an attempt to aid this process, I will this morning address four subjects.

Linkages between strategy, force structure, hardware and people;

The East-West balance, including capabilities of U.S. and allied forces in comparison with our potential adversaries;

The President's budget; and

A brief look ahead.

LINKAGES BETWEEN STRATEGY AND THE MILITARY

To begin, the role of U.S. military forces is shaped by national security policies which

have remained essentially unchanged since the late 1940's:

Preserve the independence, freedom of action, and territorial integrity of the United States;

Support U.S. and allied vital interests abroad; and

Encourage an international order in which our freedoms and democratic institutions can prosper.

These policies genuinely describe what our strength, especially our military potential, can do for us in an often violent and turbulent world. The main point to keep in mind is that our military forces contribute to achieving these objectives every day not just when the nation is under direct attack.

Defense policies

Our military posture is further shaped by some basic themes which have evolved in the post World War II era. We strive to:

Deter wars rather than fight them. This strategy of deterrence aims to make war or the threat of war too risky for any hostile power or combination of powers to contemplate.

Optimize our collective security arrangements and forward defense posture through combined defense planning with allies in Europe and Asia and through vigorous security assistance programs. At the heart of this policy is the principle that the capabilities of the whole will be greater than the sum of its parts. In turn, our coalitions present potential adversaries with formidable political, psychological and ideological challenges—as well as enhanced military power.

Maintain robust central reserves supported by global mobility. Many of our treaty commitments are bolstered primarily by our power projection forces. Indeed, many strategists in and out of the Pentagon now recognize that real-world deterrence depends upon our inherent capability to "get there firstest with the mostest," deal effectively with the threat at hand, and withdraw just as quickly from the scene of action.

Pursue a vigorous arms reduction policy which seeks equitable, effective and verifiable arms agreements with potential adversaries. For more than fifteen years, we have been trying to engage the Soviets in an agreement which will sharply reduce offensive nuclear arms.

Military strategy

Historically, the United States has attempted in peacetime to maintain sufficient capability to blunt initial attacks on our own interests and to form a nucleus around which we can expand for major hostilities. In practical terms, this means that we do not attempt to match potential adversaries weapon for weapon and man for man, but to develop quality forces and "edges" (marginal superiorities) that will deter our enemies by keeping their level of uncertainty high or allow Washington to manage crises in a manner that will prevent them from escalating or getting out of hand. In essence, we are betting that in major war we can expand our peacetime forces and bring our total resources (technological, industrial, personnel, economic, political) to bear so that we will ultimately prevail. This is an appropriate policy for a democracy but it also leaves little room day-to-day for miscalculation. More importantly it means that since we operate on the margin seemingly small reductions in our peacetime capability may result in large increases in the risk. It is imperative that the nation understand this fundamental relationship.

Over the course of time, we have followed a number of principles in determining how to build and deploy our forces. For instance, we attempt to:

Plan in a total force context—i.e., active and reserve forces of the U.S. and its allies, host nation support in forward areas, various types of combat service support from civilian sectors, and allied military enhancements underwritten by our security assistance program;

Exploit the deterrent value of nuclear forces while avoiding a nuclear war;

Defend forces in-being against an initial attack at a time and place of the enemy's choosing;

Emphasize our qualitative advantages—technical, personnel and organizational—to defeat an adversary who will normally outnumber us on the field of battle;

Expand our forces rapidly in the event of major crises and especially in all-out war; and

End any conflict on terms favorable to the U.S. and its allies.

Given our built-in pluralism and constrained resources, it is very difficult to bring all these policies and principles together even when you are not worried about static or sagging expenditures for defense.

THE EAST-WEST BALANCE

Cutting across the strategic landscape—and in many respects dominating it—is the East-West balance. In my view, a number of factors are imperative to consider: geography, economic defense potential, allied contributions, and military trends over time.

Geography

Geographically, the Soviet Union has a very large border and airspace to defend—much larger than ours—and a disadvantage in its limited access to the open oceans and non-European friends. For our part, the United States is much more dependent upon its use of international airways and oceans, not only in its daily commerce but also in cementing its fair-flung alliances. Thus, geography tends to provide a mixed picture of inherent strengths and weaknesses.

Economics

On the other hand, economic defense potential clearly favors the U.S. and its allies as compared with the Warsaw Pact. Today, for example, our gross national product is nearly twice that of the Soviet Union. Similarly, NATO as a whole continues to outpace the Warsaw Pact by a factor of two-to-one.

Today, we also see the Soviet Union struggling to overcome weaknesses endemic to its system: the difficulties of running a "command" economy with no measure of profit and loss, depletion of their European mineral base, challenges of developing alternative resources in Siberia, lack of discipline among workers, management shortcomings revealed in the Chernobyl disaster, and a host of problems keeping political and economic relations with Eastern Europe on an even keel.

Thus, by general measures of economic strength, the U.S. and its allies are considerably stronger than the Soviet Union and its allies. But how the money is spent also is a critical factor. Like Axis Powers in the 1930's, the Kremlin continues to stress armaments at the expense of all other sectors of the economy.

Allied contributions

With respect to allied contributions, Western Europe routinely accounts for about 30% of all military expenditures by NATO

members and provides about 60% of the active military personnel, as well as 60% of the ground and air combat units. In North-east Asia, South Korea and Japan also field the bulk of deterrent forces numbering 600,000 and 250,000 military personnel respectively. By comparison, we normally have about 130,000 military personnel stationed, ashore and afloat, in the Western Pacific.

On the other side of this coin, few of our allies have a nuclear deterrent of their own and, in the postwar years, many stressed ground and air capability rather than naval strength in their defense planning. Thus, in the overall scheme of things, it is necessary for the United States to place a high priority on its strategic nuclear umbrella, global maritime superiority and strategic mobility forces.

For its part, Eastern Europe normally accounts for about 15% of all military expenditures by the Warsaw Pact. The USSR shoulders the other 85% and, in turn, dominates the Pact's High Command, military strategy, force structure, and hardware. In this situation, it is relatively easy for the Soviets to achieve economies of scale in military production and standardization of equipment and tactics among Warsaw Pact forces. But they can never be certain that the forces or peoples of Eastern Europe will rally around a call from Moscow. I suspect that this one uncertainty weighs most heavily on the minds of the Russian leaders.

On balance, our allies shoulder a much greater defense burden in Europe and Asia than do allies of the USSR. Of course, we could prefer that many of them do even more and we strongly encourage them at every opportunity. Nevertheless their contributions are most significant and count heavily as a factor in our favor.

Trends in the military balance

Still overall trends in the military balance give us little cause for optimism and strongly call for greater U.S. effort.

Our strategic nuclear deterrent is neither as secure nor as dominant as it once was. Particularly disturbing is the Soviet emphasis on strategic defense—the steady hardening of command and control facilities, a very robust defense against air-breathing threats, and an ABM system with potentially nation-wide coverage. Concurrently, we see their large ICBM force becoming more hardened and mobile, their submarines more quiet, and their bombers more capable of intercontinental missions.

Soviet conventional capabilities on and around the Eurasian Continent are much greater than they were two decades ago. In these forward areas, we have always been considerably outnumbered by Soviet ground and air forces. Now we are also seeing our qualitative edge erode.

Soviet surrogates in Asia, Africa, and Central America are more heavily armed and troublesome than they once were. In turn, they are much more inclined to support terrorism, subversion, and greater forms of aggression against their neighbors and the West in general.

While the likelihood of a major Soviet assault on Western Europe is perhaps remote, the coercive threat of Soviet military power will loom over the Eurasian Continent for many years to come. Moreover, the Soviet Government has never departed from policies holding that its allies and surrogates in the Third World must remain strategically subservient to Moscow and that the rest of the world is an open field for destabilizing actions.

Further, we see no slackening in tomorrow's military investments. By their own admission, such expenditures will continue on an upward slope—just as they have over the last four decades. All of this puts an enormous burden on the Soviet economy, but I see no sign that the system cannot sustain such an effort.

In my view, these and other indicators strongly suggest that we must prepare ourselves for a marathon, not a short-term sprint, in the military competition with the USSR. That thought must be a cornerstone of any successful U.S. strategy. Yet, this is one of the most difficult ideas to get across to the U.S. Congress and the American people. Frankly, our history would argue that where military preparedness is concerned, we are notoriously short-sighted.

Net assessment of military capabilities

Moving on, I recognize that this Committee is interested in more than broad trends in the East-West balance. You want to know more specifically how the capability of U.S. armed forces and those of our allies compare with those of the Soviet Union and its allies.

Strategic forces

First, strategic forces. There is no question that in the static sense the Soviets have reached strategic parity or better. This is one of the major shifts in the balance between the two superpowers wrought in recent years. They have clear superiority in ICBM's and overall megatonnage. Hardened communications (C3) and passive defense measures give them a survivability U.S. forces do not yet have. Likewise, the Soviets are further along in shifting to mobile missiles and are posturing themselves for a possible ABM breakout.

On the other hand, the U.S. ballistic missile submarine force is less vulnerable than the Soviets and we have a more effective bomber force still capable of penetrating the USSR. Moreover, the President's strategic modernization program if fully implemented—MX, D-5, B-1, ATB, C3 initiatives and Small ICBM—will prepare us for the long haul, keep pace with Soviet improvements offensively, and correct our more glaring deficiencies.

Thus all things considered, I am relatively confident that strategic forces and programs which are being proposed will deter a direct nuclear attack on the U.S. and our allies. But I must reemphasize, for that judgment to continue to be solid, it is imperative to stay the course with our strategic modernization programs.

Maritime

The maritime picture is the second major shift in Soviet strategic policy.

Throughout the immediate postwar period the U.S. enjoyed undisputed mastery of the seas, but the Kremlin was not easily discouraged. By the late 1970's the Russian Navy had made tremendous inroads into our margin of superiority and the trends were even more alarming. We have now reversed these curves—particularly in overall shipbuilding—but the Soviets are on the high seas to stay.

Our main concern is a "blue water" Russian fleet pushing its area of operations further and further from the homeland. By stretching our forces and tactics to the limit and working harder to understand Soviet naval thinking, we still hold a slim margin of superiority on the high seas. But whether that margin holds up will depend, in part, on our reacting quickly to indications and

warnings and our willingness to match their forces an efforts. As an example, we must take full advantage of the superiority of our nuclear attack submarines and carry the battle to the Soviets in the forward areas. Without such pressure, we could expect to see a major breakout by Soviet naval units and formations on to the sea lines of communications.

While we still enjoy an advantage in sea-borne air, amphibious forces, and underway replenishment, and in support we receive from allied navies, a significant challenge on the high seas is growing out of Soviet success in:

- Deploying very advanced anti-ship missiles which are constantly improving;
- Increasing their over-the-horizon targeting capability by exploiting space;
- Improving submarine propulsion (speed and quietness) and metallurgy (depth); and
- Steadily improving their ASW capabilities.

In essence, we cannot afford to relinquish naval superiority to the Soviets. To do so would jeopardize our coalitions, economic and trade dependencies (which are necessary in war as well as peace), and capabilities to project our power overseas. Our ability to prevail at sea is a cornerstone of our overall strategy.

NATO/Warsaw Pact

Turning to the NATO/Warsaw Pact balance, major trends are generally adverse to NATO. I have already spoken to the implications of strategic parity. Moreover, we have essentially no deterrent to chemical warfare in NATO or elsewhere—this is a crucial weakness when confronting the USSR. Reinforcing this trend has been the extensive Soviet modernization, expansion, and reorganization of their theater forces.

Further, the Soviets are better able than NATO to conduct theater nuclear war in Europe. Today they possess a pronounced superiority in numbers of intermediate nuclear forces, both long- and short-range. Similarly, our one-time lead in battlefield nuclear systems has disappeared.

In light of these developments, conventional forces assume an added significance. The Soviets have always had imposing ground forces but the gap in numbers of modern weapons continues to widen. In ground equipment they lead the U.S. and also NATO in virtually every category by ratios ranging from 1.5 to 1 to 6 to 1. Moreover, we have lost our lead in surface-to-air missiles and anti-armor capability. Similarly, NATO's qualitative edge in ground systems may have eroded somewhat. On the other hand, NATO ground forces on the Central front have made progress in the use of combined arms and in the fielding of modern equipment. Similarly, the sustainability of U.S. forces has improved markedly over the last few years. Unfortunately, the stocks of certain munitions among the allies have not improved appreciably and could be exhausted too quickly.

On the plus side, the NATO qualitative edge in tactical aviation while somewhat diminished has not disappeared. It is not clear, however, what this will mean against the numerical advantages of the Soviet air forces (offensive and defensive) which run in the neighborhood of 2.0 to 1. I have complete confidence that the quality of our pilots and weapon systems would permit us to exact high exchange ratios but overcoming the impressive numbers of Russian medium-range bombers, fighter bombers, interceptors, and surface-to-air weapon sys-

tems will be a sporty course. The outcome is difficult to predict.

We will, of course, have the support of our naval forces in Europe and, as I mentioned earlier, the Soviets have yet to surpass our lead.

To put all of this into perspective, NATO capabilities are still deterring a war in Europe. Surely, the prospect of having to fight 16 nations at once remains a sobering one for the Kremlin.

But if, for some reason, war breaks out, maintaining a successful forward defense will be a "near thing" under the best of assumptions. Barring a major change in the dynamics of the competition, NATO can no longer hope to offset Pact numbers merely by improving the quality of its equipment or relying on the dedication of people defending their own territory.

In the final analysis the military balance in Europe is not encouraging and needs a great deal of tending—politically as well as militarily.

East Asia

Until the late 1960's Moscow paid little attention to the defense of its eastern provinces and its strength in the Western Pacific. With the PRC's breakaway from the Soviet orbit and the burgeoning affluence of East Asia, the Kremlin began to build up its forces in the region—not by drawing down in Western Europe, but by commissioning new units and increasing defense production to help them.

Overall, the balance on the Chinese border favors the Russians in every way except manpower and as yet the Chinese have been unable to turn things around—preferring to put their current priorities elsewhere. The one exception is Chinese nuclear capability which provides "minimal deterrence" of a sort.

Nevertheless, China looms large in the Kremlin's calculations—witness the gradual buildup from 20 to 50 Soviet divisions on the Chinese border.

On the Korean Peninsula, Pyongyang has made a determined effort to outstrip the South's forces. Besides this general buildup several recent initiatives are particularly worrisome—the relocation of a number of 2nd echelon divisions close to the DMZ and recent emphasis on improving special operations forces both quantitatively and qualitatively. However, as long as North Korea is not directly assisted by the Soviet Union, United States augmentation—especially our air power—should make the difference in deterring or, if necessary, defeating the North. The fact remains, however, the Peninsula is an unstable focal point with a significant threat of major war lingering on the horizon.

In the context of global hostilities, the East Asian area presents both opportunities and challenges to U.S. planners. We have significant leverage against Soviet naval and air forces in the region which both reduces the threat to our sea lines of communication, and constrains the Kremlin's ability to accomplish its strategic goals in the Far East.

Further, our political relationships generally work in our favor. It is clear that PRC forces tie down substantial Soviet ground and air deployments in the region and that Peking puts considerable stock in its U.S. tie. In a similar vein, Japan is a pillar of U.S. strategy in the Pacific. Without Japanese cooperation, it would be difficult to bottle up the Russian fleet, augment South Korea, and find sufficient bases to support continuing operations against the Soviets.

Likewise, the health of the U.S.-Philippine relationship, politically and militarily, impacts heavily on the regional balance. Obviously, the firmness of U.S. alliances will rest to a great degree on our ability to successfully confront the Soviets in the region and, in the event of war, to keep open our sea lines of communication to the Western Pacific.

While predicting what the Soviets will do is a hazardous business, I am inclined to believe that any U.S.-Soviet confrontation in the Pacific will take its lead from events in Western Europe or elsewhere. This means that we would most likely be fighting a containing action as well as supporting our Pacific allies. While the prospects for achieving our objectives in Asia are encouraging, there is clearly a great deal to be done before we can confront the future with confidence.

Power projection

Turning to power projection, the Soviets have long been able to project military power successfully adjacent to their borders. Basically the Russians' continental location and large resource base gives them an asymmetrical advantage vis-a-vis the U.S. when applying force in Western Europe and along their immediate periphery—witness events in Afghanistan.

In the last decade the Kremlin has increased its ability to project forces, employing cargo aircraft, naval units and non-military shipping, although Washington continues to enjoy a distinct advantage where long range lift is concerned. However, the Soviets have developed a style of power projection that avoids confrontation with U.S. units, e.g., through the use of Cuban proxies, arms sales to clients, covert operations, and intervention in areas where U.S. action is not anticipated. I am generally confident that in a direct confrontation, U.S. forces would be able to defeat Soviet troops operating far from the Soviet Union. In peacetime, however, we will continue to see the Soviets selectively intervene (projection of influence) in regional conflicts around the globe where they believe the calculus genuinely favors them.

Special operations forces

Because they so often operate behind the scenes, straight one-on-one comparisons of our Special Operations Forces and Soviet "SPETSNAZ" are difficult to derive and sensitive to portray in an open fashion. Nevertheless, several points are worth noting. Both sides depend upon such forces to complement conventional forces in general war planning. But the Soviet side tends to use its SPETSNAZ more routinely in low intensity conflict as during the Czechoslovakia invasion of 1968 and in the current Afghanistan campaign. Their capability for covert and clandestine operations also fits into the Kremlin's policy of keeping pressure on the West through state-supported intimidation, terrorism, and subversion—and making sure that no surrogate ever gets out of the Soviet camp. In short, the Brezhnev doctrine and SPETSNAZ go hand in hand.

Against this background, there is no question that our SOF have become very good at the business of counter-terrorism. In 1981, our capability was very limited; now we probably have the best in the world. But this is a rather narrow field and we are still groping to fit our SOF—and other forces—into an overarching strategy to meet the threat of low intensity conflict. Further progress should be possible with more focused organizational arrangements, includ-

ing the new Special Operations Forces Command, and increased emphasis on procuring the specialized equipment and training for these types of operations.

Overall, I believe we are building a credible and effective capability against state-supported terrorism, subversion, and other forms of indirect aggression against the West. But, a great deal of hard, constructive work still lies ahead in this area.

Net assessment

In summary, it is clear that the investments made in the last 8 years have materially improved the foregoing net assessment from the U.S. standpoint. It is equally obvious that the picture is a dynamic one, that the Soviets are working diligently to improve their position across the board, and that there are still a number of serious gaps in our own posture. On balance, we still need a number of years' growth before we can face the future with confidence. In particular, I cannot help but be alarmed by the signal which a continuing zero or negative growth defense budget would send to both our allies and potential opponents in Europe. Frankly, such a signal at this time is not justified by the threat, the political climate or the military situation.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Against this background, the President is starting anew with the 100th Congress by proposing three percent real growth in defense spending against the FY 87 baseline.

The Joint Chiefs believe that the budget for FY 1988-1989 supports the nation's strategy and will reinstate modest real fiscal growth so necessary to long-term health. The Chiefs and CINCs participated in the formulation of the budget and while it is by no means risk-free they are satisfied that appropriate compromises and trade-offs have been struck at the resource level which has been set. The budget continues the modernization of the equipment for our forces both nuclear and conventional; includes growth in naval force structure; addresses our more pressing sustainability shortages; provides an appropriate balance between readiness and modernization; preserves the kind of quality manpower which is the backbone of our forces; and, with an eye to our reliance on quality technology, continues to emphasize research and development accounts. Secretary Weinberger's statement has addressed each of these areas in detail. Consequently, I will only mention some of the more significant items.

Military personnel

As I noted last year, our most precious asset is quality personnel—the cornerstone of our military establishment. This year, the President's budget continues support for adequate levels of compensation accompanied by a modest increase in military pay and additional funding for family housing. This action will sustain a personnel picture which overall remains healthy.

Too often, we are inclined to count people as the intangible factor in the military balance. So I believe it is useful to cite one area where your support has paid extremely high dividends. We are the best in the world at operating and supporting complex weapon systems under night/all-weather conditions. I see this in all of the Services and count it as one of our strongest cards in managing crises and deterring our adversaries. It all flows from the talent, high morale, and competitive spirit of our officer and enlisted ranks.

Strategic modernization

The Chiefs have consistently made strategic modernization their number one priority. Our TRIAD of strategic nuclear forces is the umbrella under which all our deterrent forces operate and undergirds the security policies of our allies as well. In the face of unrelenting Soviet efforts to modernize their strategic weapons across the board, we have no choice but to refurbish all three legs of the TRIAD. The MX, Small ICBM, Trident, D-5, B-1B, ATB and accompanying C-3 programs are designed to give us an updated deterrent which will see us into the next century.

In a similar vein the JCS support the President's Strategic Defense Initiative which will determine whether an alternative to sole reliance on the threat of nuclear retaliation is feasible. It is both prudent and moral for the United States to explore means for ending the dominance of offensive ballistic missile weaponry.

Concurrently, the JCS strongly applaud efforts by the President to achieve progress in arms reduction negotiations. While I believe there are some encouraging signs, I do not see any immediate breakthrough in the offering or any reason to relax our strategic modernization initiatives. Negotiations are not a substitute for force modernization; rather negotiations and our modernization efforts are mutually reinforcing.

Conventional force modernization

It should be obvious from the comparison of U.S.-Soviet forces that we have some pressing needs in our conventional forces which must be corrected if we are to move into the 1990's with confidence. The number one priority is to maintain our qualitative edge on the field of battle and the President's budget takes a positive step in this direction—in both procurement and R&D funding.

While we have made great progress over the last few years, it is also important to stress that we are only mid-stream in the conventional force modernization process. To cite some expected end FY 1987 figures:

About 25% of the Army's active mechanized battalions and 40% of its tank battalions will be re-equipped with the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and M1;

From 50% to 65% of our tactical air wings will have received new fighter/bombers;

Some five out of fifteen carrier battle groups will have AEGIS; and

About 36% of our submarine force will be operating basic or improved versions of the 688 Class.

More progress will be made as equipment currently in the pipeline reaches our combat forces. But it should be clearly understood that we are stretching out and, in turn, delaying the modernization effort.

As explained in the OMB Budget Summary this is a direct consequence of fiscal austerities and, in some cases, a deliberate decision to buy more modern munitions and fewer platforms. Only in FY 1989 does procurement in general resume an upward slope and that, of course, is contingent upon Congressional approval of the President's two-year budget request. The bottom line is that many of our active and reserve units will remain behind the power curve in quality, particularly as reinforcements for NATO.

Chemical warfare

Of special note are the requested funds for chemical weaponry. These programs are necessary to offset a serious disadvantage on the battlefield and to counter offensive

and defensive asymmetries strongly favoring the Soviet Union. From the perspective of the American fighting man in the field, it is difficult to overemphasize this request.

Special forces and low intensity conflict

With respect to Special Operations Forces this budget continues to place considerable emphasis on procuring equipment and weaponry. There is increasing recognition of the value of these specially tailored assets in today's world. In turn, there is a new determination to see that not only organizational but equipment deficiencies are corrected and that these forces are brought to an even higher state of readiness. The requested funds for SOF equipment will pay a high return in capabilities desired by both the President and the Congress.

Sustainability

The FY 1988-89 budget proposes to continue the trend of the last few years in improving our sustainability which includes war reserve stockpiles (munitions and spares), transportation capabilities, and industrial surge capacities. We worry about potential "war stoppers" or their impact on the theater nuclear threshold.

In the past four years, funding for ammunition has grown by over 25 percent; spare parts funding has doubled; and ammunition inventories of all Services have improved substantially. In Europe, for instance, ground ammunition tonnage is up 18 percent, and it has almost doubled in the Pacific. Munition deficiencies which plagued us for years are improving steadily, but at the current rate of expenditures, it will be several years before we can near our goals and breathe easier.

We simply must stay the course if we want a genuinely sustainable force as well as a modern and well-trained one. Otherwise we will be spending a great deal for modern equipment with one hand and then reducing its effectiveness with the other.

Budget overview

The peacetime strategy and defense spending of the United States seek to maintain the cutting edge of our deterrent forces, active and reserve, while counting on our economic and mobilization potential to cope with any clear and present danger to the U.S. and its allies. Everything about this deterrent stance hinges upon the quality of our people, hardware, munitions, and logistic support.

Overall, this budget addresses adverse trends in the overall balance, stresses our qualitative advantages, reduces deterrent risks over time, and avoids the dramatic trade-offs which would distort the force structure as we move into the 1990's. While by no means risk-free, the President's budget is a prudent approach to the problem of maintaining an effective and balanced deterrent across the full spectrum of potential hostilities. As the President's principal military advisor, I wholly support the defense budget for FY 1988 and FY 1989, and I urge the Congress to do likewise.

LOOKING AHEAD

Looking ahead, this may well be a critical year in the national security debate. Recently mandated, across-the-board cuts in funding and officer strength have slowed our progress in achieving force goals; stretched out force modernization; thinned out some of our combat units in hardware or people; left us with still inadequate stocks of modern munitions; and resulted in a growing backlog of equipment and facility maintenance.

Against this background, a considerable amount of reprogramming and fine tuning has managed to avoid either a hollow strategy or a hollow force—but the overall trends remain a matter of serious concern to the JCS and the CINCs. We may be able to live with one or two years on a flat or descending appropriations curve, but we will eventually pay heavily for several years of zero or negative growth. At this point, it is difficult to forecast the specific impacts. But given the Soviets' steady progress and the narrow margins inherent in our defense policies, small reductions in our capabilities could very well provoke a disproportionate change in the risk. Our experience has confirmed that time and again.

If confronted with no real increase in defense spending over the next five years, for example, it is my judgment that our military risks will increase throughout this decade (possibly sharply) and into the 1990's. Primarily, this is a function of stretching things out, delaying improvements in a total force context, and living with sustainability problems we should be solving at a steady pace. Frankly, it's a pure function of the U.S. marching-in-place or making heavy tradeoffs which will sacrifice some part of our structure while the Soviets move forward in their customary fashion, correcting one military deficiency after another. That's precisely how we can lose our present ability to deter and our already slim edge on the field of battle.

In essence, I would like to see America settle down in the defense debate—start looking at where we will be in the 1990's. What is most needed is a consistent and rational defense policy geared for the long run rather than the peaks and valleys which have characterized so much of our peacetime history. We have a great deal going for us in economic defense potential and in partnerships with other free nations of the world. But we must take the lead and set the pace in this long-term military competition with the USSR. If we fail to meet this challenge—and let the Soviet-controlled forces dominate the field—then we must be prepared to face the consequences of a world starkly different and less hospitable than the one we are living in today.

THE PANAMA CANAL GIVEAWAY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there is a significant book, "The Panama Canal Treaties Swindle: Consent to Disasters," detailing the intrigues behind the giveaway of the Panama Canal, which has just been published by Signal Books of Carrboro, NC. In it, the author, Capt. G. Russell Evans (USCG, Ret.), has presented an in-depth study of the diplomatic and legislative processes which led to the tragic giveaway of a critical and strategic waterway. The long-term consequences of this grave error will, no doubt, haunt Americans for decades to come.

Mr. President, the Panama Canal with all of the vast array of equipment necessary for its operation, is now disintegrating day by day. The condition of the canal, lock machinery, and railroad facilities are in a shocking state of disrepair. The Government of Panama could care less about maintenance and repair and has not exer-

cised the kind of stewardship over the canal which can make it a viable system for maritime transportation.

As Adm. Thomas J. Moorer, writes in the introduction to the book:

It was clear from intelligence reports that Panama fitted in the grand scheme of the Soviets to project Marxism into the Caribbean through the Cuban connection. In short, we were faced with a Torrijos-Castro-Brezhnev Axis.

Mr. President, looking back on the events that unfolded in Central America since the giveaway of the Panama Canal in 1977, we can trace the collapse of Central America. The canal giveaway was the beginning of the end for Central America. It signaled the loss of American will and power in the region. It gave the green light for stepped up Communist penetration and subversive activity in the region. As a result of this activity, Nicaragua fell to communism in the summer of 1979. El Salvador began its cascade down the slippery slope of Communist inspired subversion in the fall of 1979. Communist backed guerrilla movements shattered the peace and tranquility of the region in Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica.

Admiral Moorer quotes from a Central Intelligence Agency assessment of 1979 as follows:

The Castro regime apparently concluded by at least last fall that prospects for revolution in Central America over the next decade or so had markedly improved largely because of the weakened position of Nicaragua's Somoza and the ripple his removal would have on other countries in Central America. As a result, Cuba has intensified its attempt to unify insurgent groups not only in Nicaragua but in El Salvador and Guatemala as well.

Mr. President, the accuracy of the paragraph quoted by Admiral Moorer has been born out by events. It is indeed a tragedy that those responsible for the Panama Canal giveaway refused to take into account that transferring the canal to a thoroughly corrupt regime under Soviet influence was a major victory for the masters of the Kremlin and their strategy of subversion in this hemisphere.

I hope that Senators, and all Americans interested in the future of this hemisphere, will read and study this fine book.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do we have further morning business? Time will shortly expire.

If there is no further morning business, morning business will be closed.

BUDGET ACT WAIVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration

of Senate Resolution 85, which the clerk will now report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 85) waiving section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the consideration of S. 387.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I designate the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] to control the 30 minutes on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. I do not see any managers of the bill on the minority side present at this moment. And, wishing that they should be here, I will suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President, so we can round up our crew for the afternoon.

Mr. President, before I do suggest the absence of a quorum, may I make the point that this is a routine measure. We are, in fact, dealing with an item of legislation which was to have been enacted in the last Congress, and only in the final days of the 99th Congress did it appear that an agreement could not be reached in a committee of conference. It is for practical purposes, an identical bill in substance to that was adopted by the Senate by a 99 to 0 vote, if memory serves.

Now, just as a technicality under the Budget Act, in that we will be authorizing funds in fiscal year 1988—a year for which we have not yet approved a budget resolution—we need this waiver. I cannot doubt that it will be routinely approved. I mean, this is a multiyear authorization, as is our established practice in highway legislation; these are programs that need stability of funding and a reasonably long horizon for the State highway planners who have to carry out the programs.

However, I do not want to proceed until the Members of the minority are on the floor and those who are within the sound of my voice would no doubt hear me asking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair understood correctly, the Senator from New York suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. May I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be equally divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

You do suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I do.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. Res. 85, waiving section 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for the consideration of S. 387, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1987. This waiver is necessary, Mr. President, because the Congress has not yet acted on the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal 1988.

The Federal Aid to Highway Act of 1987 is within the current year budget totals and projected outyear targets. Section 303(a) of the Budget Act simply requires a waiver process to ensure accountability for measures considered before enactment of the budget resolution for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, this is a routine procedure. I urge adoption of this waiver so we can proceed with the consideration of Federal aid highway legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. STAFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I think the very able Senator from New York has already stated the case as far as this Senator is concerned. The bill that is in front of the Senate now is substantially the same bill that we passed last year when I had the privilege of being chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. We did not require a budget waiver last year because it did not exceed the budget as I recall, and we did have a budget within which to operate. This year at this point there is no budget which the Congress has agreed upon, and, therefore, we can proceed now as I understand it to the budget waiver.

So I join with the very able Senator from New York, and the Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the committee, in hoping that the Senate will pass this budget waiver.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the President. To anticipate some matters and to use the time not now being consumed in debate, there being no one further desiring to speak, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members be allowed to remain on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of and any vote on S. 387, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1987.

They are: Peter Prowitt, Mike Weiss, Phil Cummings, Nadine Hamilton, Jean Lauver, Dan Dant, Marc Litt, Bailey Guard, Katherine Cudlipp, Elizabeth Thompson, Marjorie Wright, Grace Reef, Martha Pope,

Bob Buzzas, Jeff Morales, Johnny Broussard, Kevin Kelly, Sheila Humpke, Sue Stendebach, Vic Maerki, Dave Griswold, Rich Innes, Joe Sherman, Taylor Bowlden, Dan McNamara, Ann Loomis, Kevin Schieffer, Stephanie Clough, and Roy Kienitz.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the President for his courtesy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum in that no person has appeared on the floor appearing to wish to debate the motion for a budget waiver. When such do, if that should happen, we will be here to respond. The distinguished chairman is here. The eminent, pre-eminent chairman emeritus, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, is here. They are humble servants, and between them we will do battle on behalf of this technicality should any champion of it appear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well; the absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first quorum call be equally divided, and I would hope that has continued to be our understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Budget Committee, I support Senate Resolution 85, which waives section 303(a) of the Budget Act for the highway bill we are about to consider. This waiver is necessary because the highway bill creates direct spending authority for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and the Budget Act forbids approval of new spending authority prior to passage of a budget resolution for those years.

The Budget Committee has reported this waiver with a favorable recommendation. First, let me explain what this waiver does not do. This waiver does not set aside our deficit or spending limits. It will not add a single

penny in outlays. It is merely a procedural waiver to allow the creation of contract authority in outyears. If we cannot afford the level of spending envisioned in this bill, the Appropriations Committee can limit, and has in the past, outlays by imposing an obligation ceiling.

I support this waiver because the Environment and Public Works Committee has responsibly kept direct spending authority in both the current fiscal year and in the outyears within the levels assumed in the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution. Furthermore, fiscal year 1987 outlays are within the limits established in both the resolution and in the committee's section 302(b) allocation. Finally, the highway bill enacts an obligation limit for Federal-aid highway programs less than that passed in the continuing resolution.

While this bill is fiscally responsible, there is a further policy reason for granting this waiver. Federal-aid highway programs use contract authority on a multiyear basis to enable States and localities efficiently to plan and build highway projects, which require stable and assured funding. In particular, the need for this type of funding authority can be seen already from the effect of the late passage of this highway bill. If a highway bill is not enacted by March 1, it has been estimated that roughly 767 projects and over 42,000 transportation related jobs could be lost in 1987. As a nation concerned with reestablishing our economic power, I do not believe that we want to unnecessarily lose jobs and projects critical to our country's infrastructure and economy.

In sum, I support this waiver on two grounds. First, this bill is not a budget buster; it is consistent with budget resolution assumptions for fiscal year 1987 outlays and fiscal year 1988-89 direct spending. Spending from this bill also falls within environment and public works allocation to the Transportation Subcommittee under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

Second, contract authority for highways is used for sound policy reasons, has historical precedence, and is an allowable method of funding because of the use of trust fund revenues. I would add, however, that section 303 of the Budget Act will be used to control any new spending legislation until we pass a budget resolution.

I commend the Environment and Public Works Committee for its fiscal responsibility. I ask that, as we consider this bill today, my colleagues bear in mind that any amendment which either increases current year budget authority or outlays or raises outyear spending could be subject to a point of order.

Finally, I am aware of the pressures my colleagues may face in conference.

I therefore urge that the Senate conferees bear in mind that any conference report is also subject to the same points of order should any Senate spending ceiling be violated.●

RECESS UNTIL 4:04 P.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, no Senators appear to be seeking recognition at this time. I have discussed with both Mr. MOYNIHAN and Mr. STAFFORD, the manager and ranking manager respectively, the idea that there be a recess now for 20 minutes, the time to be charged equally against both sides.

Mr. President, before I make that request, the rollcall vote, which has already been ordered on the adoption of the resolution, could occur as soon as the Senate returns into session, unless Senators who wish to speak notify the respective cloakrooms in the meantime. Otherwise, the rollcall vote may begin at that time.

I now make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered and, without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess for 20 minutes.

Thereupon, at 3:43 p.m., the Senate recessed until 4:04 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STENNIS).

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, we have in the Budget Act many budget points of order. Some of those points of order were strengthened under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law; others exist freestanding of that law. This is one of the points of order that exists freestanding of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. What we are voting on here is a section 303 waiver. It is a provision of the budget law that very wisely forces Congress to be aware of budget authority commitments that are created in various authorization bills. In voting to waive this point of order, we are not voting to bust the budget. We are not voting to violate the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law. What we are saying, however, is that we have looked at this bill and that we are aware of the fact that there are implications in the future, in years for which a budget is yet to be written, where spending will be affected by decisions we make here. The 303(a) point of order is a point of order that exists in regard to the consideration of legislation providing budget authority in a

future year for which a budget resolution has not been agreed to by Congress.

I think it is important that our colleagues understand the distinction between this point of order and the point of order we voted on last Thursday, where in fact we were waiving a point of order which represented a breach of the budget which we have already approved. I see no reason why, given that we are aware of the long-term budget implications of what we are doing here, that section 303(a) should not be waived.

I would like to serve notice, however, that the same point of order would apply to the amendment which will attempt to add the UMTA authorization to the highway bill. In addition to trust fund authorization, there is a section, section 19, in that authorization that directs an allocation of funds by mandating that a project be undertaken. One might normally argue that such a project would be undertaken within existing spending constraints. But we need to see whether or not existing funds have already been allocated, in which case mandating that we enter into this contract on UMTA as an amendment to this bill, might represent not just a 303(a) point of order but perhaps other points of order as well.

So I thought it was important, since a vote has been asked here, that a clear distinction be made between the 303(a) point of order, which is a point of order where we simply note that a budget resolution has yet to be adopted for a future fiscal year in which a bill would apply, and a point of order where we are waiving the budget we have already adopted and which we are now trying to enforce.

I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for holding up consideration to allow me to come over and speak on this point.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I state my complete agreement with the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. The section 303 waiver is technical in nature.

It might be added at this point that for 30 years now, it has been our practice to authorize highway outlays over a 4-year period, it being the nature of highway construction that the State departments of transportation need that time in which to plan projects, some of which take 4 years to complete and some of which take more. We have routinely provided the 4-year horizon.

Our particular difficulty at this moment, and the reason why we are under some urgency to commence, is that this bill was passed in the 99th Congress—passed the Senate by a vote of 99 to 0—and only at the very last minute did it fail in the committee of conference.

We are now on the edge of the construction season, in the current fiscal year, with no authorization. There are many States of the Union—not that of the Senator from Texas, but that of the Senator from Idaho—where the construction season is short, and if you do not get going soon, you cannot finish because of snowslides. We want to get on with this legislation and get it going very quickly.

I hope we will have it done tomorrow evening or Wednesday at the very latest.

I see that my good friend the manager of the bill on the other side is nodding in agreement. Let us hope we can proceed in this manner and do our duty, which is nothing less than to keep the Interstate Highway Program going and the country's business being done.

Mr. President, I once again see no one wishing to speak. Indeed, there was never any reason for anyone to speak, as the Senator from Texas has said. That being the case, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kevin Schieffer and Jenifer Warkenthien have the privilege of the floor during the pendency of S. 387, the Federal highway legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I once again suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. 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. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator LAWTON CHILES, I support Senate Resolution 85, which waives section 303(a) of the Budget Act for the highway bill we are about to consider. This waiver is necessary because the highway bill creates direct spending authority for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and the Budget Act forbids approval of new spending authority prior to passage of a budget resolution for those years.

The Budget Committee has reported this waiver with a favorable recommendation. First, let me explain what this waiver does not do. This waiver does not set aside our deficit or spending limits. It will not add a single penny in outlays. It is merely a procedural waiver to allow the creation of contract authority in outyears. If we cannot afford the level of spending envisioned in this bill, the Appropria-

tions Committee can limit, and has in the past, outlays by imposing an obligation ceiling.

I support this waiver because the environment and Public Works Committee has responsibly kept direct spending authority in both the current fiscal year and in the outyears within the levels assumed in the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution. Furthermore, fiscal year 1987 outlays are within the limits established in both the resolution and in the committee's section 302(b) allocation. Finally, the highway bill enacts an obligation limit for Federal-aid highway programs less than that passed in the continuing resolution.

While this bill is fiscally responsible, there is a further policy reason for granting this waiver. Federal-aid highway programs use contract authority on a multiyear basis to enable States and localities efficiently to plan and build highway projects, which require stable and assured funding. In particular, the need for this type of funding authority can be seen already from the effect of the late passage of this highway bill. If a highway bill is not enacted by March 1, it has been estimated that roughly 767 projects and over 42,000 transportation related jobs could be lost in 1987. As a nation concerned with reestablishing our economic power, I do not believe that we want to unnecessarily lose jobs and projects critical to our country's infrastructure and economy.

In sum, I support this waiver on two grounds. First, this bill is not a budget buster; it is consistent with budget resolution assumptions for fiscal year 1987 outlays and fiscal years 1988-89 direct spending. Spending from this bill also falls within Environment and Public Works allocation to the Transportation Subcommittee under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

Second, contract authority for highways is used for sound policy reasons, has historical precedence, and is an allowable method of funding because of the use of trust fund revenues. I would add, however, that section 303 of the Budget Act will be used to control any new spending legislation until we pass a budget resolution.

I commend the Environment and Public Works Committee for its fiscal responsibility. I ask that, as we consider this bill today, my colleagues bear in mind that any amendment which either increases current year budget authority or outlays or raises outyear spending could be subject to a point of order. Finally, I am aware of the pressures my colleagues may face in conference. I, therefore, urge that the Senate conferees bear in mind that any conference report is also subject to the same points of order should any Senate spending ceilings be violated.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his very clear explication of the matter before us. He is indeed correct.

The Committee on Environment and Public Works has kept precisely to the provisions of the budget resolution adopted in the 99th Congress. This is the unfinished business of the 99th Congress that we are about.

He is particularly apt in pointing out that we have to get this legislation enacted by the first of March at the latest.

I do not know why we cannot have it the end of this week, perhaps we cannot, but immediately after the recess surely we can. In absence of that, we are going to disrupt the orderly business of the Nation in maintaining and in building its highway system.

I would like to record that I have noted the statement of the Senator from Louisiana, that if there are amendments to this legislation that raise the authorizations involved they are subject to the budget provisions and should we come back from conference with a measure that exceeds our limits it too will be subject to a point of order and there will be a general pileup all around.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum is suggested.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be recinded.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 94

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have cleared this request with the distinguished Republican leader and it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle through our cloakrooms, and Mr. DOLE has no objection to my proceeding at this time to put the request. As a matter of fact, it was his feeling that he would like to have the request gotten before the rollcall begins. I feel the same way about it.

I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 17, at 2 p.m., Calendar Order No. 14, S. Res. 94, a resolution concerning arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union, be made the order of business at that time, that there be no amendments in order thereto, that no motions to commit or recommit with or without instructions be in order, and that there be 40 minutes of debate to be equally divided between Mr. PELL and Mr. HELMS on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Has the time run on the waiver, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, the time has expired on the waiver.

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

On this question, the yeas and nays have already been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Adams	Glenn	Murkowski
Armstrong	Gore	Nickles
Baucus	Graham	Nunn
Bentsen	Gramm	Pell
Bingaman	Grassley	Pressler
Bond	Harkin	Proxmire
Boren	Hatch	Pryor
Boschwitz	Hecht	Reid
Breaux	Heflin	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Heinz	Roth
Burdick	Hollings	Rudman
Byrd	Humphrey	Sanford
Chafee	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cochran	Johnston	Sasser
Cohen	Kassebaum	Shelby
Conrad	Kasten	Simon
Cranston	Kennedy	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerry	Specter
Danforth	Lautenberg	Stafford
Daschle	Leahy	Stennis
DeConcini	Levin	Stevens
Dixon	Lugar	Symms
Dodd	McCain	Thurmond
Dole	McClure	Trible
Domenici	McConnell	Wallop
Durenberger	Matsunaga	Warner
Evans	Melcher	Weicker
Exon	Metzenbaum	Wilson
Ford	Mikulski	Wirth
Fowler	Mitchell	
Garn	Moynihan	

NAYS—1

Helms

NOT VOTING—8

Biden	Hatfield	Riegle
Bradley	Packwood	Zorinsky
Chiles	Quayle	

So the resolution (S. Res. 85) was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President. I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BURDICK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tongour of my staff be allowed on the floor during the consideration of this highway bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND UNIFORM RELOCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 387, which the clerk will please report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 387) to authorize appropriations for certain highways in accordance with title 23, United States Code, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the body?

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, last year marked the 30th anniversary of the Interstate Program. The Interstate Highway System represents the largest Public Works Program in history, and it has revolutionized transportation and economic development in this country.

I am very pleased that the Senate is moving to consideration today of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1987. This legislation, S. 387, was reported by the Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously last month.

S. 387 is a new bill reported in lieu of S. 185, as amended. The new bill is in most respects the same legislation as S. 2405, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1986, that passed the Senate last September by a vote of 99 to 0.

States should have received their apportionments for fiscal year 1987 interstate and noninterstate programs last October 1, but unfortunately S. 2405 was not enacted last year. Vital highway construction and rehabilitation work has had to be postponed for 4 months now.

If there is a much longer delay, States such as mine in the northern part of the country will lose the entire 1987 construction season.

Reauthorization of this essential program is in my view a top legislative priority for the 100th Congress.

Highway users continue to pay their Federal highway taxes, but those moneys are in effect frozen until Congress acts. The House has passed its bill, H.R. 2, and I hope that the Senate will also move quickly to approve the legislation before us today.

Two years ago, the Environment and Public Works Committee began work on highway reauthorization legislation. Extensive hearings have been held. At stake are \$13.2 billion for fiscal year 1987, tens of thousands of construction jobs, and the transportation needs of every highway user in this country.

The new highway bill, S. 387, contains the following important provisions, as did last year's bill: New authorizations totaling \$52.3 billion in Federal aid for fiscal years 1987 to 1990; automatic approval of the interstate cost estimate and interstate substitute cost estimate; the one-half-percent minimum apportionment for all States which have completed or nearly completed their interstate construction program; a strong emphasis on completion of the Interstate System by 1990; retention of the existing interstate 4-R formula; clarification of the calculation requirements for the 85-percent minimum allocation program; and a consolidated interstate and primary program.

I would like particularly to stress the importance of maintaining the existing interstate 4-R formula and the minimum one-half-percent apportionment. The Interstate System is a remarkable achievement, but it is now over 97 percent complete. S. 387 emphasizes the need to finally finish the interstate, it gives States considerable additional flexibility to do so, but it does not change apportionment formulas and it does not change the one-half-percent minimum. In my view, the proper time to consider such major policy changes is 4 years from now upon completion of the interstate. At that time, the future Federal interest in the highway program will be

thoroughly reexamined, and I am sure that major changes will be considered. S. 387 is interim legislation in a sense, but the new authorizations it provides are critically needed and overdue. Let me set aside controversial issues for now and focus on reauthorizing the existing program.

On January 6, 1987, S. 185 was introduced, and it served as the markup vehicle in committee. It is the committee's intention that all legislative history accompanying S. 185 would apply to the new bill, S. 387, which was reported as an original bill by the committee on January 21. The report accompanying S. 387 is Senate Report 100-4.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Federal Highway Administration showing estimated apportionments for fiscal year 1987 interstate and noninterstate programs by category and by State be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BURDICK. I believe that S. 387 addresses the important issues and accommodates the interests of everyone who depends on our highway system. I would like to also note, however, that the committee has reported additional legislation. S. 245 is an advance construction bill which will enable the States to move ahead with some construction work if for any reason there are lengthy delays in reaching agreement on highway legislation. While the October 1, 1986, reauthorization deadline has been missed, let us assure the States as soon as possible of funding for 1987 and beyond. I thank my very distinguished colleagues, Senator MOYNIHAN, the chairman of the Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee; Senator STAFFORD, the ranking member of the committee; and Senator SYMONS, the ranking member of the subcommittee. We have worked closely in the past on highway legislation, and I am pleased that the committee has been able to move so quickly in reporting S. 387. I hope that the committee will continue to make such good progress, and have a bill on the President's desk in very short order.

EXHIBIT 1

ESTIMATED APPORTIONMENTS FOR FY 1987 INTERSTATE AND NONINTERSTATE PROGRAMS, FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR MAJOR FEDERAL-AID PROGRAMS BASED ON S. 387

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Interstate	and primary secondary	Urban	Bridge	Hazard elim.	RR Hwy. Xings	Int. Hwy. Transf.	Total apport.	85 percent min. alloc.	Grand total
Alabama	225,438	12,223	9,418	24,481	3,054	3,505	0	278,119	0	278,119
Alaska	111,599	32,057	3,638	3,156	853	2,648	0	153,951	0	153,951
Arizona	117,433	9,440	9,398	3,156	2,299	1,676	119	143,521	0	143,521
Arkansas	71,586	10,378	4,442	18,289	2,067	2,550	0	109,312	30,598	139,910
California	773,906	22,866	92,137	35,413	14,700	10,931	2,106	952,059	10,985	963,044
Colorado	152,097	10,329	9,752	14,320	2,382	2,341	4,354	195,575	0	195,575
Connecticut	138,797	3,887	10,441	44,253	1,895	1,115	68,677	269,065	0	269,065
Delaware	39,369	2,911	3,648	3,156	853	538	0	50,465	0	50,465

ESTIMATED APPORTIONMENTS FOR FY 1987 INTERSTATE AND NONINTERSTATE PROGRAMS, FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR MAJOR FEDERAL-AID PROGRAMS BASED ON S. 387—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

State	Interstate	and primary secondary	Urban	Bridge	Hazard elim.	RR Hwy. Xings	Int. Hwy. Transf.	Total apport.	85 percent min. alloc.	Grand total
District of Columbia	66,799	0	3,638	6,873	853	237	9,806	88,206	0	88,206
Florida	345,931	14,380	34,711	18,910	6,347	5,033	0	425,312	0	425,312
Georgia	225,974	15,887	13,844	36,411	4,103	4,931	7,292	308,442	22,998	331,440
Hawaii	142,903	2,911	3,638	0	853	429	0	153,894	0	153,894
Idaho	72,502	7,226	3,648	3,718	1,254	1,547	0	89,885	0	89,885
Illinois	200,734	16,777	39,928	37,063	7,641	8,852	52,097	363,092	0	363,092
Indiana	133,965	13,611	14,461	22,191	3,958	5,704	3,327	197,217	77,039	274,256
Iowa	88,477	12,797	6,618	28,477	2,787	4,084	19,318	162,558	0	162,558
Kansas	87,141	11,972	6,186	30,194	2,703	5,199	0	143,395	0	143,395
Kentucky	111,527	12,125	7,400	29,356	2,730	2,883	0	166,021	31,612	197,633
Louisiana	221,206	9,916	11,799	30,660	2,905	3,435	0	279,921	0	279,921
Maine	42,450	5,104	3,638	4,919	853	1,019	0	57,983	1,647	59,630
Maryland	193,680	5,628	14,315	17,757	2,582	1,657	48,775	284,394	0	284,394
Massachusetts	291,712	6,011	20,288	40,678	3,473	2,149	7,315	371,626	0	371,626
Michigan	217,875	17,590	27,435	18,292	6,284	6,284	0	293,744	0	293,744
Minnesota	163,281	14,592	11,002	18,636	3,573	4,549	2,481	218,114	0	218,114
Mississippi	80,712	10,660	4,639	23,566	2,136	2,457	0	124,170	13,726	137,896
Missouri	142,858	15,535	13,618	55,961	3,945	4,473	0	236,390	24,035	260,425
Montana	84,127	10,935	3,638	7,956	1,195	1,783	0	108,634	0	108,634
Nebraska	63,606	9,574	4,005	20,351	1,840	2,994	1,497	103,867	0	103,867
Nevada	56,732	6,938	3,638	3,156	905	871	0	72,240	0	72,240
New Hampshire	39,369	2,911	3,638	7,451	853	710	0	54,932	0	54,932
New Jersey	201,034	5,218	27,947	60,246	4,356	2,932	23,572	325,305	0	325,305
New Mexico	85,321	9,489	3,827	4,782	1,282	1,273	0	105,974	0	105,974
New York	241,571	17,709	62,967	126,258	10,700	6,702	136,660	602,567	0	602,567
North Carolina	172,051	18,167	11,273	35,743	4,189	4,356	0	245,788	72,968	318,756
North Dakota	54,236	7,145	3,638	6,249	1,277	3,012	0	75,557	0	75,557
Ohio	242,433	18,266	33,230	45,253	7,067	7,150	8,570	361,969	102,193	464,162
Oklahoma	88,847	11,800	8,096	32,272	2,829	3,486	0	147,330	33,907	181,237
Oregon	90,272	9,910	7,235	10,344	2,438	2,359	7,905	130,463	0	130,463
Pennsylvania	360,094	22,272	34,145	87,961	7,674	6,431	7,586	526,163	0	526,163
Rhode Island	39,369	2,911	3,638	3,542	853	483	45,419	96,215	0	96,215
South Carolina	95,897	9,302	6,683	9,181	2,372	2,946	0	126,381	38,722	165,103
South Dakota	60,749	7,745	3,638	8,513	1,161	1,920	0	83,726	0	83,726
Tennessee	130,054	13,440	11,374	49,822	3,389	3,440	17,378	228,897	41,420	270,317
Texas	498,213	37,160	46,996	52,679	10,744	11,561	0	657,353	267,188	924,541
Utah	105,032	6,358	5,115	3,156	1,313	1,339	0	122,313	0	122,313
Vermont	39,592	2,911	3,638	5,837	853	685	0	53,516	0	53,516
Virginia	201,353	12,957	14,742	16,500	3,602	2,949	1,084	253,187	0	253,187
Washington	228,599	10,061	12,605	24,245	3,111	3,142	0	281,763	0	281,763
West Virginia	58,406	7,589	3,638	32,543	1,434	1,819	0	105,429	0	105,429
Wisconsin	99,492	13,569	12,252	29,184	3,716	4,255	0	162,468	50,529	212,997
Wyoming	67,339	7,067	3,638	3,156	853	985	0	83,038	0	83,038
Puerto Rico	43,242	3,891	8,737	3,156	1,838	821	0	61,685	0	61,685
Total	7,906,982	582,108	727,631	1,262,582	168,927	170,623	475,338	11,294,191	819,565	12,113,756

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does anyone else seek recognition?

Mr. STAFFORD addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate begins consideration today of S. 387, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987. This legislation to reauthorize the highway program through fiscal year 1990 was introduced on January 6, 1987, by my distinguished colleague the most able Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill.

I want to particularly commend my distinguished colleague, Senator BURDICK, for the leadership he has provided as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee in bringing S. 387 to the floor so quickly. I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator MOYNIHAN, for his excellent work in moving this legislation through the committee and to the floor just a few weeks after the 100th Congress convened. I want to thank the distinguished ranking member of the sub-

committee, Senator SYMMS, who guided the highway bill through the Senate last year and who continues to make a very valuable contribution.

S. 387 was reported unanimously by the Environment and Public Works Committee on January 21, 1987. This is an indication of the cooperative effort and support behind this legislation. I am very pleased that the bipartisan support for highway legislation has continued over the years in the Environment and Public Works Committee regardless of which party is in the majority.

I was extremely disappointed that we were unable to reach agreement on highway legislation with the House Public Works Committee before Congress adjourned last year. Because highway apportionments were not made last October 1, most States are now facing this year's construction season without any Federal-aid highway funds. The urgency of approving highway legislation so this money can be released to the States cannot be overstated.

The Transportation Subcommittee began hearings on the reauthorization of the Federal-Aid Highway Program, the Highway Trust Fund, implementation of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) of 1982, the need for timely approval of the Interstate Cost Estimate (ICE) and Interstate Substitute Cost Estimate (ISCE), and

other important issues over 1½ years ago. The series of 10 hearings was completed on May 20, 1986. These hearings, the introduction of S. 185, and the committee consideration of S. 185 should all be considered part of the legislative history of S. 387.

The 1982 act provided authorizations for fiscal years 1983 through 1986, increased the gasoline tax and other user taxes, and effectively doubled program funding levels. These increased revenues have helped bring about marked improvements in the condition of the Nation's transportation infrastructure.

We must not jeopardize the gains which have been made since the passage of the 1982 act. If we are to avoid further disruptions in the highway program, multiyear reauthorization legislation must be enacted immediately. Motorists are continuing to pay highway user taxes even though we have not met the deadline of reauthorizing the program by October 1, 1986. It is only fair that the user fees paid by the motoring public are put to work on schedule.

Uncertainty and delays in funding can cost a State an entire construction season, and that is precisely what will happen this year if highway legislation is not enacted within the next few weeks. The rehabilitation and construction needs on our highway

system remain pressing. I hope my colleagues will agree on the importance of reauthorizing the highway program as soon as possible. This program is vitally important to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the territories.

S. 387 provides \$52.387 billion in new authorizations for the Federal-Aid Highway Program over a 4-year period from fiscal year 1987 through fiscal year 1990.

The bill sets an annual obligation limitation of \$12.350 billion for the Federal-Aid Highway Program. In addition, two categories, Emergency Relief and Minimum Allocation, are not subject to the obligation ceiling. Spending in these two categories is estimated to be \$800 million per year. Over the 4-year period, States will be able to obligate approximately \$52.6 billion, the total amount authorized by S. 387. It is important that new authorizations not exceed the amount States are permitted to obligate each fiscal year. In recent years, authorizations have surpassed States' obligation limitation with the result that States have approximately \$6 billion in apportionments from previous years which they are not allowed to spend. It is important, therefore, that the new authorizations are not permitted to exceed those limitations.

Last year, we marked the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Highway Trust Fund and the beginning of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Back in 1956, it was believed that the Interstate Construction Program would take 13 years and cost \$27 billion it is now 30 years and \$112 billion later, and the interstate system is over 97 percent complete. It is time to direct our attention and limited resources to other parts of the transportation network which have been neglected. I believe that a top priority must be completion of the interstate system by 1990. Major program changes or apportionment formula changes should not be considered until that time. The future Federal responsibility for the highway program also cannot be determined until the interstate is completed.

In order to complete the interstate system by 1990 and give States the ability to set their own priorities, S. 387 provides a combined interstate-primary category funded at \$8.15 billion per year. States can choose to accelerate completion of their remaining interstate segments by using interstate 4R or primary system funds for interstate completion. States could also determine that their essential interstate segments are complete and direct interstate funds to higher priority interstate 4R or primary projects.

I would like to briefly describe a few other major provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987. Through an automatic administrative release

mechanism, States will be assured of stable, reliable funding for interstate construction and substitute projects. Congress will no longer need to approve an ICE and ISCE before these authorized funds can be released October 1 by the Department of Transportation to the States.

I am sure my colleagues who have been through this with me will remember how much trouble we had in the past trying to get ICE and ISCE resolutions through on a timely basis.

S. 387 also provides for continuation of the one-half percent minimum for those 25 States which have completed or nearly completed their interstate construction program. I strongly believe that as long as the program exists, States which worked hard to finish their interstate roads, often at the expense of other roads, should not be penalized for that early commitment.

The bill continues a strong Federal participation in the Bridge, Secondary, Urban, Safety, Minimum Allocation, Interstate Substitution, Federal Lands, and Emergency Relief Programs.

At a time when highway needs continue to grow as revenues are shrinking, States need as much flexibility as possible in spending available funds. S. 387 provides additional flexibility in numerous areas, including total transfer among interstate construction, interstate 4R and primary funds; a 50-percent transfer between urban and secondary funds; the use of interstate substitute funds on any public road; extension of the availability of interstate construction funds to 4 years and interstate substitute funds to 2 years; permission for States to use a State funded bridge program as matching funds for their Federal-Aid Bridge Program; permission for up to 10 States to participate in a demonstration block grant program; permission for the States to combine toll revenues and Federal-aid funds for new noninterstate roads and for increasing capacity on existing noninterstate roads; incentives for right-of-way donations from the private sector and an expanded advanced construction program.

S. 387 also provides for several new programs aimed at improving the effectiveness of the Federal-Aid Highway Program. These include the combined interstate-primary category; the Strategic Highway Research Program [SHRP], a major new research initiative; the Block Grant Demonstration Program; incentives for private sector participation in Federal-aid highway projects; and the planting of wildflowers along highway rights-of-way.

Highway user fees have been collected and were increased in 1982 with the promise that this money would be spent on improving the Federal-aid highway system. I believe this promise

must be kept as long as the highway trust fund is maintained to fund the Highway Program. However, since Congress has determined that the Highway Program must be subject to deficit reducing efforts and the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings process, the committee has worked very hard to comply with budget requirements. In order to do so, the committee had to make reductions in the program compared to the funding levels authorized for the program in fiscal year 1986. This meant that some program needs could not be fully met, including some areas of the program that I know certain of my distinguished colleagues are very interested in.

In conclusion, Mr. President, passing this legislation is absolutely necessary if the States and localities are going to continue to provide the excellent transportation services we have all come to expect. Our network of highways and bridges is one of the largest and most remarkable infrastructure achievements in history, and it is certainly one of the most vital items in terms of our economic and social well-being. I hope that we can move expeditiously to approve this legislation and achieve enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987 within the next few weeks.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, our chairman emeritus has given a very comprehensive statement of the purposes of this legislation. I would add only two matters.

So far, we have been discussing the highway legislation and discussing this measure as a highway bill. It is primarily that, in terms of the resources involved; but, as our revered former chairman points out, the mass transit authorization will be added to this amendment in the course of the next day or less—more, if we must. This is as integral a part of the transportation planning of the country as highways. It will extend again for the exact 4-year period—fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990—a total authorization of some \$13 billion.

This is the essence of a balanced transportation system which we have been trying to develop and with which we have had some success. I will speak to that matter when the time comes, but it should be recorded at the outset that we have a transportation bill here, not just a highway bill.

The second matter I wish to speak to briefly, but with some feeling, is the question of toll roads on the Interstate System.

We have a provision in the bill, section 111, which allows, as a State option, the combined use of toll financing and Federal aid highway funds for new and expanded capacity

construction, operation, and maintenance of noninterstate Federal aid highways, bridges, and tunnels. I stress "noninterstate." We make a provision that the Federal Government may provide up to 35 percent of such a toll facility and that the State will impose tolls for the pure purpose of financing the balance of its construction costs and not long-term revenue and not on any Interstate System. There are, however, a number of toll roads that are part of the Interstate System, incorporated for one reason or another and in some cases built as such.

Section 142 of the bill will allow the West Virginia Turnpike Commission to renegotiate a section 129 agreement, which brought segments of roads and bridges into the Interstate System with the understanding that at the time the bonds were retired, the system would become toll free. At this moment, the anticipated date for that retirement will not be met, and we are making a simple extension.

This brings me to a local matter, for there is hardly anything more specific to a place than a highway. They are not movable. It is the question of the New York State Thruway.

The chairman emeritus, as we like to call him, remarked that last year was the 30th anniversary of the enactment in 1956 of the Interstate and Defense Highway Program, which President Eisenhower, very properly, thought to be the most important achievement of his administration in domestic matters and the largest public works project in the history of the world. It has taken us longer to complete than we anticipated at the time, and it should be noted that it has been done.

I should like to note that it did not begin in 1956. To the contrary, the origins of the program go back to 1954, when Congress authorized a request of President Roosevelt that such a system, a nationwide system, be built, the equivalent for the automobile, as the railroad systems built in this century. This was seen as a postwar project, and immediately the postwar period came.

New York State built the first segment of the Interstate System we call the Thomas E. Dewey Thruway.

An inspired civil engineer, Bert Talamy, constructed the first segment exactly along the routes as had been anticipated. In 1956, he came down to Washington to head the Bureau of Public Roads and designed the rest of the system exactly to the model set by the thruway.

Alack, Mr. President, when we built that road by ourselves we did finance it with tolls, and when the time came to start a national system it would have been elemental for Congress and for the New York State delegation to ask that this first segment be made toll free as payments were made from the highway trust fund. It was, after

all, the first segment completed. This was not done.

At the time the Honorable Charles A. Buckley of New York was chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, it could have been easily enough done—it was not—much the same way we built the Erie Canal in 1825. That was a toll canal, and again without Federal assistance, until last year remained the only extensive canal system in the country that was not maintained and indeed had not been built by the Federal Government. The Baltimore and Ohio Canal had been an earlier exception to that case.

However, in 1978, Congress did provide that the New York State Thruway and New York State would undertake to eliminate tolls, and 90 percent of our population lives within 10 miles of the thruway, which is basically the route of the old canal system plus the Hudson River. We commence to partake in the now increasingly dominant expenditure of highway trust fund money for reconstruction, resurfacing and such like we term the 4R Program. It took the New York State Thruway 4 years to reach that agreement—such is the entrenched attachment of a sure, clear source of revenue—but it was signed in 1982.

I am informed today by Mr. James A. Martin, who is the deputy executive director of the New York State Thruway, that exactly as planned on July 1, 1996, the thruway bonds will have been paid off and the tolls removed. That is July 1, 1996.

By that time, the State will have received some \$538 million in Federal moneys that otherwise would not have been forthcoming.

Mr. President, I will not belabor the Senate in this matter but it is of consequence to New York. The tolls will not be removed if the State legislature and the Governor do not provide by law that this will happen.

If they do not, we will have to repay one-half of a billion dollars in funds advanced and other onerous conditions, but even so the period between now and 1996 is short enough for this planning, the removal of tolls on this section of the interstate system to begin, for a timetable to be set, for the fact to be known. There cannot be 50 people in our State who are aware of this legislation and those who are aware I fear are the ones who like it least. The honorable exception is the officers of the American Automobile Association.

But I would like to record as we finish this last segment on the interstate system that Senator STAFFORD and Senator BURDICK made clear we are now finishing. We are 97 percent done. By the end of this 4-year period, the system will be completed.

We will have to think, as Senator BURDICK has said, of what now, what next?

As we do, I would hope that State of New York would keep a good-faith agreement. I am not suggesting any absence thereof, but I am suggesting that the time is at hand when the statutes need to be enacted in Albany that lead to the elimination of these tolls which ought never to have been there in the first place. It will mean that for 30 years—at this point, almost 40—New York State has been paying tolls to drive on its segment of the interstate or a principal segment, and paying taxes to build free roads of identical design elsewhere in the country, and I cannot but suppose it has had consequences in our economy. It is time we let it be known to those who are thinking of the future of that region that these tolls will not be there, to wit, anyone now thinking of locating industries or warehousing activities or maintaining them, to know that on a date certain there will be this change in transportation costs, a very considerable consequence.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be the floor manager for S. 387, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987.

There is no time to waste. The construction season is nearly upon us, and the bill must be approved before the States can let their contracts. For the last 4 months State Highway Departments have not known how much money their States would receive, and have been unable to plan ahead.

The leadership provided by Chairman BURDICK and Senator STAFFORD resulted in quick action by the Environmental and Public Works Committee.

On January 21, the Environment and Public Works Committee reported out S. 387 on a unanimous vote. There ought not be much debate on this measure, for it is very similar to the bill, S. 2405, passed by the Senate on a vote of 99 to 0 last year.

This legislation maintains the Federal commitment to development, construction, and restoration of the Nation's infrastructure. The bill authorizes \$52.3 billion in funding for highway programs from the highway trust fund for fiscal years 1987-90.

There is an annual obligation limitation of \$12.35 billion per year, with approximately \$800 million for emergency relief and the 85 percent minimum allocation program not subject to the obligation ceiling.

Last year marked the 30th anniversary of the creation of the highway trust fund, and the beginning of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The Interstate System is essentially complete, and this bill would allow States which are close to completing their portion of the system to use their apportion-

ments for other parts of the highway program. S. 387 would give the States greater flexibility in how they spend their funds by consolidating the Interstate, Interstate 4R, and Primary Programs.

The bill also provides for an administrative release mechanism for interstate construction and interstate substitute funds. Congress will no longer be required to approve the interstate cost estimate [ICE] or interstate substitute cost estimate [ISCE] to allow the Department of Transportation to apportion interstate construction and interstate substitute funds each October 1. After the Secretary of Transportation makes administrative adjustments to both the ICE and the ISCE for fiscal year 1987, the approved cost estimates would be used for the next 4 years. That will ensure a stable and reliable source of funding for the States.

S. 387 also provides for continuation of one-half of 1 percent minimum for those 25 States which have completed or nearly completed their interstate construction program. States which placed a top priority on construction of the Interstate System and concentrated resources on that system early in the program's history, often at the expense of other roads, should not be penalized for finishing early. One-half of 1 percent minimum allows States to use Interstate construction funds for other projects.

I should also point out that the administration supports our bill. Elizabeth H. Dole, Secretary of Transportation, wrote on January 20:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, January 20, 1987.

HON. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: The Committee on Environment and Public Works will be marking up S. 185, the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987", in the near future. I support your efforts to act quickly to reauthorize the highway construction program to ensure a restoration of funding to the states at the earliest possible time. At present, 35 states have depleted most of their Interstate construction funds, 38 have used most of their Primary funds and roughly half the states have exhausted their Interstate repair funds. At this critical stage, we are in danger of losing the entire construction season absent decisive congressional action.

In an effort to ensure speedy enactment of basic reauthorizing legislation, I transmitted to the Congress on the first day of the new session a clean highway bill (S. 312) that would fully use tax receipts by authorizing \$13.4 billion per year for highway programs over the period 1987 to 1990.

The Administration is pleased with the general direction of S. 185, particularly that the sponsors have recognized the need for constraints on Federal spending and have not included provisions or additional funding for special interest projects. Should S. 185 be enacted in its current form with an acceptable revenue title, I would not hesitate to recommend that the President sign the bill. I urge you to oppose any amendments in Committee and on the floor that

further increase the authorization or obligation levels in the bill for highway programs, or that will slow the reauthorization process down.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of these views for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH HANFORD DOLE.

And, on January 21, James C. Miller III, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget wrote:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 21, 1987.

HON. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: The Administration strongly supports highway reauthorization legislation along the lines of S. 185, "The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987." In general your bill is consistent with our highway reauthorization proposal, S. 312.

We are very pleased that the bill provides prudent levels of Federal funding and we encourage the Committee to maintain those levels throughout the legislative debate. We are hopeful that the Senate Finance Committee will terminate Federal gas tax exemptions, thereby increasing highway trust fund receipts in support of your authorizations.

In particular, we applaud the absence of special interest provisions or funding in the bill and urge the Committee to uphold that position. Authorizing demonstration projects, regardless of the funding mechanisms, reduces the funds available for maintaining the Federal-aid highway system.

The Administration shares your objective of a timely, clean reauthorization of the Federal highway program. In view of the necessity to avoid further delay in reauthorizing Federal highway funds, I encourage your efforts to maintain that approach throughout deliberations on the legislation, so that the President's senior advisors may recommend approval of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MILLER III,
Director.

The issue of tolls is addressed in this bill, and that is of special importance to me. Section 111 allows, at State option, the combined use of toll financing and Federal-aid highway funds for new and expanded capacity construction, operation, and maintenance of non-Interstate Federal-aid highways, bridges, and tunnels. The Federal share for such projects will not exceed 35 percent. That section, as well as section 142, would also allow highway authorities such as the West Virginia Turnpike Commission, to renegotiate section 129 agreements that brought segments of roads and bridges into the Interstate system. The New York Thruway is not affected by these provisions.

New York State built its Thruway on its own, during the administration of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. The New York State Thruway is the first true segment of the Interstate and Defense Highway System which was conceived on President Franklin Roosevelt's

watch. It was built as a toll road. Then, in 1956, the Interstate System was established by Congress at the urging of President Eisenhower. An inspired civil engineer, Bertram D. Tallam, having built the thruway, went from Albany to Washington to build the Nation's system.

With this difference: for the rest of the Nation, the Interstate was to be toll free, financed by gasoline taxes. Driving the thruway, New Yorkers would pay tolls for the construction of their part of the system, and taxes to build the rest.

One does not need to know much of the economic history of New York to know the pioneering role of its transportation system, up the Hudson River, and across to the great inland lakes. With the opening of the Erie Canal in 1925, the National Waterway Transportation System was begun. Next came the second railroad west, and now the first post-war superhighway. But, set in our ways—the Erie Canal had been financed with tolls, the New York Central Railroad was privately owned—we failed to consider what the impact of toll roads might be for us, and toll-free roads elsewhere. (The Interstate was to be, after all, the largest Public Works Program in history.)

Hon. Charles A. Buckley, a New Yorker, was chairman of the House Committee on Public Works in 1956. It would have been quite manageable for him to insist that the Federal Government assume the cost of the Thruway. It wasn't done. Not until 1978 did we get any legislative relief—and it was not until 1982 that New York finally entered into a so-called section 105 agreement with the Department of Transportation. (Public Law 95-599 provides that beginning in 1996 New York Federal Thruway tolls will be entirely removed.) The Thruway Authority currently estimates that its bonds will be entirely paid off, and the tolls removed, by July 1, 1996. In the meantime, the State will have received \$538 million in maintenance money. But 40 years of tolls is a long time.

The authorizations for the Highway Program expired on September 30, 1986. I am hopeful that the Senate can agree to this reauthorization legislation in short order, and that the conference agreement will be presented to the President early in February.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 101. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the title may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987".

SECTION 102. AUTHORIZATIONS

This section authorizes the appropriation of sums from the Highway Trust Fund, other than the Mass Transit Account, for the Federal-Aid programs for fiscal years 1987 through 1990.

Clause (1) provides authorizations for the Interstate-primary program of \$8.15 billion for each fiscal year 1987 through 1990.

Clause (2) provides authorizations for the Federal-Aid urban system of \$750 million for each fiscal year 1987 through 1990.

Clause (3) provides authorizations for the Federal-Aid secondary system of \$600 million for each fiscal year 1987 through 1990.

Clause (4) provides authorizations for the bridge replacement and rehabilitation program of \$1.5 billion for each fiscal year 1987 through 1990. A total of \$200 million per year shall be set aside for the bridge discretionary fund.

Clause (5) provides annual authorizations for each of the components of the Federal lands highway program for fiscal years 1987 through 1990 as follows: forest highways \$50 million, public lands highways \$50 million, Indian reservation roads \$75 million, and park roads and parkways \$75 million.

Clause (6) provides each of the territories (the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas) with an annual authorization under the Territorial Highway Program for fiscal years 1987 through 1990 of \$5 million, \$5 million, \$1 million, and \$1 million, respectively.

Clause (7) provides annual authorizations for highway related safety grants by FHWA for the fiscal years 1987 through 1990 of \$10 million.

Clause (8) provides annual authorizations for highway construction safety research development grants by FHWA for the fiscal years 1987 through 1990 of \$10 million.

Clause (9) provides annual authorizations for hazard elimination for fiscal years 1987 through 1990 of \$175 million.

Clause (10) provides annual authorizations for rail-highway crossings for fiscal years 1987 through 1990 of \$175 million.

SECTION 103. INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTE PROGRAM

This section amends section 103(e)(4) of title 23, the Interstate Substitute Program. The amendments to section 103(e)(4) are simple recodification except as follows.

Section 103(e)(4)(B) makes highway construction projects on any public road eligible, as highway substitution projects, expanding the current eligibility from projects authorized under any highway assistance program under section 103 of title 23.

Section 103(e)(4)(C) deletes the deadline for project removal.

Section 103(e)(4)(E) makes substitution funds available in a State for 2 years. Funds not obligated in the 2 year period shall be reallocated or reapportioned as the case may be.

Section 103(e)(4)(G) provides authorizations for highway substitution projects for the fiscal year 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990 of \$650 million per fiscal year.

Section 103(e)(4)(H)(iv) provides for the administrative adjustment of the last Interstate Substitute Cost Estimate (ISCE) approved to make substitution apportionments for highways after fiscal year 1986, beginning on October 1, 1986.

Section 103(e)(4)(J)(iv) provides for the administrative adjustment of the last ISCE approved to make transit substitution apportionments after fiscal year 1986, beginning on October 1, 1986.

Section 103(e)(4)(P) directs the Secretary to reserve in a State's account under section

103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, an amount equal to that expended on right-of-way for a withdrawn route or segment of the Interstate where the right-of-way has not been disposed of. Such sum shall be released to the State upon partial or full repayment of funds in accordance with section 103(e)(7) of this title or upon the determination by the Secretary that under section 103(e)(5)(B) or (6)(B) repayment is not required.

Section (b) adds a new section 103(e)(10)(A) to title 23 which permits States flexibility in crediting funds expended on withdrawn Interstate routes. Section 103(e)(7) of title 23, requires payback of the costs of construction items, materials and rights-of-way acquired for highway projects on segments withdrawn from the Interstate System on or after November 6, 1978, unless the State gives assurances acceptable to the Secretary that such items, materials, rights-of-way (i.e., property acquired for highway projects) have been or will be applied to a transportation project within ten years from the date of approval of withdrawal of the interstate segment. Preliminary FHWA estimates indicate that \$94,097,583 in Federal funds were expended for such costs in connection with the construction of Westway (I-478).

The Final Rule on Use and Disposition of Property Previously Acquired by States for Withdrawn Interstate Segments (effective May 30, 1986) specified that in the event of such payback, an amount equivalent to the funds paid back will be credited to the repaying State's unobligated balance of the same class funds which were used to acquire the property. This section enables a State to credit its payback to its unobligated balance of combined Interstate-primary and Interstate 4R and primary projects.

Under this section, New York shall fully repay the United States Treasury for the amount of Federal funds expended for the cost of construction items, materials and rights-of-way associated with the withdrawn Westway Project. Under the present rules, such action would result in a sizable increase in funds which would be available only for interstate completion for New York. However, New York already has adequate funds to complete its remaining uncompleted portions of the Interstate System. This section provides the State with the flexibility to credit other accounts where funds can be better used.

SECTION 104. APPORTIONMENT

This section amends section 104 of title 23 as follows:

Subsection (a) makes technical and conforming amendments.

Subsection (b) adds a new subsection to set aside funds for the Strategic Highway Research Program from Federal-Aid Interstate primary, Urban, Secondary, Bridge, Highway Substitution, Railway-Highway Crossings and Hazard Elimination authorizations.

Subsection (c) repeals transfer provisions which do not conform with the creation of a new Federal-Aid Interstate-primary program.

Subsection (d) provides apportionment formulas for the Federal-Aid Interstate-primary formula, the Secondary System and the Urban System. The Secondary and Urban formulas are unchanged. The Federal-Aid Interstate-primary formula replaces existing Interstate construction, Interstate 4R, and primary program formulas which are unchanged. Those programs are consolidated by this Act into one program.

Paragraph (A) provides a formula for the new Interstate-Primary program which apportions \$3.0 billion based on an administratively adjusted Interstate Cost Estimate, \$2.8 billion based on the existing Interstate 4R formula and \$2.35 billion based on the existing primary formula.

Subsections (e), (f) and (g) make technical and conforming amendments.

Subsection (h) permits a State to transfer up to 50 percent of its apportionment between the Urban and Secondary Systems. Urban System funds allocated to an urbanized area under section 150 of title 23 cannot be transferred without the approval of the local officials of the area.

SECTION 105. AVAILABILITY

This section amends section 18 of title 23 to provide four-year availability for the Interstate-primary program, with any unobligated funds lapsing at the end of the period.

The new paragraph (b)(2) clarifies the availability of bridge replacement and rehabilitation funds. Apportioned funds remain available for obligation in a State for four years with unobligated funds reallocated as bridge discretionary funds. Bridge discretionary funds remain available for obligation in a State during the year of allocation with unused authority available to the Secretary for further reallocation.

This section also makes technical and conforming amendments to eliminate the Interstate and Interstate 4R discretionary funds.

SECTION 106. INTERSTATE SYSTEM RESURFACING

This section makes technical and conforming amendments to section 119 of title 23 and amends provisions that require a reduction of a State's Interstate apportionment by 10 percent for failure to maintain the Interstate System adequately to require a reduction of not more than 10 percent of a State's Interstate portion of the Interstate-primary apportionment at the discretion of the Secretary.

SECTION 107. FEDERAL SHARE PAYABLE

This section amends section 120 of title 23 making technical and conforming changes and also provides a Federal share for Interstate-primary funds used on the Primary System (other than the Interstate) of not to exceed 75 percent of the cost of construction. These percentages may be increased under the sliding scale provision of current law.

Interstate projects will have a Federal share of not to exceed 90 percent. Routes designated as Interstate under section 139(a) and 139(b) of title 23 prior to March 9, 1984, and under section 139(c) of title 23 will be able to be improved at a 90-percent Federal share. These percentages may be increased in certain circumstances under current law.

This section provides that the Federal share payable for a highway emergency relief project shall be the same as for a regular Federal-aid highway project on the system in question except that the Federal share payable may be 100 percent only for emergency work done in the first 30 days after the occurrence of the event that triggers emergency relief.

This section also provides that States may contribute amounts in excess of the normal State share on all title 23 projects.

SECTION 108. RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

This section amends section 123(a) of title 23 to clarify that Federal-aid highway funds may participate in utility relocation pay-

ments legally made by a State for utility relocations necessitated by the actual construction of a highway project and for safety improvements under a State's safety improvement program.

This section also eliminates the requirement in the existing section 123(a) that limits Federal reimbursement to only those utility relocation payments made by a State with its own funds. This would establish consistency with the overall Federal-aid program by allowing the State to obtain all or portions of its pro-rata share of the costs for the utility work from other parties such as the utilities or political subdivisions, if it so desires.

SECTION 109. EMERGENCY RELIEF

This section amends section 125 of title 23 to make the territories eligible for emergency relief with a \$5 million cap on obligations during any one fiscal year.

SECTION 110. VEHICLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS—INTERSTATE SYSTEM

This section amends section 127(a) of title 23 to provide for the withholding of the Interstate construction portion of Federal-Aid Interstate-primary funds, in lieu of withholding Interstate construction funds, for violations of section 127. The change is needed as Interstate construction funds will be unavailable to withhold. The current penalty provision in section 127(a) is revised to provide that any withheld funds do not lapse if they are subsequently released and obligated within the normal four year availability period.

SECTION 111. TOLL FINANCING

This section amends section 129 of title 23 to allow, at State option, the combined use of toll financing and Federal-Aid highway funds for new and expanded capacity construction, operation, and maintenance of non-Interstate Federal-Aid highways, bridges, and tunnels. The Federal share for such projects shall not exceed 35 percent.

This section incorporates the toll provisions of section 105 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978 into section 129 of title 23 and clarifies a provision of section 105 concerning the repayment of Federal funds.

This section also requires toll authorities to certify to the governor that sufficient reserves are available to cover the construction, operation, maintenance, and repair or replacement of the toll facilities not eligible for Federal-Aid highway funds. The Governor is to transmit this information to the Secretary who will transmit it to Congress. If funds from the Highway Trust Fund are spent on these toll facilities, an equal amount will be deducted from the State's Federal-Aid highway apportionments the following year. This section does not apply to international toll facilities and those toll facilities covered by a section 105 or section 129 agreement.

SECTION 112. RAILWAY—HIGHWAY CROSSINGS

This section incorporates the provision of section 203 of the Highway Safety Act of 1973 into section 130 of title 23 and makes technical and conforming amendments.

SECTION 113. STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM

This section adds a provision for the Strategic Highway Reserve Program (SHRP) to title 23, United States Code. SHRP will be funded by deducting one-quarter of one percent from funds authorized for the programs specified in subsection 104(c) of title 23, United States Code. The Secretary will carry out SHRP in cooperation with State highway departments and will set standards

for the use of the funds to conduct research, development and technology transfer activities determined to be strategically important to the national highway transportation system. The Secretary may provide grants to and enter into compensation agreements with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the National Academy of Sciences to conduct appropriate portions of SHRP. Advance payments may be made under such agreements. No State matching share is required for SHRP and the funds will remain available for four years. This section also provides that the National Academy of Sciences will be treated as a federal agency in the case of any litigation which may result from the implementation of SHRP.

SECTION 114. SECTION 139 ROUTES

This section makes amendments to sections 139 (a), (b), and (c) of title 23 to conform with the new Interstate-primary category. This section also provides that routes designated by section 139 are eligible for any of the funds provided by the Interstate-primary program.

SECTION 115. OFF-SYSTEM BRIDGE PROGRAM

This section permits a State to credit State-only financed off-system bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects toward the State share of the cost of other Federal-Aid bridge projects. Off-system bridges that are eligible for section 144 funds, are noncontroversial, and certified by the State to have been carried out in accordance with all standards applicable under section 144 of title 23 are eligible for this program.

SECTION 116. MINIMUM ALLOCATION

This section amends section 157 of title 23 to add total allocations as well as apportionments to the calculation of the 85 percent minimum funds and makes the provision permanent law. This will provide donor States to return closer to 85 percent of the amount contributed to the Highway Trust Fund by these States. Currently, in calculating the return of 85 percent minimum to the States, only apportioned programs are considered. Two major categories are added which are bridge discretionary and emergency relief. Several smaller Highway Trust Fund categories shall also be included.

Subsection (b) makes the provisions of subsection (a) effective October 1, 1986.

Subsection (c) provides authorizations for the minimum allocation for fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990.

SECTION 117. FEDERAL-AID INTERSTATE-PRIMARY PROGRAM

This section amends title 23 to establish the Federal-Aid Interstate-primary Program. The Interstate-primary program will emphasize bringing all elements of the Primary System to acceptable standards of operation and safety. The program will consist of both new construction and 4R work on the Primary System and the Interstate System (including additions thereto under section 139). The Interstate-primary program will include traditional primary program projects, Interstate construction projects, and Interstate resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation and reconstruction projects.

The designated Interstate System in all States will receive attention in maintaining its high level of serviceability. At the same time, there is sufficient flexibility to allow States to concentrate on neglected primary routes and other primary routes which have developed into significant Interstate traffic carriers.

SECTION 118. INCOME FROM RIGHTS-OF-WAY

This section provides that the net income a State receives from the use, lease, or sale of right-of-way airspace acquired as a result of a project under title 23 shall be used for projects under chapter 1 of title 23. Certain exceptions are provided. This section requires that the States obtain at least the fair market value for permitted non-highway uses of highway right-of-way air space. This section also requires that any net revenues, after deducting the cost of sale or cost of issuing and maintaining the joint use agreements, obtained by a State or political subdivision for the use of the airspace of right-of-way of a Federal-Aid project by non-highway facilities shall be applied to highway projects eligible under the provisions of title 23. The term right-of-way airspace would include space, both above and below ground. The charges and disposition of fees for utility use and occupancy of right-of-way will continue to be governed by 23 C.F.R. 645. The term utility includes publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities. This section permits the Secretary to grant exceptions to these requirements for social, environmental, and economic mitigation purposes. This section is not intended to interfere with any court proceedings or consent decrees issued for I-95 and I-676 in Philadelphia.

SECTION 119. TERRITORIAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

This section amends subsection (f) of section 215 to clarify that the provisions of chapter 1 of title 23 which are applicable to Interstate-primary program funds and the Primary System are applicable to the Territorial Highway Program. Subsection (f) also authorizes a Federal-Aid system in each territory similar to the Primary System established by the provisions of the STAA of 1982 and provides that the Secretary may determine the applicability of the provisions of Chapter 1.

SECTION 120. BICYCLE PROJECTS ELIGIBILITY

This section permits States to use Federal-Aid highway funds apportioned or allocated for a highway substitute project for the purpose of designing and constructing bicycle facilities.

SECTION 121. HIGHWAY PLANNING AND RESEARCH

This section permits a State to use one and one-half percent of apportioned Interstate Highway Transfer funds for highway planning and research activities. It would not include the 25 percent of transfer funds that are allocated.

SECTION 122. NATIONAL HIGHWAY INSTITUTE

This section modifies section 321 of title 23 to direct the Secretary to provide training at no cost to States and local governments for subject areas which are a Federal program responsibility and to allow the States to use Federal-Aid funds to pay 75 percent of the cost of education and training purchased from any source including the National Highway Institute.

SECTION 123. RIGHT-OF-WAY DONATION

Subsection (a) allows 100 percent of a private contribution of right-of-way to be credited, according to its fair market value at the time of donation, to the State's matching share for the project if the donation is made to the State. A State would receive no credit for the excess of a donation which exceeded the State matching share for the project.

Subsection (b) amends title 23 to provide that land may be donated in advance of the

environmental and planning process for a prospective highway project. The donation will in no way affect the required planning process for the location and environmental review of the decision with respect to alignment. If during the alignment study and environmental analysis the route for which the land was donated is determined not to be feasible, the donation of right-of-way would be cancelled and the land reverted in the grantor or successors in interest.

Subsection (c) amends title 42 to permit donations of right-of-way and financial contributions to a State or other political subdivision. The provision also encourages the promotion of such joint projects wherein private citizens and governmental entities participate in the cost of projects as consistent with Federal policy.

Subsection (d) allows the fair market value of lands donated or dedicated to California for the relocation and construction of State Route 73 in Orange County from I-405 to I-5 to be credited to the State's matching share of the project and any excess value to be credited toward the State's share of the cost of any other Federal Aid project. Any recorded irrevocable offer of dedication or donation effective prior to the State's request for final reimbursement on the project shall be considered a part of the State right-of-way acquisition. The Federal Aid reimbursement may not exceed the actual cost to the State for the project.

SECTION 124. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCLOSURE AND ADMISSION AS EVIDENCE OF STATE REPORTS AND SURVEYS

This section amends title 23 to provide that no report, survey, schedule, list, or data compiled for the purpose of complying with any requirement of sections 130, 144, and 152 of title 23, United States Code, or for developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented with Federal-Aid highway funds shall be required to be admitted into evidence or used in any action for damages arising from matters mentioned or addressed in such documents.

SECTION 125. BUY AMERICA

This section exempts projects costing \$500,000 or less from domestic content requirements. Reestablishment of such a threshold provision will help to reduce administrative burdens and facilitate the highway and transit procurements of grantees with small projects, and lower the costs of the highway and transit programs.

SECTION 126. REGULATION OF TOLLS

This section removes Federal regulation and review of toll increases on certain toll bridges. Toll increases on these deregulated facilities must be just and reasonable but will not be subject to review by DOT.

SECTION 127. INDIAN EMPLOYMENT AND CONTRACTING

This section brings the antidiscrimination provision of section 140 of title 23, United States Code, into conformity with title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act on the issue of Indian preference in employment and contracting for certain Federal-Aid highway projects.

SECTION 128. DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM

This section authorizes a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program which establishes goals to encourage the participation of disadvantaged business enterprises.

Subsection (a) requires States to expend 10 percent of Federal-Aid highway contracts

with DBEs unless the Secretary determines otherwise.

Subsection (b) defines a disadvantaged business enterprise. The definition includes a small business owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals provided that an individual's receipts do not exceed \$1 million. Women are also included in the rebuttable presumption of being disadvantaged.

Subsection (c) would allow costs incurred by State and local governments and prime contractors in assisting disadvantaged businesses in meeting the goal. These costs cannot be used to meet more than 10 percent of the DBE contract.

Subsection (d) would require the Secretary to establish minimum uniform criteria for State governments to use in certifying whether a concern is a disadvantaged business enterprise for the purpose of this section.

Subsection (e) requires that a DBE subcontractor perform at least 30 percent of the subcontract work with its own organization in order for the work to count towards a State's DBE goal. Certain exceptions can be made to the 30 percent requirement.

Subsection (f) provides that States must contract part of their DBE goal directly with DBE firms beginning in 1988.

SECTION 129. RELEASE OF CONDITION RELATING TO CONVEYANCE OF A CERTAIN HIGHWAY

This section relieves the State of Maryland from the obligation of accepting title to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway in return for Federal participation in improvements to the Parkway as required under section 146 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

SECTION 130. WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PROJECT

This section authorizes \$58 million out of general revenues to upgrade certain roads in the State of New Mexico. This authorization fulfills an agreement among the State of New Mexico, the Department of Energy and the Department of Transportation for the upgrading of roads in the vicinity of the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP). This facility is being built as a long-term repository for storage of low-level nuclear wastes from around the country.

SECTION 131. OBLIGATION LIMITATION

This section establishes an obligation limitation of \$12.35 billion for fiscal year 1987, \$12.35 billion for fiscal year 1988, \$12.35 billion for fiscal year 1989 and \$12.35 billion for fiscal year 1990. The Emergency Relief and Minimum Allocation funds are not subject to the obligation limitation.

SECTION 132. HISTORIC BRIDGES

This section encourages the preservation of historic bridges. Subsection (a) establishes that it is in the national interest to preserve historic bridges.

Subsection (b) directs the Secretary to cooperate with the States in implementing section 144 of title 23 in a manner which promotes the preservation of historic bridges.

Subsection (c) requires States to identify historic bridges on the National Bridge Inventory.

Subsection (d) clarifies that any reasonable costs associated with mitigating harm to an historic bridge would be eligible for Federal-Aid bridge funds if the bridge remains part of the highway system.

Subsection (e) permits States to use bridge funds equal to the cost of demolition for preserving an historic bridge eligible for demolition if they, or any other responsible

entity, sign an agreement taking future legal and financial responsibility for the bridge.

Subsection (f) defines an historic bridge as any bridge that is listed on, or eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places.

Subsection (g) requires the Transportation Research Board to review the rehabilitation of historic bridges and develop recommendations for specific standards for the rehabilitation of historic bridges.

SECTION 133. FOREST HIGHWAYS

This section provides that two-thirds of the Forest Highway funds are allocated according to the formula used prior to the STAA of 1982 and one-third is allocated according to section 202(a) of title 23.

SECTION 134. WILDFLOWERS

This section requires that one-quarter percent of Federal-aid highway funds expended for landscaping on a project be for the planting of wildflowers or seedlings. The requirement can be waived if a State certifies that the planting of such wildflowers is not feasible because of conditions with respect to the particular project on which landscaping funds are expended. Public donations of wildflowers or seedlings are allowed.

SECTION 135. COMBINED ROAD PLAN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

This section authorizes the Secretary to conduct a combined road demonstration program to permit up to ten States to participate in a block grant program for Federal-Aid secondary, Federal-Aid urban, and off-system, urban and secondary bridge projects.

The block grant program authorized in this section will help to demonstrate the feasibility of turning over greater responsibility to State officials for administering the highway program. The categories included in this initiative serve State and local highway and bridge needs and these needs can perhaps be met more effectively if greater flexibility is extended to the States.

In carrying out the block grant program the Secretary may extend to State officials certain responsibilities currently carried out by FHWA. However, all environmental requirements currently delegated to FHWA will continue to be the responsibility of FHWA.

SECTION 136. NEW JERSEY-PENNSYLVANIA TOLL COMPACT

This section allows the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission to continue tolls on the existing Delaware Gap Bridge on I-80 and to impose tolls on the uncompleted bridge under construction on I-78. The section also amends the Interstate Compact between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to allow the Commission to use the tolls collected on its toll bridges for expenses of any of the bridges under its jurisdiction.

SECTION 137. MOTOR VEHICLE STUDY

During hearings, witnesses expressed concerns about larger and heavier trucks. Section 137 directs the Secretary to make arrangements with the Transportation Research Board of the National Research Council to study the motor carrier industry.

Among the subjects for analysis are: existing grandfather clauses which allow for higher axle loads and gross vehicle weights; the current bridge formula and its relationship to trucks and existing bridges; special truck permits and the circumstances for which they are issued; appropriate treat-

ment for motor vehicles unable to comply with the current bridge formula; and associated costs and benefits.

TRB shall consult with DOT, state highway and transportation agencies, the motor carrier industry, highway safety groups, and other interested parties throughout the course of the study and shall submit a final report to the Secretary, to be transmitted to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the House Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Congress. A total of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1987 and the same amount for fiscal 1988 is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund for the study. The final report is due no later than 30 months after enactment of this legislation.

SECTION 138. RAIL-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS STUDY

The most recent major assessment of rail-highway crossing needs was done in the early 1970s. A report was made to Congress at that time, leading in turn to passage of section 203 of the Highway Safety Act of 1973. Since then, there has been a large investment of Federal-aid highway funds to improve safety conditions at crossings.

The earlier study focused on crossing problems for both railroad and highway traffic. The major recommendation was for approximately 30,000 active warning devices to be installed. It is appropriate for a new study to be undertaken of developments in the last 20-25 years. In particular, the Committee is interested in an evaluation of the present program; a study of needs and of responsibilities, including those for maintenance, abandoned bridges, and Conrail crossings; an analysis of driver behavior; and a review of the effectiveness of the rail-highway demonstration program. It is intended that the new, broader report address safety, mobility, and capacity issues as they relate to improvement and maintenance needs.

A total of \$600,000 is authorized for the purpose of performing the study. The Secretary is directed to conduct the study and report findings to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the House Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Congress no later than 24 months after enactment of this legislation.

SECTION 139. CALIFORNIA EMERGENCY RELIEF

This section removes the Emergency Relief Program cap of \$30 million per year per disaster for calendar year 1986 so that California's 1986 disaster is eligible for Federal-aid funds for the total amount of the disaster.

SECTION 140. PRIORITY PROJECTS

This provision establishes that priority projects designated in the bill be funded from State's regular apportionment at the specific request of a State to the Secretary. It is not the intent of the Committee that States be obligated to undertake projects listed as priorities in this section. No new Federal funds are authorized by this section. These priority projects must be on the Federal-Aid system and must meet the requirements of title 23. Additional flexibility is provided to States by permitting them to use any funding category with the applicable match to build such a designated priority project.

SECTION 141. LETTING OF CONTRACTS

This section amends section 112(b) of title 23 to permit the Secretary to waive competitive bidding on a reconstruction contract where an emergency situation such as an emergency relief project exists.

SECTION 142. WEST VIRGINIA TURNPIKE TOLLS

The West Virginia Turnpike was constructed as a toll road. In 1971, the West Virginia Turnpike Commission entered into an agreement with the Federal Highway Administration to bring the Turnpike into the Interstate System. As a condition of the agreement, existing tolls were to be removed when the bonds were paid off in 1989. Current projections show that the Commission will not be able to meet December 1, 1989 due date on its bonds. This section allows the West Virginia Turnpike Commission to renegotiate the terms of its agreement with the Secretary of Transportation.

SECTION 143. ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION

This section amends the existing section 115 of title 23, United States Code. Under the provisions of this amendment, States have greater flexibility in the use of the advance construction mechanism as follows.

Subsection (b) permits a state to carry out advance construction projects in the highway substitute, urban, secondary, or bridge programs if a state has used or demonstrates that it will use all of the funds apportioned or allocated to it in the category for which advance construction is being sought, or if the state has used or demonstrates that it will use all of the obligation authority allocated to it. The state will be paid the Federal share of the cost of construction of the project when additional funds are apportioned or allocated to it.

Subsection (c) permits a state to carry out advance construction projects, regardless of its balance of apportioned or allocated funds, and regardless of its balance of apportioned or allocated funds, and regardless of its balance of obligation authority. The state will be paid the Federal share of the cost of construction of the project when additional funds are apportioned or allocated to it.

Subsection (e) provides a January 1, 1987 effective date for the amendments made by this section. This allows a State to proceed with a project or projects during the period in calendar year 1987 prior to the enactment of a highway authorization bill. For the months in calendar year 1987 until a highway authorization bill is passed, states have the ability to carry out advance construction projects with the assurance of federal reimbursement for project costs. This avoids or minimizes the loss of the 1987 highway construction season which may occur if states are not able to proceed with scheduled projects.

SECTION 144. REVIEW OF REPORTS ON UNITED STATES ROUTE 13 RELIEF ROUTE

This section requests the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the United States Army Corps of Engineers to review reports regarding the United States Route 13 Relief Route and the Inland Waterway from the Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay.

SECTION 145. CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, VIRGINIA

This section would permit expansion of route 58 within the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park from two to four lanes. Parkway funds would be eligible to be used in such an expansion project. The priority of the project would be determined by the normal programming process.

This section is not intended to compete with the tunnel project for construction funds. It will take effect upon completion of the other segments of the tunnel.

SECTION 146. FERRY BOAT SERVICE STUDY

This section directs the Secretary of Transportation to study the feasibility of re-establishing ferry boat service on the Missouri River between the vicinities of Springfield, South Dakota and Niobrara, Nebraska. The study is to be conducted in conjunction with the South Dakota and Nebraska highway departments. The record should reflect that the previous ferry landing on the South Dakota side of the river was at a community named Running Water, but the nearest incorporated town is Springfield. In addition, the Secretary is not constrained to the exact locations of previous ferry services, but is to consider all appropriate sites within the general area.

This section requires the Federal Government to pay half the cost of the study and the named States to pay the remaining cost of the study.

SECTION 147. EXTENSION OF TOLLS TO FINANCE CERTAIN INELIGIBLE CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

This section allows Florida to continue the use of tolls on a segment of Interstate 75 known as Alligator Alley until the State is reimbursed for its expenditures for the construction costs necessary to meet the area's unique environmental needs.

SECTION 148. LOUISIANA, ARKANSAS, AND MISSOURI HIGHWAY FEASIBILITY STUDY

This section directs the Secretary of Transportation to determine the feasibility of constructing to appropriate standards a highway from Shreveport, Louisiana to Kansas City, Missouri. The Secretary is to report to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and the House Public Works and Transportation Committee not later than one year after the bill's enactment. The Federal Highway Administration estimates the cost of conducting the study to be \$50,000.

This section requires the Federal Government to pay half the cost of the study and the named States to pay the remaining cost of the study.

SECTION 149. STATE MATCHING SHARE

This section provides that the State or local government matching share for the Calder bridge title 23 project in Idaho may be credited by the fair market value of land incorporated into the project when the land is in addition to existing public right-of-way, and may be credited by the fair market value of construction on the project performed by or donated to the State or local government. The fair market value of right-of-way and construction, including preliminary engineering and preparation of an environmental impact statement, donated before and after enactment of this section, may be credited to the State or local matching share.

SECTION 150. SUBSTITUTE TRANSIT PROJECT IN OREGON

Subsection (a) provides that on the joint request of the Governor, of Oregon and the concerned local governments, the Secretary of Transportation may approve a substitute project for the construction of a light rail transit system. Such a rail system would be in lieu of construction of any eligible interstate bus lane or busway project, if such a substitute rail project is in or adjacent to the proposed right-of-way for such bus lanes.

Subsection (b) states that upon the approval of any such substitute transit project, the cost of the construction of the eligible interstate bus lanes for which the

project is substituted shall not be eligible for funds authorized under section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and a sum equal to the Federal share of such costs shall be available to the Secretary to incur obligations for the Federal share of the costs of the substitute project.

The language of subsection (c) requires that by September 30, 1989, any approved substitute transit project (for which the Secretary determines that sufficient Federal funds are available) must be under contract for construction or construction must have commenced. If any substitute project is not under contract for construction or construction has not begun by that date, the Secretary shall withdraw approval of such project and no funds shall be appropriated for any such project.

Subsection (d)(1) provides that a substitute transit project approved under subsection (a) shall be considered a substitute transit project under the Federal-aid system statutory language, at section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code. Subsection (d)(2) states that unobligated appropriations for the Interstate System in Oregon, shall, on the approval date of a substitute transit project under subsection (a), be reduced in the proportion that the Federal share of the costs of the construction of the eligible interstate lanes for which such project is substituted bears to the Federal share of the total costs of all interstate routes in Oregon, as reflected in the latest cost estimate approved by Congress. Subsection (d)(3) requires that the Secretary shall administer the provisions of this section through the Federal Highway Administration.

Subsection (e) provides that for the purposes of this section, the term "eligible interstate lanes" means any bus lanes which are to be constructed on Interstate Route 205 in Oregon.

SECTION 151. INTERIM AMENDMENTS

Subsection (a) provides that unobligated Interstate construction balances (apportioned or allocated) shall remain available until October 1, 1990, for Interstate construction projects. Unallocated Interstate discretionary funds are to be distributed using existing procedures.

Subsection (b) makes the unobligated balances previously apportioned to a State under subsection 104(b)(1) (Primary System program) and 104(b)(5)(B) (Interstate 4R program) of title 23, United States Code, as they existed prior to enactment of this legislation available for obligation for projects under the Federal-aid Interstate-primary program.

Subsection (c) makes the unobligated balances of funds apportioned to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under the provisions of section 108 of the Highway Improvement Act of 1982 available for obligation under provisions of section 215 of title 23, United States Code.

Subsection (d) makes the unobligated balances of funds apportioned to a State under section 203 of the Highway Safety Act of 1972 available for projects under section 130 of title 23, United States Code.

SECTION 152. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

This section makes needed technical and conforming amendments.

This section also conforms the provisions of the Uniform Minimum Drinking Age Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-363), as amended by the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, to the changes made in Interstate and primary

highway construction funding contained in the bill. The bill makes no changes to the Uniform Minimum Drinking Age Act and its intent to withhold a portion of Federal-aid highway assistance from those States which fail to adopt a legal minimum age of 21 by October 1, 1986, as specified in Federal regulations.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gary Aldridge, Miss Clare Thorne, and Mr. Don Campbell, of Senator CRANSTON's staff be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 387, the Federal Highway Act.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I am pleased that we are here today to begin consideration of S. 387, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1987.

I think that we cannot overemphasize the importance of early passage of this legislation. It is important to the entire Nation. It is important to every State.

I thank the majority leader and minority leader for working together to bring this bill to the floor early in this 100th Congress.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator BURDICK, the ranking minority member of the committee, Senator STAFFORD, and the subcommittee chairman, Senator MOYNIHAN, and all of our colleagues on the committee for their expeditious work on the markup session and the unanimous votes to report the bill favorably to the Senate.

Mr. President, my colleagues on the committee have already summarized the major provisions in this bill. I will not reiterate these points, but I would just say to all my colleagues that this is a very good, sound highway bill. With the adoption of a few amendments, it could be made into even a better highway bill.

The bill provides increased funding flexibility to assure that the Federal Aid Highway Program will continue without annual interruptions, with greater control of the programs for the States. S. 387 includes virtually all of the programmatic changes which the Senate adopted unanimously last year by a vote of 99 to 0.

So I think it is important to start off with that all our colleagues are aware of the fact that we think we brought to the floor a very good piece of legislation that is important to the country.

I want to focus special attention on one of the provisions of this legislation, the section on priority projects. I am particularly pleased with the work the committee has done in this area.

Last year the committee voiced overwhelming support for the priority project funding mechanism suggested by the Transportation Subcommittee

leadership. This year the full committee has adopted the same funding mechanism for those special projects. Section 140 of the bill authorizes a State to use its regularly apportioned funds for any project listed in that section. No additional Federal funds are authorized for the projects, but States will have the opportunity to build the projects without being limited to a single funding category.

The reason that is good policy, Mr. President, is that this in fact gives the States additional flexibility for very worthy projects in many instances that they may not otherwise be able to have authorization to build, but it does not take more money and give the money to them additionally over and above what their apportioned Federal highway aid formula apportionment would be.

So I think it is important that the Members of the Senate recognize that any influence or help they can give us with the other body will be appreciated by those members of the committee and those who will be conferees. This is a sticking point with the House. It has become very popular, I say to my colleagues, over the years to add new projects to the highway bill and then get extra money to pay for them and then it puts the Federal Government in position where the Congress is then dictating which projects specifically get the bill.

I think for the longrun for the country this is bad policy because we get so political then and it becomes a political game of who has the number of votes and who is the chairman of what subcommittee, and it is not good policy.

I think what the Senate has done here truly is good, sound public policy, and I hope we will be able to support it and win that issue in the conference.

I believe the priority projects is sound fiscal and public policy. The growing number of demonstrations projects are a serious threat to the fiscal integrity of the highway program.

This year there are more than 100 special projects in the House bill at a total estimated cost of over \$4 billion. Congress must act decisively to limit the number and cost of such projects if we are to sustain the broad public and political support of the Federal Aid Highway Program which we have enjoyed since the inception.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this provision on the Senate floor and in the conference with the House of Representatives. Authorization for the Federal Aid Highway Program expired last October 1 and House-Senate conferees were unable to reach an agreement for a new authorization for the program prior to the adjournment of the 99th Congress. This 4-month delay in reauthorization of the pro-

gram and apportionment of highway funds already has caused serious damage to highway construction programs in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories. If the program is not reauthorized very soon, we may lose an entire construction season in many States, including my own State of Idaho.

According to a report of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials [AASHTO]; another month's delay in apportioning highway funds will result in the postponement of 767 projects, valued at \$1.2 billion. If no bill is enacted by May 1, 1987, almost 1,900 projects; valued at \$2.9 billion; will be postponed. In addition, long-term damage resulting from further delay will be very serious. According to the AASHTO report; "as of March 1, 1987, Federal-aid reimbursement will run out for the planning or right-of-way purchase for 1,277 projects nationwide." Such delays may result in postponement of construction projects long into the future.

The postponement of highway projects and the possible loss of a construction season means lost jobs. A report issued last week by The Road Information Program [TRIP] indicates that each \$1 billion reduction in Federal highway funds results in a loss of 41,600 jobs in all sectors of the economy. While I have never argued that the Federal-Aid Highway Program should be continued because it is a jobs program; the fact is that about \$9.5 billion is sitting in the trust fund; taxes continue to be collected from highway users; and those funds should be spent on highway projects which affect the jobs of thousands of American citizens.

Now, I look forward to an expeditious consideration of the bill. As most of my colleagues know, I intend to offer the speed limit amendment which the Senate debated and adopted by a 20-vote margin last year. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will cosponsor the amendment and I invite other Senators to contact my office if they wish to be listed as a cosponsor when the amendment is offered today or even tomorrow, depending on what the floor manager does today.

The time is right to give the States greater authority to regulate their own speed limits. This highway bill is the appropriate legislative vehicle on which to address the issue. State governments and the Nation's highway users cannot wait any longer for Congress to resolve this issue. I will discuss in more detail the merits of the speed limit reform when I offer the amendment.

Again, I want to compliment my colleagues on the committee for their diligent efforts to move this bill to the floor as quickly as possible. I look for-

ward to the debate and passage of this bill.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from New York that the sooner we can accomplish passage of this legislation and have a successful conference, the better it will be for a sustained highway program for the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I have been guilty of a breach of courtesy. In my earlier remarks I did not mention the extraordinary work which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] has done on this matter. He carried it in conference to the honor of the Senate by insisting on the principles which he enunciated in detail. He has more detailed knowledge of this matter than, certainly, the Senator from New York. I thought that was so obvious in my mind that I failed to make it explicit.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am pleased to be among the cosponsors of the Federal-Aid Highway Act. Expedient passage of this bill is imperative to assure continued provision of funds to the States for construction and modification of highways, bridges, and tunnels, covered under this act. Currently, States do not have access to Federal-aid highway funds for fiscal year 1987, and many States have run out of funds from fiscal year 1986. The bill as reported out of the Environment and Public Works Committee represents years of work by members and their staffs. This is an excellent package which would allow our Federal and State highway systems and mass transit programs to be completed or expanded to accommodate growth.

This legislation would release \$450 million in annual Federal-aid highway apportionment to my State of Florida. It would permit Florida to carry out a \$608 million Federal-Aid Highway Program during 1987 without disruption. Passage of this bill would preserve 2,000 jobs in the highway construction and supporting industries in my State, which would have been lost to a prolonged legislative impasse. The increase in State discretion through the consolidation of the interstate and primary programs would provide additional options for the completion of major Florida projects, such as the eastern bypass around Jacksonville, State Road 9A.

The focus of the Federal-Aid Highway Program has been moving toward maintenance rather than construction and expansion of highways. Federal construction dollars are thus decreasing. In States such as Florida, where we are experiencing dramatic growth, new and expanded highways, bridges, and tunnels are necessary to relieve the overburdening of existing facilities. State public finance can only absorb so much of this Federal reduc-

tion in construction dollars. For this reason, I am pleased that the Environment and Public Works Committee accepted my provision which addresses toll financing of non-interstate highways, with the combined use of Federal-aid funds.

This provision, offered by Senator CHILES and approved on the floor last year, offers the flexibility to States with growing highway needs to use tolls to obtain the additional revenues to carry out the necessary expansion. The existing highways are not adequate to accommodate the high volume of traffic. This amendment would create one more—and might I add very necessary—option for financing our transportation needs.

In my home State of Florida, tolls have worked effectively in Orlando, Jacksonville, and Tampa to complete major highway projects which otherwise could not have been built. A future project that would be made possible under this provision is the 3-mile Sawgrass Expressway extension. We have a daily average of 39,600 cars currently using the expressway, with traffic using various residential routes to get to the interstate. The existing tolls on the Sawgrass Expressway are not adequate to fund the extension, and this essential extension to connect the current expressway with Interstate 95 would not be feasible within the necessary timeframe unless Federal-aid moneys could be used in conjunction with tolls.

The Federal share on these projects could not exceed 35 percent. Use of revenues received from toll payments under this provision are to be strictly limited to payment for construction and reconstruction costs, or for the costs necessary for the proper operation and debt service of the facility, including resurfacing, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and restoration. No new toll mileage created by this provision would be counted in any Federal apportionment formula.

This provision is permissive in that the use of tolls are not required of any State. Furthermore, toll revenues are only to be applied to that specific project where the toll is collected. Toll imposition is to be terminated upon the State's recouping its expenditures toward the cost of the toll road and the cost of maintenance and operation and debt service for the time tolls are collected.

Another provision which I introduced and which was approved by the committee specifically applies to a stretch of highway in Florida, commonly known as Alligator Alley, which is being converted to Interstate 75. Hydrologic structures are needed along this segment of Interstate 75 to ensure the natural flow of surface water into the Everglades. Animal crossings are essential to protect the environment

of the Florida panther and other threatened species. At this time, we have only 30 Florida panthers left in the country. During funding negotiations with the Federal Highway Department, the State agreed to bear the cost of the animal crossings, recommended in the environmental impact statement, and so vital to the preservation of this species. The State currently imposes tolls on Alligator Alley. The provision allows Florida to continue the use of tolls to pay for the additional environmental improvements associated with the conversion of this road to a Federal highway. Several other provisions were added in committee which serve to enhance the highway portion of this bill.

The package that is before you today benefits each and every State. I urge your support of this important reauthorization so vital to our Nation's highway system. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, reauthorization of the Federal-Aid Highway Program expired on October 1, 1986. Due to Congress' inability to reach a compromise on the reauthorization bill prior to that date, many States are now without funds for their highway programs. I believe this is an outrageous situation and one which I hope we will be able to reverse with dispatch. Accordingly, I am pleased that the Senate is now considering this vital legislation and I hope the conferees will be able to expeditiously resolve the differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills.

Mr. President, since adoption of the Surface Transportation Act of 1982 [STAA], Louisiana has developed a number of highway related problems that deserve immediate attention. S. 387 addresses some of these problems by giving the State authority to use all of its highway funds to extend I-49 in the Shreveport and Lafayette vicinities, four lane Seigen Lane in Baton Rouge and construct two interchanges to I-10 in Lafayette. It also authorizes a feasibility study on extending I-49 from Shreveport, LA to Kansas City, MO. One additional problem is addressed in the priority project amendment which will be offered during floor debate on S. 387. This project will allow the State to use its federally allocated highway funds to construct a frontage road to I-20 near Minden.

I commend the committee for its willingness to give the State the flexibility it needs to meet these needs within its current allocation of Federal highway funds. I regret that given the current fiscal deficit, the committee does not feel it can earmark extra funding for these needs at this time; however, I hope that we will be able to correct this problem in the future. I would like to briefly describe the need for these projects to my colleagues.

In the early 1970's, Congress authorized construction of I-49 in Louisiana. I-49 is 206 miles long and it is the only major north-south highway in the State. It begins at an intersection with I-10 in Lafayette and extends in a northerly direction to its termination with I-20 in Shreveport. Shreveport is my hometown and it is located in the northwest corner of the State.

The problem, Mr. President, is that when we authorized I-49, we connected I-10 in south central Louisiana with I-20 in north Louisiana. However, both of these termination points empty the traffic from the interstate into the middle of a major city. By extending I-49 approximately 3 miles in each direction, we can alleviate this problem and vastly improve our national defense highway system.

As I mentioned Mr. President, without these extensions the traffic from I-49 will empty into the middle of busy cities. For example, if we do not extend the northern terminal of I-49 from I-20 to I-220, the I-49 traffic will have to use city streets to reach the next controlled access route. Most likely, motorists will use Allen and Western, two small roads near the present terminal of I-49 in Shreveport. I am very familiar with both of these roads.

Current plans call for making Allen a one-way road going south and Western a one-way going north. Presently, the traffic flow is about 3,400 vehicles per day on Allen and about 6,300 vehicles per day on Western. Upon completion of I-49 in the Shreveport area, traffic is expected to increase to approximately 13,083 vehicles per day on Allen and to 17,667 vehicles per day on Western. That means that when I-49 is completed, three times as many vehicles will be dumped into downtown Shreveport. Mr. President, Allen and Western are your typical city streets. They are very small, modest streets and the projected increase in traffic on them will create an impossible traffic situation.

Alternatively, to reach I-220 a motorist could take I-20 to Market Street. However, if he went down Market Street, he would have to travel through 12 traffic lights in the heart of downtown Shreveport. Consequently, the present design of I-49 defeats the reason for having an interstate road because you will be dumping traffic into the middle of a city.

Mr. President, the situation in Lafayette is equally as difficult as the situation in Shreveport. Presently, I-49 terminates at an intersection with I-10 in Lafayette. A 3-mile stretch of road, known as the Evangeline Thruway, then connects I-49 with U.S. 90, the major east-west highway in southern Louisiana.

The Evangeline Thruway sounds like a substantial road and it was a good road when it was built. However,

the thruway is currently handling 1.49 times the traffic it was designed to handle and it is terribly congested. Mr. President, the Evangeline Thruway is presently servicing 45,000 vehicles per day. Once I-49 is completed, it is expected to service from 60,000 to 65,000 vehicles per day.

Moreover, Mr. President, the Evangeline Thruway intersects with 27 different roads. Nine of these intersections are major intersections, with traffic at these intersections being controlled by stop lights. At the remaining 18 intersections, traffic entering the Evangeline Thruway is controlled by stop signs.

Mr. President, I do not know of any noncontrolled access road in the country that can service traffic of this magnitude. It is virtually impossible to cross a road that is servicing 60,000 to 65,000 vehicles per day. The situation is a mess now and if we do not do something about it we are going to have a gridlock.

Lafayette has grown very quickly from a small sleepy country town to the capital of the oil industry in Louisiana. In fact, in 1985 a New York Times article stated that Lafayette is one of the Nation's fastest growing metropolitan areas, having grown 19 percent since 1980. Because of the fast pace at which this town has grown, the roads were not designed for easy access or for heavy concentrations of traffic. Consequently, today, Lafayette is a mess in terms of traffic control and this situation will deteriorate further unless we do something about it.

Mr. President, the House has also recognized the seriousness of the I-49 terminal points and has authorized \$40 million for preliminary engineering and design work to cure this problem. I hope the conferees will be able to favorably resolve this issue.

S. 387 also authorizes Federal funding for the construction of two interchanges to I-10 in Lafayette. Both of these ramps are located on the east side of the city and will serve as a near-term solution to the traffic situation on Evangeline Thruway. One of the interchanges will connect Louisiana Avenue on the west bank of Bayou Vermillion to I-10. The second interchange will provide access to the Interstate System from Louisiana Highway 354.

As reported to the Senate, S. 387 also authorizes the four laning of Seigen Lane near I-10 in Baton Rouge. This project is an excellent example of State, private, and Federal interests working together to meet our ever growing highway needs. Seigen Lane is currently a two-lane road located in an area that is rapidly growing. Mall Properties, Inc. is presently constructing a 1.2 million square foot regional mall on a 400-acre site adjacent to Seigen Lane. Rush hour traffic jams

are already an every day occurrence on this section of Seigen Lane and will grow once the mall is completed. This mall is projected to provide more than 2,000 construction and 2,000 permanent jobs. State and private interests have already committed one-half to three-fourths of the funds that are necessary to four-lane Seigen Lane and inclusion of this provision in the final bill should be sufficient to make this project a reality.

Finally, with respect to actual construction projects, I have asked that language be included in the committee's floor priority project amendment which would authorize the construction of a frontage access road to I-20 near Minden. Many companies have expressed interest in locating along this road once it is completed. Given the currently depressed economy in the area, authorization of this road should provide immediate construction jobs in the area and long-term employment by the firms that locate there.

In conclusion, Mr. President, section 148 of S. 387 authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a study of the feasibility and necessity of constructing to appropriate standards a proposed highway which would link Shreveport, LA to Kansas City, MO by way of Texarkana, Fort Smith, and Fayetteville, AR. This study, the cost of which would be shared by the Federal and State governments, would update a previous feasibility study that was conducted under section 143(6) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973.

The proposed highway would start at the present termination point of I-49 in Shreveport. As I have already pointed out to my colleagues, I-49 is the only major north-south highway in Louisiana and its construction is one of the State's priority highway projects. Shreveport is a growing city located in the northwest corner of the State. During the past 13 years, the population of the Shreveport/Bossier City area has increased from 226,000 to 266,000 and it is projected to grow to 350,000 by the year 2000. This growth is attributable to two factors: first, the creation of new jobs due to industrial growth; and second, city expansion due to annexation.

Almost daily, city officials meet with industry representatives regarding the possibility of relocating or expanding business in Shreveport. In many instances, these talks have been successful. For example, in 1985 AT&T closed its last U.S.-based household phone manufacturing plant and moved the entire operation to Asia. That plant was located in Shreveport and the move resulted in the loss of over 3,000 jobs. In an effort to turn this depressing situation into a positive situation, city officials went to New Jersey and convinced AT&T that they should import their finished products and

component parts to Shreveport for distribution around the United States. After careful study AT&T acknowledged the benefits of operating in Shreveport and decided to locate a warehouse and distribution center in Shreveport to service all of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains.

The AT&T story is an example of successful negotiations; however, the city's Outreach Program does not always lead to industrial growth in Shreveport and one of the most common reasons given for a negative decision is the lack of a major highway linking Shreveport with major cities to the north.

Mr. President, the Corps of Engineers is currently developing the Red River navigation and port facilities in Shreveport. When this project is completed, Shreveport will be the northern most terminal on this waterway which will connect to our inland waterways system and our deep water ports. Many companies located in Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma are expected to truck their product to the Red River port in Shreveport. Construction of the proposed road will certainly facilitate this effort.

Both the House and Senate highway reauthorization bills recognize the need for a portion of this road by authorizing a 3.6-mile extension of I-49 in Shreveport. I certainly hope that time and money will eventually permit us to continue construction of the interstate to Kansas City, MO. However, over a decade has passed since the first feasibility study of this project was conducted and time may have altered some of the findings of that study. Therefore, I would argue that it is fiscally prudent to update the earlier feasibility study at this time. Such action will assure that we go forward with this project in an effective and cost-efficient manner and I thank my colleagues on the committee for seeing that this matter was included in S. 387.

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I rise in support of passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987. I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works for his leadership in moving this legislation quickly through his committee. Also to be congratulated is the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont, both for his efforts this year and for his work on this bill in the last Congress. I also want to thank the Senator from New York and the Senator from Idaho for their work in assuring quick consideration of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. President, failure to act on highway authorization legislation in the last Congress threatens highway work in all States. All States have been forced to finance Federal-aid highway projects with Federal apportionments

carried over from last year. These funds are running out.

In Florida, approximately \$500 million in annual Federal-aid highway funds cannot be apportioned until this legislation is approved. The Florida State Department of Transportation reports that some funding categories will be exhausted in March. Almost all carryover funds will be used up by summer.

It is clear that we need to act quickly, but also wisely, if disruption of our highway program, at considerable expense to the taxpayers, is to be avoided.

It is also clear, in looking at the history of our commitment to highways, that Federal funds alone are not enough to finance needed capacity in many States. More and more dollars are being spent on maintenance, and that work is clearly needed. But this shift has come at the expense of new construction.

Many of you know all too well the result of dollars not spent on needed new capacity. Urbanizing areas become congested. Traffic snarls, time is wasted, and economic productivity declines. States facing the problems of rapid growth cannot build new arteries fast enough.

Mr. President, the need exists now for added capacity. The problems must be dealt with now. Delay will only compound the problems, increase the congestion, hurt the quality of life and decrease economic growth and efficiency in many areas of the country.

We must face the reality that Federal dollars alone will not meet this need. I am pleased that the committee recognized that States must be allowed more flexibility in financing new capacity, and included a provision for limited, noninterstate construction utilizing Federal-aid and toll financing.

I am especially grateful to my new colleague, the distinguished Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, for his outstanding leadership on this issue in the committee. Senator GRAHAM joined with me and Senators NUNN, THURMOND, HUMPHREY, and SPECTER in introducing the Toll Facilities Development and Improvement Act of 1987 earlier this year.

The action of the committee in adopting the toll provision speaks clearly on the need for this approach. The provision is the same one adopted by the Senate last September with the support of numerous groups, including the American Association of State, Highway, and Transportation Officials, the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Regional Councils, the American Consulting Engineers Council, the American Transportation Advisory Council, the International Bridge,

Tunnel & Turnpike Association, and the Associated Builders & Contractors. In addition, the Secretary of Transportation, in a letter to Senator STAFFORD of September 18, 1986, supported the inclusion of toll provisions in highway legislation.

Mr. President, the toll financing provision in section 111 of the bill will allow up to 35 percent Federal participation of the cost of noninterstate construction or reconstruction to expand highway capacity. It is limited to those special situations where expanded highway capacity is needed. Toll revenues may only be used for that facility. It will not change the apportionment to the States, and States are not required to utilize this provision. It will, however, provide the option of using toll financing where it is required.

In short, if the need is there, roads can be built. If not, there is no obligation to use toll financing at all. The likelihood is that toll financing would only be used where there is a consensus on need, and strong local support.

I want to again express my appreciation to the committee for its prompt action on highway reauthorization legislation. The toll provision is an important one, and I hope that this key measure, widely supported by the States and many groups, will be maintained in conference. I think all members of the committee deserve the thanks of the body for their work. It is my hope that we will now move promptly to approve this legislation. ●

MORE LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION AMENDMENT

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters I have just received from the Junior Poster Group, the National Audubon Society, the National Recreation and Park Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the League of Conservation Voters, the chief executive officers of major conservation groups and the Garden Club of America in support of a highway beautification amendment which will be offered by myself and Senators MOYNIHAN, BENTSEN, CHAFEE, EVANS, and WILSON be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNIOR POSTER GROUP,
February 2, 1987.

DEAR SENATOR: Senators Stafford, Moynihan, Bentsen, Chafee and Wilson will sponsor a floor amendment to the Highway Bill (S-387) to reform the Highway Beautification Program. This amendment recognizes that the small displays of the Junior Poster Group are compatible with an urban environment.

The compromise Stafford amendment has been drafted to narrow the differences between the House and Senate versions of highway beautification. This will result in a less controversial and faster conference agreement on the issues.

The Junior Poster Group, a segment of the outdoor advertising industry, supports this amendment as a reasonable, workable compromise position on this important environmental issue.

This is an opportunity to reform a law which is in need of reform with the support of both sides of the issue. You will not often see a segment of the outdoor advertising industry and environmental groups united and working together towards a common good. We, along with the Coalition for Scenic Beauty, ask your support.

Sincerely,

BRUCE E. THOMAS,
Junior Poster Group.

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,
New York, NY, January 29, 1987.

Re: Billboard reforms to S. 387.

DEAR SENATOR: When action is taken in the very near future on the Highway Beautification Act of 1987, Senators Stafford and Moynihan will offer an amendment to S. 387 on billboards.

The National Audubon Society strongly supports the efforts of Senators Stafford and Moynihan to add this important reform measure to the highway bill. The House bill, H.R. 2, contains billboard provisions and adoption of the Stafford-Moynihan amendment will create an appropriate position for the Senate when the issue is raised during the Conference Committee.

We believe the Stafford-Moynihan amendment is an important step toward eliminating the wasteful practices surrounding regulation of billboards in this country. We strongly urge you to adopt the Stafford-Moynihan amendment.

Sincerely,

PETER A. A. BERLE,
President.

NATIONAL RECREATION
AND PARK ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, December 28, 1987.

Re: Highway beautification.

DEAR SENATOR: An opportunity to stem the proliferation of billboard construction on America's highways will be at hand when the Senate considers, S. 185, the 1987 highway bill.

The National Recreation and Park Association urges your support for Senator Robert Stafford's amendment ending billboard construction along federal highways, banning tree removal on public lands to improve billboard visibility, eliminating federal payments to the billboard industry, and allowing states and local communities to use their own zoning laws to remove billboards.

The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors has said in its executive summary that, after walking, "pleasure driving is the most popular form of outdoor recreation" among adults. The Commission recommends that Congress authorize a program of scenic byways, providing high-quality roadside landscapes that exclude billboards.

The Commission's report supports the removal and control of billboards as part of its plan for a byways program whereby state and local governments would designate scenic roads as part of a nationally linked system. The recommendations states that "under the 1965 Highway Beautification Act, taxpayers have been asked to pay approximately \$200 million for the removal of 115,000 billboards that did not meet the scenic quality criteria set up under the act. Nevertheless, according to the General Accounting Office more than 30,000 new bill-

boards have been added to these same highways."

With over 320,000 new billboards erected since 1965, payments of tax dollars for billboard removal amounts to a subsidy of the outdoor advertising industry.

Sen. Stafford's bill contains no provisions for public expenditure, nor would it affect the property rights of land owners. It would move in a positive act to save our remaining scenic heritage.

Sincerely,

R. DEAN TYCE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1987.

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR STAFFORD: During the 99th Congress, the National Trust for Historic Preservation supported your efforts in the Committee on Environment and Public Works to reform the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. It is my understanding that you are continuing to fight for this important reform in the 100th Congress by offering an amendment to S. 387, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987.

The National Trust stands in support of your amendment as the best means for solving the problem of billboard pollution because it effectively restores to the states the power to manage their own zoning problems and ends the federal subsidy that encourages visual blight along our highways. Furthermore, it will result in a long-term reduction in the number of billboards by allowing the states to choose amortization as a means of retiring illegal and nonconforming signs, rather than rely solely on cash payments to compensate the billboard industry. It is clear that the existing just compensation requirement of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 has, according to the Environment and Public Works Committee report language in the 99th Congress, "provided the billboard industry with a unique exemption from the exercise of State police power and has cost taxpayers millions of dollars to remove signs that could have been lawfully removed by other means." The National Trust stands behind this language, the findings of the Department of Transportation, previous court decisions, and your amendment in recognizing amortization as a valid alternative to just compensation requirements as long as such amortization schemes are reasonable.

Given the estimate of \$1 billion to remove the remaining nonconforming signs along our highways, the National Trust views highway beautification reform as a necessary first step toward reasserting state control over sign removal and restoring scenic beauty along our nation's highways. It is our hope that the Senate will follow your lead and adopt your amendment as part of a comprehensive highway bill.

Sincerely,

J. JACKSON WALTER,
President.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, January 27, 1987.
Re: Highway Bill—Billboard Reform Amendment.

DEAR SENATOR: Billboard reform is important to the League of Conservation Voters. In fact, the League's Board of Directors decided to include the House Floor vote on

billboard reform on August 7 of last year as one of the key votes to be used in preparation of our annual environmental voting chart for 1986.

The upcoming vote on the Senate Floor on Senator Stafford's and Senator Moynihan's billboard reform amendment thus has a high probability of being among those included in the League's 1987 voting chart.

While we recognize the importance of the gratifyingly overwhelmingly margins by which both Houses of Congress have passed the Clean Water Act (again), we further note that the billboard issue is the first major environmental vote of the 100th Congress wherein senators will choose between special interests and the environment.

Last year, with bipartisan support, the Committee on Environment and Public Works incorporated reforms similar to Stafford-Moynihan in the highway bill that ultimately passed the Senate 99-0. Last year there was no Senate Floor vote on the billboard issue, per se. This year there will be . . . and it will be the first time in a long time that the votes of all 100 senators will be recorded on this issue.

This year, to expedite Conference action on essential transportation funding legislation, the Stafford-Moynihan Amendment modifies last year's legislation to minimize the differences between the Senate and the House.

Sincerely,

BRENT BLACKWELDER,
Chairman.
ALDEN MEYER,
Executive Director.

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

The Garden Club of America, representing 187 chapters across the nation urges you to support Senator Stafford's amendment to the highway bill, scheduled for a floor vote on Thursday. Billboard reform is sorely overdue and needed to enhance our road system through the United States, thank you for your consideration.

Garden Club of America, Winsome McIntosh, National Affairs and Legislation Committee.

JANUARY 29, 1987.

DEAR SENATOR: As the Chief Executive officers of the major national conservation organizations, we urge you to support reform of the Highway Beautification Act (HBA) by voting in favor of the Stafford-Bentsen Billboard Reform Amendment which will be offered when the 1987 Highway Bill reaches the Senate floor.

The billboard control measures in the proposed amendment provide a reasonable and workable solution to the problem of billboard blight along our nation's highways.

The Amendment would: prohibit the construction of new billboards in environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. along rural roads, and adjacent to national parks, wildlife refuges and historic sites) but allow new billboards in urban areas; ban tree-cutting on public land when done solely to make billboards more visible; restore local government authority to regulate billboards under their own laws but retain federal cash compensation for billboard removal under the Highway Beautification Act.

These provisions are a major compromise. They do not go as far as the provisions which the Senate passed last year. Nor do they address all the problems associated with the current law. However, they do address the most serious problems caused by

billboards in a reasonable and responsible manner.

Uncontrolled billboard pollution is a threat to the quality of life in America. It is eroding our natural, historic and cultural diversity and it is causing economic harm to countless communities. A vote for billboard control is a vote for environmental protection.

Now, while Congress is moving to reauthorize the highway program, is the time to reform the Highway Beautification Act. We urge your active support for the compromise provisions contained in the Stafford-Bentsen Amendment.

Sincerely,

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL: MOST STATES WILL BE LOSERS UNDER HOUSE BILL

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as the 100th Congress begins consideration of a highway bill, there is a renewed sense of urgency surrounding it. By March 15, the State of North Carolina will completely run out of the Federal-aid highway money due my State as a result of taxes paid by North Carolinians.

If and when this happens, it will severely affect the quality and safety of North Carolina highways. In addition, it will cause the loss of thousands of jobs in the construction industry. The same is no doubt true in most other States.

Mr. President, the House has already passed a highway bill—H.R. 2. But for fiscal year 1987 alone, the House version authorizes some \$1.2 billion for so-called demonstration projects in certain States. The funding of these projects will prevent many other States from receiving all of the funds they need.

I have a table prepared by the North Carolina Department of Transportation showing which States will gain and which will lose under the House version of the bill. According to the table, in fiscal year 1987, 40 States will lose funds if the House version of the bill is enacted. I ask unanimous consent that the table be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, safe highways are a high priority in every State. Uninterrupted construction and maintenance are crucial if the States are to continue to maintain safe highways. We must make a strong statement to our conferees on this bill to ensure that the States will quickly receive their full apportionment of highway funds.

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

PROJECTED ESTIMATED GAIN OR LOSS UNDER HOUSE VERSION (COMPARED TO SENATE VERSION) OF HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT BILL INCLUDING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

(In thousands of dollars)

State	Net 1987	Re-sults	5 years	
			Net	Re-sults
Alabama	10,743	Loss	20,215	Loss
Alaska	30,260	Loss	151,300	Loss
Arizona	8,031	Gain	40,155	Gain
Arkansas	2,031	Gain	3,045	Loss
California	45,763	Gain	214,815	Gain
Colorado	19,551	Loss	97,755	Loss
Connecticut	18,239	Gain	75,795	Gain
Delaware	21,787	Loss	108,935	Loss
District of Columbia	8,093	Loss	42,465	Loss
Florida	12,597	Loss	34,485	Loss
Georgia	8,178	Loss	8,110	Gain
Hawaii	20,921	Loss	104,605	Loss
Idaho	16,511	Loss	82,555	Loss
Illinois	44,858	Gain	102,290	Gain
Indiana	21,434	Loss	101,530	Loss
Iowa	10,272	Loss	42,360	Loss
Kansas	5,782	Loss	43,910	Loss
Kentucky	3,689	Loss	13,055	Gain
Louisiana	649	Loss	21,245	Loss
Maine	6,322	Loss	31,610	Loss
Maryland	11,416	Gain	57,080	Gain
Massachusetts	289,247	Gain	1,434,735	Gain
Michigan	3,596	Loss	33,580	Loss
Minnesota	8,225	Loss	66,995	Loss
Mississippi	15,332	Loss	76,660	Loss
Missouri	14,572	Loss	12,860	Loss
Montana	39,145	Loss	195,725	Loss
Nebraska	15,442	Loss	77,210	Loss
Nevada	19,329	Loss	108,645	Loss
New Hampshire	18,027	Loss	90,135	Loss
New Jersey	36,746	Gain	189,230	Gain
New Mexico	29,767	Loss	148,835	Loss
New York	58,156	Gain	265,780	Gain
North Carolina	41,124	Loss	185,620	Loss
North Dakota	27,559	Loss	137,795	Loss
Ohio	37,827	Loss	202,635	Loss
Oklahoma	3,714	Gain	18,570	Gain
Oregon	7,978	Loss	39,890	Loss
Pennsylvania	34,733	Gain	253,185	Gain
Rhode Island	8,628	Loss	43,140	Loss
South Carolina	10,656	Loss	43,280	Loss
South Dakota	30,596	Loss	152,980	Loss
Tennessee	28,262	Loss	141,310	Loss
Texas	107,852	Loss	570,760	Loss
Utah	26,430	Loss	132,150	Loss
Vermont	21,496	Loss	107,480	Loss
Virginia	14,015	Loss	65,075	Loss
Washington	17,481	Gain	87,405	Gain
West Virginia	2,700	Loss	8,900	Loss
Wisconsin	27,400	Loss	137,000	Loss
Wyoming	37,828	Loss	189,140	Loss
Puerto Rico	948	Loss	4,740	Loss

Note: Calculation of gain or loss based on fiscal year 1987 difference of apportionment plus 85 percent minimum allocation in Senate and House bills.

AMENDMENT NO. 10

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for certain highways in accordance with title 23, United States Code, and for other purposes)

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I send the committee amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. I ask that it be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc and treated as original text for purpose of amendment.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PRESSLER proposes an amendment en bloc numbered 10.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further

reading of the amendment be disseminated with.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 79, after line 20, add the following:

(37) For work on U.S. 70 in the State of New Mexico from Las Cruces, New Mexico to Texico, New Mexico.

(38) U.S. Route 48 (National Freeway); Washington County, MD.—This project involves the construction of an eastbound ramp to Scenic U.S. 40 and a westbound access road from Mountain Road. It provides the opportunity to monitor the before and after impacts associated with access to commercial establishments. Data for current business trade can be compared to future indicators after access project is completed to ascertain the costs and benefits associated with the improvement and commercial vitality.

(39) MD 162 (Hammonds Ferry Road) at Popular Avenue.—Realign intersection to tie MD 162 directly into popular Avenue. Construction lanes will be added at intersection so that northbound MD 162 to westbound Popular Avenue will become a through movement.

(40) MD 162 (Poplar Avenue to MD 176).—A two-mile project to widen MD 162 from two to four lanes with left-turn movements at selected intersections. Will allow smoother traffic flow from MD 3 to Poplar Avenue.

(41) Poplar Avenue (MD 170 to MD 162).—A one-half mile project to widen Poplar Avenue from two to four lanes. Will provide freer flow of traffic from MD 162 to MD 170.

(42) MD Rte. 4 (Southern Maryland Boulevard); Prince George's and Anne Arundel Counties.—This project involves the replacement of a bridge carrying Md. Rte. 4 over the Paxtuxent River, in a sensitive wetlands and river area. The project is critical to meeting the growing traffic in the Rte. 4 corridor due to development in Anne Arundel and Calvert Counties.

(43) MD Rte. 3 at Belair Drive.—This project involves the construction of an interchange connecting these two facilities. It is needed in order to meet the growing traffic levels in the City of Bowie and also to serve the purposed University of Maryland Science and Technology Center. The project highlights the various aspects of creative financing which has enabled the advancement of a project's construction schedule.

(44) MD Rte. 197, Rustic Hill Drive to South of Amtrak; Prince George's County.—This project involves the construction of a four-lane divided highway which will provide an alternative route for traffic bypassing Bowie, Maryland. It will also improve access to Bowie State College and would demonstrate the before and after impacts of improved access to a minority college.

(45) MD 115 Relocated, Montgomery Village Avenue to Shady Grove Road Montgomery County.—This project involves the construction of a four-lane divided dualized highway. Maryland Route 115 Relocated is an important part of the proposed I-270 corridor transportation network providing access between the rapidly growing Gaithersburg/Montgomery Village area and the Shady Grove Metro Station. This improvement is needed to relieve traffic congestion on existing MD 115, MD355, and I-270.

(46) MD Rte. 213; Chester River Bridge (Queen Anne's and Kent Counties).—This

project involves the rehabilitation of a bridge over the Chester River at historic Chestertown, Maryland. The project will highlight the benefits associated with a creative bridge construction technique of replacing spans with prefabricated sections at night. It would analyze traffic impacts, community impacts, construction time duration, and cost implications.

(47) MD 838 (Wye Island Road): Queen Anne's County.—This project involves the replacement of a bridge connecting Md 838 to the Wye Island Natural Resources Management Area, owned and operated by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. The existing bridge is obsolete; the new bridge will be designed to be compatible with its natural setting. For example, it will have a timber deck, similar to the existing bridge.

(48) In Lawrence, Kansas, a by-pass project which is a model for its cost-sharing arrangement and economic development goals.

(49) In Wichita, Kansas, the replacement of a conventional intersection of two heavily travelled streets at Kellogg and Oliver with a new low-cost European fly-over design for the interchange.

(50) In Olathe, Kansas, the 119th Street Interchange to correct a dangerous interchange.

(51) In Emporia Kansas, a new Prairie Street overpass to overcome existing flood conditions.

(52) In Kansas City, Missouri, the South Midtown Roadway, a north-south route on the Federal-aid Primary System.

(53) In St. Charles County, Missouri, a bypass highway to connect an east-west Interstate route with the Interstate beltway around St. Louis, Missouri.

(54) A segment of north-south highway on the Federal-aid Primary System from the vicinity of Carthage, Missouri, to the boundary between the States of Arkansas and Missouri, in the vicinity of Noel, Missouri, increasing the number of lanes on such segment from two to four.

(55) A 106-mile highway on the Federal-aid Primary System in Missouri, beginning in the vicinity of Columbia and ending in the vicinity of Lancaster.

(56) To reconstruct and rehabilitate the Eugene Talmadge Memorial Bridge, a functionally obsolete bridge which is located in Savannah, Georgia, and crosses the Savannah River.

(57) Highway bridge at Lock & Dam 4 near Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

(58) In the vicinity of Jonesboro, Arkansas, for the construction of four grade separations on a four-land bypass route for demonstrating methods of improving highway safety.

(59) In the State of Arkansas on a segment of a north-south highway on the Federal-aid primary system from the vicinity of the junction of Interstate routes I-40 and I-540 to the boundary between the State of Arkansas and Missouri in the vicinity of Bella Vista, Arkansas.

(60) In the vicinity of Fort Smith, Arkansas, to widen a segment of the Federal-aid urban system and improve signalization.

(61) Interstate connector from I-95 near Florence, South Carolina, to U.S. 17, north of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, to allow increased access to the Grand Strand.

(62) The South Carolina portion of the Bobby Jones Expressway by-pass from I-20 near North Augusta, South Carolina, south across the Savannah River into Georgia, where it connects with I-520.

(63) Replace the Highway 30 bridge across the Missouri River between Blair, Nebraska and Missouri Valley, Iowa.

(64) U.S. 75 North Central Expressway Extension.—Combines several individual projects which involve construction of additional lanes, more efficient interchanges, and improved bridge structures for added capacity and safer travel on a Federal-aid Primary System highway. Improvements to this major North-South route in north central Texas near Dallas would cover 15.4 miles of highway from Interstate 635 in Dallas County to State Highway 121 in Collin County. Cost of the project is estimated at \$134.5 million.

(65) Interstate Highway 30 Interchange ("West Leg")—Ft. Worth, Texas.—Reconstructs and widens a critical interchange involving major, heavily traveled East-West and North-South Interstate Highways (IH 30 and IH 35, respectively).

(66) The demonstration of the state of the art highway technologies on U.S. 220 Blair County, Pennsylvania.

(67) The New Sewickly project, located in the townships of New Sewickly and Conway, Pennsylvania. To construct a two-lane highway between the two municipalities.

(68) The Basin Street Railroad Crossing. To secure funding for a railroad grade crossing project in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

(69) The Southern Expressway project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. To enable traffic to bypass airport and local roads that access the Pittsburgh Airport.

(70) The Ebsenberg Bypass. To divert traffic from Route 219 in Ebsenberg, Pennsylvania, to a 5.1 mile relocated segment.

(71) The Chadville, Pennsylvania interchange project, located in Franklin County. To relieve traffic congestion at an existing interchange on a north-south interstate route and to provide access to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

(72) The Chadville, Pennsylvania highway project. To relocate and reconstruct a 3.5 mile segment of the Federal-aid primary system from the vicinity of Chadville, Pennsylvania, to Fairchance, Pennsylvania.

(73) The Kittanning-Brookville, Pennsylvania project. To reconstruct approximately 30 miles of a two-lane on the Federal-aid primary system between Kittanning and Brookville, Pennsylvania.

(74) The Johnstown Flood National Memorial project. To upgrade a narrow, 1.3 mile access road to the Johnstown Flood National Memorial, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

(75) A highway project to demonstrate methods of improving highway safety by making improvements to a road providing direct access from the Fort Campbell Military Reservation to the City of Clarksville, Tennessee.

(76) Ferry Street Bridge—Eugene, Oregon. A preliminary engineering study to plan and design alternatives for this heavily traveled bridge.

(77) The restoration of the Martin Luther King bridge connecting the metro east area in Illinois and St. Louis, Missouri.

(78) U.S. Route 30 Bridge—Iowa. Construct a bridge on U.S. Route 30 to replace a 56 year old structure which is too narrow to be utilized by motor carriers.

(79) The Cline Avenue/I-94 Interchange in East Chicago, Indiana.

(80) Cline Avenue Interchange Improvement Project in East Chicago, Indiana for the reconstruction of an intersection of Cline Avenue and the Borman Expressway.

(81) Hammond Railroad Relocation Project in Hammond, Indiana to complete acquisition of right-of-way and construction of the Homan Avenue underpass to improve transportation and economic benefits to the community.

(82) Lafayette Railroad Relocation in Lafayette, Indiana to reroute rail traffic to a single corridor with few crossings reducing the threat posed to the safety of the local citizens by over 40 rail-highway intersections.

(83) U.S. 59 Highway Corridor in Texas, from Texarkana to Houston to Beeville.

(84) Construction of the New River Parkway in West Virginia, a two-lane scenic highway through the New River Gorge National River area connecting with Interstate 64.

(85) West Calcasieu Parish Access Road and on and Off Ramp.—The project would provide for an access road which parallels Interstate 10 at Sulphur, La., in West Calcasieu Parish, to provide access to and from the Interstate system for said access road.

(86) Liberty/Laurel Overpass—Texas. This project would connect two one-way streets to Phelan Blvd. over I-10 in Beaumont, Texas.

(87) To improve the Peachtree Industrial Boulevard from I-285 to S.R. 141 in Atlanta, Georgia.

(88) Highway 98—Baldwin County, Alabama. This project would widen Highway 98 for the rapid emergency evacuation of individuals in the vicinity of Fairhope and Foley, Alabama.

(89) Highway 98—Mississippi. This project would widen Highway 98 in a 14.7 mile section in the vicinity of Hattisburg, Mississippi.

(90) Bridge—Patton Island, Alabama. This project would be to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River in Lawderdale and Colbert Counties in Alabama.

(91) Mason County, Michigan. U.S. Route 10/31 and 31 in the county of Mason, Michigan.

(92) For a new route from Los Alamos, New Mexico to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

(93) A highway project in Minden, Louisiana to construct a frontage road which provides Minden, Louisiana alternative access to a highway immediately connecting to a highway on the Interstate system.

(94) This project concerns the relocation of Highway 61 in Dubuque, Iowa, and the broadening of the highway south from Dubuque to DeWitt, Iowa.

(95) To construct a connecting road of approximately 3600 feet between Liberty Street and Mass. Highway 21 in Belcher-town, Mass.

(96) A study to determine the feasibility of constructing a four-lane highway out of a two-lane segment of Route 219 between Somerset, Pennsylvania, and the border of the State of Maryland.

(97) A study to determine the feasibility of constructing a four-lane highway out of two-lane segment that connects Route 56, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania to Route 22.

(98) A study to determine the feasibility of making Route 22 between Ebensburg and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania completely four-lane.

On page 67, line 10, insert after "bridges" the following: "highway revenue and cost responsibility."

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further debate? If

not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 10) was agreed to.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I see our distinguished and always welcomed colleague from Maryland has risen. I look forward to hearing her remarks.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of S. 387, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1987.

I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle for their expeditious bringing of this legislation to the floor.

As I travel through Maryland, among the most consistent concerns raised by mayors, county executives, business officials, and working people is the need for a sound transportation infrastructure.

Whether it is Baltimore County or Cumberland, Upper Marlboro, or Rockville, people tell me we need adequate highways and byways, improved beltways and subways, both today and for the future.

The legislation before us today makes a much-needed and long overdue step to reach that goal.

S. 387 will free billions of dollars in Federal highway aid that States and localities desperately need to complete existing highway projects, and begin those projects needed for the future.

It guarantees that our country's transportation needs will be met with a minimum of delay and disruption. In addition, this measure makes the kind of public sector investment which generates private sector development and jobs.

This measure is particularly important to Maryland. As one of thousands of area commuters who travels daily to our Nation's Capital, I have first hand experience of the transportation problems we face in the Baltimore-Washington corridor.

Without quick passage of this legislation by the Congress, the State of Maryland, under the leadership of our new Governor, William Donald Schaefer, will not be able to start on key projects in every portion of our State.

In fact, unless there is prompt, final approval to this measure, 31 projects, valued at more than \$110 million to the State will not be started this year. We must not miss another important paving season.

The net result: Added frustration for thousands of Maryland residents because of strains placed on our infrastructure from enormous population growth and development.

In addition, up to 7,000 Marylanders who may have had jobs on these projects during the 1987 construction season will go without work.

Among the Maryland projects which will begin in 1987 with passage of this bill are:

Major renovations to I-270 in Montgomery County at the Maryland Route 189 interchange;

A major extension of Route 702 in Baltimore County to ease congestion and rush hour delays on Back River Neck Road;

Upgrading of Route 50 and relocation of Route 197 in Prince Georges County; and

A host of resurfacing and repair projects in western and southern Maryland, the Eastern Shore, and in both major metropolitan areas.

Mr. President, S. 387 will provide Maryland with over \$275 million in each of the next 4 years to meet its highway and mass transit needs.

I commend the leadership of the Environment and Public Works Committee for working to bring the bill to the floor so promptly.

To our chairman, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, QUENTIN BURDICK, for taking such early action on this bill.

To the chairman of the Water Resources and Transportation Subcommittee, DANIEL MOYNIHAN, for this insight and expertise in helping the committee reach a consensus on the bill's major issues.

To the committee's ranking member, Senator STAFFORD of Vermont, and the subcommittee's ranking member, Senator SYMMS of Idaho; without their hard work and dedication in the previous Congress we would not have moved on this bill so early in 1987.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to commend the members of the Banking Committee who have worked on the mass transit legislation which will be added to this bill later in the floor debate.

In particular, I want to thank my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from my State of Maryland, PAUL SARBANES, for his diligent and excellent work on mass transit funding. Through his efforts, the State of Maryland will get over \$65 million annually in mass transit funds.

This success in times of great fiscal austerity demonstrates once again how Senator SARBANES has worked to make Maryland transportation infrastructure second to none.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to help the committee move this measure through the Senate quickly.

AMENDMENT NO. 11

(Purpose: To amend the national maximum speed limit law)

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I call up an amendment I have at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS), for himself and Messrs. BURDICK, BAUCUS, BENTSEN, COCHRAN, DASCHLE, DECONCINI, GRAMM, GRASSLEY, HECHT, HUMPHREY, MCCAIN, McCLURE, MELCHER, NICKLES, SIMPSON, WALLOP, WILSON, and BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 11.

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

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment reads as follows:

At the end thereof add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) Subsection 154(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "other than a highway on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more, (2) a maximum speed limit on any highway within its jurisdiction on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more in excess of sixty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour"; and

(2) by renumbering "(2)" as "(3)" at the two places "(2)" appears.

(b) Subsection 154(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "on public highways with speed limits posted at fifty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour".

Mr. SYMMS addressed the Chair.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, this amendment is identical to the speed limit amendment which passed the Senate, and was adopted by a vote of 56 to 36 last year. It allows the States the authority—I want to emphasize that it allows the States and does not direct the States the authority—to raise the speed limit up to 65 miles an hour on rural interstates outside an urbanized area of 50,000 population or more. The amendment is cosponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator BURDICK, and by Senators BAUCUS, BENTSEN, COCHRAN, DASCHLE, DECONCINI, GRAMM, GRASSLEY, HECHT, HUMPHREY, MCCAIN, McCLURE, MATSUNAGA, MELCHER, NICKLES, SIMPSON, WALLOP, and WILSON.

This amendment has broad bipartisan support, and I hope the Senate will vote it up as it did last year so that we can go to conference in a strong position because there is opposition to this in the other body. We have to work out some agreement with the other body.

It is a modest proposal. That is the first point I would like to make to my

colleagues. It is a modest proposal to reform the national maximum speed limit.

Adoption of this amendment would not raise the speed limit on a single mile of rural interstate; but would grant State officials the authority to do so if they determine that certain miles of rural interstate highway in their jurisdiction can be driven safely at speeds higher than 55 miles per hour.

As I indicated last year, organizations of highway users and State officials from around the country have adopted policy statements and resolutions supporting legislation that goes at least this far to return the regulation of speed limits to the States. Among those important organizations is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials [AASHTO], which represents the transportation departments of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The AASHTO policy position, approved by more than a two-thirds vote of all AASHTO member departments, reads as follows:

The Congress should amend the 55 mph law to allow the States to establish up to a 65 mph speed limit on rural limited access freeways, as the States may find appropriate.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is important to Members to review the position of our own State department of transportation officials when considering such important transportation issues. They are the ones, after all, that are running the State DOT's in the 50 States, and are on the ground with the people working daily with these problems. I think they are in the best position to make that judgment.

In addition, efforts to modify the national maximum speed limit have received the strong endorsement of the President of the United States. After Senator HECHT and I met with him to discuss the speed limit issue last year, President Reagan sent me the following letter, dated August 15, 1986:

DEAR STEVE: I enjoyed our meeting this week, and the opportunity to review with you the issue of reforming the current national speed limit laws.

As I told you on Monday, I believe that the time has come to restore greater authority to the States in this area. To that end, I welcome proposals like those you and Senator HECHT have offered, or other reasonable reforms that would provide States enhanced ability to regulate highways within their jurisdictions.

As a former Governor, I have great confidence in the sensitivity of the Governors to the need for protecting public safety, and know that they will exercise with the greatest of care whatever level of control is ultimately returned to them.

Thanks for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

I am pleased the President has stated in writing his strong belief that State officials can and should be trust-

ed to regulate speed limits in a manner consistent with the need for public safety. This amendment is only a modest step in that direction, but it is a step nonetheless. If the States are allowed greater authority to regulate speed limits, I believe Congress soon will share the President's confidence in the ability of State officials to exercise their increased responsibility with the utmost regard for public safety.

The Emergency Highway Energy Conservation Act, which established the 55-mile-per-hour national maximum speed limit, was enacted to conserve fuel during the 1973 Arab oil embargo. With the exception of a short period during World War II, the Federal Government had never before intervened in the States' responsibility to determine speed limit policy.

A 1984 study conducted by the Transportation Research Board [TRB], entitled "55: A Decade of Experience," concludes that the national maximum speed limit has served its original purpose. The amount of motor fuel saved in 1983 as a result of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit was estimated at 167,000 barrels per day or about 1 percent of total consumption.

The TRB study also concludes that 55 has reduced the number of annual highway fatalities by 2,000 to 4,000 fatalities per year. While the authors of the report make it clear that any estimate of the safety benefits of lower speed limits are based on a number of assumptions which may or may not be accurate, I do not think anyone doubts that a lower speed limit on some of the Nation's highways has indeed saved lives. The questions presented here are: First, whether or not safety can be maintained on some highways if the speed limit is posted higher than 55 and second, whether or not the States can be trusted to make that judgment with a reasonable concern for public safety. I believe the answer to both of these questions is yes, and I offer this amendment based on that understanding of the issues involved.

The TRB report also indicates the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit requires about 1 billion additional hours of passenger time annually. While it is difficult to assign a dollar value to this additional travel time, clearly it represents some economic loss in terms of reduced productivity.

The cost in terms of employee hours and funds expended by law enforcement agencies in an effort to enforce the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is also significant. The lack of driver compliance and the threat of funding sanctions have forced States to devote an extraordinary amount of time and money monitoring speeds on roads posted at 55. Some States deploy up to 85 percent of their officers on 55-mile-per-hour roadways in an attempt to reduce the rate of noncompliance and,

thereby, protect themselves against the loss of highway funds—not the loss of life, but the loss of highway funds. This effort takes personnel, equipment, and funds away from other important enforcement efforts, for example, operations to stop drunk driving, like bar-closing times on Friday nights and Saturday nights, in many areas having officers on duty offering to help and assist sometimes with the threat of them picking up people and keeping the drunks off the highways. That is the way to save the lives.

Despite a nationwide increase in enforcement efforts, the rate of noncompliance continues to grow. In 1985, five States reported noncompliance rates at or above 50 percent—at which point they become subject to funding sanctions, and based on preliminary data, six States are out of compliance for 1986.

The Administrators of the Federal Highway Administration and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration recently notified the Governors of Maryland and Vermont that while their States were out of compliance for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, the previously withheld highway apportionments would be released because the States appear to be in compliance for fiscal year 1986. A similar letter was sent to the Governors of New Hampshire and Rhode Island because those States were out of compliance in fiscal year 1985 but appear to be back in compliance for fiscal year 1986.

The two Administrators also have notified the Governor of Arizona that they will continue to withhold 1 percent of Arizona's fiscal year 1986 non-interstate highway funds for failure to comply with the national maximum speed limit law during fiscal year 1984. In addition, Arizona may lose more highway funds for lack of compliance in 1985 and apparent lack of compliance in 1986.

While highway funds are not being withheld from Maryland, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island because those States appear to have met the 50-percent compliance requirement for fiscal year 1986, it should be noted that, respectively, they reported a fiscal year 1986 noncompliance rate of 49.8 percent, 48.0 percent, 49.9 percent, and 49.1 percent. Beefed up enforcement efforts and generous adjustments of speed monitoring data have combined to bring these States just barely into compliance for fiscal year 1986.

The lack of driver compliance is particularly notable on rural interstates. In 1985, more than 75 percent of drivers on those roads exceeded the speed limit, and the noncompliance figures are more than 85 percent on rural interstates in at least eight States.

These statistics are not surprising when one considers that the Interstate

System was designed for travel at 70 mph and that rural interstates comprise, with the exception of urban interstates, the safest highway system in the country. The 33,910 miles of rural interstates are just 6 percent of the highways posted at 55 and they carry 19 percent of the traffic on those highways. Yet, the fatality rate on rural interstates is lower than that of any other highway system except urban interstates. In 1985, fatalities on rural interstates accounted for less than 5 percent of all highway fatalities.

Also, actual driving speeds are already well above 55 mph on rural interstates. In 1985, the average speed on rural interstates was 59.5 mph, and 23 States reported average speeds in excess of 60 mph on those highways. The 85th percentile speeds on rural interstates in 1985 was 66 mph. The 85th percentile speed is the speed at or below which 85 percent of the vehicles are traveling. It is a speed measure commonly used in the process by which speed limits are established. Thirty-seven States reported an 85th percentile speed at or above 65 mph on rural interstates in 1985.

Based on these statistics, I believe we can expect only slight increases in actual driving speeds in States which choose to raise the speed limit to 65 mph on rural interstates. Clearly, the speed at which one drives is based in large measure on the speed at which one feels comfortable driving. I do not believe for a minute that most Americans driving 65 or 70 mph on the interstates today will increase their driving speed by 10 mph if the posted limit is raised to 65. The question for most drivers is, "At what speed do I feel comfortable driving?" rather than, "How fast can I drive without getting pulled over by a State trooper?" When speed limits are posted at a reasonable level—and most highway engineers would use the "85th percentile" speed to define "reasonable"—speed variance is reduced, driver comfort is enhanced, and traffic safety is greatly improved.

I understand the concern about highway safety which many of my colleagues have raised in connection with this issue last year. As the ranking Republican on the subcommittee of jurisdiction in the Environment and Public Works Committee, I share their interest in taking every reasonable step to make travel on our Nation's highways as safe as possible. I would only repeat that, as I see it, the primary questions to be answered when considering this amendment are: First, whether or not safety can be maintained on some highways if the speed limit is posted higher than "55," and second, whether or not the States can be trusted to make that judgment with a reasonable concern for public safety. I believe both questions can be answered af-

firmatively, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEFLIN). Is there is sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SYMMS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be no more rollcall votes today.

Mr. STAFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I have supported the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit ever since it was temporarily established in 1974 as a conservation measure in response to the 1973 Arab oil embargo. The Senate voted on this issue last year and, as my distinguished colleague from Idaho said, the amendment was approved by a vote of 56-36. Undoubtedly, the outcome of today's vote will be similar to last year's vote. However, I must again oppose the amendment being offered today to raise the speed limit.

I am still convinced that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has contributed significantly to saving lives and conserving fuel.

According to the Transportation Research Board's study, "55: A Decade of Experience," the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has saved 2,000 to 4,000 lives per year. This means between 1974 and 1985 between 20,000 and 36,000 people's lives have been saved. The 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has prevented an even greater number of severe injuries, and prevented between 35,000 and 62,000 less serious injuries.

While it is a fact that not everyone is driving 55, the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit remains a strong deterrent to excessive speeding. National public opinion polls taken since the passage of 55 continue to show that a large majority of American drivers support the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, whatever speed they may be driving.

The argument has been made that increasing the speed limit to 65 will save time and provide economic benefits. The TRB study shows, first of all, that 62 percent of all trips are not work-related. Even if there is a savings in travel time of 7 hours per motorist per year, as someone has calculated, most trips are short ones and for non-work purposes. On average, a motorist could save 3 minutes per trip. Economists argue that such small time losses have essentially no value. I think a few minutes here and there is a small price to pay to save a life.

The TRB report states that if the speed limit were raised on rural interstates, and that is the amendment pending, there would be about 500

more deaths each year. That is a terrible trade-off for the families of those killed. Without 55 altogether, there would be an additional death every 2 to 4 hours and a marked increase in serious and incapacitating injuries every hour.

Fifty-five does save lives, and, of course, it saves energy too. It is easy to forget those long, frustrating gas lines we went through in the 1970's. Energy is a limited resource. The attitude that there is plenty for us is an attitude that is irresponsible and unfair to our children and grandchildren because it is their share we will be using.

According to Department of Transportation studies, cars get from 17 to 40 percent better gas mileage at 55 than at 70. Other tests show that most trucks get up to 27 percent better gas mileage at 55.

There have been some major changes since the enactment of 55 in 1974. The size of cars has become significantly smaller. Many of these cars are not designed to handle well at high speeds. We also have a new generation of drivers who have been licensed since the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and have never driven with higher speed limits. At the same time, we have the highest percentage ever in our population mix of those over 65 years of age.

A variety of groups continue to support the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit including the American Public Health Association, the American Insurance Association, the American Trucking Associations, and the National Safety Council.

In conclusion, I believe that the reasons for maintaining the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit far outweigh the arguments to change the law. I wholeheartedly agree with the National Safety Council's view that 55 is "still this nation's best single device for saving lives and preventing injuries from motor vehicle accidents." It is more important to get to our destination safely than not to get there at all.

So, Mr. President, with regret, as I so enjoy the friendship and work with the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, I must oppose his amendment, as I did last year. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment which has been proposed by my colleague from Idaho [Mr. SYMS] which would allow States to raise the speed limit up to 65 miles per hour on rural interstate highways.

I would like to emphasize it would allow the States to raise the speed limit. It would not force them to do so.

The Emergency Highway Energy Conservation Act, imposing the 55-

mile-per-hour speed limit, was a temporary measure, as pointed out by the Senator from Vermont. It was a temporary measure enacted at a time when this Nation was suffering under the throes of the most serious energy crisis in the history of this Nation.

Aside from this and temporary Federal action during World War II, speed limit policy has always been a responsibility of State and local governments. I think it is time to return to that policy, Mr. President.

Statistics indicate that lack of driver compliance with the law is particularly notable through our rural interstates.

Rural interstates are defined in this amendment as those interstate highways located outside an urbanized area of 50,000 population or more. In 1985, more than 75 percent of drivers on those roads exceeded the speed limit, and the noncompliance figures are more than 85 percent on rural interstates in at least eight States.

The cost in terms of employee hours and funds expended by law enforcement agencies in an effort to enforce the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is also significant. In Arizona during the past 6 years, \$1,578,886 has been spent over and above normal enforcement practices in trying to comply with the Federal mandate. Additionally, during this same period of time, nearly 10,000 man-hours have been spent exclusively in efforts to comply with the law. These statistics illustrate that the current law is no longer workable from either an economic or enforcement standpoint.

I will talk later in my statement about the problems engendered in our society when we pass a law which is not complied with by a majority of its population nor is it respected, as is the case with this law.

Mr. President, this amendment does not seek to reverse the irrefutable fact that reduced speed limits do save lives. What this amendment seeks to do is to allow State officials to raise the speed limit to a reasonable level on highways that comprise, with the exception of urban interstates, the safest highway system in the country.

I believe there is no one more qualified to make this judgment than State officials. Undoubtedly, Vermont and Arizona are not the same. As my colleague from Vermont knows, our States have entirely different topography, like the long stretches of straight roads uninterrupted by mountains or hills or valleys, as we have in my State. I do not suggest that the State of Vermont raise the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. I do, however, urgently request that Vermont and other Eastern States allow us in Arizona to decide which is the safest as well as the most reasonable speed limit for our State.

There are a total of 33,910 miles of interstate highway located outside urban areas, as defined in the bill.

Almost every State has some segments of rural interstate on which State officials could choose to raise the speed limit up to 65 miles per hour, under this amendment.

Rural interstates comprise only 6 percent of all highways posted at 55 miles per hour and they carry about 19 percent of all traffic on highways posted at 55 miles per hour. Additionally, the fatality rate on rural interstates is lower than that of any other highway system except urban interstates. In 1984, fatalities on rural interstates accounted for less than 5 percent of all highway fatalities.

I think that is an important number after mentioning, as I did earlier in my statement, that over 85 percent of automobiles and vehicles on these highways exceed the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit at this time.

Adoption of this amendment would make the speed limit more enforceable and allow State enforcement agencies to use their personnel, equipment, and limited funds in a more efficient and cost-effective manner. The noncompliance rate on rural interstates is a major obstacle for many States trying to meet the 50 percent compliance standard. If States are allowed to set speed limits that bear some relation to actual driving speeds on rural interstates, enforcement agencies can direct more attention and effort to other safety programs.

Mr. President, I have the dubious distinction of representing the first State in America to be fined under the present law. Our distinguished Secretary of Transportation, Mrs. Dole, enacted the most minimum fine that she could impose under the law and still be enforcing it. However, these much-needed taxpayers' dollars, which should have been, in my view, returned to Arizona and spent under the Federal Highway System for interstate roads which are so critical to us as a rapidly growing State are now denied to us. Additionally there is every likelihood there will be more fatalities on the substandard highways and byways we are being required to use instead of the interstates which could have been built with this much-needed money.

I believe it is also important for us to recognize that if Americans are subjected to laws which they neither believe in nor comply with, it is very difficult for us to expect them to comply with other laws. What does a parent tell a child when he or she is exceeding the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and the child makes note of the fact? If this occurs, it should not surprise any one of us when young Americans follow this example and they, in turn, go out on the highways of America and exceed those same speed limits. I believe if we are to expect our citizens to comply with the law, we must enact

realistic laws. This law may not be unrealistic for some parts of America but it is totally unrealistic for my State and many others west of the Mississippi.

I urge my colleagues, from a sense of fairness, a sense of equity, a sense of safety and, indeed, in a spirit of allowing our individual States to decide what is best for its citizens to approve the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS].

I thank the Chair.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Arizona for a very temperate and reasoned exposition of a case that clearly can be made. I hope to offer some remarks not in rebuttal but to offer an alternative view of this matter.

It begins with the proposition that in the course of the last 20 or so years, we have commenced to learn a good deal about the problems of automobile safety. We have gone well past that point in time which persisted for so very long when we referred to crashes of automobiles with other automobiles and with inanimate objects as accidents, as if they were something beyond our normal comprehension, an event that could not be explained.

There is nothing accidental about these events. They are incidental to a mode of transportation which puts individuals at very great risk, more than perhaps we have ever fully realized. We begin to note the variations in this incidence of high-energy transfer from a vehicle to a passenger.

There are, as we learned early in the study of the epidemiology of these matters, two collisions. One is when the vehicle collides with something external and the second when the individual passengers collide internally with the vehicle. We find uniformities across State lines and across national lines. They are surprising in that regard. We are dealing with a phenomenon of an industrial society. You can almost measure the degree of industrialization in society, as we know, between the age of one and at what subsequent age the largest source of fatality are various forms of accidents, by which we mean encounters on a sustainable level of energy—electrical, chemical, mechanical, or nuclear—that bring about pathology, trauma and morbidity.

In 1904, I believe, there were two automobiles in St. Louis, MO, and they managed to collide with injury to both occupants. We went on for many, many years seeking to change the behavior of drivers, or to trust in their competence, without thinking we were building up a driving population in which almost everyone over a very early age and unlimited old age did drive, with all the associated physical capacities or incapacities that that involves. We began to look to certain

passive activities which we could build into the environment in which the passenger drove that would limit the consequences of collision.

The redesign of dashboards and introduction and mainly transfer of airplane technology—somehow airplanes have always seemed inherently more dangerous to occupy than motor vehicles. That is not at all the case, but in any event the motor vehicles lagged very much in the development of safety features, and the transfer of, for example, the seatbelt and such like worked considerably well. We found in the Interstate Highway System itself one of the single most important of the passive provisions was the separation of ongoing traffic by median barriers such that the absolutely unsustainable forces generated by a head-on collision between two vehicles were in the main eliminated simply by separating the two different directions of traffic. However, we have also learned that it is possible to modify behavior by things such as speed limit changes, and this experiment took place almost all over the industrialized world in the aftermath of the oil shock of 1973.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona is entirely correct when he observes that the 55-mile speed limit in the United States on interstate highways is not strictly observed, but I would respectfully suggest that there has always been a little penumbra above the speed limit which means we have tended to exceed it. And it is a fact that while we never did drop from 65 to 55, it went down in practice, from 65 to 58—it has gone up a little since then, but we are below 65. This has been a measurable, discernible, quantifiable change in behavior, and that change has been associated with a decline in fatalities. On that I think there is no argument.

The simple fact is that the energy transferred in a collision comes as a square of the speed. It is not a linear, but, rather, geometrical climb, such that a collision at 50 miles an hour will result in, on average, twice the fatalities of one at 40. The most significant measurement with respect to the effect of the Interstate System was that the fatality rate per hundred million miles, which was at 2.29 in interstates, dropped steadily. It has since never failed to decline year by year to 1.21, whereas on local roads not affected by this change, there has been a very slight decline, probably associated with somewhat lesser vehicle miles—you do not always know; there are always answers I do not have here—from 3.66 to 3.14. The difference is very great. We almost cut in half the fatality rate on the Interstate System. We have done very little on the others.

To just give a sense of this with the experience of some other countries, in Finland, in 1973, speed limits were cut

from 66 miles an hour to 48 with a 30-percent fatality reduction. In France, the speed limit was established at 54 mph in 1973 with a 23-percent reduction. In New Zealand, the speed limit went from 55-60 mph, to 50 with a yet higher, 37 percent, fatality reduction. In Ontario, Canada, which is just opposite us on Lake Ontario, which is the industrial center of Canada, a reduction in speed from 60-70 mph to 55-60 brought a 23-percent reduction. In England, dropping the speed limit from 70 mph to 54, in 1973, brought a 43-percent daytime reduction, and then in Victoria, Australia, a large chunk of that continent, very much like Arizona and Idaho in size and distances, cutting the speed limit simply from 70 mph to 60 in 1974 brought a 42-percent fatality accident reduction.

I think these particular numbers are reported by the respected Insurance Institute for Highway Safety which acquired its first very sound methodological results under the late Dr. William Hadden, Jr., with whom I happened to be associated as a friend and colleague in State government in New York in the 1950's. I think the evidence is here. The consequences of what we do will be what they are. I do not dispute the judgments of the distinguished Senators who have spoken. I think they speak for a very considerable portion of their citizenry. I think the Senator from Arizona makes a clear case that this has been costly to his State, and I can understand why he would wish it otherwise.

On the other hand, I think we have something in place which is of value and I hope it will be kept in place. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SYMMS. I pose this question, Mr. President, because I think it is worthy of our consideration. The Senator from New York made some very good points. I would give him the benefit of the doubt in that maybe some lives have been saved, but I think we have to remember also where we were and what it was like when the OPEC oil embargo hit most of the free world. There was a massive drop in the numbers of people driving on highways, so there was instantly a big saving of lives.

Whether it was all because of the speed limit or people simply were not driving because there were gas lines, that it was inconvenient, that the price of fuel had gone up, people simply got off the highways. So there was some saving of lives from people simply not driving as much. Would the Senator agree that some of those numbers are slightly skewed, that since 1974 as traffic has come back up and speeds have come back up, we have

managed to control safety? We have an extensive safety program in the public schools of America today, training our young people in the safety of driving, getting people to be more cautious, to buckle up. Just in general I think Americans drive very well. We are not doing all that badly.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I am happy to respond. They are fair questions, to which I have only hypothetical answers, but I think they are coherent.

The first of the two points the distinguished Senator makes is that in the aftermath of the sharp increase in energy costs there were fewer vehicles on the roads. Certainly there was less travel and one can assume that that meant at any given time fewer vehicles. I have never seen the quantified study, but I cannot doubt that a certain proportion of collisions are a function of density.

I can demonstrate it with some clarity, even confidence, when I say that if there is only one car on the road, it will not run into another car. Once you get two, you begin to get this problem.

At some level, density is going to contribute to collisions. That is a fair argument. I have not seen studies of controlled density. If you are a highway engineer, you know how to do it.

I admit the possibility. I admit the possibility that the use of seatbelts has gradually increased. Just how much, I do not know. But, if over this time, seatbelts and better designed vehicles led to fewer fatalities, simply in consequence of those features, then you would not have a speed effect.

Again, I have not seen the data; I do not know that it exists. But the argument is sound.

With respect to a decline in fatality rates around the country and around the world, it is interesting that when you go down from 70 mph to 50, you will get a drop of 43 percent, and from 65 mph to 60, it is about one-half of that. The case, I think, has to be made by those who think otherwise.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield the floor. I do not believe we can yield one to the other.

Mr. President, in order to finish this colloquy, I believe the Senator from Arizona wishes to address a question.

Mr. McCAIN. I think the statements that the distinguished Senator from New York made are very important. He gets to perhaps the most crucial aspect, and that is saving lives. Saving one life is, of course, worth many sacrifices.

However, I ask the distinguished Senator from New York if it is not plausible and logical to believe that the elected representatives in the States could make these decisions. I am sure that the Governor of my State and the legislature and other

elected representatives, including the Department of Highway Safety officials, are privy to the same information which was so eloquently described by the Senator from New York.

I would like to see them have the ability to make the decisions as to how fast the citizens of my State should drive. I do not think they should make the decision on how fast the citizens of New York should drive, nor of any other State.

I believe that one of the cornerstones of our Constitution is that we allow local government to govern where it is possible and efficient to do so.

I would like to yield back to the Senator from New York for his response as to what I think is the basic principle of the way this country functions.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is welcome in this Chamber, that what he says seems to me to be beyond critique.

It is surely clear that the elected officials of the State of Arizona are as capable of making a wise judgment in this matter as are those at the national level. My only answer would be that this is our highway system, the Federal-Aid Highway System, so maybe we can set the limits on our roads. What the Senator says is not to be disputed. He is right.

Mr. DECONCINI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I am glad to join in the debate on the 55 mph speed limit with my colleague, Senator McCAIN.

The distinguished Senator from New York, I am sure, is aware that I am in support of the amendment offered by Mr. SYMMS. I am a cosponsor of that amendment. We were able to have that amendment adopted last year. I do not believe the views represented by this body have changed that much this year—at least, I hope they have not.

I listened to my colleague from Arizona's statement, and he eloquently made the arguments I planned to make, so I am at a loss for words. Some might say that will be the day, when the senior Senator from Arizona is at a loss for words.

On January 23, 1987, the Department of Transportation fined the State of Arizona \$510,000 because motorists exceeded the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Arizona is the only State which has received a penalty from the DOT because of speed limit violations. While Arizona indeed admits that its own records show violations were above the 50-percent threshold, I am convinced that many other States are just as guilty as Arizona. In Arizona's case, transportation officials kept ac-

curate records and complied with the law to the best of their ability.

Two, three, or five wrongs do not make a right. It is interesting that our State seems to have been singled out. The bulk of violations that have occurred in Arizona took place on the interstate system in rural areas away from highly urbanized zones. It makes no sense to me, Mr. President, that the Federal Government should force penalties on States where speed limit violations are in the range of 10 miles per hour above the maximum limit of 55. Research conducted since the imposition of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit indicates that raising the national speed limit on the rural interstate system to 65 miles per hour would not pose serious safety threats to the traveling public.

The original purposes of the 55-mile-per-hour national speed limit were to reduce fuel consumption and reduce increasing fatalities on our Nation's highways. The law has met its goals. Traffic-related fatalities on the Federal-Aid Highway System have decreased and energy consumption has also fallen. However, I think we need to view the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit in the context of today's highway driving conditions. Violations in the speed limit occur most frequently on the rural interstate system. Motorists on the rural interstates already drive at speeds over the 55-mile-per-hour limit. Rural interstates comprise only 6 percent of all highways posted at 55 miles per hour yet they carry 19 percent of all traffic on highways posted at 55 miles per hour. The fatality rate on the rural interstates are lower than on other highways. Giving States the option to increase the maximum speed limit by 10 miles per hour to 65 miles per hour on the rural interstate system should have a negligible effect on driving speeds, and would eliminate enormous manpower costs associated with enforcing the speed limit on these highways.

I continue to believe the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is valid for all other highway systems. In my judgment, statistics have not shown evidence to support changes on other Federal-aid systems. But, if we can meet our overall objectives of reducing highway fatalities and energy consumption by making a modest change in the law, we should do so. States are having a very difficult time trying to comply with the current speed limit law. Arizona has spent a significant portion of its highway safety budget trying to comply with the law and has been unsuccessful. I would rather see Arizona spend precious highway safety funds in areas where they will have larger impact on reducing highway fatalities. Using these funds to force compliance of the 55 mile per hour on the rural

interstate system is not a wise use of these funds.

I heard the Senator from New York make the comparison to foreign countries. It is a very eloquent argument, and the Senator always is eloquent. It seems to me that we have a different type of problem and society than Finland—I have been there and have driven the roads in most European countries. We have vast rural areas in my State. You can literally drive for 50 or 60 miles and not come across anything but an exit to a farm, but certainly no community. We have areas in which you cannot even get off Federal land for 50 or 100 miles. You are either driving on Indian trust land or Park Service land or BLM land. In reference to this amendment, we are not talking about speeding through the cities of Phoenix, Scottsdale, or Tucson at 60 miles an hour.

This amendment, as I understand it, only permits the variance on the rural interstates. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SYMMS. The Senator is correct. It is the rural interstates, so that means interests outside the boundaries of communities of 50,000 population.

Mr. DECONCINI. I want the Senator from New York to understand that if this amendment is adopted, he has really won three-fourths of the loaf, because most of our population is in urban areas. So most of the populated areas are still going to be governed by current law and the Senator's arguments about safety and fuel efficiency will still apply.

I do not know if the Senator from New York agrees; but if he travels by automobile, as I do, around this vicinity or in his own State at 55 miles an hour, he will live in the smog of the cars and the exhaust of buses and trucks.

Mr. President, My point is—

Mr. SYMMS. Excuse me.

Mr. DECONCINI. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMMS. I want to hear the Senator's point.

Mr. DECONCINI. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the distinguished senior Senator for his support on this and thank the distinguished junior Senator.

I want to say I think this is one of the first times that the junior Senator from Arizona has been on the floor and participated in the debate. He certainly is a welcome addition, and I am glad to have him here.

I have to say my colleague from New York has a good rationale position like this argument he has presented to us, and it is very thoughtful. I think we all admire that.

But I do think there is one point that we need to make. I want to say it because it is right in conjunction with what the Senator from Arizona is saying.

The actual driving speeds since 1974 have gradually increased. It is like the

Senator said: They got them down to 58 and they gradually crept back up as people were pushing out and driving a little faster. Highway fatality rates have continued to decline.

I think that is a point we do not want to overlook.

There is a massive effort in this country to get people to drive more safely. If we want to really save lives, we need to get the drunks off the highway. That is a way to really save lives. I think that is a point we do not want to overlook, because if I thought, and I am sure if the two Senators from Arizona thought this was going to be mass destruction and carnage on the highways, we would not support this. I do not believe that is the case.

In my State, I would venture to say that I doubt if the speed will change substantially. It will certainly be a better life for the Idaho State policeman being asked to go out there on the highway between Pocatello and Boise and try to keep people driving below 55 miles an hour. It is a difficult thing to put them to.

I think the point we need to recognize is we are still doing well. We are making headway even in spite of the fact they are gradually driving faster.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Senator from Idaho. He makes a very convincing point which to me is overwhelming. If the speed limit goes up slightly, you do not automatically have higher fatalities. In fact, as the Senator from Idaho pointed out, they have come down.

What really bothers me is what my junior colleague has referred to and that is who is the Federal Government to tell Arizona what is safe. If we do not have the trust and the confidence in our States' elected officials to at least give them the discretion to grant a 10-mile variance on a national speed limit, we ought to go home and we ought to face up to those legislators and say "We do not trust you."

Maybe some in this Chamber feel that way about their State legislators. But, although the State legislature in my State is controlled by the other political party, I have faith in them. They are not going to grant the increased speed limit in areas which are unsafe. They are not going to increase the speed limit in the rural areas if it is unsafe. There are some areas I suspect in Arizona which are unsafe, particularly based on varying climatic conditions.

So, Mr. President, I think we are talking about a law here, when it was raised and imposed there was a necessity. As the Senator from Idaho pointed out, we were experiencing an energy crisis. We had gas guzzlers like we never had before. The situation has changed and we have demonstrated very clearly that letting the speed

limit move up slightly from 55 does not cause more fatalities.

I believe there is overwhelming merit to see that this amendment is passed. I think this body ought to demonstrate that we have confidence in the State and local governments to make those speed limit decisions.

I thank the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from North Dakota for pushing this amendment. I hope that we can get a clear and overwhelming vote that will be a message to the House of Representatives that we are very steadfast in our views that we must grant some discretion in this area. It would be in the best interest of this whole country if we could.

I do not want to tell the people of New York or any other State what speed they want to drive. That is not the case. We have a law now that tells us all. We are not abandoning that.

So the good arguments the Senator from New York makes for having some control on a national highway system that belongs to all of us, not just the State that we represent, still stand.

But this is a relatively minor variance in the highway speed limit and something that is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thank the Senator from New York and I yield the floor.

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

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the Senator from Nebraska has been very active in giving the States the option to raise the speed limit on the rural interstates. I have done a tremendous amount of research on this proposition, and I am convinced that many of the scare stories that we hear time and time again with regard to how no one could be for this bill if they are seriously concerned about highway safety are simply all wet in the opinion of this Senator. They do not want to listen to the facts.

So I think my credentials from long time back have been in support of giving the States the option and I once again emphasize the option of raising the speed limit to no more than 65 miles per hour on rural interstates and rural interstates only and not, of course, Mr. President, on primary and secondary roads where the record clearly shows that over 90 percent of the highway deaths occur. Or to put it another way, it is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. President, in my opinion, if someone would look at the facts and look at the record, to say it is safe to drive 55 miles per hour on the primary and secondary roads where 90 percent of the deaths occur, and they say that is OK, but it is all right to have the same 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on a rural interstate.

Study after study, statistic after statistic, have clearly indicated that somewhere between 60 and 90 percent of the traveling public are not paying any attention to it anyway.

It seems very clear to this Senator that we should recognize the realities, that when the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on all roads was put into effect in the early 1970's it was very clear that we had an energy crisis at that time, and it was in the national security interest of the United States to set a ridiculous low speed limit given those circumstances. That is not true today.

Having said all of that, Mr. President, I simply lay the groundwork for a question or two that I would like to ask the managers of the bill.

I was one of the leaders over the years and I was one of the leaders in the Senate last fall when we tacked this option onto the Senate version of the bill after the House of Representatives failed by some 18 or 20 votes, as I remember the figures, not to add that to their version of the highway bill. But we put it on there hoping that we could win it in conference. We did not win it in conference. There was no conference that ever amounted to anything. It was a foregone conclusion by most of the conferees that we were not going to have a bill last year and certainly the leading opponent of that in the House of Representatives, our colleague from New Jersey, said no highway bill if you are going to touch the speed limit.

Members of that conference came to this Senator knowing of my feelings and said "Would you hold up or object to passing the highway bill if we had to give that up so that we could get the highway bill out with the urgent need for construction funds to keep up and repair our highways in this Nation?"

I said "Certainly not. Let's be fair and let's be reasonable. If that highway bill is going to be held up for that reason and that reason only, I understand and I say let's give in because we need the highway bill."

My concern here then is to whether or not this is the right time and the right place for this bill that I strongly support, and I would like to ask the managers of the bill: Given the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives against tying the option to go up to 65 miles per hour to the States was overwhelmingly defeated, as I understand it, when this version of the bill was before us, what chances do you think that we have if we are successful in passing this measure of not being forced to drop it in conferences; or, to ask the question another way, has it not already been presumed that the chances are better than 50-50 that this is an exercise in futility, this is a chance for some of us, including this Senator, that stood firmly for the increase in the speed limit to 65 miles

per hour at the option of the States, to kind of look good, boy, we passed that speed limit bill again, and then it dies in conference with the House of Representatives?

If that is something that is of major concern or a major possibility, then I would say to the Senate is this the measure that we want to tack this on as strongly as many of us feel about it, or would it be wiser to wait for another time, another day?

Because I am very fearful that our friend from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee over there, has his heels dug in. One thing that I think we should all recognize and realize is that we should not tie something on this highway construction bill that is going to delay it any more than it has been already delayed.

If there is one thing that is clear, it seems to me, it is that we should have passed the highway bill last year and we could not get the job done. We should have passed the bill in January. Here it is February and we have not passed it yet. Those of us from the northern States of the Union that have a comparatively short construction season should now be in the business of letting contracts.

Therefore, the question that I am posing to the managers of the bill is: What is their best judgment on the chances of this ever becoming law with what I understand is the continued opposition of our colleagues across the hall in the House of Representatives?

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator yield?
Mr. EXON. I am happy to, and I will yield without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SYMMS. I would say to my good friend from Nebraska that we have some contentious issues that we have to settle with the House. The speed limit, even though it is somewhat contentious, is much less contentious than the demonstration project differential of how to fund it.

The Senate version, as I said earlier in my remarks, we call these priority projects and we give the States the authority to build them, but we do not give them the extra money.

The House has a system in their demonstration projects where they actually put more in. They have 4 billion dollars worth of extra projects.

So it is my best guess that this speed limit amendment, as is written here, if given a vote up or down on the floor of the House, it will pass. Because when the vote was taken in the Senate, that was prior to all of the publicity and all the talk about it and all of the national attention that has been focused on raising the 55-mile-per-hour limit. It was before President Reagan came out strongly in favor of it and it was before this Senate voted strongly, by a 20-vote margin, in favor of it and all

the publicity that went around the country.

So, in my view, we will pass the speed limit here. And it is, in answer to the Senator's question, the appropriate place to put it. This is the bill that is appropriate. It is legislatively correct, it is germane, and it is a bill that must pass.

So if the Senator wants to get the speed limit raised, I would urge him and appeal to him to stand with me and others and we will win this issue in the conference. I see other issues that would be harder to work out with the House. I think there will be some compromise made, I say to my good friend from Nebraska, probably in the realm of some kind of an encouragement or incentive or something to encourage the States, if they go to the 65, to require a State speed limit or some kind of minimal seatbelt legislation. That would be a compromise. It was talked about last year.

And I just think that now, with the pressure of the cement mixers of America that need to get to work building our highways, that we are in a better position in the Senate than we were last year, because there was no pressure on many Members of the House. It is quite a different matter now.

So the Highway Users Federation and Highway Users Lobby of America are putting the heat on now to get this bill passed before the American people. It is very true, it is the same in New Jersey as it is in Nebraska or Idaho or Maine or California, the pressure is going to be equally distributed to all of us. So I think it will help us and it will encourage the Senate and the House conferees to reach a compromise.

So I would say to my good friend, this Senator views this as a very serious proposition. I have been told by several Senators that, if we come back without this amendment from the House, they will filibuster the highway bill to try to instruct the conferees. So I think they are equal. This is the time for us to pass it, go on to the House with an olive branch. Maybe there is something else we can deal on, but we do not have to deal on this issue. I think there is no reason for the Senator to feel that we will not be able to get this, because if they ever give it a vote on the floor of the House, I am confident the American people will get their duly elected Congressman to vote to lift that speed limit.

Mr. EXON. Well, I thank my friend from Idaho for his explanation. But I am very fearful that he has raised more questions in my mind than he has resolved with his statement.

If, for example, this is passed in the House of Representatives, and it may well be—although it is true, is it not,

that the House of Representatives defeated the option of raising the speed limit at the option of the States by only 18 to 20 votes, but is it not true that within the last 10 or 15 days the House turned around and had an overwhelming vote against it on this measure? Is that not true?

Mr. SYMMS. It was not a clear vote. They voted on a rule. What the House did is they offered a substitute rule that would have allowed them to offer a substitute amendment and so they did not win that. But they did not have a clear up-or-down vote on the speed limit.

Mr. EXON. It is my feeling that it was pretty clear.

May I ask the leader of the bill from the majority side if he shares the view expressed by our colleague from the State of Idaho?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank my friend from Nebraska for being so open, as he was earlier, about what our alternatives might be.

I would beg of him the opportunity to be more evasive. If this measure passes on the floor of the Senate, we will be committed, we will be instructed, as conferees, to insist on our position. And we will insist on it, but as the experienced Senator and former Governor knows, you do not always get everything you insist on. We will follow our instructions as faithfully as we can do, and we will come back to you to your applause or your distress accordingly as we succeed.

But I think that we will all want to recognize—and the Members of the House, with respect to some things they have insisted on in the past—that we have to have a highway bill. We have got to have a highway bill. A mass transit bill, too, I would like to say.

Mr. EXON. I appreciate that. I hope that my friend from New York and my friend from New Jersey, who I see has joined us on the floor, would not impinge upon this Senator's time talking about mass transit, which is not a prime issue in Nebraska.

But I would say that I was quite concerned with the statement of the Senator from Idaho when he said that if this measure does not come back to the Senate, that there are people in the Senate who would wage a filibuster against it. Now those are the concerns that I have. I worry about that. I wish we could strip this bill of all of the amendments and just pass it as its central theme, and that is to fund highway construction.

(Mr. GRAHAM assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. EXON. I will yield in just a moment when I finish my remarks.

It just seems to me that, while I believe in and strongly support this measure, I am very fearful that we are being set up, once again, to pass an option and it will go to conference and

it will be traded off. I am not sure that a series of defeats necessarily assures the road to victory for a more reasonable highway speed limit.

So I am only trying to draw the question out as to whether or not this is the time and the place. I do not want this highway bill held up because of strongly held views by Members of the House, or strongly held views by those of us over here, and in our case it is the speed limit. We have to get on with construction. Therefore, I simply say I am not sure. If I thought we had a chance of passing this and it would become law, I would be enthusiastically in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Idaho. I think he knows where I stand on this issue.

I just am wondering. I am trying to get a feeling as to whether or not we are making a step in the right direction by attaching it to this bill. In that regard, may I ask before I yield the floor why it was that this increased highway speed limit bill was not put on in committee before this came out to the floor?

Mr. SYMMS. I can answer that very easily. Because if it were put on in the Public Works Committee, then it would have allowed the Commerce Committee to ask for sequential jurisdiction and further delay the bill.

I would just say to the Senator as to his doubt about this that I have enough enthusiasm for this for both of us. We are going to go to conference and do the best job we can to come back with a highway bill. And we all feel the concern that the Senator is talking about. Every one of our States want the highway bill passed. I think there will be no issue that will be too contentious that the House and the Senate conferees will not be able to reach some sort of an agreement so we will get highway legislation passed and out to the States on very short notice from now.

But the Senator's concerns I respect, but, believe me, there is a lot of enthusiasm across the country and certainly this Senator has it, as I said, to pass this now. This is the appropriate legislation to have it attached to. It is germane. It speaks to highway safety and the general transportation of the highways. I know of no other bill coming up that would ever have a chance to become law that would give us a better chance than this particular piece of legislation.

So I urge the Senator to join with us. I think we will be able to do good work and achieve both of his goals: One is, as he has stated, to lift and relax the speed limit, and let his State of Nebraska set it somewhat on their own, at least up to 65, and second to get those highway dollars out to the State of Nebraska and other sovereign States.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend. I am fully aware that this is an appropriate vehicle for this amendment to be attached. I recognize that it is germane. I thought I made myself clear in my earlier remarks that was not my concern. I know all of that. I am talking about whether or not this is the politically expedient moment, the politically expedient bill to get the job done that the Senator and I both seek. I will continue to listen to the debate and make up my own mind. But I do want to sound that possible warning because of those of us who very much want the States to have the option. Some of us are not sure. If we pass it here, then if it is sold out in committees, and then if that bill comes back as the Senator from Idaho has suggested and is filibustered here in the U.S. Senate, I think that would be bad not only for the road structure of the United States of America, but I think it would be bad indeed for something as important as raising the speed limit is to this Senator. I do not believe that should hold up the matter of construction of our highways.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska when he talks about the critical issue being the passage of the highway bill. I assure our distinguished friend from Idaho that there is enough enthusiasm to pass this highway bill stripped clean of any amendments that says we are going to get to work to continue the building and maintenance of our highway system. Let us get on with it, and not confuse the issue by attaching amendments, no matter how important they are if we truly support the notion of getting the highway bill passed.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho. This issue is not new to the Senate floor. We debated the merits of the 55 miles-per-hour speed limit when considering the highway bill in the 99th Congress. And, Mr. President, the merits have not changed.

The simple fact of the matter is stated on the signs along our highways. "55 saves lives."

Much of the responsibility under the Federal highway program is delegated to the States. But the Federal Government retains a most important responsibility—safety.

Above all else, it is the duty of this body to ensure that the American public can travel our highways safely. One of the most effective tools available in this effort is the 55 miles-per-hour speed limit.

Before 55, there were 4.24 deaths per 100 million miles travelled on our highways. Since that time, with 55, that rate has dropped to 2.58 deaths per 100 million miles travelled. That is a 40 percent drop.

Even though my colleague from Idaho noted highway speeds are inching up, there are other reasons for that drop in the fatality rate, and we are pleased to see it.

In terms of lives saved, the numbers are overwhelming. The National Safety Council estimates that 36,000 tragic deaths have been avoided as a result of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Each year, as many as 82,000 injuries, many of them critical, are avoided.

With enactment of this amendment, the Council estimates that some 500 additional lives will be lost on our highways each year. All for the sake of a few minutes saved.

And where will it stop? The next step may be to get rid of 55 altogether. That would be an even more tragic step. The National Safety Council projects that 2,000 to 4,000 additional deaths will take place on our highways if that happens.

We in this Chamber respond to many tragedies. Recently, I chaired a hearing on the Amtrak-Conrail collision which took 16 lives. The accident was truly a tragedy. The Nation joined the victims' families in grieving the loss, and we are searching for ways to prevent future accidents. Well, Mr. President, with this amendment, the Senate would be going the wrong way. The Senate would be taking a huge step backward. We know the way to prevent accidents on our highways. And we should not abandon it.

The loss of one or two lives on a rural highway is no less tragic to the families involved than if those deaths occurred in a midair collision of two jets or on a railroad train. Just as it is our duty to ensure the safety of our traveling public while they are in planes, or on trains, it is our duty to protect them on our highways.

Mr. President, the supporters of this amendment will argue that it is a States rights issue. That the Federal Government does not have the right to set a national speed limit. But I say that the Federal Government not only has the right, but the responsibility to do so.

We are not here just to represent our individual States. Each of us have a responsibility. We are here to establish and promote sound national policy. Policy that protects the American people, and is in the public's best interest. The 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is such a policy.

Polls indicate that the majority of Americans support 55. A 1986 Gallup Poll indicated that 66 percent of the population supported 55. Additionally, 79 percent agree that 55 saves lives.

It is a fallacy to presume that a speed limit of 65 would be observed any more closely than 55. The Department of Transportation has been lax in its enforcement. There is no reason to assume that this would change. With 55, the actual average speed on our highways is more like 60. With 65, average speed would approach 70 miles per hour.

High speeds endanger everyone, not just the speeder. I certainly agree that the enforcement mechanism needs to be altered, to focus attention on truly high speed violations. But getting rid of 55 altogether would be a mistake. Raising the limit will only result in less safe highways, and more needless traffic deaths.

Mr. President, I am fully aware of the sentiment of many in this body to allow the raising of the speed limit on our highways. I hope that they are looking beyond the shortsighted view of those wanting to save a few minutes of traveling time, and are taking a close look at the facts. For every mile over 55, there is an increased risk of being involved in a crippling or fatal accident. That is the question before us. Not whether we are going to allow people to drive faster. But rather, are we going to allow thousands of lives to be lost each year on our highways for the sake of saving a few minutes?

Once again, Mr. President, I restate, the highway bill has universal acceptance in this and the other body as well. If we are serious about getting highway construction underway, about getting the maintenance performed that needs to be done, we ought to strip this bill of amendments and not conceal the fact that we are trying to improve the situation by adding this 55-mile-an-hour change. If we seriously believe that that change ought to be made, let us do it independently. Bring it up and let it stand on its own merits. Do not tack it onto a piece of legislation that is being cried for in every State of this country, including the State of New Jersey which I represent.

We have a chance to do it. It has been long in coming. I would urge my colleague from Idaho, and as so eloquently expressed by my colleagues from New York and Nebraska, to move along with the highway bill. Let us not clutter it up with anything else that we know or conjecture will be received one way or another in the House.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield the floor?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, the more I listen to this debate the more confusing it becomes. When I hear state-

ments by my good friend and colleague from New Jersey that would lead the Senate to believe that those of us who want to give the States the option to go up to 65 miles per hour are inviting wholesale additional deaths on the highways, I wonder if my friend from New Jersey knows the percentage of deaths on the highways of the United States for the year 1985. I wonder if he would state if he knows what those percentages are of the total percentage of deaths on the rural Interstate System as opposed to the broad category of highway deaths that I believe the Senator from New Jersey would concede were the thrust of his remarks, therefore not pertinent to the argument and the discussion of giving the States the option to raise the speed limit.

Does the Senator from New Jersey have the percentage of highway deaths on the Interstate System nationwide as compared to the total highway deaths?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for an answer?

Mr. EXON. I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I would say that, no, I do not have the precise percentages, but I do have some information in front of me that I think is relevant. I see that the 10 States with the highest fatality rates on rural interstates in 1984 were some of the important States in our country with substantial mileage classified as rural interstate. Arizona, which had a very poor rating of compliance, evidenced by the fact that it received \$510,000 worth of fines for noncompliance, is fourth in death rates on rural interstate highways. That suggests some kind of a correlation that persuades me that, though I do not have the precise numbers that the Senator asked for, that as we increase speed, we do several things. We inadvertently encourage more deaths per miles traveled and we encourage more injuries per miles traveled and, furthermore, we encourage consumption of energy that we have seen costing our country enormous sums of money in recent months. We have seen \$1 billion a month added to the cost of imported oil when we have an incredible trade deficit.

To concede to my colleagues from the West, I am willing to engage in the debate just as they are, but let us do it in an environment that does not cloud things or suggest that the highway bill is all important but we are willing to play with it, to delay it and take the risk that it will not sail through as we would like it to.

I would encourage us to have the debate independent of this issue.

Mr. President, I think we ought to fess up here and decide whether or not we want a highway bill to go through

here or do we want a highway bill that will have all kinds of appendages tied to it that will detract from our avowed purpose of getting the highway bill going through.

Mr. EXON. I thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. President. Let me answer my own question.

Less than 10 percent of all the highway deaths in 1985—and this has been true for years—occurred on the Interstate System. That means, Mr. President, that 90 percent of all the deaths occurred on the non-interstate System, the primary- and secondary-road systems of the United States.

But the Senator from New Jersey and others on this floor, and the so-called safety experts, ignore that fact when they get in front of the U.S. Senate and they cite figures as to how many lives have been saved by the reduction in the speed limit.

We know that is true, but we also know, Mr. President, that it is the primary and secondary road systems where over 90 percent of the deaths occur.

So my colleagues in the Senate are not confused, the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, the same one that this Senator has offered previously and has supported, does not touch, has no effect upon whatsoever, the speed at which 90 percent of all the deaths in the United States occurred during the year 1985. Therefore I think it is not fair, it is not reasonable, and it does not contribute to constructive debate, I suggest, to cite highway death figures when you lump the Interstate System and the primary and secondary road systems, which the amendment before us, and which this Senator has supported in the past, does not touch, the 55-mile-per-hour speed limits where 90 percent of the deaths on the highways of America occur.

So that is a phony argument.

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator yield for a point on that?

Mr. EXON. Yes, but I will not yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. EXON. I yield for a brief statement.

Mr. SYMMS. The point is quite right about less than 10 percent of the fatalities. But even to make it more dramatic, we are asking for such a meager point here, Mr. President. We are only asking for rural interstates.

On the rural interstates, less than 5 percent of the traffic fatalities occurred in 1985. So it is even more dramatic than the Senator's point.

That means that 95 percent of the traffic fatalities—if we change this authority, we are only talking about highways where less than 5 percent of the fatalities occur, where 19 percent of the traffic is traveled on those

roads, incidentally. So the record of safety is already pretty well proven.

May I say one other thing to the Senator—because I hear him very well when he talks about not adding things to this bill that are going to confuse the issue.

The Banking Committee has jurisdiction over the transit or UMTA funds. There is a great concern from this administration over the formula. They want to end the Transit Discretionary Program and administer the transit share of the program equitably by formula. As the Senator knows, in his State and my State, we are not getting much back from the 1 cent per gallon that we pay on the transit. We do rather well on the 8 cents per gallon that the highway users pay. But on the 1 cent we pay for transit, we do not get much back. Most of it goes to just a few States.

The administration is shopping around for someone to offer an amendment on the floor to change that formula. If it becomes an issue, the administration has said that they think it should be made more fair. This Senator has not been trying to get anyone to offer it; this Senator has been trying to discourage that. But I say to the Senator from Nebraska, if the administration pushes their point, they may very well decide to veto this bill over the fact that the formula distribution on a 1-cent-per-gallon tax that our taxpayers pay that goes into the transit fund has never been distributed the way it was asked for when this bill originally passed in 1982, in the Reagan administration. If the President pushes that issue, there are certainly more than half of the Senators in this Chamber whose States come out on the short end of that stick on the 1-cent per gallon and could force that issue. So to the Senator from New Jersey and others who have been pushing the transit section, that could end up being more contentious than the speed limit question.

I thank the Senator for his observation. I think we should recognize that we have several other contentious issues to deal with on this legislation. I just hope we will be able to work it all out.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend. Let me close, Mr. President, by refreshing our minds. There is so much confusion about facts and figures. The figure that my friend from Idaho just used is so accurate: Less than 5 percent of the deaths do occur on rural interstates. But I always try to compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges, because all too often, the opposition to this do not. I was using less than 10 percent because that is the accurate figure on all interstate highways, both urban and rural.

The Senator from Idaho makes an excellent point. If one ever stops to

wonder about the volume of traffic in the United States of America, where is the volume of traffic? Obviously, it is on interstates. Yet on both rural and urban, still we have deaths of only 10 percent.

Those who are seriously concerned about highway safety, what they should be doing here is offering an amendment to drop the speed limit from 55 to 45 or 40 on all the roads—at least on the primary and secondary roads. I say again, Mr. President, that is where 90 percent and more of the people are killed.

I do not mean that they are not sincere. I simply mean that they have their facts all mixed up. I think it is wrong for us either to pass legislation or not pass legislation on scare tactics and phony scare figures that are advanced on a cause.

My last statement is that in Nebraska in 1985, there were about 141 deaths—do not hold me to that exact figure. But of that some 140, less than 5 percent were killed on all of the interstates, rural and other, or a total of 11 persons. In those accidents where that less than 5 percent of Nebraskans were killed in 1985, speed—speed, Mr. President—was not cited by the patrol in a single case of traffic fatalities on the interstate.

When one recognizes that an Interstate System is a divided two-lane highway, where head-on collisions are all but eliminated, with controlled entrances and exits, and compares the safety of that road at 10 miles per hour faster than all of the primary and secondary roads—which are two-lane highways, where death from a head-on collision is divided by 2 or 3 feet—one has to wonder at those who try to say that 55 miles per hour is the proper speed on a highway of the interstate class that is built for reasonable speeds, and not the primary and secondary roads where 90 percent of the people are killed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Robert Malakoff and Mr. Andrew Valentine of the Banking Committee staff be granted privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 387, the Federal Highway Act, and all rollcalls thereon.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate will soon be able to act on this legislation to reauthorize the Federal-Aid Highway Program for the next 4 years. This measure remains one of the major pieces of unfinished business of the 99th Congress. Since the Highway Program technically expired last October, a number of construction and repair projects across the country have been

halted. Projects will be postponed and construction jobs jeopardized unless this legislation is approved swiftly.

During the past 4 years highways across the country have benefited from the increased funding made possible by the 1982 Highway Act, which increased the gasoline tax by 5 cents per gallon. According to a recent report of the Department of Transportation, the steady deterioration of highways prior to 1982 has been halted. The funding authorized in this bill will continue to improve the quality of our transportation system.

This legislation takes a thoughtful and realistic approach to the challenge of meeting our Nation's highway needs in an era of budgetary constraints at the Federal level. It also enables us to look beyond construction of the Interstate System—which is almost 98 percent complete—to other highway needs. A number of changes are included in the bill to increase the spending flexibility of the States, making the program respond better to State and local highway priorities.

While providing funds for completion of the Interstate System, the bill will also assist States, like Rhode Island, that have completed their interstate segments. This legislation continues the policy of apportioning to every State a minimum of one-half percent of the interstate construction funds. It also combines the interstate construction, interstate repair, and primary highway categories into a new interstate-primary category. This will enable those States whose interstate segments are completed to concentrate on other neglected routes.

In addition, the bill provides increased flexibility for States which receive funds in the interstate substitution program. This program, enabling States to transfer unused interstate highway apportionments to alternative projects, is playing an important part in Rhode Island's long-term road improvement plan. This bill will enhance the program by expanding eligibility to any public road, rather than only those roads on the current Federal-aid system, and deleting the Federal deadline for project approval. These modifications will help the States respond better to changing highway needs.

The interstate substitution category will be further enhanced by a provision which I sponsored during the committee markup to permit the use of these funds for bicycle projects. States are already permitted to use Federal funds in the primary, secondary, and urban categories for bicycle projects. This provision will also give States the option of utilizing their interstate substitution funds for this purpose.

This will further encourage the development of alternative transportation systems to reduce traffic conges-

tion, promote energy conservation, and reduce auto pollution emissions. The State of Rhode Island has plans underway for the establishment of a bicycle path along the Blackstone River, linking several cities in the northern part of the State. This provision will expand the funding options available to the State in carrying out this project.

S. 387 also authorizes a new modified block grant program on a demonstration basis. Up to 10 States will participate in this initiative, enabling them to administer the secondary, urban and off-system bridge programs with greater flexibility. We must begin to look ahead to the structure of the Highway Program beyond the completion of the Interstate System in 1990. It makes sense for us to begin testing the feasibility of turning over greater responsibility to State and local officials for the allocation of highway resources.

Rhode Island Gov. Edward Dipepre has strongly supported the concept of an enhanced role for the States in administering the Highway Program. I believe this block grant initiative will be an important first step in demonstrating the advantages of giving more authority to the States. Rhode Island would be ideally suited to participate, and it is my hope that the Secretary will give Rhode Island priority consideration when the program gets underway.

I hope this legislation can be approved swiftly so that the conference discussions can go forward and the funds released to the States as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SALA G. BURTON

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk regarding the death of Representative SALA BURTON and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A Senate resolution (S. Res. 96) relative to the death of SALA G. BURTON, of California.

S. RES. 96

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Sala G. Burton, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved further, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved further, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRANSTON. Joining me in that resolution is my friend and colleague, Senator PETE WILSON.

Let me say something now, and I shall say more later about SALA BURTON.

She and her husband, Phillip Burton, were long time, close, personal friends of mine. Over many, many years, we were in grassroots politics, in electoral politics, and in public office in California, in Sacramento, and nationally.

Phillip Burton was a great leader in the House of Representatives, a great environmentalist, a great worker in the vineyards and elsewhere, for equal opportunity for all people, for peace, and for many great causes. When he died, a special election was held and SALA BURTON, his widow, was, in effect, elected by acclamation to succeed him in the House. Where she has served with great dedication and brilliance in all the causes that inspired her husband, that inspired her, and that have inspired so many of their constituents and so many other Californians and national and world citizens who were aware of the Burton team, the Burton dedication, the Burton accomplishments.

SALA was appointed to the Rules Committee and served with great distinction on that vitally important committee in the House of Representatives. We shall all miss her. We all have profound respect for her accomplishments and for her husband's before her.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I join the Senator in my sympathies to the Burton family, particularly to former Congressman John Burton.

I say to the Senator from California that when I came to Congress, Phil Burton was a power to be reckoned with on the House Interior Committee. He always treated those of us on the low end of the Republican side of the table with great deference and fairness in operating things in the Interior Committee. I always felt that I really cut my teeth there as to how an honest politician operates, and I think Phil Burton fit that mode.

It is an end to an era with the passing of his wife. He truly was a political leader who could get things done in the House and would come to those of

us who had completely different views on issues.

I always had the highest feelings for Phil and SALA. We differed on many philosophical issues, but we worked closely on that committee.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator.

They were indeed a team. In all the years that Phil was the leader, SALA was his companion and compatriot and collaborator. She carried on that work alone with great distinction.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wish to express a measure of condolence to our beloved senior Senator from California, who is clearly deeply moved by the loss, first, of Phil Burton and now of SALA. They were part of his life in a very special way. He would want to know that they were part of the life of this Nation as well. You could not be aware of public events in the 1960's, 1970's, 1980's without thinking of those two.

We have some sense of what you have lost.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank my friend from New York for his remarks, which, as always, were thoughtful and eloquent.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, first I wish to thank my friend and colleague from California [Mr. CRANSTON] for the resolution he has submitted memorializing the very sad and untimely death of our colleague, SALA BURTON. I will take just a moment or two to add personal recollections, personal observations.

Often in the heat of politics those of different parties find a personal relationship strained and genuine divisions, real differences in philosophy often actuate personality clashes, but I do not think that very many people who were privileged to know SALA BURTON came away from the experience without feeling for her a genuine respect and affection. She was someone who, although a partisan, often put personal relationships with her fellow legislators above mere partisanship and what I know she put above all else was service to her city, because I was privileged to work with her on a number of common concerns. She was San Francisco's greatest lobbyist. I will not forget the many times that she called and told me how important it was either that there be a breakwater or a new building or some other requirement which would improve the quality of life for her constituents, and in doing her duty she reflected the great pride that she felt in representing San Francisco. I think a great deal of her success came from the genuineness of that conviction and also the fact that she genuinely liked people, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, not that she was a Pollyanna. I have heard her express some opinions about people, even

those in her own party, with which I felt compelled to agree.

But she was a genuine San Franciscan, a genuine politician in the best sense of that word. She was a great support to her husband Phil.

Senator SYMMS, recounting his own early experiences in Congress, I think has paid a deserved tribute to the late Phil Burton.

I did not have the privilege of serving with him either in the State legislature or in Congress beyond the few brief months that he was here in that session in which his life ended.

I must say that I had all too brief a time of service with SALA. She was warm, she was caring, she did have a sense of humor, and she I think understood something very basic about American politics. That is that those who are privileged to be elected to represent whatever constituency owe it to their constituency and colleagues and themselves to work hard at the job, but to be quite human about it, to recognize that the importance that you attach to a project may not be shared and that you owe it to the colleagues to take special pains to make it clear.

She did that. I think that she enjoyed a rather remarkable success in her rather too brief span of service here.

In addition to admiring her and having a great affection for her, I think that many of us will genuinely miss her presence. She brightened whatever room she came to. She has been described as grandmotherly. Well, she did have a genuine warmth about her that I think made people instinctively warm to her.

So, with Senator CRANSTON, Senator MOYNIHAN, and Senator SYMMS and others, let me add my voice in saying of her, a job well done, and a warm, caring, and very able colleague whose memory will not fade from ours. She is someone who did well by her family, who made her city proud and I think can make us proud regardless of whatever party.

With that, Mr. President, I will relinquish the floor and hope that Congress is fortunate enough to have many SALA BURTONS from now on into the future.

I thank the Chair for the courtesy in permitting me to interrupt the debate and particularly thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I might just say, as I said earlier, that it really marked the end of an era, but I hope that I truly misspoke myself when I said that with the loss of both Phil and SALA BURTON. I hope that Congress has many, many more people come here who have the integrity to their colleagues and to their constituents and their ability to work within the committee system and

in the system of legislation that the late Phillip Burton had.

I did not have the privilege of working with SALA in the House. I hope it was not the end of an era but that some of the new Members coming here could learn from the experience of talking how oldtime politicians and in the best sense of the word, as the Senator from California said, the late Phil Burton used to work on that House Interior Committee. It was a marvel. He had great integrity to his work.

He and I differed philosophically as much as any two members of the committee but he was of great help to my constituents.

I know if my senior colleague were here he could agree with that. He preceded me on that Interior Committee.

Phil Burton did many things for my constituents so that we could get things that we needed through that committee, because of the vast acreages of Government land in our State; 63 percent is owned by the Federal Government.

I shall be forever grateful for that experience and I hope that we have many more people with that kind of personal political integrity coming to Congress in the future.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Emery, 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.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 60. A resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Sala Burton, a Representative from the State of California.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING THE ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1987, the following reports of committees were submitted on January 30, 1987:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 83. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to energy conservation standards for appliances (Rept. No. 100-6).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BOREN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence: Special Report entitled "Preliminary Inquiry into the Sale of Arms to Iran and Possible Diversion of Funds to the Nicaraguan Resistance (Rept. No. 100-7).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 427. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to create a secondary market for sound mortgages secured by farm real estate and guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TRIBLE (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 428. A bill to enact the "Tributyltin-Based Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1987"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 429. A bill to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to delay for 2 years the exception for certain technical personnel from certain rules for determining whether an individual is an employee or independent contractor for employment tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. SIMON):

S. 430. A bill to amend the Sherman Act regarding retail competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. DeCONCINI, and Mr. SIMON):

S. 431. A bill to amend the Clayton Act regarding partnerships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METZENBAUM:

S. 432. A bill to amend the Clayton Act regarding mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Olga Sellares Barney and her children Christian Sellares Barney, Kevin Sellares Barney, and Charles Sellares Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Doctor Pablo Esguerra, Theresa Esguerra, and Micheline Esguerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Ayrton Oliver Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to give special recognition to the birth and achievements of Aldo Leopold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WIRTH):

S. Res. 96. A resolution relative to the death of Representative Sala G. Burton, of California; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 427. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to create a secondary market for sound mortgages secured by farm real estate and guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

FARM MORTGAGE GUARANTEE ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I rise for the purpose of introducing legislation which would set up a secondary market for farm loans. I call this legislation the "Farm Mortgage Guarantee Act." It is very similar to legislation which was introduced by a colleague of mine in the other body, and now former Congressman, Cooper Evans of Iowa, in the last Congress.

As the troubles of the Farm Credit System deepen, the need for a secondary market for farm loans becomes greater. If lenders could sell farm real estate loans on the secondary market, it would encourage more agricultural lenders to provide long term financing for the purchase of farm land.

Currently, commercial banks do not make long term real estate loans and some insurance companies have pulled out of the farm lending business. The only alternative for many borrowers is the Federal Land Bank where there are typical 30-year loans. A secondary market for farm loans would have the effect of giving individual farm borrowers access to the national capital markets and thus allowing them to borrow money at lower rates. The secondary market for residential mortgage loans has helped millions of Americans to own homes. I would also like to have that same principle apply to agricultural lending as well. A secondary market for farm real estate loans would give farm borrowers an affordable alternative to the Federal Land Bank.

Not only would farm borrowers benefit from the creation of a secondary market, but there would be significant

benefits for the lender as well. The lenders would benefit from increased liquidity because with a secondary market they would be able to recover in a few months what would take them decades to recover under normal repayment schedules. Lenders would also boost their profits with loan origination fees. When a bank sold its farm loans on the secondary market, it would further enhance its profitability by being able to make new farm loans, which in turn would generate new fees.

My bill, the "Farm Mortgage Guarantee Act," provides that after banks and other retail lenders make farm land loans, they be able to pool these loans and sell them to "Aggie Mae," a revolving fund administered by the Farmers Home Administration [FmHA]. Aggie Mae would then sell the loan pools or package the loans and sell them as mortgage backed securities to institutional investors. The enticement for investors is that Aggie Mae will guarantee the investment, thus making Aggie Mae securities a risk-free proposition.

This legislation also calls for the creation of a farm real estate insurance fund. The insurance fund would require an initial appropriation of \$100 million and would guarantee the investment of purchasers of Aggie Mae securities. The insurance fund will be credited with all fees charged on loans sold to Aggie Mae by lenders. When the amount in the insurance fund exceeds an amount equal to 5 percent of the aggregate value of the loans for which a guarantee is in effect, the amount in excess of 5 percent will be transferred to the Treasury until the \$100 million appropriation has been repaid.

Then, at that point, no real cost or any potential cost to the taxpayers.

The Aggie Mae revolving fund will be capitalized by pooling existing FmHA loans on which the borrowers are current and selling them to institutional investors. The proceeds from the sale of these loans would be used by Aggie Mae to purchase loans from banks and other lenders. From that point forward, Aggie Mae would become a self-supporting revolving fund. Loan quality will be assured by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to certify that there is adequate collateral securing the loan and that the borrower has a sufficient cashflow to repay the loan.

Other Members of Congress have also introduced secondary market legislation, and there are many different ways a secondary market for farm loans could be structured. It is possible that a secondary market could be set up without Government guarantees and congressional action, and I would encourage the banking trade associations and the Farm Credit System to

continue their discussions on this issue. In the meantime, "The Farm Mortgage Guarantee Act" is a starting point, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to explore this issue further, and to result in some legislation that will help us curb the very rapidly declining farmland prices and the panic that that brings to the farm economy.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 427

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 "Farm Mortgage Guarantee Act of 1987".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to encourage agricultural lenders to provide long term financing for the purchase of agricultural land by providing a secondary market for sound mortgages that are adequately secured by farm real estate and guaranteed by the Farmers Home Administration.

SEC. 3. FARM MORTGAGE GUARANTEES.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by adding after section 352 (7 U.S.C. 2000) the following new section:

"SEC. 353. FARM MORTGAGE GUARANTEE.

"(1) FARM REAL ESTATE LOANS.—The Secretary may purchase or repurchase under this section any qualifying farm real estate loan or an interest in the loan.

"(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may make such purchases on such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"(3) FEES AND CHARGES.—The Secretary may charge to sellers of loans under paragraph (1) such fees and charges as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

"(4) QUALIFYING FARM REAL ESTATE LOAN.—For the purposes of this section a loan is a qualifying farm real estate loan if—

"(A) the loan is initiated by an approved federally or State chartered commercial bank, savings and loan association, credit union, mutual savings bank, mortgage banker, cooperative lending agency, or other legally organized lending agency, including an institution of the Farm Credit System established under the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2001 et. seq.) or an insurance company;

"(B) the Secretary finds that the loan is secured by adequate collateral in the form of farm land to ensure low risk of loss of principal by the maker of the loan or the successor in interest of the maker;

"(C) the Secretary finds the borrower to have sufficient resources or cash flow to ensure a high probability that the borrower will be able to maintain payments in accordance with the terms of the loan contract; and

"(D) the loan meets such other requirements as the Secretary may impose.

"(b) LOAN GUARANTEE.—

"(1) SECURED LOANS.—the Secretary shall guarantee, with respect to principal and interest, any loan or interest in any loan purchased under subsection (a) on such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds to be

prudent and that will assure an adequate market for the purchase of loans so guaranteed.

"(2) FMHA LOANS.—The Secretary may guarantee a farm real estate loan held by the Farmers Home Administration that meets the requirements of subsection (a)(4)(B) and (a)(4)(C) or any other farm real estate loan or interest in such loan that meets the requirements of subsection (a)(4)

"(c) FMHA LOAN SALES.—A loan or interest in such loan guaranteed under subsection (b) and held by the Farmers Home Administration may be offered for sale by the Secretary on such terms and conditions as the Secretary finds appropriate.

"(d) SECURITIES BACKED BY LOANS.—The Secretary may sell, resell, purchase, and repurchase securities backed by loans or interests in loans guaranteed under this section.

"(e) LOAN AGENTS.—

"(1) SERVICING LOANS.—The Secretary may contract with any person to act as an agent to perform functions necessary for the ongoing servicing of a loan as the Secretary may direct.

"(2) OTHER FUNCTIONS.—The Secretary may contract with any person to act as an agent to perform functions necessary for the purchase, repurchase, sale, and resale of qualifying farm real estate loans or an interest in such loan as authorized by this section, or for the ongoing servicing of a loan or interest in a loan sold under the provisions of this section as the Secretary may direct.

"(f) FARM MORTGAGE REVOLVING FUND.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Farm Mortgage Revolving Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Revolving Fund') consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Revolving Fund.

"(2) REVOLVING FUND CREDITS.—The Secretary shall credit to the Revolving Fund—

"(A) all sums received by the Secretary from the sale of loans under this section;

"(B) any interest earned from the investment of a part of the Revolving Fund under paragraph (4);

"(C) all principal and interest payments received by the Secretary on loans being held for sale under this section; and

"(D) all fees and charges the Secretary directs to be charged to sellers or buyers of loans under this section that the Secretary finds should be credited to the Revolving Fund.

"(3) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Amounts from the Revolving Fund shall be available—

"(A) for the purchase or repurchase of loans or interests in loans under subsection (a);

"(B) for paying the costs of administering this section, including the cost of services authorized by subsection (e); and

"(C) for the purpose set forth in subsection (g)(4).

"(4) EXCESS DEMAND DEPOSITS.—If the Secretary determines that the Revolving Fund contains demand deposits in excess of current needs, the Secretary shall invest such excess in obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States.

"(g) FARM REAL ESTATE INSURANCE FUND.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Farm Real Estate Insurance Fund (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Insurance Fund').

"(2) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to the Insurance Fund to be available without fiscal year limitation.

"(3) INSURANCE FUND CREDITS.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the Secretary shall credit to the Insurance Fund—

"(A) all fees or charges the Secretary directs to be charged sellers or buyers of loans under this section that the Secretary finds should be credited to the Insurance Fund; and

"(B) any interest earned from the investment of Insurance Fund amounts under paragraph (7).

"(4) TRANSFERS FROM REVOLVING FUND.—The Secretary shall transfer to the Insurance Fund such funds from the Revolving Fund as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out paragraph (5).

"(5) DISCHARGING OBLIGATIONS.—Amounts from the Insurance Fund shall be available, as provided in advance by appropriations acts, for discharging obligations of the Secretary to guarantee loans under subsection (b)(1).

"(6) AMOUNTS PAID TO TREASURY.—The Secretary shall pay the amounts described in paragraph (3) into the general fund to the Treasury during any period if—

"(A) the amount in the Insurance Fund exceeds an amount equal to 5 percent of the aggregate value of loans and interests in loans for which a guarantee is in effect under subsection (c); and

"(B) until an amount equal to any amount appropriated under subsection (g)(2) to the Insurance Fund has been repaid.

"(7) INSURANCE FUND HOLDINGS.—The Insurance Fund shall be held in the form of demand deposits and obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States.

"(h) LOANS NOT GUARANTEED.—No loan shall be guaranteed under this section if the loan amount exceeds 70 percent of the most probable price that a property securing the loan should bring as determined by the Secretary at the time the loan is guaranteed.

"(i) PROGRAM TERMINATION.—The authority of the Secretary to guarantee a loan under this section shall terminate on December 31, 1991, except that a guarantee made prior to that date shall remain in effect for the life of the loan.

"(j) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate regulations necessary to carry out this section."

By Mr. TRIBLE (for himself,
Mr. COHEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 428. A bill to enact the "Tributyltin-Based Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1987"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

TRIBUTYL TIN-BASED ANTIFOULING PAINT
CONTROL ACT

● Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce today legislation to suspend the use of highly toxic marine paints containing tributyltin [TBT] until the Environmental Protection Agency determines such paints do not pose an unacceptable hazard to the marine environment.

Today over 70 percent of the world's commercial and recreational ships are painted with the antifouling paint known generally as organotin. This antifouling paint, which contains biocide tributyltin [TBT], is extremely effective in eliminating barnacles and other fouling organisms on vessels. This leads to lower operating and

maintenance costs and reduced fuel consumption.

TBT paints, however, may also have a lethal effect on marine and freshwater life. EPA is now conducting a special review of TBT compounds because the Agency has determined that this highly toxic substance may present "unreasonable risks to nontarget aquatic organisms such as mussels, clams, oysters, and fish."

I am deeply concerned about the harmful effects TBT paints pose to marine life and public health and believe that it is important to act now and limit the use of these paints until EPA is able to complete its lengthy review process.

The United States lags far behind other nations in regulating this toxic compound. France, England, and Japan all have limits on the use of TBT. Germany and Switzerland have totally prohibited its fresh water use.

TBT paint can generally be classified in two categories based on how the TBT compound is incorporated into the paint coating. In copolymer paints TBT is chemically integrated within the matrix and releases the TBT at a steady rate. Free association paints have TBT mixed in freely and tend to dump the toxic compound at a high rate when first put into the water. Everyone agrees that free association paints are bad, but some copolymer paints also leach at unacceptably high rates.

Therefore, this legislation suspends the use of all marine paints that release large concentrations of the toxic TBT compound—release rates greater than 0.5, $\pm 20\%$ micrograms per square centimeter per day as certified by EPA—regardless of how the TBT is incorporated into the paint matrix. The suspension will remain in effect until EPA determines which TBT paints pose an unacceptable hazard to the marine environment. The enactment of this legislation will immediately reduce the amount of TBT introduced into the marine environment and make the world safer for water life and people.

Mr. President, this is an emergency situation we face. TBT levels found in the Chesapeake Bay and other waterways around our country are alarmingly high. Something must be done now to reduce the levels of this highly toxic compound. This bill is supported by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and the Environmental Policy Institute and is cosponsored by Senators COHEN and WARNER. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 428

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Tributyltin-Based Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1987".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) "steady-state release rate" means that rate measured after the initial 30-day exposure to seawater of a freshly painted surface, which remains constant over a four-week period at $\pm 20\%$, as measured in accordance with procedures specified by the Administrator;

(3) "vessel" includes any ship, boat, watercraft or other marine structure (whether or not private, commercial, public, or military); and

(4) "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, or other entity

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 3(a) The Congress hereby finds that: (1) more than 70 percent of the worldwide commercial shipping fleets and recreational boats are painted with an antifouling paint known generally as organotin;

(2) this antifouling paint, which contains the biocide tributyltin (TBT), is extremely effective in eliminating barnacles and other fouling organisms;

(3) the elimination of fouling growths on vessels is highly beneficial for operating capability and leads to lower operating and maintenance costs and substantial fuel consumption reductions;

(4) laboratory studies and data show that TBT is highly toxic and potentially lethal to marine and freshwater organisms at very minute levels and the Environmental Protection Agency has determined that their continued use may present unreasonable risks to nontarget aquatic organisms such as mussels, clams, oysters, and fish; and

(5) organotin paints which release organotin at steady-rates not greater than 0.5 micrograms per square centimeter per day are available from United States paint manufacturers, and provide long-term protection from fouling, while significantly reducing the impact on the environment.

(b) The purpose of this Act, subject to section 4, is to immediately reduce the quantities of tributyltin in the marine environment by prohibiting the use of antifouling paints containing tributyltin which have a release rate greater than 0.5, $\pm 20\%$ micrograms per square centimeter per day as certified by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

PROHIBITION

SEC. 4. (a)(1) The use by any person in the United States of paints containing tributyltin as an antifouling paint for the painting of any vessel is prohibited if such paints have a steady-state release greater than 0.5, $\pm 20\%$ micrograms per square centimeter per day as certified by the Administrator. Any person who uses, or permits, authorizes, or orders the use of, any such paint shall be in violation of this section and subject to a civil penalty in accordance with section 5 of this Act.

(2) The Administrator shall determine the steady-state release rates at which organotin paints do not pose an unacceptable

hazard to the marine environment and shall publish such rates in the Federal Register.

(b) On and after the date on which such rates referred to in subsection (a) of this section have been published in the Federal Register, the prohibition set forth in subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to the use of any such paint which is in compliance with such rates so published.

CIVIL PENALTIES

SEC. 5. (a) Any person who uses, or permits, authorizes, or orders the use of, any paint in violation of subsection (a) of section 4 shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 for each such violation. Each day such a violation continues shall, for purposes of this section, constitute a separate violation of subsection (a) of section 4.

(b) A civil penalty for a violation of subsection (a) of section 4 shall be assessed by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to in this section as the "Secretary") by an order made on the record after opportunity (provided in accordance with this section) for a hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code. Before issuing such an order, the Secretary shall give written notice to the person to be assessed a civil penalty under such order of the Secretary's proposal to issue such order and provide such person an opportunity to request, within 15 days of the date the notice is received by such person, such a hearing on the order.

(c) In determining the amount of a civil penalty, the Secretary shall take into account the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation or violations and, with respect to the violator, ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, economic benefit to violation resulting from such violation, any history of prior violations, the degree of culpability, and such other matters as justice may require.

(d) The Secretary may compromise, modify, or remit, with or without conditions, any civil penalty which may be imposed under this section. The amount of such penalty, when finally determined, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, may be deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the person charged.

(e) Any person who requested in accordance with subsection (b) a hearing respecting the assessment of a civil penalty and who is aggrieved by an order assessing a civil penalty may file a petition for judicial review of such order with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit or for any other circuit in which such person resides or transacts business. Such a petition may only be filed within the 30-day period beginning on the date the order making such assessment was issued.

(f) If any person fails to pay an assessment of a civil penalty—

(1) after the order making the assessment has become a final order and if such person does not file a petition for judicial review of the order in accordance with subsection (e), or

(2) after a court in an action brought under subsection (e) has entered a final judgment in favor of the Secretary,

the Attorney General shall recover the amount assessed (plus interest at currently prevailing rates from the date of the expiration of the 30-day period referred to in subsection (e) or the date of such final judgment, as the case may be) in an action brought in any appropriate district court of the United States. In such an action, the va-

lidity, amount, and appropriateness of such penalty shall not be subject to review.●

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, my good friend and colleague from the State of Virginia, Senator TRIBLE, and I are introducing legislation today to prohibit the use of certain highly toxic marine paints containing the chemical tributyltin [TBT].

Organotin is an effective, tin-based antifouling compound used in paint. TBT is the active ingredient in organotin-bearing paints. It is used to keep ship hulls free from barnacles, sea grasses, and other fouling organisms that may damage or increase friction on the hull. The increased friction requires more power and hence more fuel to maintain ship speed. Increased fuel consumption means higher operating costs. Navy officials estimate that fleetwide use of TBT copolymer paints would save \$150 million per year in fuel costs and \$5 million in maintenance once the entire fleet is so treated. TBT is superior to copper-based paints that were used in the past because it extends the duration of the antifouling action. A majority of the worldwide commercial shipping fleets and pleasure craft are painted with organotin-bearing paints.

While there may be substantial economic benefits derived from the use of TBT based antifouling paints, there are potentially severe environmental and human risks. The Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], the Navy, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, the States of Maine, Maryland, Virginia, Florida, North Carolina, and California, and several environmental groups have voiced such concerns. Others are joining the debate daily.

The principal concern is not whether organotin-bearing paints kill the organisms that foul a ship's hull. Rather, concern centers on whether the organotins leach out of the paints into the water at rates and toxicity levels that contaminate or kill nontarget aquatic organisms such as clams, shrimp, oysters, crabs, lobsters, and fish.

Last year, Senator TRIBLE and I introduced a sense of the Senate resolution urging the EPA to accelerate its investigation into the environmental and health effects of organotin-bearing paints. While organotin-bearing paints are presently registered with the EPA as pesticide antifouling compounds, many of these compounds were registered for use over 25 years ago. More recent studies raise new and troubling questions about the acute and chronic toxicity of these compounds even at extremely low concentrations, and their potential transmission into the food chain.

Biological damage by organotin leaching from boat bottoms has been noted in other countries. In 1982, France banned the use of TBT on boats under 25 meters—80 feet—in

length. French scientists noted that oysters in and around boat moorings and marinas were found to have abnormal shell growth, reduced reproduction rates, and mutations in oyster larvae. Evidence of these abnormalities was no longer present following the prohibition.

In 1985, William Waldegrave, England's Junior Environmental Minister, stated that he had "seldom been faced with clearer scientific evidence of the need for environmental action—and fast; that the apparent tendency of organotin-bearing paints to stunt the growth of Britain's pacific oyster is just the visible tip of a potentially massive environmental iceberg." England is now regulating the use of TBT. In addition, Japan has regulated the use of TBT, and Germany and Switzerland have prohibitions on freshwater use.

Mr. President, preliminary findings seem to confirm the suspicion that contamination levels that are adverse to our marine resources may be present at some marinas and shipyards in this country. Very high levels of TBT were recorded in the Chesapeake Bay last summer. These high readings have led many scientists to conclude that we must, without delay, take whatever steps are necessary to reduce the levels of TBT being introduced into our marine environment.

Mr. President, a large part of my strong concern about the dangers involved in this compound relate to Maine, a State with a long coastline, thousands of boats, and tens of thousands of individuals and families whose livelihood depends on a clean and productive marine environment. Few States would be as adversely affected by any unhealthy side effects of this organotin-bearing paint as Maine, and the interests of my State and all coastal States are clearly at stake here. Any coastal area with recreational, commercial, or naval activities has the potential for being so affected.

I applaud EPA's efforts to determine the potentially harmful effects these highly toxic pesticides of the organotin family of compounds may have on estuarine marine life and public health. I strongly urge the EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs to continue its special review to determine as quickly as possible how much TBT is present in our oceans, bays, rivers, and marinas, and what level of TBT concentration is dangerous to our Nation's marine resources and public health.

EPA's review is well underway, but far from complete. The legislation we are introducing today is urgently needed. It would significantly reduce the impact of TBT on the environment by suspending the use of antifouling paints containing TBT that have unacceptable release rates as certified by the Administrator of the

EPA. The suspension would remain in effect until such time as the EPA completes its special review and certifies steady-State release rates generated by organotin paints which do not pose an unacceptable hazard to the marine environment.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator TRIBLE and me in supporting this legislation.●

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 429. A bill to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to delay for 2 years the exception for certain technical personnel from certain rules for determining whether an individual is an employee or independent contractor for employment tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EMPLOYMENT TAX DETERMINATION

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation that would delay for 2 years the effective date of section 1706 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. This legislation is vitally important to the thousands of technical service personnel whose status as employees or independent contractors is currently in limbo.

Section 1706 of the Tax Reform Act was adopted without a single minute of debate in the Senate Finance Committee or on the Senate floor. Indeed, some might contend that section 1706 was a mere afterthought which was included in the Tax Reform Act solely for the purpose of raising revenue to pay for a wholly unrelated amendment. Yet in the process, we have caused unwarranted confusion and certainty for engineers, designers, drafters, computer programmers, systems analysts, and other technical services personnel.

Mr. President, the classification of a worker as an independent contractor or employee has generally been determined under certain common law tests. But in 1978, Congress created a safe harbor for certain workers, including technical service personnel, when an employer had a reasonable basis for treating someone as an independent contractor. Even though the Senate Finance Committee never considered the issue, the Tax Reform Act eliminated the safe harbor for technical service personnel.

My legislation would delay for 2 years the implementation of section 1706. This would enable the Senate Finance and Ways and Means Committees to hold hearings on the classification of technical services personnel and make a reasoned decision as to how these workers should be classified.●

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. SIMON):

S. 430. A bill to amend the Sherman Act regarding retail competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE

● Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to codify the well-established principle that vertical price fixing is per se illegal and to clarify the evidentiary standard for establishing the existence of vertical price-fixing agreements. I am pleased to be joined by Senators RUDMAN, SIMON, and BRADLEY as original cosponsors.

The bill would promote retail competition in two ways. First, it would codify current law that a vertical price-fixing conspiracy is per se illegal, that is, it is presumed to harm competition without the need for an elaborate analysis of economic effects. This principle was first articulated more than 75 years ago by the Supreme Court in *Dr. Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park & Sons Co.*, 220 U.S. 373 (1911). While the Supreme Court has restated this proposition on many occasions. Its integrity was undercut by the enactment of State fair trade laws and a Federal exemption from the antitrust laws for resale price maintenance.

Ultimately, however, in 1975, Congress repealed the antitrust exemptions for resale price maintenance calling them legalized price-fixing and proclaiming that its action would "result in a lowering of consumer prices." S. Rep. No. 466, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 1 (1975). The congressional finding that consumer prices would fall upon the elimination of laws legalizing resale price maintenance relied on studies by the U.S. Department of Justice. Those studies showed that the fair trade laws cost consumers \$1.2 billion in 1969 and \$2.1 billion in 1975. Other statistics showed that legalized resale price maintenance increased the price of goods by 18-27 percent.

Although current law states that vertical price-fixing conspiracies are per se illegal, the Department of Justice has failed to bring even one vertical price-fixing case in the last 6 years. Instead, the Department has intervened as amicus on behalf of defendants advocating the overruling of resale price maintenance rules.

Since the proper functioning of our free market system requires that each firm set its prices independently, it is appropriate that this well-established principle be firmly reaffirmed by Congress. My bill does this.

Second, my bill clarifies a point of evidence that arises in the proof of vertical price-fixing cases. Since conspiracies usually operate clandestinely, it is often difficult to prove the existence of a conspiracy through direct evidence. A jury may consider indirect, or circumstantial, evidence, therefore, and infer the existence of a conspiracy from it. See, for example, *American*

Tobacco Co. v. United States, 328 U.S. 781 (1946). Since the Supreme Court announced its decision in *Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Service Corp.*, 465 U.S. 752 (1984), however, there has been considerable confusion on this evidentiary issue. As a result, proof of resale price maintenance has been made extremely difficult under some courts' interpretation of that case.

The Monsanto court stated that, "permitting an agreement to be inferred merely from the excellence of complaints, or even from the fact that termination came about 'in response to' complaints, could deter or penalize perfectly legitimate conduct." 465 U.S. 763. Instead, "there must be evidence that tends to exclude the possibility that the manufacturer and nonterminated distributors were acting independently." *id.* at 764. Some lower courts' interpretations of what evidence a plaintiff must present under Monsanto run counter to traditional conspiracy law and result in the dismissal of cases that should be presented to a jury.

So, for example, consider a situation in which a discounter is terminated by a manufacturer as a result of complaints by a competing high-priced retailer, and the manufacturer offers no credible legitimate reason for the termination. Courts prior to Monsanto would have been able to allow the jury to consider this evidence and infer the existence of a conspiracy from it. After Monsanto, however, some courts would not allow this evidence to be presented to the jury and would dismiss the case. As a result, vertical price fixing has been extremely difficult to prove, victims of illegal behavior are not compensated for their losses, and future illegal conduct is not deterred.

The bill I am introducing today would help prevent these harmful results. It would allow a jury to infer the existence of a price-fixing conspiracy from proof that a discounting retailer was terminated as a result of complaints from a competitor. The bill would still allow defendants to present evidence that they were acting independently or for nonprice reasons such as dealer promotion or service.

The National Association of Attorneys General passed a resolution in March 1985 supporting similar legislation.

I am hopeful that my legislation will continue to receive strong bipartisan support so that consumers may once again receive the benefits of full and vigorous price competition among retailers.

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

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

S. 430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Retail Competition Enforcement Act of 1987".

SEC. 2. The Sherman Act is amended by redesignating section 8 and any references to section 8 as section 9 and by inserting between section 7 and section 9, as herein redesignated, the following new section:

"SEC. 8. In any civil action based on section 1 or 3 of this Act, including an action brought under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which alleges a contract, combination, or conspiracy to set, change, or maintain a price level, evidence that a person who sells a good or service to the claimant for resale—

"(1) received from a competitor of the claimant, a communication regarding price competition by the claimant in the resale of such good or service, and

"(2) in response to such communication terminated the claimant as a buyer of such good or service for resale, or refused to supply to the claimant some or all of such goods or services requested by the claimant, shall be sufficient to raise the inference that such person and such competitor engaged in concerted action to set, change, or maintain a price level, for such good or service in violation of such section.

"(b) In any civil action based on section 1 or 3 of this Act, including an action brought under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which alleges to contract, combination, or conspiracy to set, change, or maintain a price level, the fact that the seller of a good or service and the purchaser of such good or service entered into an agreement to establish the resale price of such good or service shall be sufficient to establish that such seller and such purchaser engaged in concerted action to set, change, or maintain the price level of such good or service in violation of such section." ●

By Mr. METZENBAUM (for himself, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. SIMON):

S. 431. A bill to amend the Clayton Act regarding partnerships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENTS REGARDING PARTNERSHIPS

● Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today that strengthens the premerger reporting requirements of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976. The purpose of the legislation is to close a loophole in the act that allows certain mergers and hostile takeovers to escape scrutiny under the antitrust laws.

The country has recently experienced a wave of hostile takeovers. Not all of these hostile takeovers, however, were designed to enhance productivity or increase consumer welfare. Businesses, workers, local communities, and consumers have suffered considerably as a result.

The Hart-Scott-Rodino Act prevents the completion of mergers that are likely to have an adverse impact on the economy. It requires that the Department of Justice and the Federal

and Trade Commission be notified before certain large mergers occur so that the proposed transaction may be reviewed for its likely impact on competition. The acquisition may be halted or modified if the review indicates that the acquisition may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

However, in some cases, corporate raiders have evaded the premerger notification requirements of the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act by structuring their takeovers to slip through the so-called partnership loophole. The attempted acquisitions of the Phillips Petroleum Co., by T. Boone Pickens/Mesa Petroleum Co., and the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co., by Sir James Goldsmith were structured to take advantage of this loophole. Thus, very complex and potentially anticompetitive mergers may escape scrutiny under the antitrust laws due to this loophole.

Evasion of the antitrust laws through this loophole is accomplished by the creation of a partnership to be the acquisition vehicle. Currently, a proposed merger must be reported to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission if: First, either the acquiring person or the acquired person is engaged in commerce or an activity affecting commerce; second, either person has annual net sales or total assets of \$100 million or more, and the other person has \$10 million or more in annual net sales or total assets; and third, the acquiring person would hold 15 percent or more of the voting securities or assets of the acquired person, or more than \$15 million worth of its voting securities and assets after the acquisition. For purposes of determining if these threshold tests are met, current law under Federal Trade Commission regulations counts the assets of the acquiring person, the entity which controls it, as well as the entities which the ultimate parent entity controls. However, when the acquiring person is a partnership, only the assets of the partnership are considered, not those of the partners themselves. Consequently, wealthy individuals and large companies may form partnerships to acquire other entities, slip by the reporting requirements, and complete the merger without any examination for potential anticompetitive effects.

The legislation I am introducing would plug this loophole by amending the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act. It is meant to make clear that, in the event the acquiring person is a partnership, the assets of the partnership, the assets of entities controlled by the partnership, and the assets of certain partners should be considered in determining whether the premerger reporting requirements apply. More specifically, my bill requires that a partner's assets be counted when the partner is a general partner or possesses a 50-percent

or greater equity interest in the partnership. These specifications are carefully designed to require that the assets of a partner who has practical control of the partnership be counted, but to avoid unnecessary reporting. Furthermore, the bill does not change the threshold tests for when compliance with Hart-Scott-Rodino is required.

This legislation deserves the prompt consideration of my colleagues so that we may abolish an unintended loophole that has thwarted enforcement of the antitrust laws.

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

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

S. 431

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7A of the Clayton Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) For purposes of this section, the term 'person' shall include, in the case of a partnership, any general partner and any partner with an equity interest of 50 per centum or more."

Sec. 2. This Act and the amendment made by this Act shall apply to every acquisition which is consummated after the date of enactment of this Act. ●

By Mr. METZENBAUM:

S. 432. A bill to amend the Clayton Act regarding mergers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENTS REGARDING MERGERS

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation amending the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 to encourage stronger and more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. My bill increases two of the threshold figures for determining whether a transaction is covered by the act, abolishes special treatment of cash tender offers, provides more time for review of the largest and most complex mergers, and gives State attorneys general access to premerger notification information. The purpose of the bill is to address the new and greater pressures that megamergers and hostile takeovers place on the entities entrusted with enforcing the antitrust laws. It helps alleviate these pressures by updating and rationalizing current procedures.

Our Nation has recently been witnessing a great proliferation in the number and size of mergers, especially those that meet the reporting thresholds of Hart-Scott-Rodino. In 1979, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission received notification of 868 proposed acquisitions. Only 7 years later, in 1986, the number of filings had more than doubled to 1,938. The number of megamergers

has also risen dramatically in the last few years. The 20 largest mergers in American history have occurred during the Reagan administration. In addition, the number of \$100 million mergers has jumped from 113 in 1981 to 268 in 1985, an increase of 137 percent in just 4 years.

Unfortunately, the increase in number and size of mergers has not yielded a concomitant increase in successful business ventures. According to Business Week, one out of three mergers has come undone. A recent management consulting study of major acquisitions showed that 62 percent of them failed to meet basic tests of success. In addition, an economists' study of mergers between 1962 and 1972 concludes that U.S. mergers did not increase profits. Instead, they tended to slow down firm growth rate.

While I disagree with the lax attitude toward antitrust enforcement that has helped generate these record-breaking statistics, it may be impossible to legislate more vigorous enforcement of the law. Nevertheless, several changes should be made to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act that would facilitate more thoughtful analyses of the larger and more complex mergers and broaden enforcement of the law.

The Hart-Scott-Rodino Act provides that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission be notified of certain large mergers before they may be completed. A proposed merger must be reported to these agencies if first, either party to the merger is engaged in commerce or an activity affecting commerce; second, one party has total assets or annual net sales of \$10 million or more, and the other party has total assets or annual net sales of \$100 million or more; and third, after the acquisition, the acquiring person would hold 15 percent or more of the voting securities or assets of the acquired person, or more than \$15 million of the acquired person's voting securities and assets.

Once the agencies receive notification of the proposed merger, the parties must wait 30 days or, in the case of a cash tender offer, 15 days, before completing the transaction. During this time, the agencies examine the merger for compliance with the antitrust laws. They may determine that the merger will not be anticompetitive and terminate the waiting period before the 30th or 15th day. If, however, either agency needs more information about the transaction to assess its antitrust ramifications, the agency may ask the parties to submit further information. The initial waiting period is then extended for not more than 20 days or, in the case of a cash tender offer, 10 days, after the additional information is received. The agencies must make a determination about

whether they will allow the proposed merger to proceed or whether they will seek to halt its consummation by the end of this second waiting period.

The monetary cutoff figures for reporting thresholds were drafted in the context of merger activity about 10 years ago. The passing of time has made two of those figures somewhat out-dated. As a result, mergers that are not appropriate for premerger notification fall into the category of transactions that must be reported. My bill eliminates the requirement that these acquisitions be reported. In so doing, it gives the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission more time to conduct thorough reviews of more potentially troublesome mergers.

While current law establishes different waiting periods for mergers occurring by cash tender offer and mergers proceeding by other means, there is no necessary correlation between the way in which an acquisition is structured and the antitrust issues it raises. Since the antitrust laws were enacted to protect competition, the length of the waiting periods under Hart-Scott-Rodino should be designed to accomplish the most thorough and accurate antitrust analysis possible.

My bill, therefore, abolishes the shorter waiting periods for cash tender offers, treats cash tender offers the same way as other mergers, and gives our enforcement agencies a uniform period of time to conduct their initial reviews.

Current law fails to recognize that extremely large and complex mergers might take a longer time to analyze. Currently, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are given the same amount of time to consider a merger involving the transfer of \$16 million worth of assets and a merger valued at 1,000 times that amount. While megamergers do not automatically pose competitive problems, they do involve more assets. Consequently, the analysis of product markets, geographic markets, entry barriers, the competitiveness of the industry, and other issues bearing on competition may take longer. Since section 7 of the Clayton Act is meant to forestall the substantial lessening of competition and creation of monopolies, Federal enforcement agencies should be provided with adequate time to conduct thorough and sound antitrust analyses.

For these reasons, the legislation I am introducing extends the period for analysis of mergers valued at more than \$1 billion if either enforcement agency decides that it needs more information to analyze the antitrust ramifications of the transaction. More specifically, the bill extends the time for review from 20 days to 60 days after the antitrust agencies have received additional information. It does

not, however, change the initial waiting period for these acquisitions or prevent the agency from terminating its investigation before the 60 days. Thus, my initiative only grants the enforcement agencies more time to review the largest of mergers that they have already identified as requiring more time to analyze.

The last provision of my bill facilitates broader enforcement of the merger laws. It involves reestablishing that State attorneys general may have access to material filed in accordance with the premerger notification procedures of Hart-Scott-Rodino.

Before 1984, the Federal Trade Commission released information filed under Hart-Scott-Rodino to State attorneys general for use in law enforcement proceedings. The Commission reversed its practice in 1984 by a 3 to 2 decision on the grounds that it did not have the authority to release the information. While several State attorneys general sued to reverse this ruling, the courts upheld the Commission's interpretation of its own statute. Thus, State attorneys general are denied access to information filed in compliance with Hart-Scott-Rodino.

State attorneys general are the primary enforcers of State antitrust laws in most cases. They also represent their States and citizens in litigation involving the Federal antitrust laws. My bill would reinstate the situation that existed prior to 1984 by allowing State attorneys general to have access to premerger notification material. Access to the information would be premised on a certification by the State attorneys general that the material will be maintained in confidence. The attorneys general, however, would be free to use the information for official law enforcement purposes, including the preparation of comments on consent agreements or decrees proposed by the Justice Department or the Federal Trade Commission. Thus, this provision would enhance enforcement of the antitrust laws by providing key law enforcement officials with critical information about mergers. The model antitrust legislation of the National Association of Attorneys General contains a provision similar to the one contained in my bill.

I urge my colleagues to support these procedural amendments so that we may facilitate stronger and more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws relating to mergers.

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

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

S. 432

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7A(a) of the Clayton Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking out "\$10,000,000" each place it appears in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking out "\$15,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 7A(b)(1)(B) of the Clayton Act is amended by striking out "(or in the case of a cash tender offer, the fifteenth day)".

(b) Section 7A(e) of the Clayton Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(or in the case of a cash tender offer, the 15-day waiting period)" each place it appears,

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking out "(or in the case of a cash tender offer, 10 days)", and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) If, as a result of an acquisition to which subsection (a) applies the acquiring person would hold an aggregate total amount of the voting securities or assets of the acquired person in excess of \$1,000,000,000 in value, the additional waiting period provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be 60 days."

Sec. 3. Section 7A(h) of the Clayton Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or to officers and employees of appropriate Federal law enforcement agencies or to any officer or employee of any State law enforcement agency upon the prior certification of an officer of any such Federal or State law enforcement agency that such information or documentary material will be maintained in confidence. The maintenance of confidence requirement does not preclude any use of such information or documentary material for official law enforcement purposes, including the preparation of comments regarding consent agreements or decrees proposed by the Commission or the Attorney General under any of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act".

Sec. 4. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 433. A bill for the relief of Olga Sellares Barney and her children Christian Sellares Barney, Kevin Sellares Barney, and Charles Sellares Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF OLGA SELLARES BARNEY AND HER CHILDREN

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce for a second time legislation to grant permanent resident status to Olga Barney and her children, Christian, Kevin, and Charles. Similar legislation during the 99th Congress, S. 1212, was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee and passed the Senate by voice vote on October 8, 1986. The other body, however, did not have time to act on the legislation prior to adjournment. And so, I am introducing the measure again today as this is a most compelling case; Olga Barney and her children are just the persons for whom private relief legislation was intended.

A bit of her story: Olga Barney is a native of Columbia. Since 1976, she

has assisted the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, the U.S. attorney's office, and local police departments in numerous investigations and prosecutions of drug traffickers, first in Bogota, Columbia, then in New York and Miami. She has identified drug smugglers, and provided testimony in court. Her efforts have led to arrests and convictions in over a half dozen cases.

In short, Mrs. Barney is an informer. She has lived under an assumed name since relocating to this country in 1979 under the U.S. Marshal's Witness Protection Program. She lives with fear. Her sons, through no fault of their own, share this fear. She is not a criminal, she has no criminal record; she has never been charged with a drug violation. For reasons I will not elaborate on, she cannot return home. She deserves our gratitude.

Numerous law enforcement officials have written to me in support of Mrs. Barney's effort to acquire permanent resident status. And I might also note, so has Vice President BUSH, who serves as chairman of the South Florida Task Force [Operation Florida] as well as the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System. Unfortunately, Mrs. Barney and her three sons do not meet any eligibility requirements for permanent resident status. Although the Barneys are in no immediate threat of deportation, Mrs. Barney seeks permanent resident status for legal protection and to enable her family to receive Government assistance—specifically to help her sons pursue education—all of which legal aliens are entitled to.

At a time when the Congress has voted to send the strongest possible message to those who deal and abuse drugs, I think we should take care to send the strongest possible message to those persons who have the courage to step forward to challenge the abuse of drugs. Let's begin here, now, with Mrs. Barney and her sons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill, and the letter from Vice President BUSH supporting Mrs. Barney's effort to obtain permanent resident status, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 433

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olga Sellares Barney and her children Christian Sellares Barney, Kevin Sellares Barney, and Charles Sellares Barney shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as pro-

vided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the proper number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, March 29, 1985.

HON. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: Last year I received an impressive letter from Mrs. Olga Perdomo Barney who was seeking to obtain permanent residence here in the United States. Mrs. Barney rendered considerable service to the drug enforcement effort, and her case merited special attention.

Regrettably, no provisions existed within immigration law that would allow the Immigration and Naturalization Service to grant Mrs. Barney permanent resident status. Her only option was a private bill.

I understand that you are introducing a private bill for Mrs. Barney. I wanted you to know that I appreciate your efforts on her behalf. I would be very proud of an American citizen who rendered such tremendous service to this country.

With warm regards,
Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.●

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 434. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pablo Esguerra, Theresa Esguerra, and Micheline Esguerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF ESGUERRA FAMILY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I introduce today a private immigration relief bill on behalf of Dr. Pablo Esguerra, his wife Theresa, and his 12-year-old daughter, Micheline.

Dr. Esguerra has been in the United States continuously since 1975. He has an American-born son, Francis, age 8, who is an American citizen and therefore not technically subject to deportation. However, as a practical matter, he will be forced to join his parents and sister if they are deported to the Philippines.

Based on inquiries, I am reliably advised as follows:

Dr. Esguerra is liked and respected in his community in Fayette County, PA, where he is a member of the emergency room staffs of the Green County and Uniontown Hospitals. Dr. Esguerra also works at the D.W. Allen Memorial Clinic, an institution that provides desperately needed medical services to the residents of small communities in the Uniontown area. Nearly 100 patients, many of them senior citizens, look to Dr. Esguerra for their medical care.

Dr. Esguerra is a productive, valued member of his community, residing within the United States for more than 12 years and, most importantly, with an American-born child.

Dr. Esguerra and his family are scheduled to be deported in February 1987, notwithstanding their eligibility in May for amnesty under the new Immigration Reform and Control Act passed by Congress last year. Deportation of Dr. Esguerra and his family at this time—only 3 months before being granted amnesty—would work a grievous hardship on his young, American-born child, while penalizing the communities that have come to value highly their contributions.

It is in the interest of all Americans to have such talented, community-spirited individuals join us as citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

S. 434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding paragraph (14) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, for purposes of such Act, Doctor Pablo Esguerra, Theresa Esguerra, and Micheline Esguerra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the proper number, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to natives of the countries in which the aliens were born or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas which are made available under section 202 of such Act to natives of the countries in which the aliens were born.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Ayrton Oliver Reid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF AYRTON OLIVER REID

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a private immigration relief bill on behalf of Mr. Ayrton Oliver Reid, a native of Jamaica and a resident of Philadelphia, PA, who is scheduled to be deported by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in February 1987. This deportation would break up the family consisting of Mr. Reid's wife and 12-year-old daughter and stepson, all of whom are American citizens except for Mr. Reid.

I am advised that in 1969, Mr. Reid first came to this country pursuant to a visitor's visa. On March 25, 1972, Mr. Reid married Delores Gallman, his present wife, who is an American citizen. They have one daughter, Tamara, who was born in Philadelphia, PA, on July 8, 1975, and is a U.S. citizen. Mrs. Reid's son by a previous marriage, Shawn Rubin Gallman, was born on April 7, 1968, in Philadelphia, and lives

with Mr. and Mrs. Reid in their Philadelphia home. Mr. Reid returned to Jamaica briefly in 1974 at the instruction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in order to facilitate his obtaining permanent resident status in this country. He received permanent resident status, and returned to Philadelphia, shortly thereafter.

From 1974 to 1980, Mr. Reid was employed as a painter in Philadelphia. In 1980, he took a further step toward achieving the American dream, when he started Allie Reid & Sons, his own painting contracting business.

Last October, Mrs. Reid suffered a serious heart attack. She currently is experiencing skin problems and respiratory ailments. I understand that Mrs. Reid is unable to travel and that certain medication she requires is unavailable in Jamaica.

With one exception, Mr. Reid has been a law-abiding citizen. Mr. Reid's business is a success.

A blemish on Mr. Reid's record in this country is a marijuana possession conviction, now more than a decade old. According to information provided to me, Mr. Reid was fined \$200 and placed on probation for 2 years.

After considerable thought—and not in any way discounting the seriousness of this conviction—I have concluded that this conviction does not warrant expelling Mr. Reid from this country. Mr. Reid served his probation without incident, and has had no other problems in the subsequent decade he has spent building a life in this country for himself and his family.

I believe that where deportation of an individual would work an extreme hardship on his or her U.S. citizen children, private relief is appropriate. As that is the case here, I urge that relief be granted Ayrton Oliver Reid.

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

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

S. 435

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ayrton Oliver Reid shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the required numbers, during the current fiscal year or the fiscal year next following, the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of sections 202(e) and 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

By Mr. KASTEN:

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to give special recognition to the birth and achievements of Aldo Leopold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECOGNITION OF ALDO LEOPOLD

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th birthday of one of America's foremost environmental leaders, Aldo Leopold.

Leopold is more than just a leader of his times, he is a giant whose actions play a major role in guiding the use of our Nation's natural resources even today.

Environmental professionals and layman alike are familiar with his work. His classic ecological text, "A Sand County Almanac" is still widely read today. The principles he first articulated form the backbone of our resource policy.

In short, Aldo Leopold was more than a man ahead of his time; Aldo Leopold is a legend; a statesman from the woods.

Leopold molded the concept of scientific wildlife management. He was one of the pioneers in the doctrine of wilderness ecology and the personification of the word "Conservation."

Born along the Mississippi bottom lands of Iowa, Leopold earned two degrees in forestry from our Nation's preeminent school of natural resources of its day. He then entered the U.S. Forest Service and worked in Arizona and New Mexico. While in the Service, Leopold played a major role in establishing the Gila Wilderness, the first designated wilderness in the national forest.

Leopold is best known for the work he did while living in my home State of Wisconsin. During that time he wrote the model treaties of game management, served as associate director of the Forest Products Laboratory and was appointed professor of game management at the University of Wisconsin. This was the first academic position specifically dedicated to wildlife management in the country.

Leopold's "A Sand County Almanac" chronicles the life of a naturalist in restoring over-farmed land. Leopold owned such a farm, and wrote of its ecology as he lovingly rehabilitated the land's wealth.

The opening passage of his foreword sets the tone of this masterpiece:

There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot. These essays are the delights and dilemmas of one who cannot.

Like winds and sunsets, wild things were taken for granted until progress began to do away with them. Now we face the question whether a still higher "standard of living" is worth the cost in things natural, wild and free.

Leopold's résumé of environmental activities reads like a Who's Who. He served as director of the National Audubon Society, helped organize the Wildlife Society and the Wilderness

Society. He also led the American Forestry Association and the Council of American Foresters. No wonder environmentalist think of him as one of the "Elders of the Tribe."

Leopold's land ethic is timeless. We are still working today to protect wetlands, enhance wildlife habitat and provide for the sustainable use of our natural resources.

To commemorate this visionary's 100th birthday, I am today introducing a resolution recognizing Aldo Leopold. I hope my colleagues will join me by supporting this resolution and acting quickly on it.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and partial public financing of Senate general election campaigns, to limit contributions by multicandidate political committees, and for other purposes.

S. 54

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 54, a bill to make foreign nationals ineligible for certain agricultural program loans, payments, or benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 66

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 66, a bill to provide for competitive leasing for onshore oil and gas.

S. 79

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] were added as cosponsors of S. 79, a bill to notify workers who are at risk of occupational disease in order to establish a system for identifying and preventing illness and death of such workers, and for other purposes.

S. 83

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 83, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to energy conservation standards for appliances.

S. 184

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. EVANS] was added as a cosponsor

of S. 184, a bill to provide economic assistance to the Central American democracies, and for other purposes.

S. 225

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] were added as cosponsors of S. 225, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to protect the benefit levels of individuals becoming eligible for benefits in or after 1979 by eliminating the disparity (resulting from changes made in 1977 in the benefit computation formula) between those levels and the benefit levels of persons who become eligible for benefits before 1979.

S. 232

At the request of Mr. WILSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], was added as a cosponsor of S. 232, a bill to permit placement of a privately funded statue of Haym Salomon in the Capitol Building or on the Capitol Grounds and to erect a privately funded monument to Haym Salomon on Federal land in the District of Columbia.

S. 321

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 321, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to better protect interstate transport of pollutants, to control existing and new sources of acid deposition, and for other purposes.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ] were added as cosponsors of S. 328, a bill to amend chapter 39, United States Code, to require the Federal Government to pay interest on overdue payments, and for other purposes.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to extend for 1 year the waiver of estimated penalties for underpayments by individuals attributable to such act.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9, a joint resolution to designate the week of March 1, 1987, through March 7, 1987, as "Federal Employees Recognition Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 15, a joint resolution designating the month of November 1987 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 18

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. EVANS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], the Senator from Florida [Mr. CHILES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 18, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating June 1 through June 7, 1987, as "National Fishing Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 19

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HECHT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 19, a joint resolution to designate March 20, 1987 as "National Energy Education Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the 69th anniversary of the renewal of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1987, as "Lithuanian Independence Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Sena-

tor from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress regarding its opposition to reductions in Veterans' Administration funding levels to pay for health care for certain categories of eligible veterans.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

At the request of Mr. BYRD, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, a concurrent resolution relating to the current human rights policies of the Soviet Union.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, a concurrent resolution calling for the release of Rev. Tshenuwani Simon Farisani from detention in Venda, a homeland in South Africa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 46

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 46, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding tax rates.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 92, a resolution rejecting the administration's recommendation to eliminate the excise tax exemption for alcohol fuels.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2 intended to be proposed to S. 240, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children of veterans.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SALA G. BURTON, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WIRTH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 96

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Sala G. Burton, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved further, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved further, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

**MOYNIHAN (AND OTHERS)
AMENDMENT NO. 10**

Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BREAUX, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PRESSLER) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 387) to authorize appropriations for certain highways in accordance with title 23, United States Code, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 79, after line 20, add the following:

(37) For work on U.S. 70 in the State of New Mexico from Las Cruces, New Mexico to Texico, New Mexico.

(38) U.S. Route 48 (National Freeway); Washington County, MD.—This project involves the construction of an eastbound ramp to Scenic U.S. 40 and a westbound access road from Mountain Road. It provides the opportunity to monitor the before and after impacts associated with access to commercial establishments. Data for current business trade can be compared to future indicators after access project is completed to ascertain the costs and benefits associated with the improvement and commercial vitality.

(39) MD 162 (Hammonds Ferry Road) at Poplar Avenue.—Realign intersection to tie MD 162 directly into Poplar Avenue. Construction lanes will be added at intersection so that northbound MD 162 to westbound Poplar Avenue will become a through movement.

(40) MD 162 (Poplar Avenue to MD 176).—A two-mile project to widen MD 162 from two to four lanes with left-turn movements at selected intersections. Will allow smoother traffic flow from MD 3 to Poplar Avenue.

(41) Poplar Avenue (MD 170 to MD 162).—A one-half mile project to widen Poplar Avenue from two to four lanes. Will provide freer flow of traffic from MD 162 to MD 170.

(42) MD Rte. 4 (Southern Maryland Boulevard); Prince George's and Anne Arundel Counties.—This project involves the replacement of a bridge carrying MD Rte. 4 over the Paxtuxent River, in a sensitive wetlands and river area. The project is critical to meeting the growing traffic in the Rte. 4 corridor due to development in Anne Arundel and Calvert Counties.

(43) MD Rte. 3 at Belair Drive.—This project involves the construction of an interchange connecting these two facilities. It is needed in order to meet the growing traffic levels in the City of Bowie and also to serve the purposed University of Maryland Science and Technology Center. The project highlights the various aspects of creative financing which has enabled the advancement of a project's construction schedule.

(44) MD Rte. 197, Rustic Hill Drive to South of Amtrak; Prince George's County.—This project involves the construction of a four-lane divided highway which will provide an alternative route for traffic bypassing Bowie, Maryland. It will also improve access to Bowie State College and would demonstrate the before and after impacts of improved access to a minority college.

(45) MD 115 Relocated, Montgomery Village Avenue to Shady Grove Road Montgomery County.—This project involves the construction of a four-lane divided dualized highway. Maryland Route 115 Relocated is an important part of the proposed I-270 corridor transportation network providing access between the rapidly growing Gaithersburg/Montgomery Village area and the Shady Grove Metro Station. This improvement is needed to relieve traffic congestion on existing MD 115, MD 355, and I-270.

(46) MD Rte. 213: Chester River Bridge (queen Anne's and Kent Counties).—This project involves the rehabilitation of a bridge over the Chester River at historic Chestertown, Maryland. The project will highlight the benefits associated with a creative bridge construction technique of replacing spans with prefabricated sections at night. It would analyze traffic impacts, community impacts, construction time duration, and cost implications.

(47) MD 838 (Wye Island Road): Queen Anne's County.—This project involves the replacement of a bridge connecting MD 838 to the Wye Island Natural Resources Management Area, owned and operated by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. The existing bridge is obsolete; the new bridge will be designed to be compatible with its natural setting. For example, it will have a timber deck, similar to the existing bridge.

(48) In Lawrence, Kansas, a by-pass project which is a model for its cost-sharing arrangement and economic development goals.

(49) In Wichita, Kansas, the replacement of a conventional intersection of two heavily travelled streets at Kellogg and Oliver with a new low-cost European fly-over design for the interchange.

(50) In Olathe, Kansas, the 119th Street Interchange to correct a dangerous interchange.

(51) In Emporia, Kansas, a new Prairie Street overpass to overcome existing flood conditions.

(52) In Kansas City, Missouri, the South Midtown Roadway, a north-south route on the Federal-aid Primary System.

(53) In St. Charles County, Missouri, a bypass highway to connect an east-west Interstate route with the Interstate beltway around St. Louis, Missouri.

(54) A segment of north-south highway on the Federal-aid Primary System from the vicinity of Carthage, Missouri, to the boundary between the States of Arkansas and Missouri, in the vicinity of Noel, Missouri, increasing the number of lanes on such segment from two to four.

(55) A 106-mile highway on the Federal-aid Primary System in Missouri, beginning in the vicinity of Columbia and ending in the vicinity of Lancaster.

(56) To reconstruct and rehabilitate the Eugene Talmadge Memorial Bridge, a functionally obsolete bridge which is located in Savannah, Georgia, and crosses the Savannah River.

(57) Highway bridge at lock and dam 4 near Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

(58) In the vicinity of Jonesboro, Arkansas, for the construction of four grade separations on a four-lane bypass route for demonstrating methods of improving highway safety.

(59) In the State of Arkansas on a segment of a north-south highway on the Federal-aid primary system from the vicinity of the junction of Interstate routes I-40 and I-540 to the boundary between the State of Arkansas and Missouri in the vicinity of Bella Vista, Arkansas.

(60) In the vicinity of Fort Smith, Arkansas, to widen a segment of the Federal-aid urban system and improve signalization.

(61) Interstate connector from I-95 near Florence, South Carolina, to U.S. 17, north of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, to allow increased access to the Grand Strand.

(62) The South Carolina portion of the Bobby Jones Expressway by-pass from I-20 near North Augusta, South Carolina, south across the Savannah River into Georgia, where it connects with I-520.

(63) Replace the Highway 30 bridge across the Missouri River between Blair, Nebraska and Missouri Valley, Iowa.

(64) U.S. 75 North Central Expressway Extension.—Combines several individual projects which involve construction of additional lanes, more efficient interchanges, and improved bridge structures for added capacity and safer travel on a Federal-aid Primary System highway. Improvements to this major North-South route in north central Texas near Dallas would cover 15.4 miles of highway from Interstate 635 in Dallas County to State Highway 121 in Collin County. Cost of the project is estimated at \$134.5 million.

(65) Interstate Highway 30 Interchange ("West Leg")—Ft. Worth, Texas.—Reconstructs and widens a critical interchange involving major, heavily traveled East-West and North-South Interstate Highways (IH 30 and IH 35, respectively).

(66) The demonstration of the state of the art highway technologies on U.S. 220 Blair County, Pennsylvania.

(67) The New Sewickly project, located in the townships of New Sewickly and Conway, Pennsylvania. To construct a two-lane highway between the two municipalities.

(68) The Basin Street Railroad Crossing. To secure funding for a railroad grade crossing project in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

(69) The Southern Expressway project in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. To enable traffic to bypass airport and local roads that access the Pittsburgh Airport.

(70) The Ebsenberg Bypass. To divert traffic from Route 219 in Ebsenberg, Pennsylvania, to a 5.1 mile relocated segment.

(71) The Chadville, Pennsylvania interchange project, located in Franklin County. To relieve traffic congestion at an existing

interchange on a north-south interstate route and to provide access to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

(72) The Chadville, Pennsylvania highway project. To relocate and reconstruct a 3.5 mile segment of the Federal-aid primary system from the vicinity of Chadville, Pennsylvania, to Fairchance, Pennsylvania.

(73) The Kittanning-Brookville, Pennsylvania project. To reconstruct approximately 30 miles of a two-lane on the Federal-aid primary system between Kittanning and Brookville, Pennsylvania.

(74) The Johnstown Flood National Memorial project. To upgrade a narrow, 1.3 mile access road to the Johnstown Flood National Memorial, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania.

(75) A highway project to demonstrate methods of improving highway safety by making improvements to a road providing direct access from the Fort Campbell Military Reservation to the City of Clarksville, Tennessee.

(76) Ferry Street Bridge—Eugene, Oregon. A preliminary engineering study to plan and design alternatives for this heavily traveled bridge.

(77) The restoration of the Martin Luther King bridge connecting the metro east area in Illinois and St. Louis, Missouri.

(78) U.S. Route 30 Bridge—Iowa. Construct a bridge on U.S. Route 30 to replace a 56 year old structure which is too narrow to be utilized by motor carriers.

(79) The Cline Avenue/I-94 Interchange in East Chicago, Indiana.

(80) Cline Avenue Interchange Improvement Project in East Chicago, Indiana for the reconstruction of an intersection of Cline Avenue and the Borman Expressway.

(81) Hammond Railroad Relocation Project in Hammond, Indiana to complete acquisition of right-of-way and construction of the Homan Avenue underpass to improve transportation and economic benefits to the community.

(82) Lafayette Railroad Relocation in Lafayette, Indiana to reroute rail traffic to a single corridor with few crossings reducing the threat posed to the safety of the local citizens by over 40 rail-highway intersections.

(83) U.S. 59 Highway Corridor in Texas, from Texarkana to Houston to Beeville.

(84) Construction of the New River Parkway in West Virginia, a two-lane scenic highway through the New River Gorge National River area connecting with Interstate 64.

(85) West Calcasieu Parish Access Road and on and Off Ramp.—The project would provide for an access road which parallels Interstate 10 at Sulphur, La., in West Calcasieu Parish, to provide access to and from the Interstate system for said access road.

(86) Liberty-Laurel Overpass—Texas. This project would connect two One-way streets to Phelan Blvd. over I-10 in Beaumont, Texas.

(87) To improve the Peachtree Industrial Boulevard from I-285 to S.R. 141 in Atlanta, Georgia.

(88) Highway 98—Baldin County, Alabama. This project would widen Highway 98 for the rapid emergency evacuation of individuals in the vicinity of Fairhope and Foley, Alabama.

(89) Highway 98—Mississippi. This project would widen Highway 98 in a 14.7 mile section in the vicinity of Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

(90) Bridge—Patton Island, Alabama. This project would be to construct a bridge

across the Tennessee River in Lauderdale and Colbert Counties in Alabama.

(91) Mason County, Michigan. U.S. Route 10/31 and 31 in the county of Mason, Michigan.

(92) For a new route from Los Alamos, New Mexico to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

(93) A highway project in Minden, Louisiana to construct a frontage road which provides Minden, Louisiana alternative access to a highway immediately connecting to a highway on the Interstate system.

(94) This project concerns the relocation of Highway 61 in Dubuque, Iowa, and the broadening of the highway south from Dubuque to DeWitt, Iowa.

(95) To construct a connecting road of approximately 3600 feet between Liberty Street and Mass. Highway 21 in Belcher-town, Mass.

(96) A study to determine the feasibility of constructing a four-lane highway out of a two-lane segment of Route 219 between Somerset, Pennsylvania, and the border of the State of Maryland.

(97) A study to determine the feasibility of constructing a four-lane highway out of a two-lane segment that connects Route 56, near Johnstown, Pennsylvania, to Route 22.

(98) A study to determine the feasibility of making Route 22 between Ebensburg and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania completely four-lane.

On page 67, line 10, insert after "bridges" the following: "highway revenue and cost responsibility."

SYMMS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 11

Mr. SYMMS (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 387, supra; as follows:

At the end thereof add a new section as follows:

SEC. . (a) Subsection 154(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "other than a highway on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more, (2) a maximum speed limit on any highway within its jurisdiction on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more in excess of sixty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour"; and

(2) by renumbering "(2)" as "(3)" at the two places "(2)" appears.

(b) Subsection 154(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "on public highways with speed limits posted at fifty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour";

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SENATOR ROTH RECIPIENT OF LORAX AWARD

● Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to congratulate my dear friend and able colleague, the distinguished senior Senator of Delaware, Senator ROTH.

On Monday, January 5, 1987, Mr. ROTH was awarded in a ceremony in Wilmington, DE, the Lorax Award of the Global Tomorrow Coalition. This distinguished award is given to individuals for outstanding service on global environmental problems and issues related to population growth resources and sustainable development. The Global Tomorrow Coalition is an alliance of more than 100 nongovernmental organizations whose memberships represent over 6 million Americans concerned with long-term global trends in environment, population, resources and development.

Although he is not a member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, over the years Senator ROTH has demonstrated a commitment to protection and preservation of the environment which is equaled by very few others. Most recently, he has developed an interest in environmental threats which are of international or global scope. It was for his efforts in these areas that Senator ROTH was given the Lorax Award.

In the fall of 1985, Senators ROTH, CHAFFEE, PELL, CRANSTON and myself introduced two bills to address long range efforts to arrest the process of tropical deforestation and subsequent loss of genetic diversity in developing countries. Due in large measure to the initiative and efforts of Senator ROTH, this legislation passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President as Public Law 99-529 on October 24, 1986.

Mr. President, I would like to personally commend Senator ROTH for his exemplary leadership in resource conservation and environmental management worldwide. This award is properly bestowed upon him as one who not only expresses concerns for the environment, but acts upon them as well.

Mr. President, I ask that a statement made by the executive director of the coalition, Mr. Don Lesh, during the award ceremony be placed in the RECORD in its entirety.

The statement follows:

REMARKS BY DON LESH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GLOBAL TOMORROW COALITION—PRESENTATION OF LORAX AWARD TO SENATOR WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., WILMINGTON, DE, JANUARY 5, 1987

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege, Senator Roth, to meet with you here in your home State of Delaware, as we have before in your office in Washington, D.C. I bring you greetings and congratulations on behalf of the more than one hundred organizations that are members of the Global Tomorrow Coalition.

This is a special occasion for us. Our trip to Wilmington this morning affords an opportunity to express our thanks and appreciation to you for your outstanding leadership in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of legislation during the 99th Congress for the protection of tropical forests and biological diversity in the devel-

oping world. This legislation, which I am happy to note has been signed into law by President Reagan, directs the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) to devote increased attention to these fundamental environmental and resource issues in AID-supported projects, and appropriates the sum of \$2.5 million for that purpose in the current fiscal year.

You would probably be too modest to point this out, Senator, but we in the Coalition have no doubt that your early sponsorship of these bills—as a respected senior Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—was absolutely critical in their successful passage. We were delighted that the bills were favorably reported to the Senate by the unanimous vote of the Foreign Relations Committee, with your support joined with that of Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana (then chairing the committee), Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island (the new chair of the committee), and Senator Dan Evans of Washington.

The Coalition was especially gratified by this demonstration of bipartisan support, because we firmly believe that these are not Republican or Democratic issues, or liberal or conservative issues, but issues of human survival that affect every nation regardless of history, tradition, ideology, or politics.

To some—on a cool January morning in Wilmington, Delaware—the accelerating rate of destruction of the world's tropical moist forests and the associated rapid loss of biological species may seem to be distant concerns. But we believe they are actually not. This community, like every other in the United States, has—through press and television coverage—been witness over the past two years to a chronicle of human suffering in Africa on an epic scale. Many of your constituents, I daresay, have given generously of their time and money, and of themselves, to help feed, clothe, and house starving men, women, and children in drought-devastated areas of Africa. And Americans always have, and always will, respond in that openhearted manner when there is an urgent need in the world.

But the monumental scale of the emergency should not blind us to the long-term sources of the problems in Africa and elsewhere in the developing world, and the need for long-term solutions. The experts are still marshalling their evidence, but there is a growing consensus that the African drought and starvation has been created at least in part by human actions. People, whether driven by need or greed (and we in the affluent nations are distinctly part of this problem), too often act in ways that undercut and destroy the basic natural systems on which their long-term livelihood must depend. Unless we are willing to look beyond emergency assistance and confront this reality, the likelihood is that such appeals for help will only increase in the future.

We are fortunate in the United States that our environmental and resource problems are not as acute as those we have seen in Ethiopia and the Sudan, for example . . . but the nature of the problem is by no means foreign to us. The issues of protecting tropical forests and biological diversity are not only inseparably linked, but are central to the concept of sustainable development.

GTC members believe that we must respect and support the aspirations of people in every society for economic progress and a better quality of life. But that progress—whether in a poor agricultural nation of

Africa or Asia, or in a rich, industrially advanced nation like the United States—must not be purchased at the cost of destroying the basic environmental and resource systems on which all human activity ultimately depends.

An understanding of this reality is growing in our country, and in every other, as we look ever more closely at the impacts of our lifestyles and our policy choices in both the public and private sectors over time. We all are familiar with the dictum of John Maynard Keynes: "In the long run, we are all dead." But while that comment teaches us one lesson—that we must, first of all, live in the present—it also can lead to a dangerous misperception. Shall all of our decisions on investment, development, consumption, and planning be governed only by the narrow horizon of our own lifetimes? What kind of world do we want to bequeath to our children and grandchildren? What obligations of prudent management and responsible stewardship of our environment and resources do we owe to future generations?

As societies begin to come to grips with such questions, and to consider their implications for current policy making, I believe the United States has a magnificent opportunity to offer global leadership and provide an example of good global citizenship . . . an opportunity that, I regret to say, is now too often going unfulfilled.

It is particularly for that reason that the member organizations of the Global Tomorrow Coalition are so pleased and proud to commend your foresighted leadership on tropical forests and biological diversity in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Roth, and to extend to you the highest honor that we can bestow: the Lorax Award.

Those of you who have read with your children the wonderful books of Dr. Seuss (Theodore Geisel) probably need no introduction to the Lorax, for he is the main character of the Dr. Seuss book of the same name. He described the Lorax as follows:

He was shortish. And oldish
And brownish. And mossy.
And he spoke with a voice
That was sharpish and bossy.
"Mister," he said with a sawdusty sneeze,
"I am the Lorax. I speak for the trees.
I speak for the trees, for the trees have no
tongues . . ."

Now I can assure you, Senator, that we discern no personal resemblance between you and Dr. Seuss' creation . . . and we know from experience that, in the Senate, your voice is not "sharpish and bossy," but deliberate, wise, reasonable, and respected. But the spirit of your action in "speaking for the trees," and for the human beings who depend on them, unmistakably qualifies you for a Lorax Award, which we ask you to accept on behalf of the Global Tomorrow Coalition.

Finally, let me stress that this marks not the end of a process, but the beginning, for we look forward to working closely with you and your able staff—especially Paul Kerkhoven—in the future. Indeed, we in the Coalition stand ready to cooperate on a bipartisan basis with public officials in the Congress and the Executive branch—as well as in state capitols and legislatures, and mayor's offices—to help expand citizen understanding of these long-term global issues and build a nationwide constituency for stronger U.S. leadership in resource conservation and foresighted environmental management worldwide.●

AFGHANISTAN: LETTERS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last December the brutal Soviet occupation of Afghanistan entered its eighth year. The horrible condition of human rights in Afghanistan was recently described in a United Nations report as: "A situation approaching genocide."

As chairman of the Congressional Task Force on Afghanistan, I have received thousands of letters from Americans across the Nation who are outraged at the senseless atrocities being committed today in Afghanistan. Many of these letters are from Americans who are shocked at this Nation's relative silence about the genocide taking place in Afghanistan.

In the weeks and months ahead, I plan to share some of these letters with my colleagues. I will ask to insert into the RECORD two letters each day from various States in the Nation. Today, I submit two letters from the State of Washington and ask that they be printed.

The letters follow.

DEAR SIR: After reading an article in Reader's Digest recently—I am very disturbed and appalled at what is happening in Afghanistan. The Soviet killing which is going on right now and the raw terror happening to these people and this nation must be stopped. How can we stand idly by and let these horrible atrocities happen right before our very eyes? We are concerned and ask you to please use your influence and whatever means necessary to bring relief, encouragement and help to these gallant, beautiful people.

In deep prayer and concern,

MR. AND MRS. LESLIE WEST,
Olympia, WA, October 7, 1986.

DEAR SIR. Please keep the U.S. citizens informed of the continuing struggle in Afghanistan. Only people armed with knowledge and will can forge a better future. The knowledge end must come from without—the will end must from within.

I'll keep my heart strong for the cause if you keep my mind informed. Together let's do something!

Sincerely,

BILL NAPIER,
SEATTLE, WA, October 9, 1986.●

TESTIMONY OF FATHER JOHN PAWLIKOWSKI ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr President, a referendum will take place in April in the city of Chicago on the question of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

One of those who testified before a former friend of ours from the House, now an alderman in the city of Chicago, Roman Pucinski, was Father John Pawlikowski. He teaches social ethics at the Catholic Theological Union.

His statement makes sense, not only for Chicago, but for people everywhere.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF FATHER JOHN PAWLKOWSKI

Chairman Pucinski and friends. My name is Father John Pawlikowski of the Servite Order. I am Professor of Social Ethics at the Catholic Theological Union here in Chicago. I came before you to urge as strongly as I can the inclusion of the proposed referendum on the February ballot. I do so in my own name and as a member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Chicago Clergy & Laity Concerned (CALC) and the Justice & Peace Committee of the Eastern Province of Servite Fathers and Brothers. The people of this city who increasingly are experiencing the profound economic consequences of the spiraling arms race must be given the opportunity to speak to the President, the Secretary of State and the U.S. Congress. And if given the chance, I think their vote will reflect what reliable public opinion polls have consistently shown: the American people overwhelmingly support a negotiated end to further expansion of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals.

The Bishops of my church in their historic Pastoral Letter on Peace have called for a halt to further production of nuclear weaponry. And their call has been reiterated even more strongly in recent months by their Methodist counterparts. And many other religious groups and leaders—Christian and Jewish—have spoken equally loudly against this suicidal escalation of nuclear stockpiles. Last October, in historic Assisi, Italy, sanctified by that prophet of peace St. Francis, world religious leaders from every part of the Earth representing over sixty traditions, Christian and non-Christian, Eastern and Western, gathered at the invitation of Pope John Paul II to pray for peace and to challenge the political leadership of the world to remove once and for all the nuclear threat hanging over humankind and all of creation.

My friends, I am asking you this morning as leaders of this world-class city to respond to the Assisi prayer and challenge by approving the proposal before you. You have been wrestling for the past several years in this Council with serious budgetary deficits in the city. Vital social services, civic improvements, educational and cultural projects are increasingly threatened with serious cutbacks or even extinction because of the lack of revenue. We often see the results of these slashes in the sad, hungry and desperate faces on our television screens and as we walk the streets of this city. This cannot continue. And you know why this is happening. You know far better than me the millions of dollars in federal grants for this city, for all cities, that have been wiped out in the past several years while we witness the greatest escalation of the military budget in the history of this republic. I am not naive. I know the danger the U.S.S.R. poses. As a Polish American who has worked for the freedom and dignity for the Polish nation, as a founding member of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry, I recognize full well the gross violations of human rights by the Soviet Union. I shall continue to fight these abuses as strongly as I know how. But I remain convinced that our defense will ultimately crumble if we continue to allow the escalating nuclear arms race to rob us of our ability to maintain a basic level of human dignity for all people in our society. We cannot have both guns and butter without limit.

As our nation debates an escalation of the arms race of unprecedented proportions and many of our political leaders contemplate committing billions of new dollars, and a significant part of our scientific and technological capacity to a totally new weapons system it is time to say no and to say it loudly and soon.

Please, my friends, give the people of Chicago the opportunity to speak out in February. I am convinced they will send a message of historic magnitude to Washington. Thank you very much for allowing me to address you this morning. ●

TED KENNEDY, JR.

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, some unknown person once said, "in some special way, each person completes the universe." Ted Kennedy Jr.'s place in this universe changed dramatically 13 years ago when he was told he would lose his leg to cancer. That was a personal loss of tremendous proportions to a young man just entering the years when physical appearance and physical activity are most important. His courage and determination turned his loss into a tremendous gain for the millions of Americans who face the daily challenge of a disability, and for all of us when we act upon his leadership.

In a November 1986 article in Parade magazine, Ted Kennedy Jr., reminded us that those who face adversity and overcome it become the strongest among us and have much to offer. As a nation, we are beginning to recognize the strengths of our citizens who live with disabilities, though we are still far too slow in using their abilities. The physical barriers we put in the way, sometimes because we simply fail to see them and sometimes because we fail to act, are still great; but the barriers created through misconceptions and attitudes are far greater. These are matters involving the basic civil rights of American citizens, and our work is not yet done in securing these rights through legislation. We must, for example, place the highest priority in the 100th Congress on passing the Civil Rights Restoration Act to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling in Grove City College versus Bell, which drastically limited the protection of those rights.

I urge my colleagues to read Ted Kennedy Jr.'s article. He is setting an example of courage and commitment, and is challenging us to follow his lead. We will be a richer nation if we do.

I am proud to serve with his father, in the Senate, but no less proud of the great example provided by his son.

I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Parade Magazine, Nov. 23, 1986]

INDEPENDENCE

(By Ted Kennedy Jr.)

I was terrified when my father told me that the doctors would have to remove part of my leg. "What part of it?" I can remember asking, thinking they would simply carve out the red, swollen section just below my knee. "From the knee down," Dad said. His words sent fear and shock into my mind.

I sobbed into my pillow, wondering, "Why me?" Of all the people in the world, why did this have to happen to me? Who would want to live like this for the rest of their lives?

To have a physical deformity, to stick out, to be different—to be "handicapped." I felt that I couldn't live the rest of my life with one leg. In fact, I didn't want to live at all. "I may as well be dead," I said to myself.

That was 13 years ago, and when I look back now, I realize how foolish I was. I have been able to meet the challenge and lead an active life. I held the same prejudices and stereotypes about people with disabilities that I am working so hard to dispel today. True, I was a victim of a dread disease, but I was victimized even more by a state of mind which said that "the handicapped" were somehow a second-class category of humanity, condemned to a pitiful and helpless existence.

In recent years, I have become an advocate for disability causes in our country. My disability is relatively mild compared to that of most individuals with whom I work. I thank God, my family and my friends for helping me to realize that disability is not so much as a condition of the body as a state of mind. As with everything in life, one can look at one's circumstances in two ways: Disability can be either a challenge or a burden. Dealing with adversity made me look deep into myself to find the extra inner strength that has enabled me to seize life to the fullest.

I was lucky to have a family with the love and resources—in that order—to see me through and to help me challenge the prevailing social stigma. For most people with disabilities, society is the real problem in the individual's struggle to be a successful contributing and independent member of the community. It is difficult to have others making decisions for you, and depressing to endure the scorn and revulsion that others often find so hard to mask. That is why I feel that ours is not the disability of accident or birth, but the one created by society. We live in a world that is largely insensitive to the needs and aspirations of millions of people.

I do not purport to speak on behalf of all persons with disabilities. Disability crosses all socioeconomic, ethnic, sex and religious boundaries. It can happen to anyone. Naturally, it is not surprising that ideas and opinions of persons with perceived limitations come from a wide range of viewpoints.

There are, however, some real strong feelings and beliefs that tie people together behind unified goals. Someone might argue that blindness is different from deafness, which is different from paraplegia, epilepsy or mental retardation. But a common social history of segregation and stigma, and common goals of acceptance and independence, have brought people together in a united front in civil rights issues. We are a minority seeking the same civil rights that others simply take for granted.

Our life's ambitions and dreams are like everyone else's: to go to a school where we

are not segregated, to find a job, to raise a family, to belong in a community to which we can contribute and gain respect.

To properly understand what our struggle is really all about, one must understand a bit of history of social policy toward "the handicapped" in the United States, a history characterized by isolation, rejection and diminished expectations.

Traditionally, citizens with disabilities have been set apart and neglected. Commissions and special programs have occasionally been established but rarely sustained; too often the needs of persons with limitations have been given low priority. People were often "warehoused" with little hope and no opportunity. Such segregation fostered fear, pity and revulsion, reflecting society's own insecurity.

The insecurity and uneasiness that people feel and show in encounters with persons who have disabilities can be called "handicappism." In some ways, it's more serious than racism and sexism because it's less understood, and we are less conscious of its deep and pervasive roots. The disabled are indeed the last bastion of segregation. It is out of this repression that the disability-rights movement began.

By the late 1960s, groups advocating civil rights for persons with disabilities had adopted strategies used by other minorities. They formed grass-roots advocacy coalitions, and the public began to view the disabled as a people denied basic civil liberties. Communities began to respond to their demands for equal access to education, transportation, competitive employment, and housing. Traditional notions about the limitations of people—and the prevailing view that society should isolate, protect and care for them—began to give way to the realization that the greatest good for society lay in fostering the fullest possible integration.

By the late 1970s, the reigning concept of institutionalization was facing aggressive challenges on two fronts. Following the example of the successful Berkeley Center for Independent Living, disability-rights groups had launched organizations that provided independent living and advocacy services. The old institutions themselves came under attack from advocates who pointed out their systematic denials of civil liberties. Soon, individualized treatment was mandated for institutions, and community-based independent living alternatives received growing support.

In ways such as this, the disability-rights movement is emphasizing the need to break down the barriers to participation and equal access. The more obvious barriers are physical and architectural. For a person who uses a wheelchair, a barrier is a sidewalk curb, an inaccessible restroom, a flight of stairs at a church or office entrance, or the lack of public transportation. For someone who is blind, the barriers include the absence of Braille in an elevator or the lack of enough reading machines in public libraries. To those who cannot hear, the barrier is a lack of sign-language interpreters at public meetings. Anything that serves to exclude a person, or foster dependency on others, is an obstacle holding someone back. Even more insidious are attitudinal barriers—stubborn misconceptions and prejudices that block the channels for greater integration and more equal opportunities.

I often find that people who genuinely want to help are confused about how to respond to a disabled person. They fail to realize how much those with physical and mental challenges can contribute to society,

if only they get the chance. We want opportunity more than we do sympathy. We are tired of being treated as dependents "to be cared for" through special and welfare programs. We are angry with paternalistic responses that only promote isolation and prevent us from living up to our potential. The long difficult battle to tear down these physical and psychological barriers is being waged because disabled Americans want access to America.

Our number is large: Today, 36 million people in the U.S. have some kind of disability. Ten million are children; 15 million are men and women in their prime working years; and 11 million are senior citizens. The vast majority—excluded from a decent education, accessible and affordable housing, and transportation—barely survive economically.

Sixty-two percent of the disabled who are able and willing to work are unemployed. For disabled Vietnam veterans, the jobless rate remains somewhat higher than the current 6.2 percent for all Vietnam veterans. When the disabled do find work, they earn less than those without disability. A disabled white male earns 40 percent less than his able counterparts. A disabled black female earns 88 percent less. And the high cost of health care compounds the burden.

We live in a society where the number of elderly is increasing dramatically. Americans are living longer, and many will inevitably incur visual, hearing or mobility impairments. We are all one accident away from being disabled. So this civil rights struggle is important to all of us.

My personal commitment is to do all I can to change public policy in ways that enhance the lives of people with disabilities. Both the public and private sectors must increase their efforts to educate, train and rehabilitate the disabled, to help them enter the mainstream.

Entitlement programs may be popular, but they must not become the principal answers. The disabled are not unable; yet each program perpetuates the misconception that they are unfit to help themselves or to exist in the life of their communities. Separate cannot be equal for the disabled, any more than it could be in education.

Ours is a grass-roots movement about people. It is a mother trying to enroll her daughter with cerebral palsy in a normal, nonsegregated classroom. It is a man in a wheelchair trying to gain access to city hall or the public library. It is a woman with epilepsy applying for a job. It is quadriplegic requesting aid for a personal-care attendant so that he or she can lead a creative life in the community.

I dislike the terms "handicapped" and "disabled," because they are negative descriptions that tend to promote stereotypes which ought to be discarded. They imply inability. I prefer to talk about the "physically and mentally challenged" or "persons with a disability," to stress human beings first and limitations second.

Our 36 million physically and mentally challenged Americans represent an enormous and largely untapped wealth of resources. As employers, consumers and citizens, they can contribute immensely to the growth and productivity of our economy and society. Beyond all the statistics, rationales, and appeals to responsibility, they are people striving for the basic rights of citizenship, not the easy handouts of charity.

What we need as a nation is a heightened consciousness about the potential each citizen has to contribute to society's prosperity.

We are all challenged, and for each of us to face that challenge is to erase all prejudiced attitudes from our hearts and minds, and from all the places where their effects still endure.●

BEST WISHES TO MAX PETERSON

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my appreciation and best wishes to Max Peterson, who is retiring today from his position as Chief of the Forest Service.

In his 38 years with the Agency, Chief Peterson has served in a variety of capacities and locations from Atlanta, GA to Missoula, MT—from California to Washington. In his 8 years as Chief, he has brought the Forest Service through challenging and difficult times—times that have seen divisive and emotional land management issues. Max Peterson has responded to these challenges with fairness, consistency, and dedication—and has always had the best interests of the Forest Service and the National Forest System at heart.

I know I speak for a number of my colleagues in wishing him well in retirement. We are all grateful for his many contributions to the sound management and wise use of our Nation's forests.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on January 29, 1987, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 39, "Lithuanian Independence Day," along with my good friends and colleagues Senator ALAN DIXON and Senator DONALD RIEGLE. I made a brief statement then, and I would simply like to say again how important it is that Congress go on record supporting the struggle of all the captive nations now laboring under soviet domination.

I hope you will join with me in co-sponsoring this resolution. I ask that the text of Senate Joint Resolution 39 be printed in the RECORD in full.

The text of Senate Joint Resolution 39 reads as follows:

S.J. RES. 39

To provide for the designation of the 69th anniversary of the renewal of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1987, as "Lithuanian Independence Day".

Whereas this year marks the 69th anniversary of the establishment of the Independent Democratic Republic of the Lithuania by the Lithuanian National Council on February 16, 1918;

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union recognized the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Lithuania in the peace treaty of July 12, 1920;

Whereas the United States does not recognize the illegal incorporation of the free and independent Republic of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1940;

Whereas the United States continues to provide accreditation to the Charges d'Affaires of the Republic of Lithuania;

Whereas the United States remains firmly committed to the principle of self-determination as contained in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (also known as the "Helsinki Final Act"), an agreement to which the Soviet Union is a party;

Whereas the people of the Republic of Lithuania struggle every day under Soviet domination;

Whereas the United States condemns the Soviet policy of forced Russification, ethnic dilution, and religious and political persecution; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the people of the United States, who so strongly cherish the principles of independence and self-determination denied the Lithuanian people by the Soviet Union, join with the people of the Republic of Lithuania to demonstrate our common desire to advance the cause of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 69th anniversary of the renewal of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1987, is designated as "Lithuanian Independence Day" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE'S OPTIONAL EARLY RETIREMENT ACT OF 1987

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor S. 42, the Federal Employee's Optional Early Retirement Act of 1987, introduced by Senator ROHR on January 6, 1987.

This legislation provides a positive means to reduce the Federal payroll while remaining sensitive to the needs of both the agencies and their employees. Objectionable provisions in S. 2197, the Federal Employees' Optional Early Retirement Act of 1986, introduced in the 99th Congress have been revised.

Agency needs have been accommodated by the provision giving the President the authority to exempt up to 25 percent of the agencies eligible early retirees, by occupational category, project, or geographic location and the provision allowing managers to hold over for up to 6 months an employee with critical skills. The original 5-year freeze limitation on the Government's ability to rehire has been reduced to a 3-year freeze and the President may waive the freeze for positions vital to the performance of an agency's mission.

Past budget reductions have resulted in the loss of young talent, particularly women and members of minority groups. This bill will allow us to preserve that talent while providing an effective transition of the more experienced work force into retirement.

Since the introduction of the first early retirement bill, the Alaska State

Legislature has passed a similar bill for State employees which was favorably received. With the successful use of early retirement programs in the private sector and State government, it is timely to consider its adoption in the Federal Government.●

REGIONAL BANKING CRISIS

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, on many occasions during the previous Congress, several colleagues joined with me on the floor to fight for various legislative proposals dealing with the depressed energy economy as well as the troubled agricultural sector.

Without detailing the depth of the problems faced in the region of our Nation where the energy and farm belts intersect, it is safe to say that the country has bountifully benefited from the decreased cost of fuel and the low cost of certain agricultural products over the past few years.

However, that benefit to the rest of the country comes at great cost to us in the Southwest: a loss of jobs; a heavy increase in the number of bankruptcies; massive State budget cuts; and most regrettably, a restriction in available commercial credit due to the domino effect in the economy and a fear within the banking industry.

In 1985 and 1986, a total of 265 banks were closed or required open bank assistance by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Seventeen banks have closed in the first 29 days of 1987. Needless to say most of these banks are located in the energy and farm area.

I am particularly concerned at this trend as it can and will have major impacts on our banking system. Some of the more visible effects will be on the viability of the FDIC and FSLIC insurance funds, the ability of this region to regain its capital structure, and the rebuilding and diversification of a crippled economy.

Mr. President, it is important to point out that bank failures—in and of themselves—are not my central concern. Yes, the continued closings can have an adverse effect on the confidence our people hold in our banking system and their own economy. However, the unfortunate adjustments that must take place in a depressed area will catch up to all components of that economy—banks, savings and loans, a local car dealership, or a downtown bakery.

The real problem which has prevailed in many States besides Oklahoma, is worse than a mere statistic about bank failures. It is the resulting devaluation of asset values, causing increased difficulty in the recovery of this region.

This rapid downward spiral of asset values is, not only a result of the true depressed marketplace, but also of the

increased liquidation activities and the compounded fear within the industry.

In my home State of Oklahoma, where 16 banks failed in 1986, we have experienced this problem due to the following circumstances.

When a bank fails, even though a buyer may be found for the deposits, which is typically the case, a large percentage of the failed bank's loan portfolio is retained by the FDIC's Division of Liquidation for quick disposition. This is the duty of the FDIC in protecting the soundness of the deposit insurance fund.

The FDIC then will usually try to gain payment from the holder of the loan. Such a transaction can usually only take place if the holder of the loan can find another institution to buy the loan from the FDIC. This however is quite difficult as a second institution will be wary of buying a loan from the FDIC as it was likely a classified loan and has a high risk of repayment.

In many instances this leaves the holder of the loan in a situation where if they are unable to meet the payment schedule of the FDIC, or if an alternate financial institution is not found to service the loan—one of two things will usually happen: First, the FDIC will settle for a much decreased payoff to terminate the loan; or, second, the FDIC will demand payment, forcing the loan holder to either file bankruptcy or enter a lengthy, legal negotiation period.

In a State such as Oklahoma, where hundreds of millions of dollars of real estate and other assets are possessed or liquidated by the FDIC as receiver of a closed bank, there is a great influence on the market value of these assets as a result of a flooding of the market in a relatively short period of time.

In one extreme example, one city in Oklahoma of about 70,000 people has had three of seven banks fail in a period of 8 months. Financial institutions in that community have a high concentration in real estate and some energy-related loans. The total assets of the failed banks were over \$425 million. While all three banks were purchased by other banking entities, a total of over \$165 million was left to be liquidated by the FDIC.

As the FDIC carries out its duty to liquidate and collect on those loans and assets to replenish its loss to the insurance fund, this creates an unusually high activity of "fire" sales that drastically reduce values on homes, businesses and other assets in that area.

The effect has been a compounded reduction in the market value of real estate—not just because of reduced demand and the depressed economy—but also because of the expeditious flooding of the market of these assets.

While the degree of this kind of problem varies from city to city and State to State within this region, the overriding problem can not be ignored.

Due to this difficulty, managers of financial institutions look at new loan opportunities with much closer scrutiny. Thus, a city that may have a chance to have new business ventures started, cannot do so because credit availability is restricted due to the overly cautious attitude of lenders who are fearful of taking new risks when their capital ratios are at a marginal level.

Let me make clear however, that I am very encouraged and pleased with the recent efforts of the chief banking regulators—FDIC Chairman Bill Seidman and Comptroller of the Currency Robert Clarke—to help ease these problems with the implementation of the "capital forbearance program" and through "open bank assistance". I have had helpful and constructive conversations with both men and feel they have a sincere concern and interest in the recovery of the banking system in the energy and agriculture region of our country. However, these initiatives obviously cannot solve all the problems related to the depletion of capital and asset devaluation.

Mr. President, I ask that a table demonstrating the frightening trends in banking activity in this region be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

To provide a forum of discussion about these matters, I have invited many Members of this body—from the States which have elements of this problem—to join with me to study and seek new solutions of stabilization. I hope to be able to share any of these ideas with Senator PROXMIRE—the distinguished Banking Committee chairman—who has already demonstrated a willingness to examine this and other problems within the financial industry.

I invite the participation of any Senator who may wish to be involved with this informal task force. I feel that the region so gravely affected by this compounding situation, must have the attention of the Senate. The recovery of the energy and agricultural belts in our Nation, will in large part depend on the ability of a strong financial structure to help in rebuilding a strong economy.

The table follows:

BANKING STATISTICS FROM 1ST QUARTER 1985 TO 1ST QUARTER 1986

	Total loan growth	Nonperf. loans/percent of gross loans
Alaska.....	-2.42	5.99
Colorado.....	-1.34	4.93
Louisiana.....	0.76	5.57
Montana.....	-0.65	6.84
Nebraska.....	-1.40	4.78

BANKING STATISTICS FROM 1ST QUARTER 1985 TO 1ST QUARTER 1986—Continued

	Total loan growth	Nonperf. loans/percent of gross loans
New Mexico.....	0.38	3.64
North Dakota.....	-0.52	6.07
Oklahoma.....	-2.42	6.80
Texas.....	-0.63	4.04
Wyoming.....	-2.09	7.96
National average.....	1.29	2.90

Source: Shesunoff Rating Services, Inc. ●

HOOSIERS

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I am taking the unusual step of recommending a motion picture to my colleagues. The film to which I refer is no ordinary piece of cinema by today's standards. There are no car chases, no special effects and no visitors from outer space. Instead, this film features the warmth of human emotions, a search for meaning and some really terrific high school basketball—Indiana style.

I am, of course, talking about the film "Hoosiers," soon to be released across the country.

"Hoosiers" had its world premier in Indianapolis last October and continues to be shown throughout Indiana. I had the good fortune to see the film during a recent trip home, and although I am admittedly not without bias, I firmly believe the rest of the country is in for a treat when "Hoosiers" makes its nationwide debut. The night I saw "Hoosiers," I wedged my way into a packed auditorium full of excitement and anticipation, the audience's enthusiasm fueled by the accurate depiction of the magic that is Indiana high school basketball.

Indiana is one of only three States which has not divided its high school basketball tournament into classes by enrollment. This arrangement creates some tantalizing contests at State tourney time as rural, small-town schools battle the consolidated and metropolitan mammoths for the opportunity to reign as basketball champion over all the State. Indiana's high school basketball tournament stands as a yearly reminder of the rewards possible through effort, dedication and hard work in the face of stiff odds.

Never has the reminder been more vivid than in March 1954, when Milan High School, with a student body of 161, just 73 boys, was matched in the tournament final against Muncie Central, a school with 10 times the enrollment. It has been estimated that 90 percent of Indiana's families were either watching or listening that day, so caught up was the entire State in the mythic proportions of this game among teenagers. When Bobby Plump hit the winning shot for Milan as time

expired, he "delivered the dream to which many Hoosiers still cling," in the words of one Indiana basketball historian.

Author Phillip Hoose has characterized Milan's victory as "one of the most remembered events in the lives of many Hoosiers." With Plump's shot, Hoose writes, "Goliath buckled, Excalibur slipped free from the rock and Indiana's dream came true." It is on this storybook saga that "Hoosiers" is based.

Directed by David Anspaugh and written for the screen by Angelo Pizzo, two former Indiana University students, "Hoosiers" makes the moviegoer part of the action. As Academy Award winning actor Gene Hackman guides the fictitious Hickory High team through game after perilous game as Coach Norman Dale, I could hardly help but recall names of real-life Indiana coaching greats—Burl Friddle, Marion Crawley, Ray Crowe, Howard Sharpe come to mind—who have prowled the sidelines over the years, compiling spectacular records.

This is a film about more than basketball, though. Dennis Hopper, as the broken-down former high school star struggling to hold on to his last chance for self-respect, gives a remarkable performance. Mr. Hopper's portrayal of Shooter will have audiences cheering with the same intensity as they will for the young men of Hickory High. He has already earned significant recognition for his role and is widely thought to be a serious contender for an Oscar nomination.

The filmmakers, in their search for authenticity, cast experienced Indiana high school athletes as the Hickory Players. Brad Boyle, Steve Hollar, Brad Long, Kent Poole, Wade Schenck, Scott Summers and Maris Valanis acquit themselves well as actors and play skillful, Indiana basketball on-screen. Shot entirely on location in Indiana, the towns of Danville, Knightstown, Lebanon, New Richmond, and Ninevah were used to create Hickory, IN. The final championship game sequence was filmed in Butler University's Hinkle Fieldhouse where Milan defeated Muncie Central 33 years ago this spring. Hundreds of local residents appear as extras and indeed many familiar faces stand out in the crowd.

Mr. President, Indiana's basketball tradition is a source of pride for all Hoosiers. The motion picture "Hoosiers" strongly reinforces this sentiment. I am pleased to be able to suggest it to my colleagues. ●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for this

week, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office in response to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report also serves as the scorekeeping report for the purposes of section 311 of the Budget Act.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 2, 1987.

Hon. LAWTON CHILES,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1987. The estimated totals of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are compared to the appropriate of recommended levels contained in the most recent budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 120. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32 and is current through January 30, 1987. The report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended. At your request this report incorporates the latest CBO economic and technical estimating assumptions issued on January 2, 1987.

No changes have occurred since my last report.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER,
Director.

CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT, U.S. SENATE, 100TH CONG. 1ST SESS., AS OF JAN. 30, 1987

(Fiscal year 1987, in billions of dollars)

	Current level ¹	Budget resolution S. Con. Res. 120	Current level (plus/minus) resolution
Budget authority.....	1,079.0	1,093.4	-14.4
Outlays.....	1,008.4	995	13.4
Revenues.....	833.9	852.4	-18.5
Debt subject to limit.....	2,208.3	* 2,322.8	-114.5
Direct loan obligations.....	42.5	34.5	7.9
Guaranteed loan commitments.....	140.5	100.8	39.7

¹ The current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects (budget authority and outlays) of all legislation that Congress has enacted in this or previous sessions or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, estimates are included of the direct spending effects for all entitlement or other programs requiring annual appropriations under current law even though the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

* The current statutory debt limit is \$2,300 billion (P.L. 99-509).

SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT U.S. SENATE—100TH CONG. 1ST SESS., AS OF JAN, 30, 1987

(Fiscal year 1987, in millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues.....			833,855
Permanent appropriations and trust funds.....	720,451	638,771	
Other appropriations.....	542,890	554,239	
Offsetting receipts.....	-185,071	-185,071	
Total enacted in previous sessions.....	1,078,269	1,007,938	833,855
II. Enacted this session:			
III. Continuing resolution authority:			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses: Water Quality Act of 1987 (H.R. 1):			
	-4	-4	
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:			
Special milk.....	6	3	
Veterans compensation.....	173		

SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR CBO WEEKLY SCOREKEEPING REPORT U.S. SENATE—100TH CONG. 1ST SESS., AS OF JAN, 30, 1987—Continued

(Fiscal year 1987, in millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Readjustment benefits.....	9		
Federal unemployment benefits and allowances.....	33	33	
Advances to the unemployment trust fund.....	(3)	(3)	
Payments to health care trust funds.....	(224)	(224)	
Family social services.....	110		
Medical facilities guarantee and loan fund.....	5	4	
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....	(33)	(33)	
Coast Guard retired pay.....	3	3	
Civilian agency pay raises.....	358	373	
Total entitlements.....	697	417	
Total current level as of Jan. 30, 1987.....	1,078,962	1,008,351	833,855
1987 budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 120).....	1,093,350	995,000	852,400
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution.....		13,351	
Under budget resolution.....	14,388		18,545

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

FEDERAL WORKERS AND RECENT LEAVE POLICIES

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that today, for only the second time in more than a week, Federal employees in the Washington area are operating on their usual, full-time, schedule. This may not seem noteworthy enough to be part of the Senate RECORD, but in light of the fact that these employees have been operating on a reduced or delayed schedule almost every day for the past week and a half, this seems to make it worthy of our attention.

Since the first snowstorm, ice on the Metro's third rail has severely hampered Metro service. Metro workers have labored strenuously to clear the tracks of ice, yet during the worst periods of the storm, their equipment was not good enough and all of the above-ground stations were closed for service. Thousands of Metro riders were unable to get to work. Indeed, the Federal Government closed part of the day on Thursday, January 22, and all day Monday, January 26. For the past week, the Government has operated on a policy of liberal leave and delayed arrival.

Of the 2.1 million workers employed by the Federal Government, more than 330,000 work in the Washington area. Tens of millions of payroll dollars were lost due to the inability of the Federal work force to report to their jobs. During the past 10 years it has been fashionable to bash Federal employees. That is not the purpose of this statement—in fact, it is exactly the opposite. Thousands of these workers tried to get to work—only to find that the Metro was incapable of transporting them throughout the city.

The Federal Government has spent \$6 billion on the Washington Metro system. According to an Administrator at the Department of Transportation, this is the Federal Government's largest investment in an urban mass transit system in the United States. Several years ago the Metro Transit Authority considered purchasing \$5 million worth of equipment which would have greatly increased their ability to clear the third rail of ice. At that time, it decided not to buy that equipment—and as a result the system has been virtually crippled by the recent storms.

If only the Metro had decided to purchase the deicing equipment earlier, these employees could have been at work. The American taxpayers have made a tremendous investment in the area's Metro service and in return, they should expect that the system operate more smoothly than recent experience suggests.

The Department of Transportation has directed the Urban Mass Transit Administration to assess the emergency snow needs of the Metro system and pledged to fund any necessary equipment. These funds will come from a mass transit grant program, which distribute grants to transit companies around the country. The fact that the Metro system will receive these additional funds means that some other transit authority around the country will have to do without. If Metro had purchased the deicing equipment earlier, Federal workers could have gotten to work, and the Federal Government would not have spent millions of dollars on extra leave.

Although the amount of snowfall was unusually large this time, the third rail could have frozen under less stormy conditions. Federally workers can not serve the American taxpayer and perform their important Government jobs if they can not get to work—that's the least we can demand of Metro.●

JACKIE STRANGE DAY

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, January 2, 1987, was Jackie Strange Day throughout the entire U.S. Postal Service, and she was recently honored at a farewell dinner.

After 40 years of service to her Nation, Jackie Strange has retired as the Deputy Postmaster General of the United States, the first woman in the history of the Nation to have managed the largest civilian work force in the world. It will be hard to replace her as an innovative manager, and I will find it hard to replace her as a friend.

Jackie Strange is a native of Memphis. Her professional postal career began in 1971 in the Memphis-based southern region where she undertook

a succession of management opportunities. Recognizing her value, the Postal Service brought her to Washington in 1981 as Assistant Postmaster General for Procurement and Supply. She became Regional Postmaster General in Memphis in 1983 and then Deputy Postmaster General in 1985.

It is reported that in 1986 alone, Jackie Strange was instrumental in a billion-dollar turnaround in the Postal Service. Now, that is impressive. The Chairman of the Postal Service Board of Governors, John R. McKean, credits her with being instrumental in reversing serious operating deficits and declines in service.

Tennesseans are justifiably proud of her. Beyond her postal work, Jackie has served in a variety of church and civic organizations, and her varied contributions include those of a poet, fashion designer, and composer. She has received recognition in every area she touches, including listings in a number of categories of Who's Who.

Mr. President, I am delighted to report that every major national postal organization has signed a resolution of recognition and appreciation, describing her service as unprecedented and calling for a Jackie Strange Day, as public service loses one of its most imaginative and effective representatives.

We shall miss her. ●

MASS TRANSIT BILL

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, In the rush to get the Mass Transit Committee report filed to allow quick Senate floor action, some mistakes slipped through in my views on the mass transit bill. In preparation for Senate floor debate, my staff brought to my attention the need to amend and update the views earlier filed with the committee.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the amended views which underscore why Chairman PROXMIRE and others are right in their efforts to limit the scope of this bill.

The amended views follow:

MASS TRANSIT BILL

More powerful than a locomotive, the Senate Banking Committee rushed through a budget-busting mass transit bill.

Yes, my friends, we are back to the days of legislate first and ask questions later.

The mass transit bill is \$5 billion more than requested by President Reagan. Naturally, taxpayers assume that spending of such magnitude would follow careful thought and reasoned debate. For instance, citizens might assume their Senators have already determined how to pay for such an increase, whether by adding another \$5 billion to our \$200 billion federal budget deficit, raising \$5 billion in new taxes, or cutting the budget by \$5 billion in other accounts.

But, none of these matters was even considered when this bill ruffled through the Committee. Consider this:

The notice announcing the mark-up said the Committee would consider legislation "yet to be introduced."

A copy of the bill was available to Committee members barely 24 hours before the Committee voted on the bill.

During the mark-up, staff and Senators were unable to answer questions about the meaning of the bill.

The Committee rejected the Chairman's proposal to fund the programs for one year, have hearings, and then proceed to a multi-year authorization bill.

The bill will be rushed to the Senate floor this week without time for thorough scrutiny of the bill or report, let alone to actually think about what the federal mass transit policy should be.

The Senate occasionally uses such expedited procedures near adjournment of a session when time is constrained, but this Congress has been in session for only 9 working days.

Why the rush?

Sorry I can't answer that question. Neither could anyone else during the mark-up * * * though I asked the question several times.

Perhaps the rush is somehow related to the urgently needed mass transit policy decisions demanding to be made in the country. In reviewing the bill, nothing in it strikes me as urgent. In fact, the opposite is true. There are provisions in this bill which may warrant defeat of the bill. Let me detail one provision in the bill that just by accident I happened to find. This provision requires the Secretary of Transportation to fund the first two segments of a rail system in Los Angeles. Not only is the specification of a transit project unprecedented for the Senate Banking Committee, it is for an "undefined" project that may cost over \$180 million-a-mile—the most expensive in history, according to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

The Los Angeles rail system was originally projected for 18 miles and over \$3 billion. But, this project was scaled back; the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) and Congress eventually funded a 4.4 mile segment that may cost the federal government up to \$700 million and, according to UMTA, have no significant impact on transportation in the 2,439 square mile Los Angeles Metropolitan area. This bill would require a further unknown amount of federal funding for a second segment that has yet to be defined. The Los Angeles Times noted in 1984 that if the entire 18 mile system is completed by the year 2000, it will reduce the 48 million daily auto trips in Los Angeles by only 236,000—a fraction of total trips. Why should farmers in eastern Colorado, steel workers in Pennsylvania, or fishermen in Boston pay for this expensive rail transit system in a city where auto ownership is well above the national average?

On the surface, at least, this Los Angeles project does not seem to be integral to federal mass transit policy. It may be the Senate Banking Committee has sound reasons to reject out of hand the President's proposals for federal mass transit policy. But, this bill does not articulate a better federal policy nor justify the additional \$5 billion more than requested by the President. One certainly is led to question the federal obligation to transit systems owned and operated by cities and local governments. While a strong case can be made for the federal government to help finance Interstate highways that are part of a national transportation network, the logic

does not hold true for local transportation systems.

Forty years ago, local transit systems were privately owned and profitable. With the emergence of the automobile and growth of cities outward to the suburbs, ridership of mass transit declined. Twenty-five years ago the government thought it could pump new life into transit by providing \$30 million to modernize transit systems. Then, thirteen years ago the oil embargo gave the government an excuse to start subsidizing operating costs. Five years ago, Congress set aside one cent of the nine cent tax motorists pay on gasoline, so cities can buy new buses and build new mass transit systems. According to OMB, Federal mass transit spending has increased 1,800 percent since 1970 and accumulated to \$50 billion in total federal assistance.

What does the country get for \$50 billion spent on mass transit? In Miami, OMB points out, the government paid most of the cost to build a \$1 billion rail system that carries less than one-tenth of expected ridership. The government could have saved money if it bought each current rider a new car every five years for the next 50 years. In Detroit, \$210 million is the cost of a rail system initially projected to cost \$30 million, and projected ridership has declined from 37,000 to 15,000. Detroit, presumably, could also have purchased a significant amount of buses for this price. The existence of the federal dollars is clearly creating pressure for all cities and states to get their fair share, and nationwide states, including Colorado, are starting and planning projects that may require \$19 billion in taxpayers money.

The government's generosity, however, has not proved to be a panacea for mass transit. Ridership has continued to decline from 8.9 percent of all commuter trips in 1970 to 6.4 percent in 1980; the fare box is relied on less and less for revenue and has declined as a percent of total operating costs from 92 percent in 1965 to 38 percent in 1983; and, between 1970-1983, transit wages have increased 28 percent, while productivity (vehicle miles per employee) has declined 19 percent, according to OMB.

One has to wonder where the federal revenues have been put to use. A 1983 study by the Transportation Systems Center updated by OMB in 1985 answered that question. Between 1975 and 1985, \$9.3 billion was provided by the government in operating assistance, less than 25 percent actually benefited transit riders. According to OMB, over \$2.5 billion went to increase transit workers wages above the cost-of-living; \$1.9 billion was absorbed by decreases in productivity; \$1.3 billion was used to keep fares artificially low, and \$1.1 billion provided unneeded service. The study further found that \$1.4 billion replaced state and local operating assistance that otherwise would have been available.

Assertions made for the federal role in mass transit rest on claims that mass transit can alleviate oil dependence, improve the environment, or stimulate economic growth. Upon inspection, these laudable goals are proving elusive. A 1977 Congressional Budget Office report, which CBO believes is still correct, found that rail system failed to divert riders from autos and that on the whole, "new rapid rail systems actually waste energy rather than save it." The 1986 OMB budget request notes that a survey of the Washington area found job growth to be 30 percent less around metro stations than for the region as a whole.

Still others will contend federal funding of mass transit is necessary to coordinate transit policy with highway policy. But UMTA administrators testify that current federal program structure discourages "integrated approach to transportation planning. Instead, in many cities, the existence of categorized federal grants had been the driving force behind investment decisions." Transit projects pop-up around the country simply because the federal government will pay 75-80 percent of the cost. Transit Districts already have 30-50 percent overcapacity in buses and transit systems are built in Atlanta, Washington, D.C. and elsewhere that parallel highways and provide double the needed capacity. I believe mass transit can do much to revitalize communities, but this is not the way to do it.●

ECONOMIC AID TO CENTRAL AMERICA

● Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues as a cosponsor of S. 184, to provide economic assistance to the democracies in Central America. It is critically important that we craft a comprehensive, sustainable and humane foreign policy toward Central America, a policy that is practical and can be readily implemented. S. 184 sets out the fundamental elements from which to build such a policy.

First and foremost such a policy should reestablish our commitment to full, sustained, multiyear economic aid to our friends in Central America, as provided by S. 184. I believe the economic assistance we give to other nations for development is an important, if not key, ingredient in our foreign policy. This is particularly so with respect to Central America. We must continue in our efforts to encourage the budding, fragile democracies in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala and sustain democracy in Costa Rica.

The National Bipartisan Commission on Central America recommended economic aid to Central America of \$1.2 billion a year. We have yet to deliver on our promises for such assistance. Even this year, \$300 million was included for economic assistance to Central America as part the package with the military aid to the Contras. But, because of the severe cuts our overall Foreign Aid Program suffered in fiscal year 1987, that \$300 million was not allocated to Central America.

S. 184 reaffirms congressional determination to see that our friends in Central America have the means to build upon their strengths and isolate and confine the Government of Nicaragua. We should help our friends, not torment our adversaries. To this end, S. 184 would end our aid to the Contras—aid that I continue to oppose.

I think it is time for us to find elements of a policy toward Central America that will draw us together, not drive us apart. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 184 and I look forward to working with Senator Dobb and my

colleagues on this legislation as we forge a vital, bipartisan policy toward Central America.●

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP 2, CENTRAL FALLS, RI, 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to take this opportunity to acknowledge an important anniversary. On February 15, 1987, Troop 2 of the Narragansett Council of the Boy Scouts of America will celebrate its 50th anniversary of service to America's youth.

Founded in 1937, by members of Saint Mathieu's parish in Central Falls, RI, Troop 2 is the largest and most active Boy Scout troop in the city. Rev. Renaldo Gadoury, and Mr. Ernest St. Louis were responsible for organizing the troop.

Troop 2 has contributed much to the city of Central Falls. In addition to providing leadership opportunities for many young Rhode Islanders, the troop, through activities at its Camp Ker-Anna, has permitted thousands of boys to experience fellowship in the outdoors. Many of the boys who were members of Troop 2 have become leaders in their communities, both locally and statewide. Troop 2 has also contributed 25 young men to the prestigious rank of Eagle Scout, Scouting's highest rank.

Mr. President, the accomplishments of Troop 2 are a reflection not only of its community but of the strong volunteer leadership provided by those who have given unselfishly of their time. Mr. Ernest St. Louis, the troop's first Scoutmaster, who is now in his 80's, Mr. Rosaire Marcotte, Mr. Laurent Lussier, Mr. Walter Laurie, Mr. Robert Corriveau, who developed the High Adventure Orientation Program, Mr. George Marcotte, Mr. Russell Bourski, Mr. Donald Benoit, and the present Scoutmaster Mr. Patrick Carr—all have devoted many hours to the growth and enrichment of our young men. I salute them, and believe that Troop 2 will continue its outstanding service to Rhode Island's youth for another 50 years.●

INNA MEIMAN

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I am sorry to inform my colleagues of distressing news concerning the health of Inna Meiman. The Soviet Union recently released Inna to the United States to undergo cancer treatment. Doctors say Inna only has approximately 1 year to live.

The Soviets refuse to allow Naum, Inna's husband, to join his wife during this extremely difficult period.

Each day is valuable. The love and support of her husband could help Inna accept her fate. I am outraged at the Soviets' refusal to let the couple

spend these treasured moments together.

I urge the Soviet Government to release Naum immediately so he and Inna may enjoy their final days.●

ORDER FOR APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, on Monday, February 16, 1987, immediately following the prayer and the disposition of the Journal, the traditional reading of Washington's farewell address take place, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint a Senator to perform its reading.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this request has been cleared with the able Republican leader and with Mr. SYMMS and Mr. MOYNIHAN.

I ask unanimous consent that on the Symms amendment, amendment No. 11, there be 1 hour equally divided; that the agreement be in the usual form; provided further that no amendment to the Symms amendment be in order.

I ask unanimous consent that out of the time of Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. DANFORTH be allotted 10 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the prayer and the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order on tomorrow, the following Senators be recognized, each for not to exceed 5 minutes: Messrs. PROXMIRE, SASSER, GRASSLEY, MURKOWSKI, DIXON, and HEINZ.

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

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the recognition of Senators on tomorrow and

the special orders just entered, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 11 a.m.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each under the period for the transaction of morning business tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 11 a.m. tomorrow the Senate resume consideration of the highway bill and the pending amendment at that time, which will be the Symms amendment.

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

RECESS AT 12 NOON AND VOTE ON SYMMS AMENDMENT AT 2 P.M.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12 noon tomorrow, the Senate stand in recess for 2 hours, and that at the hour of 2 o'clock p.m. the Senate resume its consideration of the Symms amendment, at which time there be a vote thereon.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE ON TUESDAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow no resolutions or motions over, under the rule come over and that the call of the calendar be waived under rule VIII.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, did I earlier get consent for Senators to speak on special orders for 5 minutes each or for 15 minutes each?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order as stated was 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I mis-spoke, Mr. President, the intent was that they be recognized each for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, 5 minutes is allocated to each of those Senators listed for special orders.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow morning at 9:45. After the prayer, and the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized each for not to exceed 5 minutes: Senators PROXMIRE, SASSER, GRASSLEY, MURKOWSKI, DIXON, and HEINZ.

Upon the completion of the 5 minute orders for the recognition of Senators, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 o'clock. Senators will be permitted to speak during morning business for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

At the hour of 11 o'clock a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of the highway bill. The pending question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment by Mr. SYMMS. There is a time limitations on the Symms amendment of 1 hour, to be equally divided. No amendments to the Symms amendment will be in order.

At the conclusion of the 1 hour—or 12 o'clock noon—the Senate will stand in recess for the two conferences of the two parties and will resume consideration of the highway bill at 2 p.m.

At 2 p.m., the question then again will be on the adoption of the Symms amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered thereon and a rollcall vote will occur at that time. During the afternoon, other amendments will be called up. Rollcall votes will probably occur.

It is hoped that action can be completed on the highway bill tomorrow. I do not intend to stay in late tomorrow evening. In the event action is not completed on the highway bill on tomorrow, the Senate will resume consideration of the highway bill on Wednesday.

I also expect that a vote to override the President's veto of the clean water bill will occur in the Senate on Wednesday if the House of Representatives takes up the President's message and votes to override and does override the President's veto of the clean water bill on tomorrow. I have not decided on an hour for that vote. I will discuss that with the able Republican leader. It conceivably could be on Thursday, but I hope that the vote can occur on Wednesday.

Later in the week, the Senate will take up and dispose of the bill which came out of the Energy Committee, the energy appliance measure which was passed last year. I do not anticipate a great deal of controversy on that bill. It is S. 83, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Conservation Act with respect to energy conservation standards for appliances.

Action will continue on the highway bill and on the appliance measure until completed this week. If action is not completed by Thursday, by the close of business, then the Senate will be in on Friday. I would not expect to be in late Thursday night in order to get the business done. I do not want to stay in until 11 or 12 or 1 or 2 in the morning on Thursday night just so we can be out on Friday.

So it would be my intention on Thursday evening, if, at a reasonable

hour, the action is not complete on the highway bill, to go over until Friday. Therefore, I think it would behoove us to make as much progress as we can on tomorrow and on Wednesday, if necessary, and if it is further necessary, to continue on Thursday and expedite our business so that the Senate can get out at a reasonable hour each evening.

Next week, of course, the Senate will be out for the Lincoln Day recess.

On the following Monday, Washington's Farewell Address will be read, and there will be no further business on that Monday.

So, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate—

Mr. WILSON. Will the leader withhold just on minute?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has yielded the floor. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his courtesy.

PRIVILEGES ON THE FLOOR—S. 387

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the pendency of S. 387, the highway bill, members of my staff Larry Golzband, Dixon Arnett, and Ira Goldman be permitted privileges of the floor.

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

Mr. WILSON. I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished majority leader.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR GRASSLEY TO THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 92-484, appoints the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] as a member of the Technology Assessment Board, vice the Senator from Maryland, Mr. Mathias, retired.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order, and pursuant to Senate Resolution 34, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased SALA BURTON, late a Representative from the State of California, that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 3, 1987, at the hour of 9:45 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 7:50 p.m., the Senate adjourned until

tomorrow, Tuesday, February 3, 1987, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1987:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Jack F. Matlock, Jr., of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

THE JUDICIARY

Robert P. Charrow, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the U.S. Claims Court for the term of 15 years vice Robert M.M. Seto, term expired.

Bohdan A. Futey, of Ohio, to be a judge of the U.S. Claims Court for the term of 15 years vice Phillip R. Miller, term expired.

Wilkes C. Robinson, of Kansas, to be a judge of the U.S. Claims Court for the term of 15 years vice Judith Ann Yannello, term expired.

David Bryan Sentelle, of North Carolina, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit vice Antonin Scalia, elevated.

Michael S. Kanne, of Indiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit vice Jesse E. Eschbach, retired.

Edward Leavy, of Oregon, to be U.S. circuit judge for the ninth circuit vice Otto R. Skopil, Jr., retired.

Bernard H. Siegan, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge for the ninth circuit vice Warren J. Ferguson, retired.

Ronald S.W. Lew, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California vice Laughlin E. Waters, retired.

James H. Alesia, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois vice George N. Leighton, retired.

James B. Zagel, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois vice Frank J. McGarr, retired.

Richard J. Daronco, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York vice Lee P. Gagliardi, retired.

Layn R. Phillips, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Luther B. Eubanks, retired.

Malcolm F. Marsh, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon vice Edward Leavy, elevated.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 593, 8218, and 8373, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

- Brig. Gen. Clyde F. Autio, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Brig. Gen. Ira DeMent III, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Brig. Gen. Boyd L. Eddins, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Brig. Gen. William N. Rowley, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Brig. Gen. William C. Roxby, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Brig. Gen. Stuart L. Schroeder, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier general

- Col. Earl A. Aler, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. John H. Burris, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

- Col. John J. Closser, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Armando Deleon, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Walter J. Giller, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Oscar M. Jardon, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Jacques P. Klein, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Robert S. Messer, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Robert G. Stein, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Raymond B. Stewart, Jr., [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Julio L. Torres, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. John P. Van Blois, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.
- Col. Frederick D. Walker, [redacted] FV, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be general

Gen. Richard H. Thompson, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Louis C. Wagner, Jr., [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Lawrence F. Skibbie, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jerry M. Bunyard, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. Donald Burdick, [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provision of section 531, title 10, United States Code, provided that in no case shall any of the following officers be appointed in a grade higher than major.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

- Arant, Christopher N., [redacted]
- Babcock, John E., [redacted]
- Badgett, Lon A., [redacted]
- Beasley, George C., Jr., [redacted]
- Bice, James G., [redacted]
- Blow, Thomas C., II, [redacted]
- Boyd, Byron H., [redacted]
- Boyer, Richard P., [redacted]
- Bradley, Frank J., Jr., [redacted]

- Brown, James E., [redacted]
- Brundidge, Marvin C., [redacted]
- Bryant, John R., [redacted]
- Buckley, Howard J., [redacted]
- Chapman, Donald P., [redacted]
- Chatfield, James R., [redacted]
- Comstock, George F., II, [redacted]
- Cooper, James C., [redacted]
- Corl, David N., [redacted]
- Croxall, Gary L., [redacted]
- Cusac, Paul E., [redacted]
- Dabrowski, Ronald H., [redacted]
- Davenport, James M., [redacted]
- Demeritt, Ralph E., [redacted]
- Froeschle, Michael A., [redacted]
- Gardner, Craig D., [redacted]
- Gardner, Stephen J., [redacted]
- Gillisple, Dennis F., [redacted]
- Ginsburg, Samuel W., [redacted]
- Guzman, Juan J., [redacted]
- Hansen, James G., [redacted]
- Harmon, Charles F., [redacted]
- Harris, David M., [redacted]
- Hartge, Joyce, [redacted]
- Haynsworth, Richard D., [redacted]
- Hernandez, Victor M., Jr., [redacted]
- Holland, George J., III, [redacted]
- Holtz, Martin J., [redacted]
- Hudson, John M., [redacted]
- Huff, Jerry M., [redacted]
- Keen, Clyde K., Jr., [redacted]
- Kemp, Roger A., [redacted]
- Koziol, Zbigniew J., [redacted]
- Leath, Roger C., [redacted]
- Madigan, Michael T., [redacted]
- Manzo, Albert P., [redacted]
- Marchman, Sylvester, [redacted]
- Martens, David A., [redacted]
- Miller, Raymond R., III, [redacted]
- Myers, James A., [redacted]
- Olson, Steven H., [redacted]
- Palmer, Edwin, II, [redacted]
- Pugh, Jerry F., [redacted]
- Reed, Lawrence A., [redacted]
- Reynolds, Sharon L., [redacted]
- Roney, Clensy R., Jr., [redacted]
- Schneider, Karl E., [redacted]
- Schoen, Barry A., [redacted]
- Seidel, Rodger F., [redacted]
- Shaeffer, Robert J., [redacted]
- Smith, Esper, [redacted]
- Spilseth, Terri V., [redacted]
- Stephens, Nelson I., Jr., [redacted]
- Strain, Frederick R., [redacted]
- Sykes, Larrie N., [redacted]
- Tate, Stephen M., [redacted]
- Tierney, James W. Jr., [redacted]
- Twine, Johnnie M., [redacted]
- Ulrich, Robert T., [redacted]
- Vandalinda, Robert P., [redacted]
- Welch, Stephen J., [redacted]
- Wheeler, Barrie G., [redacted]
- Whitworth, Douglas P., [redacted]
- Woodmansee, Donald D., [redacted]

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, provided that in no case shall any of the following officers be appointed in a grade higher than major.

CHAPLAINS

- Boleyn, R. Lee, [redacted]
- Booth, John R., [redacted]
- Bragdon, William A., [redacted]
- Brown, Alvin, [redacted]
- Broyles, David E., [redacted]
- Bruno, A. Robert, [redacted]
- Buffington, Gary W., [redacted]
- Cadenhead, Curtis C., [redacted]
- Carlson, Greg W., [redacted]

Cochran, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diab, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dicks, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franks, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gay, Clifton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goff, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Janovec, Jon F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Landham, Jackson W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leurck, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Losey, Christopher R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lovin, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ludwikoski, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luongo, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macy, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malone, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oditt, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Otterstein, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popeleski, Frank X., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Daniel N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preskenis, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rich, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rider, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seaton, Terrell S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Synder, Gordon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stine, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Towne, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Travis, Clyde R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yeun, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATES

Breslin, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carey, Peter N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colopy, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conrad, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dattilo, Anthony P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Harold C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dillingham, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doogan, Daniel F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fivehouse, Darence V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gabriel, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldner, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gunderson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hart, Erich O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Ronnie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karns, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ketchel, Charles T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McLaughlin, Owen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monahan, Kevin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moriarty, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Dana E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pecinovsky, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petrow, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phelps, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodgers, Dean C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Springer, Aaron S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, Laura B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanpelt, Marcia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wille, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willing, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Steven K., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Adams, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Addison, Martha W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Grady F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allsup, Doris J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alvarado, Laura V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arthen, Terry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baxter, Judith T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bednarek, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beinborn, Linda K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bernal, Beverly B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bouffard, Diane E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, Barbara E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryan, Jacalyn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buttino, Mary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Camp, Nancy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Jana L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cassell, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Chenevey, Nancy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cihak, Arlis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clukey, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colasanti, Alfred M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colville, Mary Jo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connelly, Virginia F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craft, Brigetta D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dankowski, Linda S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davidson, Sandra A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dawkins, Diane A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Devoll, Vickie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickson, Lois J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dubovecky, Barbara L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffield, Linda J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ervin, Nora M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farrington, Janelro D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foote, Linda N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fortson, Dianne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Francis, Kathryn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fry, Shirley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gammage, Deborah M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Benito H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Cathy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garner, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gavett, Connie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gedman, Joann S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haines, Jan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Deborah Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Maryann H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hammond, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Herriman, Judy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hitchcock, Sandra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, Gwendolyn F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, Linda D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hutchison, Leola M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Inman, Brenda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Iversen, Ruth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jacobs, Susan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jakaitis, Christine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Betty G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jarabek, Kathleen K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Sandra C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koozin, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lackey, Angela K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larsen, Barbara A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopez, Diana E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lott, Susan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutman, Linda F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Magdaleno, Cheryle K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malavakis, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Philip F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGraw, Shirley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milberry, Robin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milhollen, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milinski, Mark N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millette, Sheila A.W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moberly, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montoya, Madonna C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Denise A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norvell, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ogdan, Penny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ogilvie, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Neill, Joann, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paoline, Monica, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pastizzo, Cynthia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pipitone, Nancy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polednick, Debra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Redfern, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinhart, Ann, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reisenauer, Kathryn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reyes, Yolanda M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Bethany L.H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roby, Trudy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roseboro, Gloria J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rye, Frederick D.C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saundersroy, Felicia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlafer, Kathryn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shankles, Donna K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Bonnie A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Simpsonharvey, Jacquelyn S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Beverly F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Cheryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stroup, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sussman, Renee, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swilley, Bennie F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szutenbach, Mary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tegeler, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Ruth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanwart, Phyllis S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vash, Alex S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waldrop, Kathleen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilder, Ann A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wotring, Joan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Beverly L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, Marsha A., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clarke, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clover, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Allan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hale, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keith, Justin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miles, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neely, Daniel R. G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pasch, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Provost, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Summerlin, Archie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tart, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tilley, Jessie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodson, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Allen, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrews, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bannister, Johnny, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beach, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennett, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berrett, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Booth, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borst, Diane L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlsongeer, Susan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carmichael, Blaine P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Casey, Theresa M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cody, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corey, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cortner, Diane M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cunningham, Rosemary A.J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobbins, Ken M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dooley, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duhart, Jacqueline K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, Rhonda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elves, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erb, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gleason, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grau, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hadfield, Ted L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heath, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgins, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huff, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Margaret B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Robert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kidney, Jay K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuhlman, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 La Poe, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamson, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laroche, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Litts, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marquardt, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Gordon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCloud, Izell J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milam, Susan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Ross N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monroeposey, Carla A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neiler, Cheryl M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scaggs, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx

Simpson, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suggs, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suiter, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Uremovich, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vansandt, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yocum, Gilbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zapf, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of section 624, title 10, United States Code, as amended, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be major

Abbott, Darwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abbott, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abel, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abelard, Clark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abernathy, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Acock, Danny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Acres, Jody D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adair, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, Jamie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Addison, Timothy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Addy, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adragna, Vito E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aguirre, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Akers, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alberico, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Albers, Lesley L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Albright, Royce W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alexander, Gerald F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alexander, Kenneth K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alkove, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allan, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alleca, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, James Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allgaier, Darrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allgood, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allshouse, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alquist, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alsdorf, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alston, Clifton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ammons, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anaya, Minerva, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Christopher G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, John I., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andreen, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrew, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrews, Curtis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrews, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrichak, John J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Angleton, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anstine, Hammond N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Antaya, Richard E.E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Antonson, Jon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Appoloni, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aragon, Henry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arant, Christopher N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arbetter, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Argo, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armor, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armour, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armstrong, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armstrong, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arnold, Leslie C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arter, James K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arvai, Joseph Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arvin, August V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ashley, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Asscherick, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Atkins, Sheryl G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ausink, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Austin, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Auth, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Avellaneda, Henry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Avent, Frank V., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Averill, Reid J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Avery, Verne W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ayotte, Susan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aytes, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Babb, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Babbitt, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Babcock, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bacher, Kevin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Badgett, Lon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bagwell, Jesse G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bair, Anthony E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Clifford B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Joe G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balco, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baldwin, Rosser J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balkham, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ball, Gilbert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ballengee, Joseph K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balluch, Eddie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baltas, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balthazar, Arnold W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banks, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banning, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baran, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barb, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barbachano, Ruben, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barfield, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barger, Samuel K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barley, Kevin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnard, John Q., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnes, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnett, Grady R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnthouse, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baron, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrett, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrier, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Basgall, Vernon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Basilone, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bates, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bauer, Kenneth W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baughman, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bauland, Charles I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bauman, Kenneth S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baxley, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baxter, Roger M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bayer, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beasley, George C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beatty, Daniel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beaulieu, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beauregard, Marcus J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beck, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Becker, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belcher, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belew, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belk, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bell, Douglas V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bell, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bell, Suzanna L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bellacicco, Bradley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beller, Denis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belt, Carol L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennett, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennie, Stewart D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Benson, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berdahl, Carl H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berg, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berg, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berggren, Kenneth E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berkenbush, Toni D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berrian, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bessant, Dale M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Best, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bets, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Betz, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bice, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Bigler, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Billingham, Marc W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bintz, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Birch, Harry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bird, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Birdwell, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bischoff, Martin E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bivins, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Black, Kenneth A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Black, Sidney T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blackwell, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blake, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blake, Martin C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blankenship, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blankenship, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blanpied, Robyn B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blow, Thomas C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blum, Carl T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bolden, Truman H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bolton, Clyde E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bombard, Harry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bondaruk, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boomgaard, Gregory K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boone, Dennis H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Booth, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borgstrand, Dwight L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borowsky, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borrero, Luis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borton, Alden D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bosier, Nyle E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bounds, Eugene C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowen, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowen, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowermeister, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowers, Kerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowie, Thomas G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowker, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, Byron H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, Jon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyer, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boylan, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bozard, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Braddy, Larry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bramblett, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branch, Danny M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branch, Sharon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brand, Andrew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brandt, Jimmie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brandt, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brandt, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Braudis, Russell P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bray, Clifton L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Breit, Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Breitinger, Frederick L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brennan, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Breunig, Jeffery L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brewer, Jay L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bricker, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bright, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brinker, Rex E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brinkley, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brockhagen, Bruce G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brockman, Ben G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Broderick, Vincent R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brookhart, Warren J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brookshire, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brotherton, Terrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, James E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Jeffrey S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Joseph K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Theron J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brownell, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bruderer, Leo L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bruley, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brundage, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brundidge, Marvin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brunelle, Raymond R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Bruns, John Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryan, Barry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buckley, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Budeller, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Budgeon, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buhler, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bullock, Ronnie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bunce, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bundschuh, Raymond W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buntsma, Charlie K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burbank, Patrick C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burch, Herbert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burg, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burgess, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burgie, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burkart, Edward D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burke, John L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burke, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burritt, Roger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burrows, Danny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burton, Baxter D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burwell, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burzynski, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Busko, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butkus, Gary F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butler, Bradley W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butler, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byars, Napoleon B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byerly, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byers, Cecilia H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byers, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byers, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Byrne, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caballero, Ricardo S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cady, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caesar, Joyce L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cahoon, Neil T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cahoon, Rory B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cain, Joel D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cain, Kelly A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cain, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Calahan, Lester Ray, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Callen, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Calvano, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cameron, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Adrienne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Alvin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Jeffrey R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Kevin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cannon, Karen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cantwell, Franklin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cantwell, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Canzano, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Capps, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carchidi, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlson, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carolan, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carpenter, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carroll, Ray D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carrothers, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carson, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, Homer A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Casey, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cashman, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caswell, Timothy H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cavalier, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chabannes, Rene N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chang, Randy Y.U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Albert V., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chase, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chatel, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chatfield, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chatraw, Van F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chavez, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chavez, Michele D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chiasson, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Chilcote, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Childers, Allan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chilstrom, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christ, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christensen, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christian, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christman, Craig D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christmas, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cicchetti, Paul, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cipperly, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ciscel, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, George D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Willis W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clarke, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clatanoff, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clay, Maureen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clayton, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clement, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clements, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cleveland, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clifton, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clotfelter, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cloud, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coats, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cochran, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coffey, Jimmy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coffin, Charles M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cohen, Howard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coke, Ronnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coker, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cole, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cole, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coleman, Sherman R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coles, Craig H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, John W., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Mona L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Neil M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Wallace A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colvin, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Compton, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Compton, Norton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Comstock, George F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Comstock, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Congelli, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conkel, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conley, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connors, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connolly, Donna M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connor, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conrad, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Contant, Donald R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Contreras, Ricardo A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Dale G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Douglas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Layton C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Marvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Thomas T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cool, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coon, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cooper, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cooper, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cooper, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cope, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coppin, Eric P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cord, Patrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corl, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cornelison, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cornwell, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Correia, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Correia, Stanley C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corrie, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corrigan, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cortese, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cosand, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cottongim, Ann H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coulter, Jack D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cowley, Gregory, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cox, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cox, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Cox, Stewart G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cox, Wesley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craig, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craig, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craighead, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cramer, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crase, Bradley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Creamer, Kelley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Creamer, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Creech, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Creighton, Lawrence P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crews, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crockett, David J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crolla, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crombie, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crone, Douglas A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Croucher, Drew E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crouser, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crossall, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cuda, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Culp, Anthony M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cunningham, Christopher B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Curtis, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Curtis, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Curton, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cusack, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cushing, Vincent E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cvitanovich, Patrick, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dabrowski, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daday, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Damiens, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daney, Leo E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daniels, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Danko, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dardzinski, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Darnall, Walter W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davenport, Alfred M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davenport, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davies, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davila, Richard, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Dee S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Silas E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Day, Dan A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daywalt, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dea, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dean, Kathy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dean, William N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deane, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deangeli, Theodore D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deano, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dearing, Auther M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dearmond, Virgil L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deaux, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deblanc, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Debruhl, Harry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Decker, Larita M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Declue, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deems, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Defrank, Stephen M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deil, Lothar W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delaney, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delaski, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delk, James W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delphenich, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delpinto, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delvecchio, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delventhal, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demeritt, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Denninghoff, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Derrick, Theodore E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deslauriers, Arthur D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Despain, Donley L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Detrick, Andrew L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Devaney, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dewese, Rodney A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Didonato, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dieffenbach, Brian E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diehl, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diener, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diesing, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Dietvorst, Michael M.J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diller, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dillman, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dingley, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dingwall, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dinino, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dittmer, Karl J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dixon, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doan, Johnnie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobson, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dodgen, Byron C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doerr, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dolan, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dominguez, Luis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Don, Howard, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donisi, Angelo A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donnalley, Gray R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doolos, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dorman, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dougherty, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doumit, Patrick F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dove, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dowd, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doyle, Eleanor A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doyle, Francis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dozier, Don B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dremstedt, Albert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Drew, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Droz, Miguel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duchein, Bradley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duke, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duncan, Alonzo E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duncan, Ted E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duncan, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunham, Christopher G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunn, Andrew W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunphey, Kenneth S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunstan, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duprey, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Durbin, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duron, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dutchyshyn, Harry V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dyer, Sandra, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dziubinski, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 East, Belinda A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eberling, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eberst, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eddy, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edens, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edgington, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edmonds, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edson, Roger T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, Chris H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, Lennie O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Egge, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eichelkraut, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eickhoff, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eidsaune, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eidson, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eiting, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elliott, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elliott, Johnnie B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ellis, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ely, Michael V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Embry, Dick V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Emery, Kenneth R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Emmert, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engle, Dwight E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engleson, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erbschloe, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erdle, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eresman, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erickson, Mazel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erickson, Todd L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eriksen, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Esbenshade, Kent A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Escobedo, Brian D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Estis, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eudy, Eileen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eulberg, Delwyn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Evans, Jon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Evans, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fagan, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Fairbrother, Edward F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fairley, Gilbert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Falconer, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Falk, Dale E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Falvey, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fankhauser, Eric W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farris, Garland O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faulk, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faulk, Jerry, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faulkner, Johnny R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fauth, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fay, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Feigh, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Felder, Lloyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Feldman, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fellows, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fellows, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Felman, Marc D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Felts, Ernest E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fennessy, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferguson, Ricky J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fernandes, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fernandez, Arturo G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferneau, Dallas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferrell, Ryan F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferrera, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferries, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferry, Geraldine H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pesko, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fetzer, Richard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fielder, Leslie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fieldstad, Kimble N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finan, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Findley, Clifford E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Findley, Vern M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fingerhut, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finley, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finnern, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fiorini, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fitzpatrick, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flannigan, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flemings, Garrison H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flerra, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fletcher, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flick, Glenda R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flinders, Bradley T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flood, Scott K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flores, Cesar, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Floyd, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flury, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foertsch, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foley, Michael F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Folsom, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fonden, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foraker, Gregory W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Forbes, Sherman Guy, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, Douglas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Formwalt, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foy, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frahm, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frame, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Francis, Alvin S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frank, Gregory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franklin, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franklin, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frazier, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frazier, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frazier, William R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Free, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeman, Doyle K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freer, Harrison C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 French, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frieniere, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frey, Jeffrey E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fricano, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frith, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frith, Marc W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Froeschle, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frondozo, Roberto G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Fruehling, Todd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fry, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fuhrman, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fuller, Roy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Funkhouser, Howard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Furlough, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Furr, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fyda, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaebel, Roger, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gafford, Frederick F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaglio, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaj, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gajeski, Antone E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gallagher, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gallagher, Edward I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Galyon, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gann Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gannon, Philip D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Manuel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Ruben, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Craig D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Danny K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garn, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garner, Debrah J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garner, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garrett, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garrison, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garten, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garza, Carlos, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gates, Karl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gauvreau, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gavares, Carolyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaver, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaze, Gregory H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gearing, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Geery, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gegg, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Geigle, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gentry, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Geoghegan, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 George, Arthur L, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gerardo, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gerdes, Bradley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Getzelman, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gewalt, Paul K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibbs, Denis I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibney, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibson, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbert, Allie R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbert, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giles, Willie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillenwaters, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillespie, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillis, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillispie, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillogly, Stephen N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilmore, Andrew G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilroy, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ginsburg, Samuel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gisel, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gladman, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glass, Demetrius D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glastetter, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glaubach, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gleason, Daniel, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glenboski, Ray A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glenn, Theodore J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glines, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goddard, Edward T, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goddard, James D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goebel, Douglas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gold, Aaron H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gold, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldbach, Bernard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldblatt, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Golding, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldsmith, Rafael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gonzalez, Gustavo, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goodman, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goodman, Reginald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goodrich, Bert F., xxx-xx-xxxx

Goodrich, Susan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goossens, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gorman, Francis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gorman, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gough, Scott W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gould, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grabulis, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graff, Patrick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, La Goge W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Steven, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Granger, Alan T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graves, Charlotte E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Cary, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Nathan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Ricky W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greasley, Philip H. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greenawalt, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greene, Traci M. M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greensfelder, Kirk B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greer, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gregoire, Scott L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gregory, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griese, Frederick R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grills, Guy T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gross, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grosshans, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gruber, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guillot, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guindon, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gumahad, Arsenio III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gummel, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gurecki, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gurksnis, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guzman, Juan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gwin, Hardin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hadden, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hahn, Danny A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hairell, Oscar C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hale, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hale, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hale, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Jay A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Wayne F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haller, Glenn F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Halliday, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Halstead, Edwin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamburg, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamed, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamel, Raymond F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamilton, Gary N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamilton, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamilton, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamiltonpowell, Pamela A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Handwerker, Paul R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanko, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanle, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanley, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanley, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hansche, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hansen, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanshaw, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanslik, Gerhard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanson, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanson, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanus, Glen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haren, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harkenreader, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harmon, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harmon, Glenn C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harmon, Glenn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harmon, Rembert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harper, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harper, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harriel, Sidney O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harrington, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Adrianna D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Chavis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Curtis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Edward E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Lynn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Samuel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Stephen, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harrison, Jeffrey B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hart, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartge, Joyce, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartley, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartmann, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harvey, Kim R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harvey, Lois M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harvey, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hasebe, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hassler, Georgette T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hatfield, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hatfield, Jackie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hatfield, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hatt, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hausen, Martin S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hausmann, Daryl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawkins, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawley, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawley, Woodrow T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, Rodney E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haygood, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haynsworth, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hays, Johnny R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heade, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heard, Willie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hebb, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hebert, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heddings, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hedgeman, Calvin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heetland, Sidney R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hefren, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heidmous, Walter N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heitman, Lee R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hellwege, Herfried S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hemmitt, Rodney T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henabray, Kevin F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henager, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henchey, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hendrickson, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hendrix, Aubrey, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henkel, Casey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henley, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hennager, Guy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hennigar, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henry, Christopher M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hensley, Sue R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henson, Kenneth N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hergesell, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hernandez, Gilbert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hernandez, Victor M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Herring, Grant F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hess, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hettinger, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heussner, Jeffrey S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hewitt, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hibler, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hicinbothem, Grant W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hicks, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgins, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgins, Donald P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgins, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Himmelstein, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinger, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinkel, Clark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinnant, Francis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinton, Byron K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hixson, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hobart, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hobbie, John M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hodel, Henry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hodges, Eric M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoenshell, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoff, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffeditz, George R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffman, Chris P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffman, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffmann, Paula L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffsette, Leon M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hogue, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoiland, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holdridge, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holkestad, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, George J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holler, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holley, Cecil D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holley, Richard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holley, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holloman, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holmes, Sanford E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holtz, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Homan, Paul B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Homeyer, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoofard, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hook, Peter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hooks, Robert I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hooper, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoover, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hopkins, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hopun, Carmen I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Horne, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Horne, Jeffery G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Horne, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Horton, Ruth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hott, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hottle, Rodney A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Houren, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Houser, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Houser, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hovatter, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howard, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howard, Jerone, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howard, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howell, Alphonso A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howell, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howell, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoy, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoyes, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hudson, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hudson, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hudson, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huerta, Jesse A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huff, Jerry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huff, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huffman, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hughes, Mark T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hulse, Randall G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Humlie, Matthew S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hunt, Bobby Lee, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hunt, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hunt, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hurd, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hurd, Rachel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Husband, Thomas R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huston, Scott L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hutchison, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ice, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Iloreta, Arsenio R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Infinger, Ernest E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ingersoll, Scott R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ippoliti, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Irwin, Stewart D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Isaacs, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ivandick, Woodrow M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Howard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Jack A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Jimmy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Jon D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Maurice L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Nelson E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Vera M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Forrest K., xxx-xx-xxxx

James, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Patrick C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jameson, Randall K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Janiszewski, Alan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jareo, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jaskey, Armas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jeffcoat, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jeffers, Homer L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jeffries, Lawrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jelusich, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jennings, Tricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jensen, Alan N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jensen, Craig R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jensen, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jepson, Elizabeth T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jewett, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jobe, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johns, Roy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Anthony K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Calvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Chase J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Katherine A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Kevin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Randall G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnston, Keith W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnston, Mark F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnston, Walter H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Budd A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Floyd G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Gaston L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Gordon R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Terry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jordan, Daniel W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jordan, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jordan, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Joseph, Jan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Joy, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jozayt, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jubinski, Stephen, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Judkins, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Juliano, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Julien, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jumper, Geoffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jung, Phillip, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kadechka, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kahn, Gary V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kahn, Neil D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kaiser, Daniel D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kalbrener, Scott O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karpack, Randall A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karr, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karraker, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karslake, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kasper, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kastner, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kaufman, Susan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kauskey, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kearns, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keen, Clyde K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keener, Charles L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keetch, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kehler, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelsacker, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keller, Bruce M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kellner, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelly, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelly, Henry F., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelly, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelso, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kemp, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kemp, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kempster, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Keneally, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kenna, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kenney, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kennon, John W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keplesky, William F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerbow, Steve L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerbs, Daniel H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerbusch, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerins, Brian R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kerl, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kern, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kettering, Michael H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Key, Olen S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kidd, Marijo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kidd, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kilbourn, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Killgore, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kim Intae, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kimbro, Tony M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 King, Rosemary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 King, Stanley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 King, Teddy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kinney, Craig G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirby, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirchoff, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirk, Samuel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirkpatrick, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kirlin, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kitchen, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klackle, Mikel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klarmeyer, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klaus, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kleinertz, Dale, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klenke, Dwight A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kleven, Jay D. D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kline, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klingaman, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Klungenberger, Kurt J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knellinger, William R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kniatt, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knight, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knipp, Delores J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knox, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koch, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koch, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koch, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kochan, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kocian, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koebbe, Terrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kogler, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kohl, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kohn, Allen E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kontak, Roger E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Konyha, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Korb, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koslov, Daniel K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kosor, Michael J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kotch, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koziol, Zbigniew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kozlowski, Kevin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kraemer, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kramer, Stuart C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krause, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krause, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kraushar, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krempa, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kringer, Mary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kristensen, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kropf, Roger F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krueger, Otto S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krutzler, Werner, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krzywicki, Sharon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuehn, Randy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuller, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kunkel, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuntz, Gregory E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kunz, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kupersmith, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kurjanowicz, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kurtz, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kwiatkowski, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kyle, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kysar, Kent K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Labarre, Edwin F., xxx-xx-xxxx

Labrato, Eugene R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laing, Terry, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamb, Duane A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Bruce K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Corliss F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lambert, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamond, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lampe, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Landis, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Landry, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lanning, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lapierre, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laplante, Theodore T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larimore, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larkin, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larsen, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larsh, Steven S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lasater, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lassus, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laugerman, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laurence, Brian S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laurenzi, Terry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawhorne, Dale M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawrence, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawrence, Peter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawton, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Layne, Steven O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lazar, Gerald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leary, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leath, Roger C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leber, Leray L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leboeuf, Harry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Russell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lee, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leech, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lefler, Daniel P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leibbrand, Lonnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leinbach, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leist, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lentz, Ralph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lenzi, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leon, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leonpacher, Norman K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Letica, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leu, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leupp, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Levy, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Bruce E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Cynthia J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Travis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Liddell, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Liles, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lillegard, Bryan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lilly, Brian Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Linaberry, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Linder, Alfred H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lindsay, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lindsley, Mark H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Link, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Linteau, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Liptak, Emil S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Livingston, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lockhart, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loerakker, Steven F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loewenhagen, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lofberg, Christine N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loffland, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loftis, Timothy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Logan, Chris D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 London, John R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Long, Benson A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Longino, Cecil A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopes, Craig J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopez, Sam A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopez, Thomas, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lorenzen, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Louis, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Love, Donnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loverro, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loverro, Stephanie H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lowe, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx

Lowery, Jerry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lowes, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lubbers, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lucero, Fred M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lucero, Louis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lucke, Edward W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ludolph, Karl H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luebben, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lugo, Edwin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lundberg, Gail M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lundie, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luszc, Edward T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutes, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutke, Neal D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luzzi, August S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lynd, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lynn, Bernard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lythgoe, Marilyn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mackey, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macklin, Winfred H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maclin, Myron T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macneil, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macsparran, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madden, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madigan, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madrigal, Francisco J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madsen, Norbert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maerz, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Magas, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Magnan, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mahar, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mahoney, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Main, Jeffery D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mallary, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maluda, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mamula, Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manke, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manning, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manning, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manning, Rufus T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manring, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mans, Toivo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mansfield, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manzo, Albert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marchbanks, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marchino, Joseph M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marchman, Sylvester, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marin, Steven N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marks, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marley, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marotta, Nicholas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marsden, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marsh, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marshall, Douglas M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marshall, Gilly A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martens, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martens, Marc S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Kevin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Rosanne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Timothy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martinez, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martorano, Matthew F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mashl, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mast, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mastin, Darrell G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maternick, Chester R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mather, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mathis, Bobby Graham, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matthews, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matthews, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mattox, Rickey T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mattson, Roy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mauer, Henry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maurer, Kim, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maxwell, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Marilyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mazurowski, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAdams, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAlister, David L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAndrew, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McBride, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCall, Edward M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCammon, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCann, Grace D.C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCann, Harry J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCann, Kevin P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarl, Mark F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarragher, Harry B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarroll, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarthy, Howard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCasland, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClain, Kay C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClary, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClelland, John C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClure, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCoy, Harold M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCracken, Earl L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDuffie, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McElroy, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McElwee, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McEwan, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGee, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGee, J. Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGee, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGillen, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGinty, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGuinness, Daniel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McHale, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McHenry, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McIntire, Brett R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKee, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKenzie, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKinney, Pamela S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKnight, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMeekin, Bryan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMullen, Scott J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNabb, Richard C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNally, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNamara, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNew, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNicholas, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McPherson, Sydney G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McQueen, Barry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McRoberts, Wade E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mead, Stanley L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meglason, Thomas H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meier, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meola, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mercer, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merideth, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merkins, Jeffery R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merlo, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merluzzi, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merrill, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merrow, Scott F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meshako, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Messmer, Barry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Metcalf, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mets, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Metzler, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Frank W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyers, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Michalke, Walter H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Michels, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Middleton, Charles, Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miedema, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Migaleddi, Peter D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mikluscak, Andrew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milan, Hernan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milbrath, Timothy O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Devery S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Evan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Gregory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Lisa R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Mickey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Neil S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Raymond R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millican, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millican, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milodragovich, Christopher N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Minnich Jeanette H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mirtle, Roderick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Misgen, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Misuinias, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitchell, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitchell, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitchell, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitchell, Walter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mixon, Phillip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miyaki, Nathan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moe, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moffett, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Molner, Eric R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moncure, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montoya, Telesfor G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moon, Ivry, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Bernard V., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Danny L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Rickey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Victoria A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moorhouse, Martha K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mooring, Don L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morey, Linda M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Pat D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Raymond B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Roy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrison, Jerry, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrow, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morse, Michael M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morse, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moser, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moses, Cornel T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moskal, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moss, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moss, Ralph J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moulton, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mounce, George D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muckenthaler, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mucklow, Norman E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muehl, Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mueller, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mulholland, Mark F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Multari, Nicholas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mumford, Carey G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Muncy, Randall G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Munevar, Hernando, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murdoch, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murdock, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murone, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Christopher P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Greg S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Jack J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Lawrence J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Petrina B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Myers, Charles V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Myers, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Myers, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Naber, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nagel, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nalabandian, Jacques, xxx-xx-xxxx

Nance, Ronald D.R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nash, Byron S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nazario, Lazzano Eliana E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neely, Wesley W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neeves, Ted H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Arthur G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Charles R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, George P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neptune, Gerald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ness, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neubauer, John A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neuberger, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 New, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 New, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newberry, Jose L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newland, Russell L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newsom, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newsom, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newstad, Theodore M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newton, Richard Y., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newton, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newton, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Shirley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nickel, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nii, Darryl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nippert, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nobile, Mark M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nomi, Stuart P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norman, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norman, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Normandin, Neil C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norrie, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norris, Johnnie E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nothstine, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Novak, Don M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Novy, Dennis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nozaki, Paul Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nuila, Otto R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nunemaker, Donald G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nunez, Anthony C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nusz, Randall A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nutz, Patrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nylund, Scott E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Obie, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Patrick T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Cain, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Chinero, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connell, Brian W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, Ann M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, Charles J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Odle, Randy T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ogan, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Hagan, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Keefe, Shawn D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Leary, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olesky, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olmstead, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olsen, Douglas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Lois R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oltman, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olynick, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Malley, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Neal, Dock C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oney, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Opel, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orear, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oreschak, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orlowski, Guy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ornellas, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ortiz, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Shansky, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Ostrowski, Dale R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Otto, David F.C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Outten, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Overholzer, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owen, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oxley, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pack, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Page, Bonnie C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Painter, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palella, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pallazza, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palm, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palmer, Cody F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palmer, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Palmer, Edwin, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pang, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pankau, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pannell, Garland J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Papp, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Park, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Park, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parkinson, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parramore, Woody W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parrilla, Ezequiel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parrish, Bobby R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parsley, Duane Harold, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Partridge, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pasqual, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pasquino, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Passarello, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patrick, Sean K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patry, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patterson, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patterson, Stewart W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pavlik, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pawlikowski, Ellen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pawlikowski, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pawlowski, Barbara E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Payne, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peckman, Todd D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peddy, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peele, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pennington, Kenneth N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pepin, Lester T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perezotero, Nelson O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perme, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perodeau, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perraut, Richard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perrone, Vincent J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Edward J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pesola, Maryetta D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pestana, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, Pamela L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Alvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pfarrer, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phelps, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, Scott R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Picard, Christopher L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pickart, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pickett, Donald F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierce, Philip A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierce, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Piercypont, Ann L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pilet, Gordon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pinc, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pinkerd, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pinney, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Piotrowski, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Pirog, Robert W. T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pitts, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Piverotto, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Platt, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pohl, Gilbert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pokora, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polakowski, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polaneczky, Aloysius J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polasek, Joseph R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polito, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pollick, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pollok, Sidney P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pontier Phillip Q., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pool, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poole, Roy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popola, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porritt, Orval W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pottinger, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poulos, Thomas, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Eugene H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powers, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preissingner, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prewitt, Darwin P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Privett, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Proctor, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Proctor, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Proft, Donovan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Przybyslawski, Anthony F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pugh, George S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pugh, Jerry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Puhek, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pundzak, Matthew A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Purvis, Quincy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pusaterivlach, Nancy F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Puz, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pyshora, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quan, Paul, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Queen, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quelly, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinn, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinn, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rachal, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Racher, Joseph P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rader, Stanley P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ragan, Rick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rainey, Raiford E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raitt, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ralphs, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramm, Otto P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsey, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsey, Frederick K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsey, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Randle, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raralio, Rudy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rathke, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rau, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ray, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rea, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rebarchak, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rechsteiner, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Redman, Winifred G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Walter E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reese, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reese, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reeves, Jimmie K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Regehr, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reh, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reich, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reichert, Theodore E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reiman, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinert, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Remington, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Remisovsky, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Remkes, Robertus C.N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rew, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reybrock, Nicholas W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Reynolds, Carmen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Randy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, Sharon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reza, Salvador, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rhoades, John F.C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ricci, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rich, Barbara L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richey, Randal L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richwine, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ricks, Jeffrey S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riediger, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rients, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riewerts, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rife, Kurt B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riggins, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riggins, Robert N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riggle, Albert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riley, Lin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rivard, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roadcap, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roark, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robb, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robert, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robertson, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robertson, Thomas S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Earl, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Janet M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roby, Allen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roche, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roche, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roeger, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Marc E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robers, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Robin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Shelley S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Wendy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogerson, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roggero, Frederick F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rohlman, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rohloff, Edward N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Romanowski, Edmond J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roney, Clensy R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rooney, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rooney, James J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Root, David Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rosanbalm, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, Dave M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, Kevin, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rotz, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roubal, Jeffry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowell, Charles H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowland, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowland, Wayne B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rudd, Dewayne, A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rudisill, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruiz, Domingo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rumohr, Mark M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruth, Jimmy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruth, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rutter, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Donald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rykaczewski, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saa, Enrique A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saad, Joseph I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sabol, Marshall K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sabree, Phillip M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sackley, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sakai, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salazar, Jerry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saliba, Sammy T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salley, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salvador, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salz, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sample, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanchez, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanchez, Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanbothe, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, Gregg, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sandlin, Sandy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sands, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sands, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sarosy, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Satre, Robert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sauers, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saunders, Percy L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sauner, Garry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sawner, Thomas E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saylor, Gregory C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sberna, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scarborough, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaaf, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaal, Neil W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schartung, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schavrien, Randy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scheel, Hellmut W. F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schellhous, Robbin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schepley, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlener, Phillip M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlenker, Leslie O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmidt, Donald K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmidt, Robin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schnabel, Raymond K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Greg R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Karl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Susan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schock, Herbert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schoen Barry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schopper, Lori J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schott, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schrader, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schreck, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schroeder, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schroeder, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schrum, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schultz, Steven G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schutt, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schweinfurth, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scoggins, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scot, Craig T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Jonathan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scroggins, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seader, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seal, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Searcey, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sears, Mark F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sears, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sefcik, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seidel, Rodger F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seigler, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Selden, Wellington A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Setnor, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sexton, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sexton, Monty D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shackelford, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaeffer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shafer, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shanley, James F. X., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharpless, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheaffer, Stephanie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheen, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheffield, Wilson E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shelton, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sherrill, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sherwin, Kelly V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sherwood, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shields, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shields, Duncan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shirey, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shoemaker, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shumaker, Keith F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siebert, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siegert, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siers, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sikes, Carol S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siler, Milton T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siler, Stetson M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simelton, Bernard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Earl C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, P.K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simms, Kevin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Bradley L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Tony, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sindelar, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sine, Dale Christy, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Singel, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Siwik, Wayne J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sizemore, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Skaer, Marcia V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Skolarus, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slaboda, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slate, Mitchell P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slate, Taylor A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slep, Shlomo S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sletten, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slough, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slown, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smilek, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Clifford R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Clifton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Dana C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Emmitt G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Esper, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Forrest E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Francis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Herbert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Joe R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Kenneth S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Penny S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Randy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Sandra L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Wesley M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smoot, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smyth, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snead, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sneed, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snider, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snider, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snider, Duane E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snyder, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soderquist, Craig W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sogard, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soifer, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Somers, Lloyd M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Souders, Cheryl G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 South, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southern, Terrell W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southern, Terence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soutiere, Marc A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spacher, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spath, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spence, Donnie C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Kathleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Speziale, Salvatore, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spilseth, Terri V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spivey, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sponsler, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spray, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Squires, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sruulowitz, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Staal, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stafford, Earl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stafford, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stahler, Lawrence H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Stanley, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stanley, Wayne W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Starkey, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Starks, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stauffer, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stearns, Bernard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steel, Carl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steele, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steele, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steeves, Jon H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steig, Jeffrey T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steiner, Karl F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steinke, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steinmetz, Jay S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephens, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephens, Nelson I., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stepp, Terry Donovan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, John R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 StGeorge, Kyle A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stickford, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stinson, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stoddard, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stohry, Kimble D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stokes, Clyde M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stokes, Donald H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Lynn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stoneharris, Regina L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Storbeck, Chris B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Storey, Cheryl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Story, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stover, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stowe, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stowers, Harry W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strain, Efen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strain, Frederick R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strait, Alvin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strang, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strasser, Nancy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strawn, Russell K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Street, Charles G., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Streit, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strom, Randie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strother, Mark O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Struna, Matthew L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stumpf, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stutte, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stutzriem, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, Raymond D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, William, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Summers, Leonard, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sumption, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sutliff, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sutter, Brian L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Svendsen, Keith C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swaim, Barbra A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sward, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sweat, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swehosky, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swift, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swift, Ulysses C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swigart, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swisher, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swygert, Roy B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sykes, Larrie N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sykes, Ruth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taft, Charles K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taliaferro, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Talty, Aida M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarbell, Philip B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarlton, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarpinning, Cory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarter, Robert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tate, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tate, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tatum, Stanley C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tatum, Thomas H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taubert, Terrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Clifton T., xxx-xx-xxxx

Taylor, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Neil W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Robin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Tracy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Teple, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Temple, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tensfeldt, Jon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Terrana, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Terranova, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Terrell, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thayer, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thebo, Ernest J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Therrien, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Therrien, Sam C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Charles H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomin, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Don G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Ernest S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Howard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Joanna R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Marcum L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomsen, Eric R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thornson, Benjamin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thueson, Con M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thunker, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tierney, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tierney, Kathleen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tillery, Randy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tilton, Howard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tiner, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tippins, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toppkins, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toney, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toohy, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tope, Chris L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toth, Mathew S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tovado, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Towery, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Traczyk, Jeffery S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trainor, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trego, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tribolet, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trivette, Johnnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Troche, Jose A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Troegner, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trott, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trott, Randall L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trotter, Lauren P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Troyer, Tim E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trump, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tschupp, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, Mark B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tuckerman, Theodore L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tудay, Clifford E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turcotte, Roger T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turk, Joel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turk, Melba B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turk, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turnipseed, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Twine, Johnnie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tyc, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tyler, Ward E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tyner, Roy, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tynes, Lonzer K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Uckert, Merri B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ullestad, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ulrich, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Umberger, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Underwood, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Utecht, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Vacca, Albert Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaccaro, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vahle, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valliere, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vancil, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vandagriff, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vandalinda, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanderberg, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanderpoorten, Joseph E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vandyke, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanepps, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaness, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanevery, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanhee, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanslebrouck, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vantonningen, Scott, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Varga, Irma R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Varner, David, L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Varney, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Varnum, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaughan, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaughan, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Venus, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vera, Glenn, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vercio, Carl F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Verhage, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vest, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Viale, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vignetti, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vincent, Dennis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vincent, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vincent, Susan B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vining, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vitalis, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vollelunga, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Voss, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vouk, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vroom, Susan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wacker, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waddelow, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Barbara J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, John F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waisanen, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waite, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waiton, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walby, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walden, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wales, Harman K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Algie, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Morris E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Sylvia D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallace, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallen, Lance, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waller, Earl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallis, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walters, Danny D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walters, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walters, Jeffery J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Dennis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ware, John C.H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warnke, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warren, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warren, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wasem, Vaughn D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Washburn, Walter R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waskiewicz, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watkins, Donald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watkins, James I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wawrynovic, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weathers, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weathers, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weaver, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weaver, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weaver, Scott E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weaver, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webb, Sherry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webber, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webster, Rebecca G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Webster, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wedertz, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weeks, Eddie D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Weidner, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weinberg, Norman A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiss, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weiszhaar, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, David A. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wells, Danner T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wendt, Gilbert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wenninger, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wenzel, Randy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weslow, Matthew E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wesolowski, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wesselman, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Westbrook, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Westlake, James Jay, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Westmoreland, Daniel K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wetterlin, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Mark T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wharton, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whatley, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheeler, Barrie G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheeler, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wheelless, Lynn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whicker, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitacre, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitacre, Timothy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitaker, Glenn T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Kathleen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Valus E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitford, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitmore, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitton, Wayland D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitworth, Douglas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wida, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wido, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiederrecht, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiekhorst, Linda A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wies, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wijbrandus, Nyckle, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilder, Jack W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wildman, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiley, Miles C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilhelm, Steven G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willard, Bryan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willeck, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Clarence F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Craig W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Dale R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Frederick V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Kenneth V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, L. C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Roderick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Zeneo B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williamson, Linda K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williford, Clifford F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willis, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Joe A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Joseph E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Windham, Bryan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winegarden, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winkle, Robin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winn, Gregory C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winney, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Winters, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, Timothy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wisniewski, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 With, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Withers, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Witt, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Witters, Gerald B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Wnuk, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolczek, Roger S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Stuart R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodman, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodmansee, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woods, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woods, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woollard, Ernest V., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worden, Roy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wordinger, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worley, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worley, Robert M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worthington, Annette T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Harold J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Ronnie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wrinkle, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wyatt, Herbert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wyman, Thomas T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yagi, Lester S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yanaros, Marcus W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yarborough, Fred A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yauch, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yauchzy, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Ben F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zacour, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zambarelli, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zane, Jerome D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zawistoski, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zelms, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zettel, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zider, Vance P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zlotkowski, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Adams, Kevin K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boleyn, R. Lee, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Booth, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bragdon, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Alvin, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Broyles, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bruno, A. Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buffington, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cadenhead, Curtis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlson, Greg W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cochran, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crawford, Nathaniel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diab, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dicks, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dillon, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ericson, Rodger T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franks, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gay, Clifton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goff, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hubbard, Jonathan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Janovec, Jon F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knudsen, Olin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kondratick, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Landham, Jackson W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leurck, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Losey, Christopher R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lovin, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ludwikoski, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luongo, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Macy, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malone, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Darrell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oditt, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Otterstein, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popeleski, Frank X., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Daniel N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preskenis, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rich, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rider, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Robinson, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seaton, Terrell S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shindel, Katherine A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Snyder, Gordon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stine, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Towne, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Travis, Clyde R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yeun, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Atkinson, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belongia, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Breslin, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carey, Peter N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colopy, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conrad, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dattilo, Anthony P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Harold C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dillingham, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doogan, Daniel F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fivehouse, Darence V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gabriel, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldner, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gordon, Marilyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gunderson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hart, Erich O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartmann, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hinesley, Ted W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Ronnie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Karns, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ketchel, Charles T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lepper, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McLaughlin, Owen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Michels, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monahan, Kevin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moriarty, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Dana E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pecinovsky, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petrie, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petrow, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phelps, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pirog, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rathgeber, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodgers, Dean C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rupe, Sam C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheffield, Kim L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Springer, Aaron S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, Laura B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanpelt, Marcia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weinstein, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wille, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willing, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woods, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Young, Steven K., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Abalos, Alma J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Addison, Martha W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alexander, Lou A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Cheryl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Grady F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allsup, Doris J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alvarado, Laura V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Applewhite, Phyllis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arellanez, Mary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arthen, Terry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrett, Cynthia, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baxter, Judith T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beamer, Karen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bednarek, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beinborn, Linda K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bernal, Beverly B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blue, Bronwyn, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bohnenkamp, Jan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bouffard, Diane H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowe, Catherine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, Barbara E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyle, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyle, Patricia E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brickley, Linda L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Bridge, Rhoda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brigante, Mary Ann G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryan, Jacalyn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butting, Mary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Camp, Nancy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Jana L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cordona, Joseph P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, Jeannette P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cassell, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chenevey, Nancy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cihak, Arlis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clukey, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colasanti, Alfred M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coleman, Hollis, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colville, Mary Jo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connelly, Virginia F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craft, Brigetta D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dankowski, Linda S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davidson, Sandra A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Patricia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dawkins, Diane E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Decamp, Bonnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Devoll, Vickie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickson, Lois J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dossey, Teresa J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dubovecky, Barbara L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffield, Linda J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ervin, Nora M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farrington, Janerio D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farris, Suzanne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Felix, Robert H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fierro, Roberta L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foote, Linda N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fortson, Dianne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fraher, Jane E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Francis, Kathryn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fry, Shirley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gammage, Deborah M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Benito H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Cathy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garner, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gavett, Connie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gedman, Joann S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbert, Rebecca A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gill, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Girga, Susan F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gookins, Janice M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grant, Susan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greenwoodbell, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haines, Jan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Deborah Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Maryann H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hammond, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hansen, Suzanne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harbour, Susan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Henry, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Herriman, Judy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hitchcock, Sandra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoffman, Wanda D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, Gwendolyn F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holland, Linda D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hontz, Cheryl M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Howell, Farley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hrapla, Constance J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hughes, Debra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Humphrey, Vicki L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hutchison, Leola M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ikirt, Judy L. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Inman, Brenda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Iversen, Ruth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jacobs, Susan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jakaitis, Christine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 James, Betty G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jarabek, Kathleen K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Rebecca R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Sandra C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kennedy, Colleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Koozin, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kramer, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lackey, Angela K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Land, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Larsen, Barbara A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lawver, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lebell, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lewis, Ellen N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lindgren, Karla G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lopez, Diana E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lott, Susan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lutman, Linda F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Magdaleno, Cheryl K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Major, Carol P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malavakis, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mathews, Kristie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Philip F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClure, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDonald, Jolene J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGraw, Shirley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGuire, Margaret M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milberry, Robin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milhollen, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milinski, Mark N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millette, Sheila A. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moberly, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montoya, Madonna C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Denise A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moran, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mudd, Steven P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murdock, Eric C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norvell, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ocampo, Rodolfo B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ogden, Penny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ogilvie, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Omahoney, Andrea L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oneill, Joann, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paoline, Monica, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pastizzo, Cynthia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pipitone, Nancy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Polednick, Debra S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preska, Anita M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Puffer, Janet L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rank, Melissa A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Redfern, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinhart, Ann, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reisenauer, Kathryn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reyes, Yolanda M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Bethany L.H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ripchik, Nancy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Kathleen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roby, Trudy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roosa, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roseboro, Gloria J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russell, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rye, Frederick D.C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saundersroy, Felicia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schlafer, Kathryn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scialdo, Antonia, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seimetz, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sells, Rudy H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shankles, Donna K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Roxanna J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Bonnie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpsonharvey, Jacquelyn S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Pamela L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Beverly F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephenson, Susan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Cheryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Story, Delia C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stroup, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sult, Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sussman, Renee, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swilley, Bennie F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szutenbach, Mary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tegeler, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tennyson, June E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Kathleen, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Ruth E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Thompson, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vadeboncoeur, Cheryl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanwart, Phyllis S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vash, Alex S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vonschlieder, Lynn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vukelich, Georgene R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waldrop, Kathleen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waterman, Sarah A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilder, Ann A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wisniewski, Mark P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wotring, Joan K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Beverly L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yarnish, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, Marshna A., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Theresa S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beam, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berger, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bonham, George C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bullis, Cordell W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bunker, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butler, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clarke, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clover, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Allan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deem, Charles F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Earnshaw, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 French, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fye, Samuel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gambino, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Geer, Byron A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gelish, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giesecke, Stephan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbreath, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hale, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Holmes, Timothy H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jayne, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Joens, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keith, Justin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Latini, Norman J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Love, Andrew F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miles, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morris, Jasper D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neely, Daniel R. G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Noa, James K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pasch, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Provost, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raynaud, Eugene H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Regner, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Melvin D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Ted Jim William, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scripture, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shelton, James W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sietsema, Harvey, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silvernail Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmerlin, Archie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szalkowski, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tart, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tilley, Jessie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Valliere, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williamson, Paul T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Leslie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodson, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Raymond D., xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Allen, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrews, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Badmaev, Franz, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bannister, Johnny, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barlettano, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beach, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belt, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennett, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berrett, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Booth, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borst, Diane L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brennecke, Cornelius G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Brooks, Anita L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Calcote, Rocky D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlsongeer, Susan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carmichael, Blaine P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Casey, Theresa M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cody, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corey, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cortner, Diane M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cotto, Miguel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cunningham, Rosemary A. J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dempsey, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobbins, Ken M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donovan, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dooley, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duhart, Jacqueline K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunovant, Victoria S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edwards, Rhonda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elves, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erb, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Francis, Melton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gleason, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grau, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grougan, Jane M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hadfield, Ted L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanak, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harpel, Leslie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hart, Danny A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartzman, Melonee J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heath, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Herres, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgins, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huff, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hunter, Barney H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Margaret B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Robert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kidney, Jay K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Killan, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kuhlman, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kydd, George H., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 La Poe, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lamison, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Laroche, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lillie, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Litts, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marquardt, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 May, Gordon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCloud, Izel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meadows, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mehm, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meier, Ardis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Middleton, Timothy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milam, Susan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Ross N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 MonroePosey, Carla A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrisonorton, Debra J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mott, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Sandra K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Navarro, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neal, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neller, Cheryl M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pillow, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pulvermacher, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Retzlaff, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryberg, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scags, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sedlack, Dennis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seely, Gregory E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Segner, Henry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shupack, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sloat, Sandra B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, John V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suggs, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Suiter, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Svntek, Jeffrey C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swacker, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tarquinio, James John, xxx-xx-xxxx

Thompkins, Macon P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Uremovich, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vansandt, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wirth, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yocum, Gilbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zapf, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps graduates for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps, pursuant to title 10, U.S. Code, sections 531 and 2107:

Abitabulo, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aglio, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alcorn, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anders, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Areman, Bryan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arnold, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arostegui, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Averyt, Brian H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barbour, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barr, Dean A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barr, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baumann, Gary F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belcher, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bell, Darren M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bensley, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bergman, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bernard, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bettendorf, Hugh J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Betts, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bianca, Andrew D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bierman, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bjorklund, Todd D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blakely, Lee A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blanchard, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blik, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boggs, Phillip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bolick, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boughton, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brahe, Bruce K., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Breitingner, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brice, Noman C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Raphael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brubaker, Kurt J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brunnick, Leo E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buckles, Brian K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Budd, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buddrius, Eric A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burke, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burke, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Butler, Lilla V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Callahan, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Canning, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carey, Shawn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlitti, Rocco P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlson, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carper, Craig M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Catencamp, Curtis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Catlett, Walter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Neil B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chapman, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cheatham, Ira M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Check, Christopher J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cherry, Jack K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chesterton, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Christensen, Marc B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Churchill, Kent A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Claeys, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, Lyle R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clark, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Arthur, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Joshua L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Collins, Patrick C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conner Jeffery T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Alfred R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Catherine D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cook, Jonathan P., xxx-xx-xxxx

Copeland, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Couch, Vernon S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Covert, Craig H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cox, Patrick F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crall, Dennis, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crudo, Eric P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cuddy, Andrew K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cunningham, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Currie, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Curtin, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daniels, Brendan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Darby, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Daugharty, Jeffrey T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 David, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Day, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dean, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dearth, Craig R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deeb, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deep David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 DeGeorge, Bradley T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dehaemer, Marc R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demorat, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dununzio, Albert, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Desy, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickinson, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickinson, Damon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Divine, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Domingue, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dorion, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dougherty, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Douglas, Debbie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Driscoll, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffy, Matthew P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dyson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eagan, Patrick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edgar, George N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eggers, Tood L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elder, Emily J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elkins, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ermer, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fahey, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Felix, Mark H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fischer, Walter F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fitts, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flack, Kevin S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flynn, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fortunato, Andrew W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fossett, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franklin, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Franzak, Michael V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fredrickson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freedenberg, Phillip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freiberg, Lorraine S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 French, Jacqueline R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 French, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frerichs, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Funk, Rodney A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Furness, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardiner, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Genberg, Marc R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 George, Anthony D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giles, Bradley S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gill, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giscard, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glavin, Christine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glover, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goedeke, Christopher W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gordon, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grant, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greene, Alan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gregg, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffith, Reade E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grinalds, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gruber, Brooks S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hall, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Halt, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanley, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hannon, Wesley S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harrop, William D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hartig, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawkins, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawkins, Martin T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Healy, Shawn D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hickman, Charles R., xxx-
 Henry, Brian F., xxx-
 Hertzog, Earl F., III, xxx-
 Herzberg, James A., xxx-
 Hessel, Darold M., xxx-
 Hinzman, David F., xxx-
 Holt, Joel C., xxx-
 Horvath, Scott M., xxx-
 Howard, Matthew C., xxx-
 Howe, David S., xxx-
 Hoyle, Stephen M., xxx-
 Hudson, Ralph R., Jr., xxx-
 Hughes, Edward W., xxx-
 Humpert, Donald E., xxx-
 Hussey, Michael F., xxx-
 Hutchison, Allie A., Jr., xxx-
 Iversen, Robert R., xxx-
 Jackson, George M., xxx-
 Jadick, Richard H., xxx-
 Jardine, Timothy L., xxx-
 Jasica, Anthony C., xxx-
 Johanssen, David A., xxx-
 Johnson, Bernt B., xxx-
 Johnson, Cedric L., xxx-
 Johnson, Clayton R., Jr., xxx-
 Johnson, Jeffrey M., xxx-
 Judy, John H., xxx-
 Kallerson, Douglas D., xxx-
 Keech, Daniel R., xxx-
 Kelleher, Patrick M., xxx-
 Kelley, John C., xxx-
 Kelly, Lannie T., xxx-
 Keng, Leslie L., xxx-
 Killeen, Sean C., xxx-
 Kimbrough, Barry R., xxx-
 Kime, Carl, M., xxx-
 Kiscadden, Jay J., xxx-
 Kline, Theodore S., xxx-
 Knapp, Dale M., xxx-
 Knowles, Grover B., xxx-
 Krieg, James A., xxx-
 Kuhn, Philip R., xxx-
 Langlois, Thomas L., xxx-
 Lanning, Scott C., xxx-
 Larkin, Bradley T., xxx-
 Larkin, Curtis A., xxx-
 Lee, Michael J., xxx-
 Leonard, Warren G., xxx-
 Lester, John T., xxx-
 Letolle, Joseph A., xxx-
 Leva, Ricky A., xxx-
 Linahan, Kirk W., xxx-
 Lipka, Eric L., xxx-
 Lonnemann, Michael J., xxx-
 Lozada, Alexander C., xxx-
 Lucci, David P., xxx-
 Lundin, Walter E., xxx-
 Lyon, Mark E., xxx-
 Lyons, Ralph A., xxx-
 Maclane, Michael J., xxx-
 Magoon, Kurt R., xxx-
 Mahoney, Christopher J., xxx-
 Marble, Thomas F., xxx-
 Mayberry, Thomas O., xxx-
 McCarthy, Michael P., xxx-
 McClenney, Walter O., xxx-
 McRitchie, David G., Jr., xxx-
 Mederos, Raymond, xxx-
 Meizoso, Stephen C., xxx-
 Middleton, Gordon W., xxx-
 Milne, Duncan S., xxx-
 Moreland, Anne M., xxx-
 Morris, Robert C., xxx-
 Muise, Robert J., xxx-
 Muladore, Stuart K., xxx-
 Mundy, Timothy S., xxx-
 Murdock, John C., xxx-
 Naylor, John S., xxx-
 Nelon, Christopher M., xxx-
 Nelson, Matthew W., xxx-
 Nolan, John H., xxx-
 Norton, Robert J., Jr., xxx-
 Novaez, Gulomar, xxx-
 Novak, John M., Jr., xxx-

Obradovic, Michael J., xxx-
 Onda, Alex R., xxx-
 Ottington, David A., xxx-
 Parker, John K., xxx-
 Pavlicin, Robert W., xxx-
 Peoples, Anthony E., xxx-
 Peters, Eugene M., xxx-
 Ponte, Peter D., xxx-
 Porter, Stephen R., xxx-
 Quigley, Thomas M., xxx-
 Randolph, Lemuel P., xxx-
 Ratte, David A., xxx-
 Reeves, David L., xxx-
 Reilly, Michael J., xxx-
 Reinwald, Mary K., xxx-
 Richter, Mark W., xxx-
 Robinson, Jeffrey M., xxx-
 Robinson, Michael A., xxx-
 Roble, Richard A., xxx-
 Roepeke, Steve M., xxx-
 Rose, Hoke M., xxx-
 Rose, Jeffrey P., xxx-
 Rosenthal, John T., xxx-
 Russell, John J., xxx-
 Salas, Paul A., xxx-
 Schaefer, Britton H., xxx-
 Scherer, Chris A., xxx-
 Schlimme, David L., xxx-
 Schmidt, Dwight C., xxx-
 Schneider, Melissa A., xxx-
 Schnorenberg, David G., xxx-
 Schulz, David S., xxx-
 Scott, Anthony V., xxx-
 Scott, John G., xxx-
 Seagrist, Richard P., xxx-
 Seals, Keith G., xxx-
 Shah, Najeeb A., xxx-
 Shannon, Thomas F., xxx-
 Sharp, Thomas E., xxx-
 Shephard, Jason W., xxx-
 Sherard, Thomas J., xxx-
 Sherlock, Christopher W., xxx-
 Shinnick, Stephen P., xxx-
 Shiring, Michael T., xxx-
 Shutt, Joseph M., xxx-
 Silk, Bradford J., xxx-
 Simon, Thomas P., xxx-
 Sindelar, Martin R., xxx-
 Smith, Andrew H., xxx-
 Smith, Eric M., xxx-
 Smith, Jeffrey J., xxx-
 Smith, Timothy R., xxx-
 Smith, Tracy R., xxx-
 Sorenson, Jeffrey C., xxx-
 Sprenger, Matthew E., xxx-
 Steele, Christopher S., xxx-
 Steinauer, John J., xxx-
 Stelling, Robert E., xxx-
 Stokvis, Richard M., xxx-
 StPierre, Keith A., xxx-
 Straka, Kevin E., xxx-
 Struckmeyer, Thomas K., xxx-
 Sulc, Brian L., xxx-
 Sumang, Vincent J., xxx-
 Summers, Eugene L., xxx-
 Sutton, Mary M., xxx-
 Sweaney, Robert D., xxx-
 Sweeney, Stephen P., xxx-
 Swift, John D., xxx-
 Tanke, Robert J., xxx-
 Taylor, Bryan F., xxx-
 Taylor, Thomas, xxx-
 Terselic, Robert J., xxx-
 Theuer, James R., xxx-
 Thieme, Donald J., xxx-
 Thomas, Tommy D., xxx-
 Thorpe, Mark A., xxx-
 Till, John M., xxx-
 Tinsley, Mark E., xxx-
 Tobias, Robert J., xxx-
 Tobias, Steven E., xxx-
 Tokofsky, Steven M., xxx-
 Tormenti, Michael A., xxx-
 Torres, Nicholas, xxx-

Tran, Van K., xxx-
 Trautwein, Steven R., xxx-
 Treuting, William T., xxx-
 Triola, Richard B., xxx-
 Tungett, Michael R., xxx-
 Turner, Ronald E., xxx-
 Utke, Michael J., xxx-
 Valentine, Paul D., xxx-
 Vanatten, William T., xxx-
 Vanderhijde, Stephen D., xxx-
 Vangorder, Kristi L., xxx-
 Vansickle, Michael R., xxx-
 Vogan, Kurt R., xxx-
 Vokey, Colby C., xxx-
 Voytko, Thomas J., xxx-
 Waldrop, Marianne S., xxx-
 Walker, Brynne V., xxx-
 Wall, Kevin J., xxx-
 Western, James W., xxx-
 Whitson, Mark A., xxx-
 Wilber, Tracy L., xxx-
 Wille, Kirk C., xxx-
 Williams, David A., xxx-
 Williams, Euseekers A., xxx-
 Williams, Wendell C., xxx-
 Witzig, William P., xxx-
 Wondra, Robert J., xxx-
 Woodburn, Christopher P., xxx-
 Wright, Lawrence E., xxx-
 Wynn, Julian J., xxx-
 Yeager, Peter E., xxx-
 York, Kevin R., xxx-
 Yunker, Roy W., xxx-
 Zecca, Louis, xxx-
 Zimmerman, Joseph S., xxx-
 Zolper, Andrew C., xxx-
 Zonder, Howard P., xxx-
 Zwingle, Michael S., xxx-

The following-named Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program graduates, for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps, pursuant to title 10, U.S. Code, section 531:

Alexander, Mark L., xxx-
 Angion, Anthony C., xxx-
 Binns, Carlyle P., xxx-
 Bowman, Anthony W., xxx-
 Brookins, Donald W., xxx-
 Cal, Joseph R., xxx-
 Candelario, Confesor, xxx-
 Coulombe, Robert L., xxx-
 Dorantich, Jonathan S., xxx-
 Egge, Daniel Q., xxx-
 Frost, Brian K., xxx-
 Gibson, Charles J., Jr., xxx-
 Haas, Glenn E., xxx-
 Jimenez, Brian P., xxx-
 Jimenez, Bill, xxx-
 Kenney, Jeffrey, xxx-
 Kirtley, Steven W., xxx-
 Kunzman, David S., xxx-
 Lopez, James M., xxx-
 Lovell, Jeremy B., xxx-
 Maris, Tommy J., xxx-
 McGuire, Kelly W., xxx-
 Mellinger, David S., xxx-
 Morgan, Paul H., xxx-
 Neuberger, Bruce W., xxx-
 Norfleet, Charles A., xxx-
 Padilla, Robert R., Jr., xxx-
 Page, Charles J., xxx-
 Reyelts, Edward L., xxx-
 Robertson, Steven T., xxx-
 Rutherford, John A., xxx-
 Salvetti, Shara G., xxx-
 Speelman, Scott R., xxx-
 Sullivan, Brian J., xxx-
 Vasquez, Modesto C., xxx-
 Vazquez, David L., xxx-
 Winstead, Scott J., xxx-
 Witzel, Mark R., xxx-