I said, ''Well, would it make any difference if your records were at the White House?''

All at once, it started to become a thing of conversation. I did not say anything more about it, but she and her husband talked about it for the rest of the trip.

When we talk about this issue of encryption and key escrow and those kinds of new terms that will filter into the conversations of America, we have to talk about trust. That is key—trust.

We look at the situation as it is with our young people today and we say, ''Well, maybe midnight basketball didn't work.'' We know that juvenile crime is on the upswing again. It is up 11 percent. Juvenile murders are up 8 percent. Juvenile robberies are up 16 percent. Marijuana use is up 200 percent. That tells me that our young people are in a sense of hopelessness; that we leaders have not talked enough about trust and we have not talked enough about hope and what this great country offers. We only hear that there will not be money for education. They are scared they will not be able to go to school after all the rhetoric that we hear.

We ought to be talking the other way around. It is what we talk about and how we put it. We should talk about hope and opportunity. Only this country offers all kinds of opportunities for young people in today's age. And they yearn for discipline. They want to talk about hope and what is out there, and this new world of technology offers that.

So when we think about encryption, we think about the new technologies, we hear those new words that are going into the conversations, but there is one old standard standby. It is who do we trust and how do we tell our young people today, how do we tell them that there is hope and their opportunities are greater than of any generation, because electronically they open the doors of opportunity around the world and it can be done in 5 seconds. It is trust.

We who are put in positions to represent a constituency teach our young every day. Some days we even use words. Some days we use words, and that is what I think this is about when we start talking about this issue and the issue of what goes on on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The keyword is an old standby word called trust.

FAREWELL TO LORI STALEY

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to bid farewell to my legislative assistant, Lori Anne Staley. She logged over 4 years time with me and I will certainly miss her.

Lori joined my staff almost in the beginning back in 1989 as a staff assistant. She quickly learned the ropes and helped to keep my office running back in the early days when many of us were still figuring out how to get around the Capitol.

Although she is from Ohio she easily adapted to Montana and soon Montana adopted her. She has worked hard for Montana and Montanans appreciate all that she has done. Her biggest compliment is when people forget she is not a native Montanan.

Lori left my office for a couple of years and then came back, proving that you can come home again. She returned as a legislative correspondent and after 2 months took over international trade and foreign relations as a legislative assistant, continuing to add to her list of duties over the course of 3 years. Today she not only handles trade, foreign relations, and defense issues, but she is also responsible for my duties as a member of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. She has been willing and able to tackle any issue and has a broad understanding of the way Washington works.

From trains, planes, and space shuttles, to Bosnia-Herzegovina, Haiti, and B–2 bombers, to GATT and NAFTA, Canadian Durum wheat, and product liability reform—Lori knew the issues well and was always able to keep me informed and up-to-date.

She was able to juggle her multiple issues while keeping the big picture in perspective and knowing how Montana fit into it. No matter how big or small the task she had a good sense of how to get the job done right. I teased her as being hard hearted, but I knew I could always count on her for a clear assessment of any issue in a snap.

I admire her energy and devotion to her job and to Montana. We have spent many late nights together as it seems the Senate gets the most work done in the wee hours of the day. Whether preparing for committee hearings or monitoring floor debate I knew she was working overtime to keep things running smoothly.

In her 3 years as part of my legislative team her accomplishments have numbered many. She was instrumental in helping agriculture shippers during the sunsetting of the Interstate Commerce Commission. She planned a small business committee field hearing in Kalispell, MT on proposed OSHA regulations for the timber industry—two issues which didn't know anything at all about when she started. She has also promoted distance learning which was showcased in a Commerce subcommittee hearing earlier this year. Whether working with NASA or the Montana Department of Transportation her ability to work through problems and get the job done shone through every time.

We will miss more than just Lori's work around the Office. Even in stressful times she managed to keep her good humor. Everyone on staff knew they could turn to her for an amusing story, some good advice, or a helping hand. Indeed we will also miss her cheerful smile.

Lori has changed a great deal since she first arrived on Capitol Hill 7 years ago and started her first job in my office. I know that neither of us will forget this period of time and I hope that she leaves my office with a feeling of having made a difference. She has done almost every job and covered almost every issue as a part of my staff and every time she goes in with a smile and comes out on top.

Today she is moving on to start a new adventure. I'm certain that she will miss all the people she's worked with here in Washington, DC, and back home in Montana. Everything she has learned and all of her experiences will be a part of her. And in return when she moves to her new job she will leave a little part of herself with us.

In closing, I would like to bid good luck, but not good-bye, to my legislative assistant and friend, Lori Staley. I know she will go far. Lori, thanks for your good work.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank you for the time.

TEAM ACT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this debate about the so-called TEAM Act has, unfortunately, produced more heat than light. I first began to focus on the issue several months ago when I visited a small high-technology firm in my State, Lasertechnics, in Albuquerque, NM. Lasertechnics is a very good employer and has on staff about 60 people.

The issues related to unions organizing are far from the minds of anyone in that firm, as far as I can tell. The company has about two dozen different teams discussing many task-oriented items. But some of those teams have the potential of running into subjects considered ''terms and conditions of employment,'' as that phrase is used in the National Labor Relations Act.

Flex time to help bolster Asia-Pacific sales is one example that stands out in my mind. If the owner of that company, Gene Borque, just decides one day to issue flex time schedules or a policy governing flex time, then clearly there is no violation of the law since there is no union in that company. If he has a team decide on a policy, and the team enters into back-and-forth discussions with him on that subject, then according to the NLRB, there probably is a violation of the law as it now stands.

This circumstance should be the focus of our discussion if we are ever able to get into a meaningful discussion about these issues in the future, because, in my view, Gene Borque, the owner of this company, should not be in danger of violating the law by operating as he does today.

The issues being debated are very real. First of all, how can we assure employers the right to organize their companies to get the best effort and

sense of ownership from their workers? And at the same time, how can we assure employees that they retain an ability to organize into unions and to bargain on terms and conditions of employment free from the threat of sham unions being established or manipulated by employers? These are both legitimate goals. Several weeks ago it was my hope and my belief that we could develop language to offer as a substitute for S. 295 that would satisfy both of these objectives.

I had hopes of offering an amendment that would substantially improve the TEAM Act so that, first, there would be no ambiguity that workplace teams and nonunion workplaces were permitted under the law, and, second, that we would specify that teams that discuss terms and conditions of employment would have to comply with certain other requirements to assure that company dominated or sham unions could not be established and that workers would have a determinative role in any discussions on those terms and conditions of employment.

Mr. President, after several weeks of trying to find this common ground to propose a substitute for the bill that we are considering, I have concluded that it is not possible at this time. The organization of employers that has been formed to support the TEAM Act has determined to resist amendments and to drive toward passage of S. 295 even though this legislation faces a sure veto by the President. The labor unions, on the other hand, have organized to oppose the TEAM Act. Relying on the President's promised veto, they have determined that the TEAM Act or any substitute for it which amends section 8(a)(2) of the NLRA should be opposed.

In my view, the concerns that the unions have about the TEAM Act that is before us are well founded. I do not want to get into a technical discussion about the legislation, but many people, including the Chairman of the NLRB, Howard Gould, as well as the Dunlop Commission and others have argued that an adjustment is needed in section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act because of recent decisions that have blurred the definition of what are considered terms and conditions of employment.

S. 295 tries to remove the ambiguity by providing a sweeping umbrella over all workplace teams and any discussions. In my opinion, this opens the window to the possibility of company dominated or sham unions. I have long believed that we might be able to fix the language of the TEAM Act so as to maintain the flexibility that is required to fit with the highly fluid nature of a modern workplace team and still build in protections for workers' rights and interests in this process.

S. 295 needs to be fixed. We have not been able to do so. Accordingly, I will vote against the bill. I regret that the two sides on this important issue cannot be brought together on common ground. Some of the explanation is in the atmosphere of hostility that has traditionally surrounded labor-management issues in our country. In part, the result flows naturally from the very different views that the two sides have of the relationship between employees and employers. Of course, to some extent, the result is a natural consequence of the political season that we are in.

Although the script for what is to happen with this legislation this year is known to us all, I hope that in the next Congress we can have a more serious and constructive debate about this important set of issues.

In many companies throughout the country, the workplace of 1996 is not the workplace that Congress was reacting to when the Wagner Act was passed in the 1930's. For many, the term ''empowering workers'' is not just hollow rhetoric. On the other hand, all employers do not concern themselves with the rights and prerogatives of workers. The concerns that unions have raised are well rooted in our Nation's history.

At a future date I hope we can see adoption of some well-reasoned and balanced reforms to the law that clearly is not possible today. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. I thank my friend and colleague from North Carolina, Senator FAIRCLOTH, for allowing me to go forward for just a few minutes.

I want to follow, very briefly, on what the Senator from New Mexico has said and basically to say that I associate myself with his remarks, as sad as that conclusion is here.

This is a case of the TEAM Act where, it seems to me, both sides, as it were, labor and management, had some merit to their arguments. There should have been a way to put this together and bring about some change in the law that recognizes, respects, and facilitates the extraordinary changes—in some ways the revolution—that have gone on in labor-management circles in this country that the team proposals and programs are part of, and thousands of employers throughout America, and yet to have done that in a way that does not threaten the organized labor movement and does not inadvertently, one hopes, open the door to some of the practices of the past, as Senator BINGAMAN has referred to, such as sham unions or employer dominated unions.

This was a case where reasonable people should have been able to sit down and reach a reasonable conclusion that would have brought about change. I really thank the Senator from New Mexico for the leadership he showed in this in trying to make this happen. He is a consummately reasonable person and has tried to pursue in a rational way that course in this matter. I followed his actions and tried to support them, in terms of the work that he was doing as they were going along.

I regret that in the end he concluded that the amendment that he had prepared really could not be introduced because it was not going to facilitate the kind of movement that is needed here to create change. So the result, unfortunately, in this polarized environment is—polarized for exactly the reasons that the Senator from New Mexico states; one, because the debate over this bill has in some sense continued a kind of labor-management negotiation with mistrust on both sides; and, also, it is obviously an election year.

The result of all this, I presume, is that Congress will pass this bill, but the President will veto it. Then we will be at the status quo, which is not, in this case, terrible because as some I talked to in this debate have said, well, maybe a lot of businesses are running good employer-employee teams in their workplaces who are technically violating the law, but the NLRB is not taking action against them unless, in those relatively few cases, there is a complaint associated with an organization driven by a union, and then the penalty is to order them to stop doing what they are doing.

I wish we could have come to a better result. The truth is that these employer-employee teams—I have seen some of them in Connecticut. When they work well, they work very well. They not only are great for the workers; they are great for the management and great for American competitiveness and great for job creation and the sustaining of existing jobs. However, like everything else, they can be misused. They can be misused in a way that runs right into some of the original goals of section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act. Again, there ought to have been a way we could bring this together.

I regret the Senator from New Mexico reached the conclusion he did. I regret that there will not be a proposal here on the floor that I feel I can support. I am very, very sad that we as a body and I as one Senator reach that conclusion. I can only say that I hope that all of us can come back, both sides, outside of the Chamber and all of us inside the Chamber, next year and work with the executive branch at that time to fashion a bill that will acknowledge the extraordinary steps forward in labor-management relations, and yet the continuing need to protect workers, both in their right to organize and in their right to be members of employee management associations that are not employer dominated.

I thank the Chair. Again, I thank Senator FAIRCLOTH. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senator from North Carolina, Senator FAIRCLOTH, will be recognized.

THE NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK ACT

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson said, ''To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions in which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.'' At noon today, the U.S. Senate will hold a historic vote on legislation to repeal those provisions of Federal law which require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment. This vote is long overdue for the working men and women of this country.

Since I introduced the National Right to Work Act, 22 of my Senate colleagues have joined me as cosponsors. We share the belief that compulsory unionism violates a fundamental principle of individual liberty, the very principle upon which this Nation was founded. Compulsory unionism basically says that workers cannot and should not decide for themselves what is in their best interest, that they need a union boss to decide for them. I can think of nothing more offensive to our core founding principles which we celebrated on the Fourth of July, a few days ago, than that principle that the working people of this country do not have the ability to decide for themselves.

With this bill, not a single word is added to Federal law. It simply repeals those sections of the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act that authorizes the imposition of forced-dues contracts upon working Americans. It simply does away with the requirement that people have to belong to a union to hold a job.

I believe that every worker must have the right to join and financially support a labor union if that is what they want to do. Every worker should have that right, of his own free will and accord, but he should not be coerced to pay union dues just to keep his job. This bill simply protects that right, and no worker would ever be forced into union membership unless he wants to be.

Union membership should be a choice that an individual makes based upon merits and benefits offered by the union. If a union truly benefits its members, then they would not have to coerce them. If workers had confidence in the union leadership, if the union leadership was honest, upright, and forthright, then they would not need to coerce their members to join. A union freely held together by common interests and desires of those who voluntarily want to be members would be a better union than one in which members were forced to join. If the National Right to Work Act were passed, nothing in Federal law would stop workers from joining a union, participating in union activity, and paying union dues.

Union officials who operate their organizations in a truly representative, honest, democratic manner would find their ranks growing with volunteer members who are attracted by service, benefits, and mutual interests, not because they are forced against their will with no options to be a member of a union and pay union fees in order to hold a job. In addition, voluntary union members would be more enthusiastic about union membership simply because they had the freedom to join and were not forced into it.

When Federal laws authorizing compulsory unionism are overturned, only then will working men and women be free to exercise fully their right to work. When that time comes, they will have the freedom to choose whether they want to accept or reject union representation and union dues without facing coercion, violence, and workplace harassment by overbearing—disreputable, in many cases—union bosses.

A poll taken in 1995 indicates 8 out of 10 Americans oppose compulsory unionism—8 out of 10 Americans do not think you should be forced to belong to a union to hold a job.

At noon today, it is my sincere hope that my colleagues will join me in defending the fundamental individual liberty of the right to work, and will support this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an editorial which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, setting forth clearly why this bill should pass.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1996]

LABOR INDEPENDENCE

Today members of the U.S. Senate will be counted on a fundamental issue of individual freedom: the right to work without paying union dues or fees as a condition of employment. It's not likely that the effort to remove sections of the 60-year-old National Labor Relations Act that authorize forced-dues contracts will pass. However, the vote will serve as a useful political marker as to which Senators want individual workers to have a say in whether they should continue to pay the $5 billion a year in dues that private-sector unions collect.

No one argues that unions haven't done a great deal of good in representing their members and in the mutual aid programs they've set up. But that cannot justify allowing the forced collection of union dues from workers who don't want to pay them. In many unions, upward of 75% of the dues money goes for political and other activities that have nothing to do with collective bargaining rights. This year unions didn't bother to consult individual workers before they financed an unprecedented $35 million propaganda campaign against the GOP Congress. In its 1988 Beck decision, liberal Supreme Court Justice William Brennan led the Court in ruling that workers were entitled to a refund of dues money not used to represent them, but the Clinton Administration has acted as if Beck didn't exist. That makes today's vote to put Senators on record on the issue of coerced dues all the more appropriate.

Union leaders themselves were once leery of laws allowing forced membership in their organizations. Samuel Gompers, the father of American labor, warned workers that ''compulsory systems'' were ''not only impractical, but a menace to their rights, welfare and their liberty.'' Public opposition to compulsory unionism has been so great (upward of 70% in most polls) that 21 states have passed ''right-to-work'' laws that allow individuals to opt out of union membership. On the national level, however, reform has been blocked by the formidable power of the unions to raise campaign cash to defeat their opponents.

North Carolina Senator Lauch Faircloth says the time is right to test the power of union bosses with his bill to remove language from federal labor law that authorizes forced-dues contracts for workers. For the first time in a generation, Senators from right-to-work states will be required to choose between the political power of the unions and the clearly expressed views of their voters. In the past, even liberal Senators such as George McGovern felt compelled to support their states' right-to-work laws. Today, 25 Republican and 17 Democratic Senators represent states with such laws. If all of them supported Senator Faircloth, his legislation would pass easily. The fact that many will oppose it deserves to be a campaign issue in the 16 right-to-work states with Senate elections this fall.

Compulsory union dues are not merely an esoteric issue of whether employers or unions hold the upper hand in federal labor law. The issue goes to the heart of individual freedom. Thomas Jefferson once wrote that ''To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.'' Today we will learn how many Senators agree with Jefferson's sentiment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HELMS. I commend the distinguished Senator from North Carolina on his excellent remarks about a very serious subject. I do not know whether this Senate is going to try to act on this bill or not, but I want him to know that I am honored to be a cosponsor of the bill.

Now, did I understand the Senator to say that four-fifths of the American people support the concept that working people should not be forced to associate with or support any organization or class of organization as a condition of getting a job or keeping the job?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. That is exactly what the American people believe.

Mr. HELMS. Maybe one of these days Congress will pay attention to 80 percent of the people.

Mr. President, the National Right to Work Act stipulates that employers and unions may no longer force American workers to pony up union dues as a condition of keeping their jobs. It is about freedom, purely and simply. It does not discourage union membership. The National Right to Work Act merely says that unions have to garner their support the old-fashioned way—they have to earn it.

Of course, there are those who suggest that this legislation is somehow antiunion, those who parrot the apocalyptic pronouncements of the AFL–CIO that this is union-busting legislation.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

I would suggest that those union bosses opposing the National Right to

Work Act are insecure about their ability to earn the support of the workers they purport to represent.

Opponents of the National Right to Work Act may also suggest that it is fair to require employees who enjoy the so-called benefits of union membership to share in their costs. Union leaders will complain that this Congress should not change this policy.

Mr. President, union leaders, having bought the horse, are just complaining about the price of oats.

Union bosses lobbied for and jealously guard the privilege of exclusive representation. They will not give it up. And if you have any doubts about that, then the answer is not to oppose this modest effort to limit union coercion, but to repeal exiting provisions of Federal labor law providing for exclusive representation. I recall that union lobbyists say that this is a free-rider bill. The National Right to Work Act is not so much a free-rider bill as existing Federal labor law is forced-rider legislation.

Doubtless, too, we will hear complaints that there are more important issues facing Americans. There will be claims that this issue is being pursued by a narrow special interest.

My colleagues should bear in mind that polls indicate that fully 76 percent of the American people—including a clear majority of union members—support the principle of right to work. Just yesterday, the administration and various lobbying groups were telling us that an increase in the minimum wage should be passed because 70 percent of the American people support it.

My suspicion is that that they find this high level of support for right to work to be less persuasive, just as they have failed to support our efforts to pass a balanced budget amendment, notwithstanding the support of overwhelming majorities of Americans.

After all, this administration's Secretary of Labor seems more interested in advancing the agenda of organized labor, rather then the rights and interests of all American workers. This is, after all, the administration which attempted to rewrite Federal labor law for Federal contractors, to deny to Federal contractors the right permanently to replace striking employees. The courts have rightly voided this usurpation of congressional authority.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Labor said, and I quote, ''In order to maintain themselves, unions have got to have some ability to strap their members to the mast. The only way unions can exercise countervailing power is to hold their members' feet to the fire.'' Whether or not that mast is attached to a sinking ship in something that the Secretary seems not to have considered.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. President, those who oppose this bill today oppose freedom. They make clear their ratification of Secretary Reich's sentiments, that this Congress believes that union bosses know better than individuals what is in the interests of individual American workers. I would respectfully suggest that this is a concept foreign to the American way of thinking. And does anyone seriously suggest that Republican majorities were sent to both Houses of this Congress in order to perpetuate the power of union bosses to force Americans to support their narrowly radical social and political agenda?

But perhaps there is another explanation. After all, look at the most vocal of opponents to this act. Is it mere coincidence that they benefit from the forced-dues, soft-money political contributions of big labor? Is it just an accident that the bulk of union political activities and contributions benefit my friends on the other side of the aisle almost to the exclusion of contributions to the GOP? Is it surprising that an administration which promises to veto this bill, if passed, has the nearly unanimous support of the leaders of the AFL–CIO?

I urge my colleagues to support the National Right to Work Act because it is the right thing to do. It is a vote for worker freedom, a vote for responsible unions. American workers deserve the protection of a National Right to Work Act, the protection of a basic personal freedom. American working men and women deserve to be able to work and feed their families without paying tribute to anyone, much less a class of specially protected organizations.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

(The remarks of Mr. CONRAD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1939 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JOSEPH PHELPS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Judge Joseph Phelps who was killed tragically in a car accident on June 22, 1996. Joe retired from his Montgomery circuit judgeship in 1995, after spending 18 years on the bench. He served the State of Alabama, the Alabama judicial system, and our Nation with dignity, prudence, courage, and honor.

Joe received both a bachelor's degree and a law degree from the University of Alabama. Even as a youth, Joe showed character in all that he did providing a glimpse into the future of the wise, Christian adult, leader, and honorable jurist he would later become.

In 1990, Joe was awarded the Alabama Bar Association's Judicial Award of Merit, its highest award for outstanding and constructive service to the legal profession in Alabama.

Joe's Christian values are reflected not only in the way he lived his life, but in the many positive organizations which he led, founded, belonged, and served. He was the past president of the Montgomery County Bar Association, and has served as a member, past president, trustee, and founder. He also served diligently in the YMCA; Montgomery Lion's Club; Lion's Club International Youth Day in Court Program, which he founded; Jimmy Hitchcock Memorial Award; Fellowship of Christian Athletes; Salvation Army; Capitol City Boys Club; STEP Foundation; Blue-Gray Association; Leadership Montgomery; the Governor's Study Task Force on Drugs; Alabama Trial Lawyers' Association; Association of Trial Lawyers of America; American Judicature Society; Montgomery Magnet Grant Review Committee; and numerous other legal, civic, and Christian groups. He was an elder at Trinity Presbyterian Church, where he served on the Christian education committee, congregational involvement committee, and long-range planning committee. Joe also taught ninth grade Sunday School. In 1980, Joe was honored as YMCA Man of the Year in recognition of his service to youth in Montgomery.

Joe's list of accomplishments are reflective of the life he led, the type of friend he was, and the positive contributions he made throughout his life to his community and his fellow Alabamian. Not the least of which was his role as husband and father. My heart goes out to Joe's family.

Joe's lifelong dedication to community and country made our world a better place. His presence will be sorely missed.

1996 JULY QUARTERLY REPORTS

The mailing and filing date of the July Quarterly Report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Monday, July 15, 1996. All principal campaign committees supporting Senate candidates in the 1996 races must file their reports with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510–7116. You may wish to advise your campaign committee personnel of this requirement.

The Public Records office will be open from 8 a.m. until 7 p.m. on July 15, to receive these filings. For further information, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of Public Records on (202) 224–0322.

THANKS TO DAVID O. COOKE AT THE PENTAGON FOR HIS CONTINUING SERVICE TO OUR NATION

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, several months ago, I participated in a ceremony at the Pentagon to open an exhibit honoring the office of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was a significant moment in recognizing the remarkable success of the Goldwater—Nichols legislation, which reorganized the Department of Defense. However, this moment would not have been possible without the help of the pentagon's Director of Administration and Management, David O. (Doc)