

countries—including the ones we certify—have made drug production, trafficking, and money laundering illegal under their own laws. And, many of these countries have bilateral agreements with the United States that commit them to take meaningful action against drugs. Thus, countries are bound to act in terms of international law. They are committed to binding agreements with the United States. And they have obligations in terms of their own domestic legal frameworks.

It is neither unfair nor presumptuous for the United States to expect other countries to abide by laws and commitments that they have made. Nor are we being a busybody or arbitrary when we expect and require countries to uphold appropriate international standards of conduct. Indeed, it is only by insisting that such principles of conduct be observed that we have any hope of sustaining respect for and observance of international law. This is understood when it comes to judging other countries on their compliance with a host of other international canons.

After all, we expect countries to observe principles governing human rights, sound environmental practices, fair trade, counterterrorism, and intellectual property rights, to name but a few. The United States has been a leader in promoting respect for these areas of concern.

Congress has passed a host of certification requirements regarding them. In part, this is because we recognize that failure to uphold these principles in the face of willful or negligent disregard is to abandon the idea of standards altogether. And it makes at least as much sense to hold other countries responsible for trafficking in dangerous drugs as it does to scold them for trafficking in pirated CD's.

As I said, we also have an obligation to uphold these standards. Our obligation is to the American people and to the policies we promote in their interest. Protection the citizens of this country from enemies, foreign and domestic, is one of our most important responsibilities. Stopping dangerous drugs coming to this country from abroad falls squarely into this category.

If we are prepared to enforce sanctions for violations of intellectual property rights, it is hardly excessive to judge cooperation by other countries to stop the flow of illegal drugs. After all, not one American has died from Chinese counterfeit CDs. China White heroin, on the other hand, has killed countless of our fellow citizens and ruined the lives of tens of thousands more. This points up our obligation to uphold international standards of conduct.

Somewhat, though, when it comes to the drug issue, many seem to believe that expecting good conduct is wrong. They seem to hold to the notion that it is unfair. They act as if it is unkind to expect countries to comply with international law, solemn agreements, and their own legal requirements.

Some seem to believe that it is outrageous that we also take steps to protect our national interest. Now, since many of the people who voice this latter concern are the leaders of drug producing and transit countries, we can take their complaints with a grain of salt. But the domestic critics are a different matter. To them, all I have to say is that it would be irresponsible for the United States to put the concerns and interests of other countries before those of the American people. Period.

As I said, we would be justified in certifying other countries on drug cooperation even if we did nothing at home. But we in fact do a great deal. Out of a \$16 billion counter-drug budget, less than 10 percent is spent on actions outside the United States.

Over 90 percent is devoted to domestic programs, many of these efforts to control demand. And this is just at the Federal level. States, local communities, and private organizations spend this much and a great deal more on demand reduction. Thus, we spend annually more than \$32 billion to deal with our demand problem. There is not another country in the world that devotes such resources to the problem at home.

I remind my colleagues and the critics of the certification process that the standard for certification is not unconditional success. This is true whether we are talking about Mexico or California. To get a passing grade on drug cooperation does not mean that a country has to have totally eliminated drug production or trafficking, or, for that matter, use.

It requires a good faith effort. The certification law takes into consideration the many problems with stopping drug production and transit. Thus, it is not unexpected that individuals can disagree on the results. It is not a sign of failure if the Congress and the President should disagree. Nor should such disagreements be the occasion for throwing overboard the very process we have for ensuring cooperation. And it does do this. Over the course of the certification process, we have seen more countries take the issue seriously. They do this because they are aware that we take it seriously. We have taught our own administration and other countries that cooperation on drugs is important. To now abandon the chief tool that we have is to run from our responsibilities at the first sign of unpleasantness.

Certification is not perfect. No legislative tool is. We must, however, not expect more than is realistic. The present process clearly indicates Congress' expectation that countries, including our own, will demonstrate serious commitment. That commitment requires more than pious words. It expects action and demonstrable results. Failing that, it is wholly within our right to judge and to take appropriate steps. It is also an obligation.

I yield the floor.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:23 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 16, 1997, at 10 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1997:

### IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF AT THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY IN THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT.

RICHARD W. SANDERS

### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

#### To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. HENRY C. GIFFIN, III, 0000.

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 618, 624, AND 628:

#### To be major

ANDREW J. JORGENSEN, 0000

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT AS CHAPLAINS (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (\*) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624, 531 AND 3283:

#### To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES R. BAILEY, 0000  
LAWRENCE M. BARRY, 0000  
DAVID E. BATES, 0000  
JOHN H. BJARNASON, JR., 0000  
GREGORY L. BLACK, 0000  
WILLIAM B. BROOME, III, 0000  
\*ANDREW J. BULLARD, III, 0000  
WALTER E. DREW, 0000  
DANNY R. FRANKLIN, 0000  
RICHARD B. GARRISON, 0000  
JERRY W. GRAHAM, 0000  
\*JOSEPH F. HANNON, 0000  
ROBERT L. HELTON, JR., 0000  
JERRY O. HENDERSON, 0000  
FREDERICK E. HOADLEY, 0000  
KENNETH KOLENBRANDER, 0000  
LAWRENCE C. KRAUSE, 0000  
JAMES M. LEWIS, 0000  
JAMES E. MAY, 0000  
WILLIAM L. MERRIFIELD, 0000  
JOHNNY W. MIMS, 0000  
STEVEN E. MOON, 0000  
ANDREW R. MULVANEY, 0000  
TED W. NICHOLS, 0000  
RICHARD L. PACE, 0000  
EARL B. PAYTON, 0000  
CHARLES D. REESE, 0000  
CURTIS C. SCHLOSSER, 0000  
WILLIAM C. SHELNUTT, 0000  
LARRY S. SMEDLEY, SR., 0000  
MICHAEL S. STEELE, 0000  
HAROLD G. TYLER, 0000  
RONALD W. WUNSCH, 0000  
JOHN L. WYDEVEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK (\*) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 624, 628, AND 531:

#### To be major

CHESSLEY R. ATCHISON, 0000  
\*ROBERT P. GROW, 0000  
RORY H. LEWIS, 0000  
MARK L. REEDER, 0000  
\*STEPHEN E. SCHLESS, 0000

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

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

#### To be colonel

RICHARD L. SONGER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR ORIGINAL REG-  
ULAR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT LIMITED DUTY OF-  
FICER TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. MARINE  
CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS  
531 AND 5589:

*To be captain*

ROBERT E. BALLARD, 0000  
BRUCE E. BATTON, 0000  
JOSEPH R. BOEHM, 0000  
THOMAS D. BONDI, 0000  
CHARLES E. BROWN, 0000  
JACKIE O. BYRD, 0000  
BRIAN K. COLBY, 0000  
DAVID L. COMFORT, 0000  
JAMES N. CROOK, 0000  
JOHN T. CURRAN, 0000  
TRACY A. DECATO, 0000  
CHRISTOPHER S. DINOFRIO, 0000  
MARK J. DIXON, 0000  
STEPHEN J. DUBOIS, 0000  
ANDREW J. FOX, 0000  
STEFAN GRABAS, 0000  
GREGORY B. HARAHAAN, 0000  
RALPH P. HARRIS, III, 0000

MARIANO G. HAWK, 0000  
JIMMY F. HEGGINS, JR., 0000  
MARC C. HOWELL, 0000  
CARL J. HUTCHISON, 0000  
THOMAS J. JOHNSON, 0000  
PHILLIP E. KLENDWORTH, 0000  
RICHARD D. KULP, 0000  
ARTHUR H. LABREE, 0000  
JORGE L. MEDINA, 0000  
RORY F. MEEHAN, 0000  
MARK A. MENTIKOV, 0000  
JEFFREY L. MILLER, 0000  
ALFRED G MOORE, 0000  
CHARLES T PARTON, 0000  
JOHN D PAULIN, 0000  
JODY D PAULSON, 0000  
STEPHEN V PENNINGTON, 0000  
DEBORAH A PERIERA, 0000  
DAVID S PHILLIPS, 0000  
ROBERT P ROBERSON, II 0000  
RONALD W SABLAN, 0000  
WILLIAM E SAULS, 0000  
MICHAEL H SCHMITT, 0000  
KENNETH A STROUD, 0000  
STEVEN C TAYLOR, 0000

TIMOTHY M TWOHIG, 0000  
MICHAEL J WEBB, 0000  
JOANN O WESLEY, 0000  
DANIEL R WESTPHAL, 0000  
ANTHONY W WHALEN, 0000  
RICHARD S WILEN, JR, 0000  
DAVID O WILLIAMS, 0000  
PATRICK K WYMAN, 0000

IN THE NAVY

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

*To be commander*

TIMOTHY S. GARROLD, 0000

THE JUDICIARY

HENRY HAROLD KENNEDY, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DIS-  
TRICT OF COLUMBIA VICE JOYCE HENS GREEN, RETIRED.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT  
JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF  
MISSOURI VICE STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, RETIRED.