(d) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share of the cost of an estuary habitat restoration project may be provided in the form of land, easements, rights-of-way, services, or any other form of in-kind contribution determined by the Collaborative Council to be an appropriate contribution equivalent to the monetary amount required for the non-Federal share of the estuary habitat restoration project.

(2) REDUCED NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—An applicant for assistance in carrying out an estuary habitat restoration project may submit an application for a reduction in the requirement of the payment of a non-Federal share of at least 35 percent, if the applicant submits a statement of need and demonstrates a need for a reduced non-Federal share in accordance with section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)).

(e) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS BY STATES TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—With the approval of the Secretary, a State may allocate to any local government, area wide agency designated under section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3334), regional agency, or interstate agency, a portion of any funds disbursed by the Collaborative Council to the State for the purpose of carrying out an estuary habitat restoration project.

SEC. 8. MONITORING AND MAINTENANCE OF ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) DATABASE OF RESTORATION PROJECT INFORMATION.—The Under Secretary shall maintain an appropriate database of information concerning estuary habitat restoration projects funded by the Collaborative Council, including information on project techniques, project completion, monitoring data, and other relevant information.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Collaborative Council shall biennially submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the results of activities carried out under this Act.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—A report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) data on the number of acres of estuary habitat restored under this Act, including the number of projects approved and completed that comprise those acres;

(B) the percentage of restored estuary habitat monitored under a plan to ensure that short-term and long-term restoration goals are achieved;

(C) an estimate of the long-term success of varying restoration techniques used in carrying out estuary habitat restoration projects;

(D) a review of how the Collaborative Council has incorporated the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) in the selection and implementation of estuary habitat restoration projects;

(E) a review of efforts made by the Collaborative Council to maintain an appropriate database of restoration projects funded under this Act; and

(F) a review of the measures that the Collaborative Council has taken to provide the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) to persons with responsibility for assisting in the restoration of estuary habitat.

SEC. 9. MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

In carrying out this Act, the Collaborative Council may—

(1) enter into cooperative agreements with persons; and

(2) execute such memoranda of understanding as are necessary to reflect the agreements.

SEC. 10. DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary shall allocate funds made available to carry out this Act based on the need for the funds and such other factors as the Collaborative Council determines to be appropriate to carry out this Act.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER OTHER LAW.—Funds authorized to be appropriated under section 908 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2285) and section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) may be used by the Secretary in accordance with this Act to assist States and other non-Federal persons in carrying out estuary habitat restoration projects or interim actions under section 6(c).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act—

(1) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(2) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

(3) $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

SEC. 12. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—The Secretary—

(1) may carry out estuary habitat restoration projects as determined by the Collaborative Council; and

(2) shall give estuary habitat restoration projects the same consideration (as determined by the Collaborative Council) as projects relating to irrigation, navigation, or flood control.

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN LAW.—Sections 203, 204, and 205 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2231, 2232, 2233) shall not apply to an estuary habitat restoration project selected in accordance with this Act.

(c) ESTUARY HABITAT RESTORATION MISSION.—The Secretary shall establish restoration of estuary habitat as a primary mission of the Army Corps of Engineers.

(d) FEDERAL AGENCY FACILITIES AND PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal agencies may cooperate in carrying out scientific and other programs necessary to carry out this Act, and may provide facilities and personnel, for the purpose of assisting the Collaborative Council in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(2) REIMBURSEMENT FROM COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL.—Federal agencies may accept reimbursement from the Collaborative Council for providing services, facilities, and personnel under paragraph (1).

(e) COLLABORATIVE COUNCIL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND STAFFING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress and the Secretary an analysis of the extent to which the Collaborative Council needs additional personnel and administrative resources to fully carry out its duties under this Act. The analysis shall include recommendations regarding necessary additional funding.

(f) APPLICATION OF AND CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER LAWS.—Except as specifically provided in this Act—

(1) nothing in this Act supersedes or modifies any Federal law in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) each action by a Federal agency under this Act shall be carried out in a manner that is consistent with such law.●

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 noon on Monday, September 29. I further ask that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate immediately resume S. 25, the campaign finance reform bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday, the Senate will resume the pending campaign finance reform bill. As a reminder to all Senators, no votes will occur during Monday's session of the Senate. The next vote will be at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, September 30, on the motion to invoke cloture on the Coats amendment concerning scholarships to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. Also during Tuesday's session of the Senate, the Senate will consider the continuing resolution. Therefore, votes will occur throughout the day on Tuesday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DORGAN.

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

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is truly what is called getting the last word, as I understand the unanimous consent agreement is for the adjourning of the Senate following my presentation.

I regret I was delayed. I wanted to be here to be involved in the back-and-forth discussion on campaign finance reform. Nonetheless, I am able to offer a few comments about some of the discussion we have had in the last few hours on this important issue.

It is important for everybody to understand that we are talking now about campaign finance reform, and we ought not take a victory lap by virtue of the fact that it is on the floor of the Senate. We are at the starting line, not the finish line. The starting line was to scratch and fight and prod to try to get campaign finance reform to the floor because a whole lot of people didn't want us to talk about it or to consider it.

Well, it is here, and now we are going to have some votes. I am going to offer amendments, some others will offer amendments, and we will see how people feel about reforming our campaign finance system in this country.

Much of the discussion in the last couple of hours has been by those who say they have constitutional objections to the McCain-Feingold bill, for example, and/or other proposals; that they somehow would violate the Constitution. Earlier in the week, 126 legal scholars weighed in saying, ''Nonsense, this wouldn't violate the Constitution at all.'' In response to the scholars, one of my colleagues said, ''Well, I suppose we could get 126 people who would tell us the Earth is flat.'' I imagine you could, but not constitutional scholars.

The issue here is people who understand the Constitution, people who study the Constitution, weighing in on this question of whether the proposals to change our system of campaign financing runs afoul of the Constitution. The answer, clearly, at least by 126 constitutional scholars is no, that's a bogus issue.

Mr. President, this issue of campaign finance reform is a critically important issue. I have served in public office for some long while, and I am proud to serve in public office. I am one of those who believes public service is important. I wake up in the morning and feel privileged to be able to serve in the U.S. Senate. I come to work enjoying my job. I have a thirst for public issues and public debate and a contest of ideas. I think this is an honorable profession. I enjoy serving here. I want to do the things to advance public policy in a way that gives the American people some confidence that those of us who serve here serve the public interest.

I want to tell a story briefly about the campaign I waged for the U.S. Senate, having served for some terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. I was better known than my opponent because I was an incumbent Congressman, although my opponent had run in statewide races previously. Nonetheless, we both were endorsed by our respective political conventions to run for the U.S. Senate.

So I called for something in public debate with my opponent that I thought was unique, unusual, and something that had never been done before in this country in a Senate campaign. I said to my opponent, Why don't you and I engage in a campaign that is the most unique and unusual that has been waged in modern times? Here's my proposition. I'm better known than you are because I've served in Congress and have run statewide a good number of times. I accept that. I will be better known than you are when we start this race. I propose this: I propose that I will not run any television commercials, no radio advertisements, no commercials of any kind during the entire campaign. You commit to do the same thing, and then what we do is we pool our money and we buy 8 hours of prime-time television on the stations that serve in North Dakota, and each week for 1 hour, we show up at a television station and have it simulcast across the stations in North Dakota; we show up with no assistants, no aides, no handlers, no notes, no research materials, just the two of us, and no moderator, and for 1 hour a week prime time that we pay for, we tell North Dakotans why we want to serve in the U.S. Senate and the kind of ideas that we have for the future of our State in this country; we debate the issues of the day, one on one, an hour a week prime time for 8 weeks leading up to the election.

At the end of 8 weeks, having an hour debate every week, prime time simulcast on all the stations, everyone in North Dakota would know who he is, how he feels about issues, how he reacts in response to a public debate about issues, and they would know who I am and how I respond to the same thing.

My opponent chose not to accept that challenge. So the result was we had a traditional campaign: He ran 30-second advertisements, the little slash-and-burn 30-second explosion that goes off in our minds that contribute nothing to the public knowledge. It is part of the air pollution in this country that happens every election year, that on television and on the radio, we hear these 30-second and 1-minute explosions that contribute nothing to the political dialog in America. So that is what happened in my Senate race.

I regret that was the case because we could have had a Senate race that would have hearkened back to the old days in which, without the 30-second slash-and-burn advertisements, we would have had live, prime-time debates without notes, without handlers, without moderators, just talking about what we believed was necessary to do to assure a better future for this country and for our children.

Election contests should, after all, be a contest of ideas, but it is not that these days. I have run in 10 statewide elections in North Dakota—10 of them. So I know something about statewide campaigns. They are not any longer contests of ideas. They are an opportunity for handlers and aides and gurus and assistants and pollsters and media advisers to put together these little explosions and put them on television, attempting to mischaracterize some other position or some other candidate.

Often, the television commercial that is paid for by a candidate has no explanation except a little line that no one can see on the bottom that the candidate is even sponsoring it. I have made some suggestions on how we should address that issue, just as an example, and I am going to offer it as an amendment and we will have a chance to vote on it in the Senate. Some will not like it. I don't know if it will prevail.

Here is what I think we should do. We, by law, say television stations are to provide what we call the lowest card rate for political advertising during certain political periods during campaigns. If you are running political campaigns and buying political time, you get the lowest rate on the rate card and you are guaranteed that by law. I am going to offer an amendment that I think will change the culture of these 30-second little slash-and-burn commercials that have become the trademark of American campaigns. Mine will be very simple. The only commercials in political advertising that will qualify for the lowest rate or lowest cost will be those that are at least 1 minute in length and on which the candidate appears on the commercial 75 percent of the time. If those two conditions are not met, they don't buy at the bottom of the rate card.

It costs them much, much more. Let us at least, if we are going to have a law that requires cutrate advertising prices, be afforded campaigns, as now exists in law, let us at least allow that to provide an incentive for the right kind of public discussion. No one who is thinking, in my judgment, can believe the right kind of public discourse in this country these days is the little 30-second pollution out there on television and radio that contributes nothing to public dialog; it simply attempts to cut down the other candidate and demean the other candidate, having nothing to do with the issues.

Am I suggesting those who run for public office ought to be free of public scrutiny and free of public criticism? Not at all, but we ought to provide some incentives in which the public gets a decent debate about public issues in our campaigns. So we will have an opportunity to vote on my amendment during this discussion.

I come to the floor of the Senate as a supporter of the McCain-Feingold legislation. Would I have written it differently? Yes, I think so. There are some things I would have changed substantially, but I have great admiration for Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD and for the persistence with which they bring this legislation to the floor of the Senate. They believe the current system of financing campaigns is broken and something ought to be done. There are some in the Senate who believe that things are just fine, let's just keep going just the way we are going, things are just terrific, and they don't want anybody to do anything to change what is now happening.

There is an old saying that the water ''ain't'' going to clear up until you get the hogs out of the creek. The only way we are going to clear up the water of campaign financing in this country is for those of us who believe that we need to change the method by which we finance campaigns in this country is if we are able to beat back, by voting on the Senate floor, the attempts of those who want to stall, once again, our ability to change this system.

Mr. President, I want to show a chart that describes better than all the words

I can use what is wrong with our campaign financing system.

This is money in politics, an explosion of money in politics, spending on all congressional races, 1976 to 1996. And you say, ''What's happening to this line?'' Money in politics.

I wonder if when George Washington and Mason and Madison and Ben Franklin sat in that little room in Philadelphia and talked about what kind of a constitution they should create for this country, I wonder if they thought that we would get to this kind of situation where a representative democracy would see the election of those representatives part and parcel of a system in which there is an explosion of money and elections all too often become auctions rather than elections. I do not think so.

I do not think this represents the best of democracy. I do not think it represents something that we can be proud of, as those of us who participate. I think we ought to change it.

So the question for me and some others in this Chamber is not whether we address this issue and make some changes, the question is, What kind of changes should we make? The McCain-Feingold bill comes to the floor of the Senate—as I have indicated, I am a cosponsor but I might have written parts of it differently.

As I understand it, the specific McCain-Feingold proposal that is brought to the floor of the Senate now does not contain some of the central portions that I think are necessary in really making progress in reforming our campaign financing system.

For example, we have to, in my judgment, have expenditure limits on campaigns in order to be effective. There is too much money in politics. If we do not put spending limits on campaigns, then we are not going to solve the problem. I understand that the spending limits which were in the McCain-Feingold bill, which were voluntary spending limits, have been removed and we will now have to try to put them back in by amendment.

So the question for the Senate is going to be, Can we attach individual spending limits, State by State, to campaigns and enforce them in some way in this piece of legislation?

Originally, the legislation had what are called voluntary spending limits which had incentives in order to get people to say, ''Yes, we'll accept spending limits.'' And the incentives persuading them to accept spending limits would then impose limits on the campaigns.

It is interesting, the Supreme Court in a case called Buckley versus Valeo ruled by a 5–4 decision that we cannot have spending limits that are enforceable in campaigns. I would like to see the Supreme Court revisit that issue, the 5–4 decision. Everybody has a right to be wrong. When the Supreme Court is wrong, of course, it is the law of the land.

The Supreme Court, in my judgment, was fundamentally wrong here. We really ought to have the Supreme Court review this once again—and I think we reach a different result. But, nonetheless, the result we now have in Buckley versus Valeo says that you cannot have enforceable spending limits. So the attempt has been to provide what are called voluntary spending limits and sufficient incentives in law that would persuade people to abide by and adopt those spending limits.

I think in the coming days it is going to be clear, with respect to the debate in the Senate, the difference between the two groups. I am not talking about Democrats and Republicans; I am talking about two groups of people. There is one group that says, ''Look, things are fine. What do you mean, there's too much money in politics? Too much money spent on Rolaids or Kleenex,'' they will say. ''Gee, we don't have enough money in politics.''

There is another group that said, ''Wait a second.'' I mean, it does not take glasses to see what is going on here. What has happened is an avalanche of money is thrown into this political system, and it is corrupting the system. If we cannot have some spending limits someplace, if we cannot, as a group, decide there is too much money in politics, if we cannot decide that this red line going nearly straight up represents the corrosive influence of money in politics, then we are not going to succeed. Yes, we got the bill to the floor of the Senate, but we will not succeed in solving the campaign finance problem that exists in this country.

So we will see now in the coming weeks, I suppose the coming 2 weeks, perhaps, when this is finally complete. There is a group that says, ''Gee, things are terrific. Let's leave things the way they are. We like money. In fact, the more the merrier.'' They don't say it, but I think they are kind of concocting a golden rule—he who has the gold, rules. The fact is that we have one group that has twice as much as the other group, so they want the rules to admire that and suggest that that is just fine.

I suppose you can make the case that those who do not have as much money would like to put limits on those who do. But you know, the American people are eventually going to rule the day here. The American people are going to make the decision through their representatives here in Congress and through public pressure to say either, ''Yes, we think this is great. We think this flood of money coming into politics is a wonderful thing. It really nurtures our political system,'' or the American people will likely say, as all the polls tell us, by 70 and 80 percent, ''This doesn't make any sense at all. This avalanche of money is hurting our political system.''

We have what is called ''hard money'' and ''soft money'' and contributions on this side and that side. I imagine that people have difficulty understanding ''hard money'' and ''soft money.'' The easy way to understand it, for example, is soft money is the legal form of cheating—cheating, yes—because no one anticipated, with current campaign laws, that the kind of money that is now used called ''soft money'' would be, could be, or should ever be used for purposes it is now being employed to achieve; that is, millions, tens of millions of dollars, yes, by both political parties, tens of millions of dollars thrown into what is called party building. But it is not party building. These are moneys that are spent in a way designed to influence individual elections and designed carefully in ways to avoid it appearing like they are direct expenditures under regulation of the Federal Election Commission.

The corrosive part of the soft money issue is that is money that can be thrown in—it can be by a corporation, labor organization, rich individuals, you name it—it can be thrown into a race under the guise of not part of the hard money contribution, but it can affect that race in a dramatic way. The source of the money is never revealed—secret money out there, never revealed. And you can move the money around three, four different ways to different organizations, and the source of the money is never revealed—half a million dollars here, a million dollars there.

You know who the victims have been of that? We can name some of the victims who at the end of their campaigns, thinking it was them versus another candidate in a contest of ideas in their State, found out it was not that. Yes, that was part of it. Then there are organizations, unnamed and newly named organizations, off to the side, running in with saddlebags full of soft money, the source of which no one would ever disclose, putting advertisements on television, negative, corrosive, ugly advertisements in order to knock one of the candidates out of the race.

That is what this political system has become. If we do not fix it, if we do not address that, shame on us. The American people know it is wrong, and we ought to know it is wrong.

So the question ought not be for anybody in this Chamber whether we address this issue in a thoughtful way and pass some legislation finally to reform the campaign finance system; the question ought to be, how? How do we do it? We have a couple weeks in which this Senate can express its judgment on that issue.

I have great respect for every other Member of this Senate. There are some who stand here today and say they are very concerned about this aspect or that aspect. I have great respect for them. I am not going to suggest they have impure motives. But I am saying that in the strongest possible ways, if they believe that what we ought to do is nothing, if they believe the current system of financing campaigns in this country is good for this country, then they are dreadfully wrong. So we will see in the next couple of weeks.

I just mentioned soft money and independent expenditures. There is another category called issue advertising which is tied in with the same sort of thing—issue advertising.

Let me read from an article out of Rollcall.

While presidential, Senate, and House candidates spent a record $400 million on TV ads last year, more than two dozen organizations dumped an additional $150 million into controversial issue advertising in the 1995–96 cycle . . .

And guess what? What kind of advertising was this? Eighty-one percent of it was negative advertising; 81 percent negative advertising. That is the air pollution in this country that we ought to worry about. We ought to do something about it.

I am not suggesting it is inappropriate to have issue advertising. But we ought to make it all accountable. If you are going to come in and play a role in these campaigns, then tell the American people where you got your money, whose money is it you are spending, and what is the purpose of the expenditure.

Mr. President, we have had a lengthy discussion today and the discussion will go on, I assume, for about 2 weeks, and it will be between those who believe we ought to have reform and those who don't.

Speaker GINGRICH calls for more, not less, campaign cash, in an article in the Washington Post. He represents a group who believe that money is not a problem—we probably need more money in politics, not less. I absolutely disagree with him.

In another article, ''Group launches effort against campaign finance reform bill.'' Some very large influential groups in this country who are deeply involved in issue advertising of the type I just described don't want campaign finance reform. I guess I can understand why, but I think they are wrong.

Mr. President, 45 members of my caucus signed a piece of legislation saying they are prepared to vote for McCain-Feingold; four in the other caucus said the same thing. If we can get a vote, up or down, we are looking for one or two additional Members of the Senate who will decide whether we pass this legislation.

There are those, I suppose, who will say, ''We need more time.'' We have had 6,700 pages of hearing, 3,361 floor speeches—and we can add today's to that, all of this on the issue of campaign finance reform—446 legislative proposals, and 113 votes in the Senate. I don't know of anyone who can credibly say we need more time.

What we need is the nerve and the will to do what is right. I hope we might see that kind of nerve and will in the next couple of weeks.

FAST-TRACK LEGISLATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have been so tempted today, I wanted very much to come and speak about fast track, which the President is asking with respect to trade authority, and I was intending to do that at time when it was appropriate today, but because of the debate on campaign finance reform time was not available for that. I thought about doing it at the end of my remarks on campaign finance reform, but I know that there are those who want to do other things and there is some sort of dispatch for the Senate to adjourn. I will respect that. But I want to say about two paragraphs as I conclude.

I hope to come back on Monday and find some time to discuss President Clinton's proposal to provide fast-track trade authority so he can negotiate additional trade agreements. I am opposed to that, and I am going to resist vigorously trade authority that would provide the President, any President, the opportunity to negotiate new trade agreements until we fix the problems in the old agreement.

Let me leave with a couple of statistics. We now have a pretty good economy, that is true. We tackled the fiscal policy budget deficit. But the other deficit, the trade deficit, is the highest in this country's history.

Every time we negotiate a new trade agreement we seem to lose. We negotiated an agreement with Canada. Our deficit was $13 billion with Canada; now it is double. We negotiated a trade agreement with Mexico. We had a $2 billion surplus; now after the trade agreement we have a $14 billion deficit. We have a $50 to $60 billion trade deficit with Japan, a $40 to $50 billion trade deficit with China. We are up to our neck in trade problems and cannot resolve virtually any of those problems because our trade treaties, first of all, were negotiated inappropriately to provide the kind of sanctions they ought to for those that don't open their markets to American goods. And second, we don't enforce trade treaties that other countries have signed with us.

I want to speak at some great length, I hope on Monday, on this subject. I am not speaking on trade because I am what is called a protectionist, xenophobe, or isolationist. I believe in trade. I believe in free trade. I demand fair trade, and I believe we ought to expand our trade opportunities. But I believe this country ought to, for a change, stand up for its own economic interests and demand that manufacturing and jobs and opportunity exist in this country's future and not trade away those opportunities so that corporations can access dime-an-hour labor by 14-year-old kids working 14 hours a day to ship products to Fargo, ND, or Pittsburgh. That is not free trade. I will talk at some length on Monday about that.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 12 noon, Monday, September 29, 1997.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:45 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 29, 1997, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 26, 1997:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

ARTHUR BIENENSTOCK, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE ERNEST J. MONIZ.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

JOSEPH B. DIAL, OF TEXAS, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 19, 2001. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

JAMES E. HALL, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2002. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

ALPHONSO MALDON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE HERSHEL WAYNE GOBER.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 26, 1997:

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

JEFFREY DAVIDOW, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ROBERT L. MALLETT, OF TEXAS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

W. SCOTT GOULD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

W. SCOTT GOULD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

NANCY DORN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 26, 2002.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

THE JUDICIARY

MARJORIE O. RENDELL, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.

RICHARD A. LAZZARA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING U.S. ARMY RESERVE OFFICER FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 14101, 14315 AND 12203(A):

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES W. COMSTOCK, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANTONIO M. TAGUBA, 0000

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

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN G. MEYER, JR., 0000.
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT L. NABORS, 0000.

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

To be major general

MAJ. GEN. ROBERT G. CLAYPOOL, 0000.

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

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. EARL L. ADAMS, 0000