

Capt. Samuel J. Locklear III, 0000
 Capt. Richard J. Mauldin, 0000
 Capt. Alexander A. Miller, 0000
 Capt. Mark R. Milliken, 0000
 Capt. Christopher M. Moe, 0000
 Capt. Matthew G. Moffit, 0000
 Capt. Michael P. Nowakowski, 0000
 Capt. Stephen R. Pietropaoli, 0000
 Capt. Paul J. Ryan, 0000
 Capt. Michael A. Sharp, 0000
 Capt. Vinson E. Smith, 0000
 Capt. Harold D. Starling II, 0000
 Capt. James Stavridis, 0000
 Capt. Paul E. Sullivan, 0000
 Capt. Michael C. Tracy, 0000
 Capt. Miles B. Wachendorf, 0000
 Capt. John J. Waickwicz, 0000
 Capt. Anthony L. Winns, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Joseph W. Dyer, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John B. Nathman, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Paul G. Gaffney II, 0000

The following named officer for appointment as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5044:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Michael J. Williams, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Carlton W. Fulford, Jr., 0000

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS of the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning Catherine T. Bacon and ending Karin G. Murphy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 6, 2000.

Air Force nominations beginning Ronald A. Gregory and ending Melody A. Warren, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Philip W. Hill and ending Joseph F. Hannon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Ronald J. Buchholz and ending *Jean M. Davis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Jack R. Christensen and ending Daniel J. Travers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Brent M. Boyles and ending Frank J. Toderico, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 6, 2000.

Army nominations beginning *Robin M. Adamsccallum and ending Esmeraldo Zarzabal, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 6, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Richard A. Gaydo and ending John E. Zydron, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Army nomination of Thomas A. Kolditz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Army nominations beginning Karen A. Dixon and ending Jesse J. Rose, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Navy nomination of James R. Lake, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 11, 2000.

Navy nomination of Robert E. Davis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Navy nominations beginning Lawrence J. Chick and ending James R. Wimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Navy nomination of Ray A. Stapf, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 17, 2000.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey M. Armstrong, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Navy nomination of Billy J. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Navy nominations beginning Aurora S. Abalos and ending Jerry L. Zumbro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Dennis J. Allston and ending David L. Stokes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2000.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Arthur J. Athens and ending Marc A. Workman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 6, 2000.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Tray J. Ardesse and ending Barian A. Woodward, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 6, 2000.

Marine Corps nomination of John M. Dunn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 14, 2000.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Paul C. Huck, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

John W. Darrah, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Joan Humphrey Lefkow, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

George Z. Singal, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 2792. A bill to provide that land which is owned by the Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Tribe may be leased or transferred by the Tribe without further approval by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2793. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen the limitation on holding and transfer of broadcast licenses to foreign persons, and to apply a similar limitation to holding and transfer of other telecommunications media by or to foreign governments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 2794. A bill to provide for a temporary Federal district judgeship for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2795. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326-A-1, 326-A-3, 326-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 2796. A bill to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. MACK):

S. 2797. A bill to authorize a comprehensive Everglades restoration plan; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALLARD:

S. 2798. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require periodic cost-of-living adjustments to the amount of deposit insurance coverage available under that Act; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2799. A bill to allow a deduction for Federal, State, and local taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, or other motor fuel purchased by consumers between July 1, 2000, and December 31, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2800. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish an integrated environmental reporting system; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 2801. A bill to prohibit funding of the negotiation of the move of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States until the Secretary of State has required the divestiture of property purchased by the Xinhua News Agency in violation of the Foreign Missions Act; read the first time.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 2802. A bill to amend the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 to add White Earth Tribal and Community College to the list of 1994 Institutions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. BREAUX):

S. Res. 328. A resolution to commend and congratulate the Louisiana State University Tigers on winning the 2000 College World Series; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. INOUE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2793. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen the limitation on holding and transfer of broadcast licenses to foreign persons, and to apply a similar limitation to holding and transfer of other telecommunications media by or to foreign governments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

FOREIGN GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in Saturday's Washington Post business section there is a headline story: German Phone Giant Seeks U.S. Firm. The concluding paragraph:

But Hedberg stressed that a joint venture will not, under any circumstances, be considered as the means of crafting an offering for multinationals: Deutsche Telekom wants full control of whatever course it pursues.

Accordingly, on behalf of Senators INOUE, ROCKEFELLER, DORGAN, KERRY, and myself, we introduce legislation to clarify the rules governing the takeover of U.S. telecommunications providers by overseas companies owned by foreign governments. The original rules in this area were established by

statute in the 1930's, and while the law has not changed, the FCC's interpretation of this statute has.

It is time to revisit this matter to ensure that current policy is consistent with efforts to promote vigorous domestic competition, maintain a secure communications system for National Security while meeting our International Trade Obligations.

The statute expressly prohibits the transfer of a license to any corporation owned 25 percent or more by a foreign government, but allows the FCC to waive this prohibition if doing so would be in the public interest. Unfortunately, the FCC in previous rule-making has found that the public interest is satisfied solely on the basis of whether the foreign government owned company is based in a WTO country. If the country is a member of the WTO, the FCC assumes that the public interest standard has been met.

The legislation we introduce today will bar outright the transfer or issuance of telecommunications licenses to providers who are more than 25 percent owned by a foreign government. We would not be alone in taking this step. Governments across the globe have prevented government owned telecommunications providers from purchasing assets in their countries. In the last month, the Spanish government prevented KPN, the Dutch provider, from purchasing Telefónica de España because of the Netherlands government's stake in KPN. They were not alone; the Italian and Hong Kong governments have recently thwarted takeover attempts by Deutsche Telekom, of Telecom Italia, and Singapore Tel, of Hong Kong Telecom, for just such reasons.

Recent comments by Deutsche Telekom are particularly disturbing. During a recent press conference in New York, DT's CEO, Rom Sommer, stated "that the market cap of Deutsche Telekom today vs. any American potential acquisition candidate means that nobody is out of reach." DT is approximately 59 percent government owned, has approximately 100 million euros in cash and operates essentially from a protected home market. NTT, the Japanese Government owned provider and France Telecom, the French Government owned provider are similarly situated.

Since 1984, U.S. telecommunications policy has encouraged vigorous domestic competition. The modified final judgment and the 1996 Telecommunications Act are key examples of our efforts in this area. While our efforts to foster competition have benefited consumers, these efforts have depressed the earnings and stock prices of U.S. domestic providers.

But in "Promoting competition" here at home we may be facilitating the ease by which foreign protected players may emerge with key U.S. as-

sets. So for example, regulated European monopolists Deutsche Telekom and France Telecom, both majority foreign government owned—and subject to considerably less domestic competition, are reportedly eyeing U.S. companies.

For more than fifty years, U.S. international trade policy has encouraged governments to separate themselves from the private or commercial sector. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the U.S. Government encouraged various privatizations of foreign government-owned commercial ventures.

With the end of the Cold War and the rise of global capitalism, we can justifiably claim an enormous amount of success in these efforts. Unfortunately, these efforts are far from complete. Around the globe, some of the world's most important sectors remain shackled with government-owned competitors. These government owned companies distort competition and undermine the concept of private capitalism.

To allow these government-owned entities to purchase U.S.-based assets would undermine longstanding and successful U.S. policy. Moreover, allowing these competitors into the United States could potentially undercut our efforts to ensure competition in our domestic telecommunications market and in markets abroad.

Government ownership of commercial assets results in significant marketplace distortion. Companies owned by governments have access to capital, capital markets and interest rates on more favorable terms than companies not affiliated with national governments. Many lenders may assume, correctly, that individual governments would not allow these companies to fail.

In addition, companies competing with these providers may suffer from increased costs as a result of the entrance of such providers into the market. Lenders may conclude that the difficulty in competing with a government-owned company will increase the likelihood of failure. As a result, the entrance of a government supported provider into a market raises troubling anti-competitive issues. Many of these anti-competitive effects can be relieved merely by the elimination of government-owned stakes.

Finally, with regard to foreign markets, it is troubling to permit companies to be regulated by the governments that own them. While there is little we can do to effect this situation, we can take care to see that it is not exacerbated. These companies may use profits from these anticompetitive markets to unfairly subsidize U.S. operations.

I must raise the national security concerns that trouble me greatly. We can all agree that telecommunications services are important for national security concerns. To permit a foreign