

Not only did the Administration not seek to consult on this important issue before the decision, it delayed action to avoid accountability after the decision. What next? Having ignored North Korea and having given Syria a wink, can we expect the Administration to certify Iran? Don't laugh. That was under consideration. The Administration cannot confirm significant changes in Iran's drug control efforts, but it was prepared to take Iran's word on the matter. It was only when J.C. WATTS and I and several other Members of Congress blew the whistle on this that the idea was dropped. What was going on here? Why all the sneaking around? Iran suggests more cultural exchanges and the Administration plans to certify them as doing the right stuff on drugs. Once again, we are going to use our drug control policy to make gestures to our sworn enemies. What is wrong with this picture? Do these steps, this lack of consultation, suggest a deficit of seriousness on drugs?

There's more. The Administration has also been mounting an effort to deconstruct the annual certification process. With all the misinformation being floated around about that process, it may be hard for the public and members of Congress to get at the facts. Let me just make a couple of points. Certification is about accountability. It is about expecting the Administration and governments in the major drug producing and transiting countries to take drug control seriously. It is about establishing standards to measure that seriousness. It is about expecting the Administration to then report on compliance with those standards to the Congress and the public. Let me note also, that recent and past polls indicate that the public supports tough standards. The Administration, however, is trying to undo this. For an Administration that has a record of avoiding accountability standards, this should come as no surprise. This is yet another area where the Administration is mounting an effort to weaken or disregard performance measures.

But let me continue. On the issues I deal with on the International Drug Caucus, I see an Administration that doesn't follow through. Let me give just one case in point. This concerns nominations. The important post of the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Control remains vacant. We have yet to see a nomination. It has been vacant for many months. The post of Commissioner of Customs remains vacant. On this latter point, however, I am happy to see some movement, at last. Still, that critical post has been vacant for over six months.

I also note that the Office of National Drug Control Policy has recently asked Congress to give them new presidential appointment positions. But the important post of Demand Reduction Deputy has not seen a qualified nominee in

several years. It is vacant. The critical post of Supply Reduction Deputy has been empty since the Administration took office in 1993. These are the two most important posts in that office. Vacant. Unqualified candidates. Inaction. This is the legacy.

The Administration also continues to send mixed signals to our partners in Latin America on drug control. Leaving aside the retreat on certification, the Administration cannot seem to get clear on its priorities. There are a number of examples, but I'll stick to one. In 1994, the Administration almost destroyed one of our most important information-sharing programs with Peru. This program enabled the closing of the drug smuggling air bridge. Congress stepped in to prevent the cutoff of information to this highly effective program.

Today, the major declines in coca cultivation in Peru—almost 45 percent in two years—are directly attributable to that information-sharing program that the Congress rescued. Now, the traffickers are seeking to circumvent that program by flying through Brazil. Brazil is prepared to cooperate, but the Administration cannot get its act together to make this program happen. What's more, I have learned that some in the Administration are once again in the process of considering pulling the plug on this not only in Brazil but in Peru and Colombia. If this happens, we will throw away all our recent gains. If this is not enough, the whole counter-drug program in the region is in disarray. It lacks a coherence or consistent oversight and strategic vision. But this is not the only place we see a lack of comprehensive thinking.

There is a similar problem on our own borders. Over the past few years, I have supported efforts to increase our ability to police our borders. This has meant more funding on the Southwest Border and in Puerto Rico. The problem, however, is that there is no coherent vision coming from the Administration. What I have repeatedly asked for is a more comprehensive concept for the whole southern tier. We keep seeing plans for this place or that place. Now we hear plans about sealing the Southwest Border with technological wonders. We know, however, that the traffickers adjust to our control efforts. Thus, if we focus here, they shift over there. And they can shift faster.

As a recent Christian Science Monitor piece notes, we're seeing Miami Vice two. The traffickers are moving back into the Caribbean and south Florida. We need, therefore, a plan that does not create trafficking opportunities in one area while trying to foreclose them some place else.

But we don't see this. Instead, we see plans that rob Peter to pay Paul. Or we see another version of data slicing that I noted in my earlier remarks. The Administration is now double counting increases in the Border Patrol as contributions to the drug war. While INS

and the Border Patrol have some responsibilities in the drug area, this is not their primary duty. Yet they are counted in drug spending. The primary responsibility at the border falls to U.S. Customs. And what is happening here? The Administration continues to under fund agents, inspectors, and intelligence support on our southern tier. Further, to strengthen the presence on the Southwest Border, the Administration robbed positions in U.S. Customs from Miami and New York and elsewhere. The result? We now see more trafficking in south Florida. It's time to stop this piecemeal approach and develop a comprehensive southern tier strategy. This will require not only more serious thinking but a look at the resources necessary to make our borders more secure. I, for one, will be looking for such an effort.

Problems at our borders and incoherence in thinking in dealing with our international partners are not the limits to the inconsistency we see.

I have been calling on the Administration to offer proposals for how to deal with the problem of international organized crime. A plan for bringing together comprehensive international efforts to disrupt the organizations most responsible for drug trafficking. To date we have seen nothing. The proposals are late. Sound familiar?

From these various accounts, it should be clear that we have a drug policy in name only. What we have is a collection of things with a price tag attached. We do not see accountability. What we do see is increasing drug use among our kids. What we do not have is the coherence Congress has asked for and the public has right to expect. We need better not just more.

With this in mind, I have proposed, separately, several initiatives to improve our drug efforts. I will be following up on those proposals.

I have gone on at this length to make it clear to my colleagues and the public that we need a lot of work on our national drug control strategy. Above all, we need seriousness of purpose and consistent follow through. We need to know where we're going. Otherwise, we will continue to wander around, lost, on roads that take us nowhere.

#### INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1931

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment this afternoon to talk about the pending highway bill and particularly the transit provisions in that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I commend Senator D'AMATO and Senator SARBANES for their work on this initiative. The bill they brought to the Banking

Committee adds immensely to the act we are debating. It provides a critical component to the overall transportation in America, and that component is mass transit. This bill that Senator SARBANES and Senator D'AMATO have worked so hard on would provide \$5 billion, which, over the next 6 years, would accumulate and provide sufficient funding for mass transit throughout the United States.

The legislation recognizes that in many regions of the country, particularly the Northeast where I come from, mass transit is one of the critical elements of our transportation policy. We do not have the space to build more roads. We also are in a congested area of the country in which environmental factors are so critical. Without mass transit we cannot deal with transportation problems, environmental problems, and also the basic needs of the people of my State and my region to be productive citizens.

This is particularly the case when we are talking about reforms we have just undertaken with respect to the welfare system, moving Americans from welfare to work. For many of these Americans, literally, their path to the work site is through mass transit, through buses, through subways. Without these vehicles, without these mechanisms, they cannot become effective participants in our work force. Transit is particularly important to my State of Rhode Island.

Just this morning I had an opportunity to meet with our director of the Rhode Island Transit Authority, Dr. Beverly Scott. She is doing a remarkable job. She impressed upon me again the important role that transit plays in my State. Ridership is up in Rhode Island. We are one of the few States in the country with a statewide system, one system serving the entire State. Last year 19.5 million bus passengers used our rider services. In addition, we had over 450,000 paratransit riders. These are small jitneys that move around the State, many times serving disabled Americans who cannot use the traditional buses that we still have in our fleet. Indeed, 18 percent of the riders of mass transit in Rhode Island are seniors or disabled Americans. These are individuals who cannot avail themselves of the highways through their own vehicles in many cases. They depend upon transit. They depend upon our role here in Washington to adequately fund mass transit throughout America.

We also have, because of our mass transit investments in Rhode Island, done some remarkable things with respect to the environment. It is estimated that the buses of the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority over the past several years have kept about 1.2 million pounds of pollution from entering our system. In doing so, they have allowed us to keep pace, at least, with the demands for a cleaner environment up in Rhode Island. We have to do more, but without mass transit we

would be in a much more perilous situation.

There are those who are arguing with respect to transit that we should move away from traditional formulations of transit policy and start talking about minimum allocations, State by State, which, in effect, would reward certain parts of the country that do not have the history and, indeed I would argue, the strong need for transit services, as we do in the Northeast or in other parts, the older urban parts of America. I think this approach would be wrong. This bill we are considering in effect shapes national transportation policy. As Senators in the National Assembly, we have to recognize our national responsibilities. One responsibility is to continue to support those systems that are so essential to my region of the country, so essential historically.

I was thinking, as I spoke to Dr. Scott, my director of public transportation, that his family goes way back in transit. My grandfather, James J. Monahan, worked for the United Electric Railway System, which was the local transit system. In fact, he started around the turn of the century. Before there were electric railroads, there were horse-drawn rail cars, and he was working on those. We have seen, in my section of the country, this reliance upon transportation for years. We must maintain appropriate funding.

I hope we can do that because I think, if we would try to arbitrarily distort the funding for transit, if we would suddenly yield, not to sensible national transportation policy but simply regional interests, we could undercut something which is very essential, not only to my region but also to the Nation. If we do not have good transit in the Northeast and other parts of the country, we will not make our environmental targets, we will not be able to continue to develop a strong economy, we will not be able to ensure that all of our citizens have access to the job sites, we will not be able, in short, to do what we all want to do—provide for a transportation system that serves all of America.

I should point out, too, that in this debate we have seen changes impacting, through the highway formulas, adversely on many parts of the country. Those parts of the country are most dependent on transit. The idea of reformulating highway policy, which many of us have approached with some sense of cooperation because of our view of the national economy and the national needs, to turn around now and inject strident regionalism into the transit formula would, I think, be a mistake. We cannot, I think, in our position, bear to see some of these changes in the highway position without the confidence that transit funding will be maintained on a reasonable basis and that we will continue to develop and support good transit throughout this country but particularly in those areas that historically have relied upon it.

Mr. President, I hope we could summon not only the wisdom and courage to support this bill coming from the Banking Committee but also to oppose those proposals which would impose a minimum allocation on the States. We have to recognize and support transit as it exists today and develop new starts, for which there is plenty of funding in the proposal that Senator D'AMATO is bringing to the floor to do that. But we cannot, I think, impose some arbitrary constraints on the transit formulation which so far has served us very well.

I hope we can support this amendment from the Banking Committee, oppose the amendment that would distort it dramatically, and in doing so contribute, along with our highway provisions, to sound and very important national transportation policy.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, let me first say I tremendously appreciate the work and the contribution and the support the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, has given to the committee in bringing this amendment to this point. He has been constructive. He has been helpful. I particularly appreciate his efforts as they relate to that part of the program that concentrates primarily on attempting to meet the needs of those people who are trying to get off welfare. We are talking about the people who want to help themselves. He has been a leader in this area. Indeed, we have provided more funds and specifically targeted them to getting transportation for people who otherwise cannot get to work.

Later, I believe a number of our colleagues will be coming to the floor. I am going to ask those who might be listening and/or their staffs, to please, if they have amendments, come on down. Let's deal with them. I believe the Senators from Pennsylvania have an amendment that maybe a great number of colleagues would be willing to support. I know Senator REED would probably be one of the prime sponsors, in terms of enhancing that program, and that is programs to help people to get to work to get off the welfare rolls. So that is a plea I make to them.

At this point, I would like to recognize the outstanding work of Senators ALLARD and GRAMS in relationship to making, I think, an important contribution to this bill in seeking great balance. I believe the distinguished Senator from Colorado has an amendment he would like to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1940 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1931

(Purpose: To make an amendment with respect to fixed guideway modernization)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to call up amendment 1940, the Gramm-Allard amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado, [Mr. ALLARD], for himself and Mr. GRAMS, proposes an amendment numbered 1940 to amendment No. 1931.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 68, line 21, strike "The next" and all that follows through "(7)" on page 70, line 1.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I again thank the chairman of the Banking Committee for his willingness to work with both Senator GRAMS and myself. I think we had a very productive floor debate this morning about the transit needs of the different sectors of this Nation. I think Senator D'AMATO has certainly showed his statesmanship this morning in recognition of the transit needs of the more rapidly growing regions of this Nation, much of which is occurring in the Western United States as well as in the Southern States. States like Colorado are experiencing extraordinary growth, and our citizens are certainly anxious to have a fair return on transit dollars. As the chairman knows, Senator GRAMS and I have filed and discussed an amendment that addresses new dollars that will flow into the New Starts and Fixed Guideway Modernization Programs.

The chairman has agreed to accept some of the fixed guideway language that was included in our amendment. He has offered to work with us further in the conference committee. I now submit the revised language and urge its acceptance. I thank again Chairman D'AMATO for his willingness to ensure high-growth areas that are experiencing problems of congestion and air quality nonattainment shall be recipients of Federal dollars for New Start projects. In addition, we will continue to work with him on the Fixed Guideway Modernization Program to see whether some of the high-growth cities can be eligible for funding on an accelerated basis. I thank the chairman.

Mr. D'AMATO. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I also thank Chairman D'AMATO for working with Senator ALLARD and myself in recognizing that growing mass transit moneys should be more fairly and equitably distributed to the new systems in our country, including Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I represent Minnesota, a State that is growing, and growing in areas where rising populations are basically dictating the needs to resolve traffic congestion through new-start mass transit options. I thank the chairman for his commitment to work with Senator ALLARD and me in the conference and again to make the Fixed Guideway Program more equitable to the new system. I thank the chairman for his acceptance of our fixed guideway lan-

guage in this amendment and for his commitment to work with us to maintain this language in conference, because it is important that a greater portion of the new funding above the current levels, currently \$760 million in 1997, go to these new systems. These are the systems, as we have noted, that are growing the most and growing fast.

I also thank him for this agreement to work with us in conference to help us establish some very significant funding for new starts. I also thank Senator ALLARD for all his work with us on this as well. I thank the Chairman very much for his help and cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, let me say I am deeply appreciative of the work of my colleagues, Senator ALLARD and Senator GRAMS, and for their patience, for their diligence in working on behalf of their constituents and, more importantly, recognizing the need for balance, the need to meet the needs of the high-growth cities in the United States, which they represent, but also recognizing the needs of the older cities, the older transportation hubs, that also need to continue to get adequate funding.

In addition, I am looking forward to working with my colleagues towards addressing the growing needs for mass transit in growing cities such as Minneapolis/St. Paul and Denver. They have unique problems. The problems of attaining the clean air standards certainly are not those just found in the cities of Boston or New York or Philadelphia. Indeed, in areas that we may not have ever considered, these are problems. They are. Cities like these must receive an equitable portion of the New Start funds so they may begin to implement mass transit as a solution of their problems of traffic congestion and air quality. Again, I commend them, and I am committed to working with my colleagues on this issue and on the issues of eligibility for funds under the fixed guideway formula.

Might I also say, I thank again, in all of this, my colleague and friend, the ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator SARBANES, for working to achieve this balance.

Mr. President, I ask acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I just say, I think this is an instance of trying to work through, in a practical and pragmatic way, points that are being made, which the chairman has indicated he is quite prepared to do. So I am prepared to go along and accept the amendment in an effort in part to move this legislation forward and also to indicate that we are trying to be reasonable here. We want to get accomplished a result without departing from the basic structure of ISTEA in some significant way. I think what has been

talked about here sort of puts us on that path. So I support accepting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment No. 1940 is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1940) was agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I urge those Members who have amendments to come to the floor so that we can work on their amendments. This could have been one of the most contentious amendments and, indeed, started out on the very basis that almost no one saw a resolve of it. We can work through these amendments because we are willing to meet and speak to those who want to be heard. But they cannot be heard if they do not come to the floor.

I have asked that my colleagues from Pennsylvania, who have a unique amendment, one that attempts to help accelerate people from welfare into productive jobs, and helps them get to work, come on down and offer their amendment, because at some point in time we are going to move to close this. If they want to object, I am going to ask that they be here to object personally.

So I do not think that this bill is completed, by any stretch of the imagination, but I think we would like to move on it rather than put us in a quorum call and wait. So again, I can only suggest, come on down, offer your amendments, or at least have your staffs meet with our staffs so we can discuss a resolve of this so we can get this important legislation passed.

Mr. President, having nothing further in the way of any kind of productive suggestions at this point in time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment being offered by Senator SPECTER, myself, and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN to the transportation bill before us, the mass transit section.

Over the past several years, when I was in the House and then here in the Senate, on the issue of welfare reform, one of the great concerns I had with putting time limits on welfare and requiring work was the ability of people, particularly in the inner city, urban areas, to be able to find job opportunities. We know that the urban core is not a job center and a lot of urban poor neighborhoods are not economically

well off in the form of job creation. So people who live in these poor urban areas have to have some sort of transportation access to get to the jobs. It has worked in the past fairly well when from the urban neighborhoods outside the center of town—in many cases where the job centers were—people could hop on transportation, a bus, rail, whatever, and go into the downtown area for jobs. That had worked well in the tourism industry, hotel/motel, et cetera. A lot of those jobs are not particularly high skilled because a lot of the urban poor don't have a lot of job skills starting out.

The problem with the current economy is that, in many cities, Philadelphia being one of them, the job creation boom is not taking place in the inner city; it's taking place in suburban corridors. In the case of Philadelphia, it is taking place in what's called the Route 202 corridor. In fact, we are not an anomaly. Two-thirds of all new jobs are being created in the suburbs. So you have a very odd situation happening. You have the dramatic increase in jobs; in fact, there is very low unemployment in most areas of the country. But there is still chronically high unemployment in the inner cities and, as a result of the new job creation happening in the suburbs, no transportation link for people in the urban neighborhoods out to the suburbs. Now, they can get to maybe a train station in the suburbs, or a bus station, as the bus that went into town for the commute comes back out of town. But they can't get from that station to their job, which may be in an industrial park somewhere. So that creates a real problem for the suburban business because the suburban business—and I have talked to a lot of suburban manufacturers who tell me they cannot find workers to get to their job sites.

Yet, we have a great pool of workers in the inner city. So what Senator SPECTER and Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN and I have sponsored is an authorization of \$100 million to be used to encourage and develop reverse commutes. It's a very flexible program. It's a program that says the money is designated by the Secretary, and the Secretary can accept bids from a variety of different regional organizations. The transit organizations, different communities, a whole variety of entities can apply, which will create a tremendous amount of, I believe, and a very positive competition for these dollars and will require innovative plans to get people to the workplace. I believe if we are going to follow through with our commitment of requiring work—and we are reaching that time now with the bill—and stating that there is a 5-year time limit on benefits where people are going to exhaust that 5-year period of time and they are going to lose their cash benefit—and if there is no opportunity for a job in their own neighborhood or there is no opportunity for a job within transit distance, then we are, in a sense, locking these people into a desperate situation.

I don't think that was the intention of the U.S. Senate. It certainly wasn't my intention. So I believe that at least one of the keys to unlocking that situation is to create the opportunity to get out to the suburbs, to get out to where the job growth is occurring, and to provide a transportation network in the area of a reverse commute to do that.

I hope that we will get strong bipartisan support for this initiative. This is something that is essential if we are going to follow through. I speak specifically to the Members on this side of the aisle, many of whom are not big fans of mass transit. But mass transit is the lifeblood for millions of people who live in urban America. Millions of people could not go to work; they can't own cars; they don't have the money; they can't afford it in many of the neighborhoods because of insurance rates and everything else, not just the cost of the car. Mass transit is the only way for these people to get to work, and it is essential for us to provide the link. Particularly in the time that we are going to be forcing people off the welfare rolls, it is essential for us to provide the link for those people to get to the job site. We are doing the right thing with welfare reform. We have done the right thing. But now we need to follow up and make sure that those people who want to work, who have in many cases worked hard to get the skills to get into the job market, now have the access to take those jobs.

So I thank my colleagues, Senator SPECTER, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, and others who are supportive of this amendment. As I said, I hope that we can get very strong bipartisan support for this amendment to be added to the mass transit title. If we do not, then I think we are going to see a lot of big city mayors and a lot of activists descend upon Washington in a couple of years when that 5-year time limit is up, and they are going to say, "You are telling us to cut these people off and there are no jobs where they live, no jobs within commuting distance of where they live, and we can't do it." Welfare reform will have failed. We can't let the transportation issue be the reason for that failure. This money will create incentives for businesses and other people in the suburbs and the city to create a network that doesn't exist now. Once that network is created, then I think we can begin to see, and, in many cases, employers will begin to see, the profitability of having this network in place. I think this money will go a long, long way in inspiring and instituting these kinds of plans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

#### THE NOMINATION OF JAMES C. HORMEL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention the nomination of James C. Hormel to be U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg. As was the case with Dr. Satcher's nomination to be Surgeon General, his nomination has been on the shelf, held by a "hold" at the request of only a few Senators. I will deal shortly with the reasons Jim Hormel's nomination has been stalled. But let me take just a few moments to review the history of the nomination and some of the facts about the nominee and his background.

Last fall, following a hearing on his nomination, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to approve Jim Hormel's nomination by a vote of 16 to 2 at a business meeting on November 4, 1997. In point of fact, for those who were not present at the business meeting, the nomination was deemed a routine matter, and was approved by a voice vote, along with the rest of the committee's agenda of nominations and legislation for that day. No Senator spoke in opposition to the nomination. It was only after the meeting that two Senators asked to be recorded against the nomination, as was their right, which resulted in the final tally. Still, 16 to 2 is a strong endorsement by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar, and, despite the fact that the Senate confirmed every other Foreign Relations Committee nominee before the close of the first session—some 50 nominees in total—Jim Hormel's nomination was left languishing because of "holds" placed on it by a few Senators.

That such a distinguished and qualified nominee would face opposition is, on its face, hard to understand. Let me tell you a little about the Jim Hormel I have known for some 20 years now. He is, first and foremost, a loving and devoted father of 5, and a grandfather of 13. His entire family has been unfailingly supportive of his nomination. Anyone who has met him or knows him knows that he is decent, patient, and a very gentle person.

His professional credentials are equally impressive. He is an accomplished businessman. He serves as chairman of the California investment firm, Equidex, and he serves as a member of the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

He has also spent time as a successful lawyer and educator. He received his J.D. from the University of Chicago, one of our Nation's finest law schools, and he later returned there to serve as dean and assistant dean of students from 1961 to 1967. In addition, he currently serves as a member of the board