

Korea, which have not signed it, will still be able to continue their efforts to acquire chemical weapons. This is obviously true. But the convention, which has been endorsed by 68 countries and will go into effect in April whether or not we have ratified it, will make it more difficult for these states to do so by prohibiting the sale of materials to nonmembers that can be used to make chemical weapons.

In an ideal world, rogue states and terrorist groups would simply give up the use of chemical weapons. But ours is not an ideal world. The Chemical Weapons Convention recognizes that, and so should its opponents. It makes no sense to argue that because a few pariah states refuse to join the convention the United States should line up with them rather than with the rest of the world.

Others have argued that if we ratify the treaty, we will not be able to verify that all members will abide by it. No international agreement, of course, is perfectly verifiable—just as no domestic law is perfectly enforceable. But the treaty sets up a verification system, including international inspections on short notice, that will be far more effective than what we possess today. Moreover, the treaty would strengthen information-sharing among member states. It would increase, not diminish, our understanding of chemical weapons threats.

Some opponents of the treaty claim that it would create yet another costly international bureaucracy and place an onerous regulatory burden on American business. Both assertions are overstated. Our share for administering the treaty would be about \$25 million a year, a truly modest amount in a Federal budget of about \$1.7 trillion. Only about 140 companies would have significant reporting requirements, while some 2,000 others would be asked to fill out a short form.

Moreover, failure to ratify the treaty would actually cost the American chemical industry hundreds of millions of dollars in sales by making United States exporters subject to trade restrictions by convention members. Our joining the convention could help American business—which is why the chemical industry supports ratification.

Other critics assert that the treaty would somehow infringe on our national sovereignty—in particular, the Fourth Amendment ban on unreasonable search and seizure. In fact, it explicitly permits members to abide by their constitutional requirements when providing access to international inspectors. Under the treaty, involuntary inspection of American manufacturing and storage sites would still require legally acquired search warrants. The idea that ratifying the treaty would repeal part of our Bill of Rights is simply wrong.

But by far the most important argument against the treaty is that ratification would somehow undermine our national security.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Let me be blunt: The idea that Ronald Reagan and George Bush would negotiate a treaty detrimental to this nation's security is grotesque.

The United States does not need chemical weapons as a deterrent. Any nation or group contemplating a chemical attack against us must reckon with our overwhelming conventional force and vast nuclear arsenal. Each is more than sufficient to deter a chemical attack.

Chemical weapons are relatively easy to develop and cheap to manufacture, so it is no coincidence that the rogue nations now seeking to build chemical arsenals are economically impoverished and technologically backward. Unlike Iraq or Libya, we don't need such weapons to project our influence. In fact, we are already committed—under a

law signed in 1985 by President Reagan—to destroy our existing chemical weapons stockpile by 2004. We will do this whether or not we ratify the treaty.

What we need is a way to limit the risk that American troops or civilians may someday face a chemical weapons attack. The convention can help do precisely this by controlling the flow of illicit trade materials and by making it easier to marshal international support for the political, diplomatic and economic isolation of countries that refuse to ratify it.

If we fail to ratify the convention, we will not only forgo any influence in the continuing effort against chemical weapons, we will also risk postponing indefinitely any progress on an international ban on the equally dire threat of biological weapons. More generally, we will imperil our leadership in the entire area of nonproliferation perhaps the most vital security issue of the post-cold-war era.

Today we face a monumental choice requiring a bipartisan consensus, just as we did in ratifying the North American Free Trade Act in 1993. Failure to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention would send a message of American retreat from engagement in the world. For this reason—and because our national interest is better served by joining the convention than by lining up with pariah states outside it—I support the treaty and urge my fellow Republicans to do the same.●

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE], from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Board of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], from the Committee on Armed Services, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1997

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9 a.m. on Wednesday, February 26. I further ask that immediately following the prayer, the routine requests through the morning hour be granted and the Senate then resume consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. ENZI. For the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning, the Senate will begin debate on the Feinstein

amendment to the balanced budget resolution, with a vote on or in relation to the Feinstein amendment occurring at 11 a.m. Then Senator TORRICELLI will be recognized to offer an amendment relating to capital budgeting. There is a limitation of 3 hours for debate on that amendment.

I want to remind Senators that under a previous order, Members have until 5 p.m. on Wednesday to offer their amendments to the balanced budget amendment. We appreciate the cooperation of the Democratic leader in working with us for this unanimous-consent agreement outlining the remaining adjustments that will be in order to the constitutional amendment. It is our hope that when we continue to make progress and complete consideration of this important legislation. Also, I want to remind Senators that on Thursday, February 27, His Excellency Eduardo Frei, President of Chile, will address a joint meeting at 10 a.m. All Senators are asked to meet in the Senate Chamber at 9:40 a.m. to proceed as a group to the joint meeting.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. ENZI. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator TORRICELLI, who will be making his initial floor speech, and Senator BENNETT.

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

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I don't mean to intrude upon the Senator from New Jersey, if he is prepared to speak next. I was going to ask unanimous consent for up to 10 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ricardo Velazquez and Cordell Roy be granted floor privileges for the balance of this session.

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

The Senator from Utah is recognized as in morning business.

(The remarks of Mr. BENNETT pertaining to the introduction of S. 357 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. President.

JOURNEY OF GENERATIONS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate for the first

time as a Member of this proud institution, and, indeed, it is an important moment in my life and that of my family.

Although I stand where I know preceding generations have often become legends, I also stand tall because I am standing here today on the shoulders of genuine giants—a tailor and his seamstress wife who walked from their native village in Italy for a boat to New York, a German steelworker who settled his young family in my native New Jersey.

Mr. President, a journey of generations brings me to this moment. I understand that I may be bound to some Members of this Senate by little more than a single common thread. Many families are more powerful, and most biographies are genuinely more compelling. But Providence has chosen what we share this moment to help define the future of our people and the Republic that they have chosen to serve them.

The burden of leadership may be greater on some generations, and perhaps it has been less on others. The only certainty for our time is that it is different. The great debates of this Chamber in other times have been framed by events—the threat of conflict in the time of our fathers, the immediate threat of economic dislocation not so many years ago. Previous generations often read the national agenda simply by the history that was presented to them. The choices were fundamental and they were very clear.

The principal issue of governance before us now is very different. The United States is largely without large-scale military strife. The successive defeats of fascism and communism leave the United States with a relative military advantage that is unprecedented. The greatest economic expansion in history has resulted in a standard of living and a scale of economic activity that was unimaginable only a generation ago. This is not to suggest that either providing for the national defense or building the national economy are complete. The world remains a dangerous place in the age of terrorism, and the blessings of America still elude too many.

But our time is different. We inherit no agenda and few national commitments from which we are not freed by the end of the cold war. This opportunity presents an enormous opening, but has also led to an extraordinary national anxiety. As a nation, we have consumed almost a decade since the cold war has subsided without being clear about what we need to achieve to succeed with the reward of peace.

In our domestic affairs, some view the success of civil rights, the completion of universal education for the construction of a national infrastructure as ends in themselves.

In our family lives, many seem uncertain as to our own objectives as people. The comfort of a home, the completion of an education, seem to bring

neither the security nor the fulfillment that we once envisioned. It is in short, Mr. President, a time of extraordinary anxiety in our affairs. Across the aisles of this Chamber, the conference tables of our businesses and even the living rooms of our homes, there is need for an honest conversation. It is time to ask the most fundamental questions about the objectives of our times and our goals as a people and as individuals.

No one element of this debate is more fundamental than our new national objectives in our relations with other States around the globe. The foreign policy goals of the United States in the next century can best be explained relative to the experience of our own time. For although the 20th century has not yet concluded, it is already possible to predict that despite all the advances of science and culture this time will best be remembered for our inability to manage relations between nations.

Any discussion of our foreign policy objectives, therefore, must simply begin with this simple commitment: the future must simply be different than the past. This century evolved through the lessons of collective security. A series of States with similar interests, political institutions, compatible military capabilities and goals found common cause. The NATO treaty was the best example and remains the foundation of our policy. But the first principal difference we are likely to face in the 21st century is that American security interests are no longer disproportionately European. In a world of global markets and intercontinental weapons, there are no regions of sufficient distance or size that they lack relevance. Treaties which restrict the global scope of our collective security including NATO are simply no longer acceptable. Creating new arrangements tailored to individual crises like the Persian Gulf are too inefficient and insufficient. Leadership requires the adoption of an established global structure of collective security. Whether under the NATO umbrella, under different sponsorship or a structure that is global in scale, collective security for our international security threats remains paramount.

The second defining difference in American foreign policy is recognizing that international conflict on a scale seen in the 20th century must never be allowed to occur again because by definition such conflicts can never be won again. Technological change will place all nations within the range of secondary powers that retain weapons now reserved for more stable nations.

Collective security, therefore, must be designed not only to prevail in conflicts but to avoid their ever occurring by denying capability to certain well-defined governments. These are States which by their systems of government, record of actions or temperament of leadership, should make themselves ineligible to ever possess or attempt to

develop certain weapons. This policy of weapons denial already encompasses technological and trade restrictions. In the future, it must also include covert or overt actions by the United States or now collective international organizations to ensure weapons denial as an assurance of national security.

A third national consideration will involve far more introspection by every American. As a decent people with deep religious traditions, it is time to recognize that technology presents a new moral dilemma. For two centuries Americans witnessed a world of famine and disease. Untold millions suffered and died with little more than passing commentary while we remained reconciled to both our moral principles and international realities by concluding that nature was sometimes cruel and divine actions difficult to comprehend. In critical moments, from the Marshall Plan to the Alliance for Progress, the Nation committed itself to confronting these tragic realities.

During most generations, the national boundaries served to define our sense of moral responsibility. That was all enough. But something has now fundamentally changed. Perhaps it is because global communication now no longer allows us to be shielded from harsh realities. But, indeed, it is even more than that. The world population group now estimates that 35,000 children die from starvation every day, this year an estimated 18 million will contract river blindness, and over 100,000 children will suffer from new cases of polio. No American can feel comfort any longer in reaching conclusions about the inevitability of human suffering. There has been a cure for polio for 40 years. River blindness is treated by medication that costs \$3. The simple truth is that some disease and much human suffering is no longer a question of divine providence or lack of understanding or a failure of technology. Most are the results of a political decision, a judgment to withhold technology, withdraw from efforts to relieve suffering because of shortages of funds or simply because we believe that political boundaries place us at sufficient distance.

Reconciling our beliefs and our actions is no longer a simple affair. Suffering in the world and judgments made by individual Americans and their governments are debate long needed on the floor of our great institutions. Within our own communities, Americans need to decide a new set of national objectives as well.

Americans have learned a lesson from the excesses of Government. Every citizen can recite a list of programs that failed or funds that were wasted. Our generation has concluded that the role of Government needs to be more limited. A previous generation learned from the lessons of child labor, the disabled, the failure to care for the elderly, that Government was sometimes too restricted in its role. Now it

is time for us to decide: Is it too limited or is it too much? It is, indeed, extraordinary that after two centuries of the American experiment we are still debating the appropriate role and scale of the U.S. Government. In our time we must ask both the appropriate range and the scale of Government activities that are needed for our generation.

The answer is likely to be somewhere in between. We must, obviously, be shaped by our own experiences. But I think most Americans will recognize that simply because Government sometimes failed, because we have learned that it cannot do everything, is not a reason to conclude that it can do nothing. We take enormous pride in the fact that America is a place with an unlimited ceiling of opportunity. But all too often we are also learning that the floor of American life is too hard. Because many, or most can succeed is not a reason to turn away from public responsibilities, because some will fail.

We are also learning, for all the lessons of the past which we must remember, they are not instructive of the future. We are living in a different time. Indeed, we are discovering that the economic success of each family, many communities, and many States are now connected in a means that we never would have imagined. We are discovering that the operation of our railroads, our airports, our highways, the education of our children all inevitably will affect the quality of life of our own families.

For two centuries our Federal Government was central to providing the private economy with certain elements that were needed for competitiveness. From inexpensive labor, through our immigration policy, to access to raw materials, competitive taxes, copyright laws, sometimes even direct subsidies, we understood an appropriate role for the U.S. Government in ensuring economic success.

As we now face this debate again in our own time, reaching our own conclusion about the role, size and scale of the Federal Government, perhaps at least this one thing should be recognized as different. As certainly as those before us recognize immigration policy, raw materials, these other elements as central to economic success, education and knowledge is now the fodder of the private economy in our own time. Therefore, as certainly as local governments, as neighborhoods at one time confronted the need for quality schools, high standards and a quality education, now the Nation itself is confronted with this question, because it is no longer good enough to know that education meets standards in our neighborhoods or our towns or even our States. Our States collectively in our Federal system will meet success or failure in whether or not people we don't even know in communities we have never visited in States we hardly know meet those same standards and are competitive.

Second, as a national community, redefining ourselves again, debating the

appropriate role of the Federal Government, we are also faced with the most fundamental of issues that first confronted our Republic. It is the issue of providing security for our communities and our families. It is, in short, assuring domestic order. From longer prison sentences to direct assistance to local police, we have in recent years redefined our Federal system for a larger role because it was necessary to assure the security of our people.

In the future, the Federal Government, as it redefines itself, will also play a larger role in other areas. We have begun to deny parents the ability to flee responsibilities to children by fleeing State jurisdictions. We have begun, indeed, to change Federal laws in relation to access to weapons. Three decades ago, in my State of New Jersey and in many other urban communities, we began to enact gun control laws. But recently, in the city of New York, it was discovered that fully two-thirds of all the weapons now found involved in serious felony crimes were not sold in New York or New Jersey or other States that had gun control laws, but were imported from other States. The Brady bill was an important beginning to assuring that, as a community, while some States did not, fortunately, share in the plague of crime, they nevertheless would begin to exercise responsibility by, through new national laws, beginning to separate criminals from the guns they use.

A third unfinished piece of business in the American social compact also needs to be addressed. It began in this century with labor standards and grew to include Social Security, unemployment insurance and Medicare. Each of those in our social compact was a generational judgment. Now there is a need for another, because that list which began early in the progressive era and expanded through Medicare by way of unemployment and Social Security now leaves us with the question of health care insurance. Before the book is closed on the 20th century, in this great redefining of America's social commitments, surely access to affordable and quality health care needs to be added to the list. It is not a question of the Government supplanting private health care. It is not a question of the loss of private options or the private exercise of talents within the health care field any more so than Medicare meant that doctors were no longer working privately or unemployment insurance meant that private companies no longer managed their own affairs.

But it is a question that what began with our grandparents and our great grandparents in assuring independence in the workplace, the right to bargain for your own wage, your freedom from want for the elderly through Social Security, that movement is not complete and that work is not finished without addressing the reality of 40 million Americans outside of the private health care insurance system, or their

children who come of age without inoculation to disease or, indeed, often are born without access to a health care system for their mothers or in their infancy.

All these are part of expanding our domestic agenda at a time when we redefine the role of Government. I recognize that there are many in this institution, as there are across this country, who would confront these issues differently. But in our time there is a new, greater threat to resolve in these questions. It is on the mantle of bipartisanship, part of the desire to settle all disputes. We are, in this institution and around the country, confusing the desire to end the noise of squabbling, the needless bickering of partisanship, with a new seeming desire of bipartisanship, to end all conflicts together.

This is, Mr. President, in my mind, a new and compelling problem. American democracy is not served best by Democrats and Republicans, or liberals and conservatives, setting aside all their differences. The public believes we are in some new accord in which we have no differences. Democracy is served best by people who do put petty interests aside, who do not argue simply for partisan reasons, who do, indeed, come together in moments of great national crisis, but who, in honesty, come to this floor as they come to their dinner tables and their businesses and their places of work every day in honest disagreement where they have honest difference.

Let us, therefore, debate the question of America's new role in the world with different perspectives. Because they are complex questions and difficult to answer. Let us begin to finally redefine the role of Government in our lives and our economy from our various perspectives, because Americans have different views, and they are difficult and complex questions. But let us not, because we want to end disagreements, where we were sometimes disagreeable, make bipartisanship a goal in and of itself. The goal is to answer the question and to serve our people, no matter the disagreements.

This is, Mr. President, finally, an extraordinary time. None of the problems that I have tried to outline tonight should overwhelm us. None concern me because none are as big as the country we represent or as bold or as talented as the people who live in our generation in this Nation.

This is an extraordinary time, and we are an extraordinary people. Indeed, I would dare to say what probably no other generation ever would have said on the floor of this Senate: That there is no time and no place when it is better to have been alive or to be an American than this moment. We have won the great conflicts in the world that threatened our democracy and the peace. We are the masters of a great new technology that can serve us, our interests and our families. There is a quality of life that awaits us if we learn to manage our affairs, raise the

resources, deal responsibly with our economy and invest in our future.

It is not to say that there will not be difficult days in our own time. There will always be difficult days. But we are a people who managed to carve out a new social order through Social Security and labor rights in the depths of a depression.

We are a people who managed through economic despair to rise to win a great world war.

We are a people who, in the midst of a cold war, conquered space, won the fight for civil rights, even enacted Medicare and began the greatest expansion of education in history.

We are a people who, through difficult times, mastered the moment to achieve great things.

Now, in far better times, though most certainly with some problems in our public and private lives, we are asked to rise again. In this, I have no doubts. Let us find a new role for America in the world where we simply do not respond to events, but help shape them; no longer see our responsibility simply to win international conflicts but to prevent them by negotiating the peace where possible, by taking action to prevent war by military means when necessary.

Let us redefine the role of Government in our lives and our private economy to ensure that it is no more than necessary, but everything that is essential to ensure our competitiveness, our fairness in social justice.

I pledge, Mr. President, in my 6 years in this institution, to simply be guided by this: The words given to me by a friend who came to me knowing that I would rise on this day and remembering that they were once spoken by Edmund Burke in a speech to the Electors of Bristol. He said:

Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment. And he betrays instead of serves you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Mr. President, to the citizens of New Jersey and to this Nation, I promise simply in these years to be guided by my judgment.

Mr. President, I thank you, and I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9 a.m. Wednesday, February 26.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, 1997, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 25, 1997:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WYCHE FOWLER, JR., OF GEORGIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

PRINCETON NATHAN LYMAN, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, VICE DOUGLAS JOSEPH BENNET, JR., RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

ROBERT N. AGEE, 0000
RONALD L. ALBERS, 0000
GEORGE C. ALLEN II, 0000
RICHARD W. ASH, 0000
ROBERT B. BAILEY, 0000
RICHARD E. BAKER, 0000
ROBERT A. BARRON, 0000
GUY O. BILEK, 0000
DAVID A. BRUBAKER, 0000
WILLIAM P. CANAVAN, 0000
JIMMY A. CARRIGAN, 0000
JOHN C. CHASE, 0000
JERE COOK, 0000
ALLEN J. CORSON, 0000
JOHN L. CROMWELL, 0000
CARL C. CUMM, 0000
GREGORY M. CUNNINGHAM, 0000
DOUGLAS K. DAMON, 0000
WILLIAM F. DAVIDSON, 0000
THOMAS J. DEARDORFF, 0000
SCOTT P. DEMING, 0000
ROBERT E. DOEHLING, 0000
JERRY L. DUNNE, 0000
RUFUS L. FORREST, JR., 0000
KENNETH C. FOSTER, 0000
PHILLIP E. GEE, JR., 0000
HEDLEY W.D. GREENE, 0000
THOMAS W. HAM, 0000
BARBARA A. HARKNESS, 0000
THOMAS E. HICKMAN, 0000
PETER K.D. HOCHLA, 0000
HOWARD L. HOGAN, 0000
MARK J. HOWARD, 0000
BENNY A. HUFFMAN, 0000
HERBERT H. HURST, JR., 0000
VINCENT E. JOHNSON, 0000
HAROLD O. KOLB, 0000
THEODORE N. KRAEMER, 0000
BERNARD L. KRING, 0000
THOMAS E. KUPFERER, 0000
ALAN J. LECZAR, 0000
STEPHEN W. LEFEBVRE, 0000
JACOB J. LEISLE, 0000
JOHN A. LEMOND, JR., 0000
ROGER P. LEMPKE, 0000
DUANE J. LODRIGE, 0000
JOSEPH E. LUCAS, 0000
BRENT W. MARLER, 0000
ROBERT E. MATTHEWS, 0000
RICHARD G. MC COLL, 0000
MORRIS E. MCCORMICK, 0000
TERRY R. MCKENNA, 0000
MICHAEL L. MCKINNEY, 0000
MICHAEL J. MELICH, 0000
RONALD O. MONTGOMERY, 0000
GERALD C. OLESEN, 0000
CHARLES M. PALMER, 0000
JAMES M. PERKINS, SR., 0000
GARY A. READ, 0000
DANIEL W. REDLIN, 0000
JAMES R. REED, 0000
WILLIAM J. RINEHART, 0000
JUDITH D. ROANE, 0000
DAVID R. RUDY, 0000
JACK A. RYCHECKY, 0000
EUGENE A. SEVI, 0000
MICHAEL B. SMITH, 0000
PAUL W. SMITH, JR., 0000
JOHN R. SPERLING, 0000
RONALD STANICH, 0000
STEPHAN J. STUBITS, 0000
IRENE L.C. TAYLOR, 0000
STEVEN W. THU, 0000
KIRK J. TYREE, 0000
THOMAS M. VIERZBA, 0000
WILLIAM J. WALTERS, 0000
ROGER L. WARNICK, 0000
OLIVER H. WARREN III, 0000
DAVID L. WEAVER, 0000
RICHARD E. WHALEY, 0000
WILLIAM H. WHITE, 0000
RICHARD C. WORKMAN, 0000
HARRY M. WYATT, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE B. GARRETT, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

VINCENT J. ALBANESE, 0000
MATTHEW C. BROCKWAY, 0000

BRUCE S. BYRNE, 0000
PHILLIP G. CLIBURN, 0000
FRANCISCO E. DE LA ROSA, JR., 0000
JOHN B. DRISCOLL, 0000
PAUL C. DUTTGE III, 0000
JULIE A. ELLIOTT, 0000
DAVID E. GOFF, 0000
ROBERT J. GUARNERI, 0000
DENNIS R. HAIRE, 0000
JAMES P. HILLS, 0000
WILLIAM C. HURST, 0000
BRADFORD M. JONES, 0000
DANIEL K. LINDSEY, 0000
MILTON K. W. LUM, 0000
LYNDA L. MANN, 0000
MICHAEL R. E. O'CARROLL, 0000
TERRY J. OXLEY, 0000
JOHN F. PARKER, 0000
ROBERT A. PETERSON, JR., 0000
FRANK J. POWERS, 0000
WILLIAM R. RADFORD, 0000
FRANK X. RIGGIO, 0000
JAMES P. SEWELL, 0000
TAROLD H. SCOTT, 0000
RICHARD H. STOKES, 0000
DANIEL J. SULLIVAN, 0000
JACKIE L. TALLIAFERRO, 0000
MICHAEL F. TREADWELL, 0000
DAVID E. WILKINSON, 0000
JOSEPH T. WOJTASIK, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JAMES M. CALDWELL, 0000
CRAIG T. CENESKE, 0000
GARRY J. COLLOTON, 0000
RAYMOND P. GOURRE, 0000
ALAN L. NYE, 0000
RICHARD G. POINDESTER, 0000
PAUL M. WARNER, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE U.S. NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant

JASON T. BALTIMORE, 0000
FRANK G. BOWMAN, 0000
SEAN P. HENSELER, 0000
ANGELA S. HOLDER, 0000
ANDRIAN J. MARENGO-ROWE, 0000
ANTHONY J. MAZZEO, 0000

To be ensign

DAVID ABERNATHY, 0000
LEAH AMBERLING, 0000
JOSEPH C. BUTNER, 0000
PHILLIP R. CLEMENT, 0000
J. CRADDOCK, 0000
LANCE B. DETTMAN, 0000
CURTIS D. DEWITT, 0000
TODD A. FAUROT, 0000
BRIAN FITZSIMMONS, 0000
JOHN S. HOLZBAUR, 0000
STEPHEN J. MADDEN, 0000
KELLY R. MITCHELL, 0000
DENNIS S. O'GRADY, 0000
JOSHUA C. RENAGER, 0000
CORY ROSENBERGER, 0000
DEREK SCRAPCHANSKY, 0000
MERRILL T. SWALM, 0000
MICHAEL E. VANHORN, 0000
RICHARD H. WILHELM, 0000
DEVIN P. WILLIAMS, 0000
ALAN R. WING, 0000
MICHAEL B. WITHAM, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICER FOR REAPPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. NAVY FROM THE TEMPORARY DISABILITY RETIRED LIST TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1211:

To be lieutenant

MASKO HASEBE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY AND FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS, VETERINARY CORPS, AND ARMY NURSE CORPS (IDENTIFIED BY AN ASTERISK(*)) UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, 531 AND 3233:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRYANT H. ALDSTADT, 0000
JEFFREY H. ALLAN, 0000
SALLYE J. ALLGOOD, 0000
GERARD P. ANDREWS, 0000
*STEVEN G. ARETZ, 0000
BRETT C. ARMSTRONG, 0000
DAVID A. BAKER, 0000
RODNEY D. BARNES, 0000
LISA M. BECKMANN, 0000
VICKI W. BELCHER, 0000
ANNETTE L. BERGERON, 0000
DEBORAH K. BETTS, 0000
RONALD L. BLAKELY, 0000
PATRICIA L. BOATNER, 0000
WILLIAM H. BOISVERT, 0000