

of anybody throughout the entire year, and they cannot preempt you. You buy the time, you've got it.

Maybe the broadcaster is in rural West Virginia or Oklahoma and has a radio station or a TV station and is scraping to get by. They are going to get paid the lowest rate they charge on a hot summer night. The broadcaster may think: This is good, we have the new "ER" or some other new show that is really popular, so we can make some money. But they are going to have politicians swamping them saying: Give that time to me.

We passed an enormous subsidy for politicians. It is an enormous advantage for incumbents because incumbents usually outraise their challengers most of the time. We just increased the advantage incumbents have by millions of dollars. Thank you very much. We should pat ourselves on the back: Hey, this is good, and we were able to slide this through. People don't know—they think we are reforming campaigns, and we are giving politicians enormous subsidies and acting as if it is reform, and being proud of it. We are going to slap everybody on the back about our great reform. We did a little nice thing to which nobody paid attention. Politicians, you get the lowest rate of anybody all year long, and you get to use it the night before an election. That is our little gift to ourselves to which nobody paid attention. It is another good reason, in my opinion, that this bill should be defeated.

I look at groups who are active in campaigns, and they will say: You are infringing on our ability to get our message out, to communicate, to run ads, to mention names, vote for, vote against. We are making it very difficult, in some cases illegal, under this bill. It is wrong and unconstitutional. We also greatly increase subsidies for politicians. I think that is absolutely shameful. We should not have done it, but we did it.

While this bill may be an improvement over present law on the whole, it is unconstitutional and it includes an egregious subsidy for politicians. It should be defeated, and I will vote no on this measure when we vote on Monday.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is midway through Friday afternoon. We know most Americans are heading

home from a busy day working and providing for their families. They may be looking forward over the weekend to some of the basketball championships that are going to be played on Saturday and again on Monday evening. They are looking forward to attending services on Sunday and then spending some time with their families.

Then perhaps on Monday, when they go to work, they may hear on the radio or on television that the Senate is involved in what they broadly term "a resolution on the budget." By and large, many are going to wonder exactly what that means and what is its relationship to their lives. They are going to wonder, what is it going to mean to my children's education, what is it going to mean to my parents' prescription drugs, what is it going to mean as far as investing in housing or in law enforcement, or any of the areas of national priority, or what is it going to mean in terms of the security of Medicare and Social Security? They are going to wonder about this.

I heard over the last several months the President of the United States talk about the fact that he is going to urge the Congress to pass a very sizable tax cut. He talks about \$1.6 trillion tax cut. We know the real figures are far in excess of that because they do not include other factors, as others have pointed out in earlier debates. Senator CONRAD has done such a wonderful job not only in educating the Members of the Senate but also in helping the American people understand what is at stake with the President's tax reductions and the real economic impact it will have on the economic stability of our Nation.

People are hearing our President say we can have a very sizable tax cut, and even with that tax cut, still be able to preserve Social Security and Medicare and fulfill the kinds of commitments that were made in the course of the campaign on prescription drugs, on education, on national security and defense.

Citizens will wonder when they hear others speak in the Senate, principally from this side, when the Democrats say we cannot afford it all. They are going to hear those voices and wonder how do we really put all of this into some perspective. They are hard working and this doesn't make a great deal of sense. Maybe there is some sense that the budget resolution will result in an outcome that perhaps, over the course of this week, citizens will think, if I pay careful attention I will better understand.

There are two very obvious conflicting statements we are receiving. One says we can afford the tax cuts. I think the American people are somewhat skeptical of that. They should be.

I remember being here in 1981. I was one of 11 who voted against the Reagan tax cut that had similar kinds of support. As a matter of fact, many of those individuals who have been working on this current tax reduction are

the same people who worked on President Reagan's tax reduction. At that time, we heard it all. It is the same record. I almost believe it's the same speech.

I can hear it then: We can afford to have these major tax cuts. We can afford that and still provide billions and tens of billions in defense, and we are going to meet our national security, and we are going to be able to afford all of this and still see an expanding and growing economy.

Of course, that was not the case. We saw the direct result of those tax cuts when this country went into a deficit of \$4.6 trillion. People's eyes kind of glaze over when we talk about those figures. For the average family, it means they will pay several hundred dollars a year more on their student loan programs because it will be higher interest rates. They will pay several hundred dollars more on their car payments when buying a new car. They will spend several thousand dollars more, if fortunate enough, in purchasing a new home.

That is what happened with the Reagan tax cut. That is the hidden cost that every working family and middle-income family is paying for every single year when we have those very sizable deficits. Those are the facts.

I think they understand it. They understood over the period of the last 8 years that we had the longest period of economic growth and price stability. In my part of the country, in New England, in 1992, we were close to 8 percent unemployment, and we were looking at the future with a great sense of trepidation. There was reduction in types of defense, the real estate market was flat. Many of the innovative and creative computer companies had not worked out. We were wondering what the future would hold.

Then we put in place an economic program, fiscal policy, monetary policy, investment incentives for the private sector, investments in people, and we saw economic progress.

We shouldn't lose track of the fact that the proposal of 1981 was characterized by our current President's father as being voodoo economics. The American people were warned it was voodoo economics. Those are not my words, they were the characterization of President Bush, father of our current President.

Now we have a very similar program. The American people are torn, with all these surpluses they keep reading and hearing about, 80 percent of which are estimated to be coming 3½ to 4 years from now. What family would be betting their own kind of future on what may happen 3½ years from now in terms of their income? But here we are talking about the future of our nation with all of its implications in terms of the economic policy, with what that means, whether we will have jobs, can you afford a home, or student loans. That is what we talk about in terms of economic policy.

We have to ask, as any family would, what does this really mean? We have on the one hand a President who says we can have all of that tax cut and everything is going to be fine. We will be able to invest in education, we can give you that prescription drug program. Don't worry, we will be able to meet our national security even though it is a changing time in national security. We will be able to meet the other kinds of requirements for our country. We can do all of this and preserve Social Security and Medicare, too.

Take a deep breath, Mr. Citizen. I think most Americans will say: Yes, let's take a deep breath.

What does all that have to do with where we are today? This proposal now that is being advanced by the same party, and in many ways, the same leadership—not the President but in the Republican leadership that we will have this next week—is supposedly the blueprint that gives the assurance to the American people that they are going to be able to afford the tax cut and also that they are going to have sufficient resources to do what this President and what the Republican Party have stated is their commitment to do in enhancing education, providing a prescription drug program, and saving Social Security and Medicare. That blueprint is in what we call the budget. That makes sense. People ought to be able to understand that. If we are going to have those very large surpluses and do everything else, we can draw one conclusion; if we are not, we ought to be somewhat more cautious about where we are going in terms of the sizable tax reduction.

I am for a tax reduction, one that is affordable and fair. But that isn't what we are talking about now. We are talking about an excessive one that is unfair. Nonetheless, we are talking about a major tax reduction.

So it is fair for the American people to ask their representatives, as has been asked by a number of our colleagues today, and particularly effectively by my very good friend, the Senator from West Virginia who is presiding, where is the meat in this package? Where are we going to find out what is in this proposal that should be on everybody's desk on a Friday afternoon, when we will be starting debate on it on Monday; where is the budget that will say, OK, if we do the President's tax program, this is what the budget is going to be in every one of these programs—in education, prescription drugs, and Medicare. Where is that piece of paper? Where is it?

It doesn't exist, Mr. President. Therefore, this kind of debate that we are being asked to conduct by the Republican leaders is basically a sham. Do we understand? It is a sham. Why? Because we have no figures. We have the general comments. We have been able to learn a figure here and a figure there, but we have the broadest kinds of figures. Being able to try and understand what is being talked about, we

don't have it. We can't represent in the debate, which is supposed to be about the future of the economic condition of this country, the proposal of the President of the United States—a proposal of billions of dollars, a document that we are unable to have, which is going to give the assurance to the American people what we will be spending to educate their children, or what we will be providing to preserve Social Security or what we will be spending for a prescription drug program. It doesn't exist. It doesn't exist. And, if it did exist, it would have been talked about and referenced by our good Republicans this afternoon when it was challenged by the Senator from West Virginia and a number of our colleagues. It does not exist, Mr. President, in spite of the requests.

There is not a family who would follow these kinds of procedures. I mean if we were looking at an American family and a family budget, could we say any family would say that all we care about is the cost of a new car. We only have to care about that. We have sufficient money to buy a new car. We do not know how we will provide for the other necessities—education for our kids, payments on the house, food on the table. But what we are going to do is, since we know we have the money here to buy the car, that is what we are going to do.

That is what, effectively, is being done with this phony debate on the budget. You are saying you have the downpayment on the tax cut. But you are not saying what you are going to do about your children's education. You are not saying what you are going to do about your children's health. You are not saying what you are going to do about food. Those are the other elements. They do not exist. What family would do that?

If there is not an American family who would do it, why should we? Why should we? Why should we, as representatives of the American family, do it with the Federal budget? That is what we are asking.

Is there an American business that would say: We have the money to buy the furniture. We have it right in our cash account. Let's go out and buy the furniture, even though we are going to have to do something in terms of new machinery, even though we are going to have to do something in terms of research in the future. We don't know what that is going to be, but let's go ahead and spend the money anyways. We don't know, we can't tell you how much of that is going to be for research. We can't even tell you what the rent is going to be for our business. We can't even tell you what advertising is going to be. But we have that money for the furniture. Is there an American business that would do that? No. There is not an American business that would do it. That is what we are being asked to do with this budget. That is why this whole process is so badly flawed.

Members who are interested in preparing amendments are having dif-

ficulty drafting the amendments because we don't know how they fit, this is the core issue. The principal responsibilities that we have on budgetary matters reflect the national priorities for this country. That is what Members of Congress and the Senate are all about, when it comes to budgetary matters: allocating resources on national priorities, that is what it is all about.

We have other responsibilities, as we have seen, trying to deal with the proliferation of money in campaign financing, or we have other functions in terms of educating our constituents. We have other important responsibilities with regard to the judiciary. Yes. But when we are talking about the finances, we are talking about the nation's priorities, and we are talking about allocating resources to reflect the nation's priorities.

The fact is not that money in and of itself is going to solve our problems. We know that is not the case too often. But it is a reflection of what our national priorities are if we allocate resources. If we, for example, fully fund the IDEA, the program to help local communities educate disabled children, which is being funded now at 17 percent—many of us believe that ought to be up to the 40 percent which we represented. We didn't guarantee it to the States, but we represented was going to be our best effort to try to provide the resources to do that. We really made a commitment to the States—more important, to the families—that we were going to do that. And we have left them short.

Is there anyone here this afternoon, anyone left of our Republican colleagues, who will be able to tell us what is going to be in that budget for the IDEA over the next 5 years? How about over the length of this tax cut? That would be pretty interesting, wouldn't it? So families could say: Do we really want to have that much of a tax break, or should we save some of those resources to make sure we are going to provide help and assistance to local communities, local school districts, to provide some relief when they have a particular need with a child who has developmental disabilities, through no fault of their own, and because of those needs and a community's attempt to provide for and mainstream these children?

Mr. President, 15 years ago, over 4.5 million of them were tucked away in closets. Now they are out in the schools. We are trying to meet those needs. We don't know what all those needs are going to be. We cannot say. In some areas, they may have very severe kinds of challenges and have scarce resources, and in other communities they may have fewer challenges and lots of resources. We are trying to see if we cannot provide some minimum to help. Isn't that more important than the tax cut?

Where in the document is it, how much we are going to expend to help

and assist those parents? Where is it? Someone show us, someone show not just Members of the Senate but someone explain it to the people of Massachusetts who think they have a Senator who ought to know that, just like every other State expects their Senators to know it.

But, no, no, we are not going to do that. No, we are not going to. One, we either do not have it, or if we have it, we are not going to give it to you—no. No.

What was the request that was made? What was the request that was made on our side of the aisle by those who are part of the Budget Committee and our Democratic leadership and our representatives on Appropriations, the committees that are going to have important responsibilities on this? Why don't we just wait, wait for just another week, wait for just another 2 weeks or another 3 weeks until we get that budget so the American people will understand and have a full picture of what is going out and what we are going to commit ourselves to and what is going to be left there for tax relief, tax reduction.

What is the answer to that? What is the reason they refuse to do so?

None of us want to be making judgments in terms of motivations. But it seems to me, if I was on the other side and believed deeply that this tax reduction of a monumental and growing size—not just as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, but every publication says it who has been over there, watching the Ways and Means Committee. If they believed in it, they ought to be able to justify it and come out on the floor of the Senate and justify why they believe that is a fair program, and why providing X amount of money is sufficient for the IDEA. They ought to be able to come out here. We ought to be able to debate it.

Will that debate take place? No. No. Why not? If they believed in the program as much as they indicated in their speeches, you would think they would relish that opportunity. Let's educate the American people. Let's take it to the American people and convince them we have the right on our side.

But, no, they are not willing to do that. They are not willing to do it. Instead, we are left completely in the dark, which is not just a disservice to any single Member of the Senate, but is just an absolutely contemptible attitude to the people we represent, a contemptible, arrogant attitude—contemptible, arrogant attitude to the people we represent.

Fairness—supposedly. We are supposed to have a new mood in Washington. We are going to change the rhetoric in Washington. We are going to change the whole parameters of debate and discussion in Washington. It is going to be a new time.

This is the worst of the old times. As a member of the Senate, I cannot think back to a time that there has been a

conscious attempt to keep the Members of this body in the dark on a major kind of policy issue that affects the nation's future in such a basic and tangible way, not a single incident. Maybe it comes to others, maybe it will come to others, but it certainly did not to me.

This is something. I can see people saying: Why are people getting all worked up about this on Friday afternoon?

Why didn't we know this earlier? We didn't know this earlier because we didn't know that was going to be the posture and the position of the Republican leadership earlier. We at least thought we might have the opportunity for just a few days to go through and examine it. But no. We are denied that. That has only become more certain and definite in the most recent hours.

The American people ought to be very wary of what will be happening in this Senate with this debate next week because we are basically failing to meet our responsibilities to them in an extraordinary and important way. Let me give a very brief concrete example of what I am talking about.

As we have seen, there have been bits and pieces of the budget which have been put out. The President has indicated that his budget for prescription drugs will be \$153 billion. We have that figure. If the Congressional Budget Office, joint task, and OMB had taken what the President guaranteed in the Presidential campaign, that would be \$220 billion. This is \$153 billion. With the \$220 billion, they were only going to get to less than a third of all the seniors. What are we going to expect with this lesser figure?

Let me go on to give some concrete examples with the limited information that we have.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that to maintain current Government services—that is effectively to maintain those services that are in effect today—for discretionary spending primarily in education, NIH—it doesn't include Social Security or Medicare—but let's take basic education programs; there would be the prescription drug program—it reports that to maintain those Government services, in the year 2002 it would cost \$665 billion. But the administration proposes only \$660.7 billion, which falls short \$4.3 billion of the CBO's current services figure.

In addition, the administration's discretionary budget includes \$5.6 billion in emergency reserve and \$12 billion in new defense spending. As a result, under the Bush budget, spending on all the nondefense discretionary programs would actually decrease by an average of 4 percent next year, or \$13 billion.

Cuts to individual programs will substantially exceed the 34 percent next year because President Bush finds the dollars to fund proposed increases for some programs—education, NIH, and community health centers—by cutting other existing programs.

Accounting for these proposed discretionary increases means that the administration proposes a 7 percent average cut to unprotected nondefense discretionary programs next year.

What does that mean? Seven percent means: 12 million fewer meals delivered to ill and disabled seniors; 550,000 fewer babies receiving nutritional supplements; 300,000 fewer families assisted with heating costs under LIHEAP, with all of the problems we have had not only in the Northeast, Midwest, and the far West; LIHEAP also helps in the South as well; 300,000 fewer families will be assisted under LIHEAP; 45,000 fewer job opportunities for youth at a time when we need greater skills for young people in order to be a part of the job market.

When I entered the Senate, you worked down at the Quincy Shipyard. Your father and grandfather worked there. You had a high school diploma, a small house, and 3 or 4 weeks off in the summertime. You had a pretty good life at that time. Now everyone who enters the job market has eight jobs. And young people have to have continuing training and education to make sure they have the skills in order to be able to compete. And with close to 400,000 of them dropping out of high school every year, we are cutting back on training and job opportunities for youth; 45,000 fewer people treated for mental illness and substance abuse at a time when we are facing, for example, the kinds of challenges we have seen in our high schools in recent times.

Sure, it is a complex problem and a complex issue. But all you have to do is read that most recent report put out by the Mental Health Institute, and look at the number of troubled young girls in their teens and the challenges they are facing with the explosion that is taking place with their needs; the increasing numbers of suicides by teenagers in our society; the challenges of mental health.

In my own city of Boston, a third of the children who go to school every day come home where there is physical and substance abuse or violence in terms of guns. And they are dropped in the schools. We are trying to provide some help and assistance to them. We don't do a very good job. We have eight behavioral professionals in our Boston school system. They are new and are very good, but eight is not enough. Talk to our superintendent who is making a real difference trying to reach out to these children who are facing some extraordinary pressures.

Just in this current proposal that we know about, there will be 45,000 fewer people receiving help for mental illness; 30,000 fewer homes prepared for low-income families.

Tell that to most of the urban areas.

We see in my part of the country the need for help and assistance on home ownership; 25,000 fewer children immunized; 10,000 fewer National Science Foundation researchers, educators, and

students; 3,000 fewer Federal law enforcement officials; 1,500 fewer air traffic controllers; 30 fewer toxic waste sites cleaned.

That is just a brief snapshot of a number of programs that are targeted to youth or children, or in terms of some of the services that people are expecting that could be reduced or cut under that budget proposal. That is one of the figures that we have.

Because President Bush's budget fails to specify what he would cut, it is impossible to determine which programs would be cut less deeply and which would be cut more severely than this. For each program held harmless, the cuts in remaining programs will exceed 7 percent by that much more.

Are we entitled to know the whole range? Isn't it only responsible, though, that we are able to say, well, we are willing to accept that, or how many hundreds of billions of dollars in terms of tax? Shouldn't that be the nature of the debate? Why do we have to scrounge around and try to get these kinds of figures that are being kept away from us? They are not in any document here. These are the extrapolations based on the Congressional Budget Office of programs in our particular committee jurisdiction, for the most part. And we see what the impact would be. Should or shouldn't we have that debate, whether it is in these areas here or the whole range of different areas of need we have seen in recent times in the areas of education?

I will just take a few more minutes, Mr. President, to look again at the Federal share of education funding. Referring to this chart, funding for early and secondary education has declined since 1980 from 11.9 percent to 8.3 percent in the year 2000. Higher education has seen these reductions. We are going down in terms of the participation. Again, it isn't just money solving all the problems, but there has been a partnership among the Federal, State, and local communities, and our primary responsibility is for those children who are economically disadvantaged.

We said in the early 1960s that for children who were particularly economically disadvantaged, we ought to, as a nation, help local communities. That is basically the Federal involvement in terms of helping local communities. That was what we accepted as part of a national commitment, that we were going to try to provide some help and assistance. And we have seen that go down.

Yet what is happening on the other side of this? We see that in the year 2000 we have 53 million children going to school, and the total number of children going to school is going to effectively double in future years. The number of children who are going to school will double. Are we going to have this kind of a debate on the budget in relation to that?

This chart shows the flow lines, with the growth to 94 million children going

to school as compared to the 53 million children going to school in 2000.

Shouldn't we, if we are going to at least begin to recognize that there is this partnership, say that in those out-years perhaps we ought to—if we are going to have those surpluses; and certainly no one can guarantee it—look at not just what the needs are today, but we ought to be looking down the road in terms of what we are going to do in terms of a national priority?

The chart I was just showing was in relation to elementary and secondary education. What we see with this chart is the corresponding escalation in terms of the total number of children who are going to higher education. That is enormously important in terms of acquiring different kinds of skills so that they are going to be able to be important players in a modern economy. Everyone has understood that for the longest period of time.

We ought to have that debate—whether this budget that we should have next week is going to take into consideration the long-range interests, not just the problem that we have \$130 billion of needs currently in terms of bringing our elementary and secondary schools up to par, in terms of safety and security, and in terms of their ventilation and electronics so that they will be able to have the modern computers. That is \$130 billion and is not even talking about current needs but about future needs.

Shouldn't we have that out here alongside of what is going to be allocated and expended in terms of this tax cut? But, oh, no, we can't have that. We can't have that. We can't wait 2 weeks. We can't wait 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, to be able to get that information out so we can have that informed debate. No, we are not going to do that.

So I join those who have expressed their concern about this process. I had a good opportunity of listening, with great interest, to my friend and colleague from West Virginia this afternoon back in my office. I hope other Members listened to his excellent presentation in outlining the challenges of this moment because he brings to this debate and discussion not only the sweep of history with his own extraordinary career in public service, but he brings to it, in addition, the most exhaustive understanding and awareness in the history of this institution and its development, and even more than all of that—on top of that, his own experience and his understanding of the history—is his love of the institution and his deep commitment to it.

So, Mr. President, when he warns about the real implications for this institution as a servant of the people, it needs to be a warning that is well heeded. And it is not being well heeded. If we are to move ahead the way it has been outlined that we will by the majority leader and the Republican leadership, at the end of next week this will be a lesser institution in terms of representing the people of this country, and that I hope to be able to avoid.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his suggestion?

Mr. KENNEDY. I withhold, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2001, AT 5 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until 5 o'clock p.m. on Monday, April 2, in the year of our Lord, 2001.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:16 p.m., recessed until Monday, April 2, 2001, at 5 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 2001:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. BANKERS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN J. BARRY, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. DORRIS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK J. GALLAGHER, 0000
BRIG. GEN. RONALD M. SEGA, 0000
COL. THOMAS A. DYCHES, 0000
COL. JOHN H. GRUESER, 0000
COL. BRUCE E. HAWLEY, 0000
COL. CHRISTOPHER M. JONIEC, 0000
COL. WILLIAM P. KANE, 0000
COL. MICHAEL K. LYNCH, 0000
COL. CARLOS E. MARTINEZ, 0000
COL. CHARLES W. NEEDLEY, 0000
COL. MARK A. PILLAR, 0000
COL. WILLIAM M. RAJCZAK, 0000
COL. THOMAS M. STOGSDILL, 0000
COL. DALE TIMOTHY WHITE, 0000
COL. FLOYD C. WILLIAMS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARTHA T. RAINVILLE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DENNIS A. HIGDON, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN A. LOVE, 0000
BRIG. GEN. CLARK W. MARTIN, 0000
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL H. TICE, 0000
COL. BOBBY L. BRITTAINE, 0000
COL. CHARLES E. CHINNOCK JR., 0000
COL. JOHN W. CLARK, 0000
COL. ROGER E. COMBS, 0000
COL. JOHN R. CROFT, 0000
COL. JOHN D. DORNAN, 0000
COL. HOWARD M. EDWARDS, 0000
COL. MARY A. EPPS, 0000
COL. HARRY W. FEUCHT JR., 0000
COL. WAYNE A. GREEN, 0000
COL. GERALD E. HARMON, 0000
COL. CLARENCE J. HINDMAN, 0000
COL. HERBERT H. HURST JR., 0000
COL. JEFFREY P. LYON, 0000
COL. JAMES R. MARSHALL, 0000
COL. EDWARD A. MCILHENNY, 0000
COL. EDITH P. MITCHELL, 0000
COL. MARK R. NESS, 0000
COL. RICHARD D. RADTKE, 0000
COL. ALBERT P. RICHARDS JR., 0000
COL. CHARLES E. SAVAGE, 0000
COL. STEVEN C. SPEER, 0000
COL. RICHARD L. TESTA, 0000
COL. FRANK D. TUTOR, 0000
COL. JOSEPH B. VEILLON, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT M. CARROTHERS, 0000