

new teachers would give us a few additional teachers per school district—not per school, per school district. We have school districts in Utah that have 100,000 students in them. We would get a few additional teachers for each school district in the State of Utah.

The thing I am afraid of is that with even one additional teacher would come a whole host of Federal controls, a whole host of Federal requirements. As I have said on the floor before, I was lured back into public life, away from my business career, when I was asked to serve as chairman of the Strategic Planning Commission for the Utah State school board. I found out the degree to which the Federal Government controls local decisions. The Federal Government puts up 6 percent of the money, but controls 60 percent of the decisions. I didn't like that when I had nothing to do with elective politics, when I was just serving a public service responsibility trying to improve education. I don't like it now, when I am in a policy position. I don't think it is sound policy.

I think you are going to see the same kind of thing apply to this suggestion from "Gore-Lieberman, Inc." that says there will be preschool available to all 4-year-olds. I think the process would be that the Federal Government might put up 6 percent of the money and make 60 percent or more of the decisions. I am guessing because we don't have any of the specifics.

Let me leave the education issue and make one final observation in response to the comments of the senior Senator from Texas. He talked about tax cuts and how, in fact, they benefited people other than the rich.

Let me give, if I may, briefly, my own experience. This is not theoretical. This is not out of some think tank. This is not some group of academics. This is a real experience of a real person in real life.

It was in 1984 that I received a phone call from a friend of mine in Salt Lake City. At the time I was living in California. I was asked: Would you come to Salt Lake and consult with us as we try to start a little business?

At the time I flew to Salt Lake to sit down with those people to talk about that business, they had four full-time employees. They were literally operating out of the basement of the man who had the business card that said he was the president of that company—a grandiose title, a lot of dreams, and four people. Mr. President, 1984 is smack in the middle of what we have heard some people call "the decade of greed," because that was the period of time when the top marginal tax rate was 28 percent. And that is terrible, some people said, because the rich are getting by only having to pay 28 percent on their income.

Well, I moved to Utah. I became the president of that company. We grew that company through the decade of greed with internally generated funds. The reason we were able to grow that

company with internally generated funds is because we filed as an S corporation under the tax law, which meant our top tax rate was 28 percent. That meant for every dollar we earned trying to get that company going, we could keep 72 cents to fund its growth.

The company today has over 4,000 employees, 1,000 times what it had when it was founded. The company pays millions of dollars today in corporate income tax. The suppliers that supply goods to that company pay millions of dollars in corporate income taxes. Those 4,000 employees of the company pay millions of dollars in income tax. If you will, that company is making its significant contribution to today's surpluses as those millions and millions of dollars come into the Federal Treasury.

If the top corporate tax rate, top effective tax rate, had been 39.6 percent, as it is today, instead of 28 percent, I can tell you from firsthand knowledge that we could not have grown that company in that atmosphere. Instead of keeping 72 cents out of every dollar we made in order to grow the company, if we had only been able to keep 60, that extra 12-cent difference would have sunk us. I know. I sweat over the books. I worried about meeting payroll. I worried about cash-flow.

It is the harvest of the seeds that were planted in the decade of greed that are now producing the tremendous income that is coming into this economy. Look at the companies that have built over time and ask how many of them were started in the period when the tax rate was lower and paid S chapter funds.

When I first came to the Senate, I tried to explain how all this worked. I asked the question on the Senate floor: Is there anybody here who understands what a K-1 is? I asked the question when the chairman of the Budget Committee at the time was on the floor. He was debating the tax structure. He had no idea what a K-1 was. I asked others in my own party: Does anybody know what a K-1 is? They had no idea. They knew what a W-2 was. That is the form that indicates your wages. But they didn't know what a K-1 was.

A K-1 is the tax form that is filed that tells you what percentage of your income has to be paid on your individual income tax because it is a flowthrough in an S corporation structure.

Most entrepreneurs all start out in that structure, and most Americans have no understanding of how it works. That is the area where the high marginal tax rates bite, and that is the area where the entrepreneur feels it. Just because there is a tiny percentage of the population who understands, it doesn't mean that it is a tiny percentage of the population who pays those taxes.

The argument being made by the Senator from Texas is a correct one. We should recognize that in America the economy and our place in the econ-

omy is not static. We are fluid, all of us. We move up and down. There have been times when I have been in the top 1 percent and I have paid millions of dollars in taxes. There have been times in my life in my entrepreneurial cycle when I have been in the bottom 1 percent and paid no taxes. It is the opportunity to move from the bottom 1 percent to the top 1 percent that motivates all Americans. It is the tax burden the Senator from Texas was talking about that de-motivates the Americans who want to make that move.

Ultimately, it is the revenue that comes from Americans who take those risks and make those moves that gives us the budget surplus.

I close with an observation. It came from another politician who made it very clear. He said: We must remember, money does not come from the budget. Money comes from the people. Money comes from the economy.

If we assume that money comes from the budget and is therefore ours to spend, we make a serious mistake. As long as we remember that money comes from the people, we will make intelligent decisions as to how we treat the people's money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my assistant leader if I might have 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Ten minutes will be fine.

CHOICES FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the assistant leader for the time.

I was very interested in hearing the Senator from Utah talk both about the economy and about education. I may never have been in quite that high an income bracket as he was, but I think I have a view that I learned growing up as a child of an immigrant family on my mother's side, a first-generation American who had to go to public schools.

I know the assistant leader has a major story to tell. I think it is very important that we consider that when we are on the floor. We ought to be fighting for the people who really need to make sure they have the economic opportunity; and everything that we do, we should keep those working families in mind because I think that the people at the top 1 percent are OK. In fact, many of them live in my State and they are telling me: Senator, we don't want a great big, irresponsible tax cut. We are doing great. We want to make sure, in fact, that the rest of America can come along. I thank them for that progressive position.

I think this Presidential race presents the starkest choice when it comes to our economy, and the good news is we have history to prove who succeeded on this economy and who has failed miserably.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator talked about tax cuts. You are aware, are you not, that the Vice President and the minority, the Senate Democrats, pushed very hard for tax cuts—for example, a tax cut to allow parents to deduct \$10,000 a year to send their child to school?

Mrs. BOXER. To college, absolutely.

Mr. REID. Yes. Also, the Senator has worked since she has been in the Congress on afterschool programs and on child care. The Senator is aware that, again, Vice President GORE and the Democrats in the Senate have pushed for making sure that people who have to work have some help taxwise with child care.

Mrs. BOXER. I think one of the biggest differences in the Presidential race, which is mirrored on the floor of the Senate as we debate tax legislation, is the fact that in Vice President GORE's plan it is the middle class who will get the breaks; in Governor Bush's plan, it is the very top 1 percent.

I want to be specific because I think people are tired of hearing that, and they don't really know exactly what we are talking about. Under Governor Bush's plan, if you earn over \$350,000 a year, you get back \$50,000 a year. You get back \$50,000 a year. That is more than three full-time minimum wage jobs, I say to my friend. If under Governor Bush's plan you earn \$30,000 a year, you get back about \$200 a year. So I think my friend is right to point out that the kind of tax cuts Vice President GORE has in his plan, the kind of tax cuts that we stand here and fight for, would be for those in the middle class who really need to have the help.

I think that tax deduction for tuition is very important because the cost of college is going up enormously.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator also yield? I will make sure she has adequate time for her statement.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. Has the Senator noticed what happened on the floor in the last couple of days? An independent group, the Rand Corporation, that doesn't have a political bone in its body—it is independent; it is bipartisan; it is fair; and it has been around for a long time. The Senator from California is aware that, in effect, the Rand Corporation's independent report came out yesterday and said the things Governor Bush has been saying about education in Texas are wrong, not true, misleading. The children in Texas, in fact, aren't doing any better than the children in other places. They are doing worse. Has the Senator noticed those statements from the other side in trying to explain education?

Mrs. BOXER. I have.

Mr. REID. Today, I got up and read the newspaper and the American Academy of Actuaries—another group similar to the Rand Corporation—which also is not political, has said that what Governor Bush has been saying about his tax plan, his dream for this coun-

try, is flawed; it would bankrupt the country. In the last 2 days, there were two blockbuster reports, from the Rand Corporation and the American Academy of Actuaries, which say what Governor Bush said is wrong about education and that his tax plan would bankrupt the country.

Mrs. BOXER. I am aware of those reports, and I am aware of yet another report that came out in the last few days as well. Another independent, nonpartisan report says Texas is 48th in ranking as far as a good place to raise a child. Only two States were worse than Texas in terms of raising a child.

I say to my friend that I don't really know why we are in session now. We should have finished our work a long time ago. As long as we are in session, I intend, on behalf of the people I represent, to come down to this floor and make sure the folks in the country understand the choices they are facing, both in the Presidential election and in the congressional elections.

When our friend from Utah comes and talks about the economy and says, amazingly, the reason we are doing well in this economy is because of what happened 20 years ago, I have to scratch my head and say this is back to the future, folks, back to the future. He is citing things that happened 20 years ago.

I want to cite what happened when then-President Bush in the 1980s went to Japan. He was there to beg for guidance on what to do about our economy, which was failing. People had no hope. They were afraid. The recession was taking hold. Things could not have been worse. Deficits were as far as the eye could see. He went to Japan and said: Please, sir, tell me what you are doing.

Well, the answer was right here in America: faith in the entrepreneurship of our people, faith in our children, investing in their education, and the guts to cut this deficit, to make the hard choices that President Clinton and Vice President GORE made. We were proud to stand with them and we saw AL GORE cast the tie-breaking vote. So our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to go back 20 years. That is similar to saying if you had a disease 20 years ago and you took something for it and it didn't work, but something else in the nineties worked, you are giving credit to that medicine.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator and I were in the Congress in 1993 when not a single Republican in the House or a single Republican in the Senate voted for President Clinton's Budget Deficit Reduction Act. The Senator remembers that.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator remember listening to Senator WAYNE ALLARD, then a Representative, saying: "In summary, the plan has a fatal flaw; it does not reduce the deficit."

Mrs. BOXER. I remember that.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator remember Senator CONRAD BURNS saying: "So we are still going to pile up some more debt, but most of all we are going to cost jobs in this country."

Mrs. BOXER. I remember that, and I remember serving on the Budget Committee and listening to these remarks in the committee by Senator PHIL GRAMM from Texas predicting the worst. What did he say?

Mr. REID. Senator GRAMM said: "This program is going to make the economy weaker. Hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their jobs as a result of this program."

He said: "I believe hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose jobs as a result of this program. I believe Bill Clinton will be one of these people."

Mrs. BOXER. How about 22 million new jobs instead of 100,000 lost jobs?

Mr. REID. The Senator knows that a majority of those jobs are high-wage jobs. As far as the deficit they talked about—how this deficit was going to be exploding—\$300 billion a year in deficit, and it was masked because there was about \$100 billion a year we used to offset the debt, which would have been really \$400 billion.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. We have a \$260 billion surplus now. I say to my friend, you know what they are saying. I was on a little debate on public television with some of them. They are scripted. I didn't realize it—I said you got this from Frank Luntz, and I didn't realize he was up in the room and he briefed them beforehand.

Mrs. BOXER. He is a Republican pollster.

Mr. REID. I am sorry I didn't mention that he is a Republican pollster. He scripts them. They are saying the Republican majority has put this economy on the road to recovery even though not a single one of them had the nerve to vote with the Democrats to get the economy on the right track.

I appreciate very much the Senator from California. I have so much admiration for the Senator from California because she represents a country, as far as most of the Senators are concerned. She represents 35 million people. I think what you say we should listen to because you have seen the economy in California reverse itself.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. The economy in California was just on its knees; it was so bad when Bill Clinton and AL GORE took over. I remember being on an airplane talking to Leon Panetta, the then-budget adviser to President Clinton. And we were looking at every avenue to bring hope to the people. One of the things they did was invest in defense technology. We had the Technology Reinvestment Act. We did so many things to bring this country back. That is why I wonder why the Bush camp isn't ahead in California because they have spent \$1 million practically every week—if not more—bashing AL GORE. People remember, I say

to my friend. We were in a horrible situation.

I was an economics major in college, which doesn't qualify me for that so much. But I do know something about Economics 101. It is pretty simple. You don't give a big massive tax cut in a time when the economy is running strong.

We have been joined by our friend from New Jersey who ran an extraordinarily successful business and came here. We are going to miss him so much. He knows because it is so clear that you don't give the stimulus with tax cuts to wealthiest people in the middle of a prosperous time. You don't do that. You will only then add to inflation, which will lead to higher interest rates, which will then turn around and make it more expensive for people to buy a home, to send their kids to college, or to buy cars. As sure as you can bet on it, people will start retrenching, and it will lead to a recessionary atmosphere.

We know the George W. Bush plan is wrong—not because we are talking about it from an academic point of view but the fact is we lived through the trickle-down economics. We lived through that decade. Oh, you could go back and find some quotes from those trickle-down big tax cuts to the wealthy. What were the wealthy going to do? They were going to invest in the businesses here and create jobs. Let me tell you that didn't happen. A lot of that money went offshore. The bottom line is we got into big trouble. While our Republican friends were talking about a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, guess what we did. We balanced the budget without one of their votes.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator remembers that the Senator from California and I sponsored our own constitutional amendment to balance the budget. Does she remember that? We wanted to exclude the surpluses from Social Security, but they wouldn't vote with us.

Mrs. BOXER. That is right. We wanted to protect Social Security. They did not want to go that way, which really led me to Social Security.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California be recognized for 5 minutes. It is my understanding we would have 10 minutes remaining after that. Is that right?

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey takes the floor, he is a person who came to the Senate with wealth. He created it himself. He knows what it means to be an entrepreneur. Yet he has been someone who has fought for the working men and women of this country for his entire 18 years in the Senate. He recognizes that the business community needs direction to try to do that. There

has been nobody in the Senate that has been more for the working men and women of this country than FRANK LAUTENBERG. When he speaks on an economic issue, we should listen.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator LAUTENBERG has been my real chairman of the Budget Committee. Senator DOMENICI is the official chairman. But I always call Senator LAUTENBERG my chairman because he speaks for me. He has incredible experience on growing a business that turns into a mega business with his compassion and his caring about his employees and people who work for a living. My friend helped on the issue of Social Security. We tried to protect Social Security and set aside that surplus in a lockbox, and we finally made it happen.

I want to say again, if we had followed Governor Bush on Social Security, he promised a trillion dollars to the seniors, and he promised the same trillion dollars to the young people, telling them they could have their private stock market accounts.

The other thing I didn't mention today is I used to be a stockbroker after I graduated from college with my degree in economics. It was a long time ago. But I have seen the market go up, and I have seen the smiles on the faces of the people who entrusted me with their investments. I have seen the market go down.

I think what we need to keep in mind as we talk about privatization of Social Security is this: If you happen to retire on a day when your stock market funds are turned into an annuity and prices are high, you are doing great. But with a volatile stock market that can go down 400 points in one day, and that happens to be your day, or within the days of the month that you are going to turn that stock market fund into an annuity, you are going to find yourself in deep trouble.

That is another reason why AL GORE makes so much sense because he is saying save Social Security; keep it the foundation of the house. And if you want to do a voluntary stock market investment on top of your Social Security foundation, that is fine.

My friends, that makes sense. It is conservative. It isn't a river boat gamble. It is another great issue at stake. Great issues are at stake in this election. It is an exciting election. It is not an election between two people who agree on everything. They do not agree. We have a Republican candidate who wants to go back to the 1980s with trickle-down economics of the past, with small investments in education.

I will end my remarks with education because the Senator from Utah said there is a big difference between Republicans and Democrats. He said Democrats want the Federal Government to tell the local school districts what to do. That is incorrect. Every single program that we support dealing with school construction, dealing with smaller class sizes, dealing with after school, dealing with high tech in the

schools—those are all options the school districts can take advantage of if they so choose. There is no program on this side of the aisle, or any in AL GORE's portfolio, that says that any local school district has to take these funds. I think that is key.

It goes back to Dwight David Eisenhower, whom I always quote, because he said you can't really be a strong country and you can't be secure unless you have an educated workforce. This was a Republican President. I liked Ike. My family liked Ike. One of the reasons they liked Ike was because he said that educating our children was a national priority and the Federal Government shouldn't just say: Here, States; take a whole lot of money and do what you want. He started the National Defense Education Act. That wasn't a blank check to the States. It was clearly for a purpose, and the purpose was to make sure that our teachers knew math and knew science and could teach math and science.

We know if you follow the Dwight Eisenhower kind of system that we need to look at our school districts and say: What do you need help with? Can we help you? We have the resources thanks to the great stewardship of the Clinton/Gore team. We have the great stewardship of the economy. We can invest some money.

Do you know what they told us? We need to help with the hiring of teachers. We need school construction. We need afterschool funds so our kids can learn after school. And the Democrats responded.

The big fight at the end of this year is over a lot of those issues. We stand with the children; we stand with the families; and we stand with the seniors against the HMOs. That will be a big issue in the last few days. Are we just going to do giveaways to the HMOs and keep letting them drop the seniors out of Medicare? We on this side of the aisle and Vice President GORE are ready to stand up to the HMOs. We are ready to stand up to the tobacco companies. We are ready to stand up for our children. In the waning days, I think these issues will play themselves out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I say to Senator BOXER and Senator REID, thank you for your comments, but, more than that, for our ability to work together to try to take care of our citizens as we believe they would want, to look at the issues fairly and squarely, and not spend as much time dancing around the truth and around the issues, as often goes on here. I thank the Senator, and I will send my thanks to Senator REID. I will miss working with both of you and colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I am particularly grateful to the occupant of the chair, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works

Committee, who, although we had some disagreements in terms of particular policies, always tried to work

them out. I appreciate that balanced view, even though we didn't win as many as I wanted to.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2000

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, October 27. I further ask consent that on Friday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BROWNBAC. For the information all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the tax legislation tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. Debate is expected to take place throughout the morning with a vote expected in the early afternoon. The Senate is also expected to have a vote on the motion to proceed to the conference report to accompany the D.C. appropriations bill, which contains the Commerce-State-Justice language. After a short period for debate, a vote on adoption of the conference report will occur. Therefore, including a vote on a continuing resolution, Senators can expect four votes during tomorrow's afternoon session.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BROWNBAC. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:53 p.m., recessed until Friday, October 27, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 26, 2000:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ISAAC C. HUNT, JR., OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2005. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

GERALD S. SEGAL, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2003. VICE SHIRLEY W. RYAN, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

S. ELIZABETH GIBSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT, VICE SAMUEL JAMES IRVIN, III, DECEASED.

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 G.F. LEE, 0000

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

To be colonel

KENT W. ABERNATHY, 0000
CARLO J. ACCARDI, 0000
FREDERICK AIKENS, 0000
WILLIAM L. ALDRED, JR., 0000
BOYD L. ALEXANDER, 0000
ANTHONY ALFORD, 0000
CHARLES M. ALLEN, JR., 0000
JAMES M. ALLEN, 0000
PATRICK D. ALLEN, 0000
RONALD C. ALLEN, 0000
JOHN R. ALVARADO, 0000
NICHOLAS C. AMODEO, 0000
ROMA J. AMUNDSON, 0000
MARCYA L. ANDREWS, 0000
PERRY E. ANTHONY, 0000
JAMES F. ARGABRIGHT, 0000
JAMES W. ATCHISON, 0000
MICHAEL E. AYAKIAN, 0000
PETER M. AYLWARD, 0000
JOHN T. BAKER, 0000
ROBERT K. BALSTER, 0000
PAUL BARABANI, 0000
LOGAN B. BARBEE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER R. BARBOUR, 0000
HUGH G. BARCLAY IV, 0000
KENNETH F. BARDEN, JR., 0000
JOHN I. BARNES III, 0000
WAYNE C. BARR, JR., 0000
PERRY E. BARTH, 0000
TIMOTHY L. BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
DAVID E. BASSERT, JR., 0000
GARY W. BAUMANN, 0000
RICHARD A. BAYLOR, 0000
RICHARD L. BAYSINGER, 0000
WILLIAM G. BEARD, 0000
DONALD L. BELANGER, 0000
THOMAS A. BELOTE, 0000
ROY C. BENNETT, 0000
RICHARD J. BERESFORD, 0000
LAWRENCE E. BERGESON, 0000
MARCELO R. BERGQUIST, 0000
GEORGE M. BESHENICH, 0000
VICTORIA A. BETTERTON, 0000
VICTOR A. BETZOLD, 0000
LETTIE J. BIEN, 0000
DONALD J. BILONI, 0000
EDWARD J. BINSEEL, 0000
ERNEST BIO, 0000
CHARLES D. BLAKENEY, 0000
ROBERT C. BLIX, 0000
JOSEPH G. BLUME, JR., 0000
KEITH J. BOBENMOYER, 0000
ROBERT C. BOLTON, 0000
PHILLIP BOOKERT, 0000
CANFIELD D. BOONE, 0000
THOMAS P. BOYLE, JR., 0000
JAMES F. BOYNTON, JR., 0000
PAMELA J. BRADY, 0000
ALLEN E. BREWER, 0000
GORDON M. BREWER, 0000
PHILIP S. BREWSTER III, 0000
WILLIAM E. BRITTIN, 0000
DEBRA A. BROADWATER, 0000
CURTIS R. BROOKS, JR., 0000
TILDEN L. BROOKS, JR., 0000
MICHAEL P. BROWN, 0000
STEVEN L. BROWN, 0000
LOUIS J. BRUNE III, 0000
WILLIAM J. BRUNKHORST, 0000
RALPH T. BRUNSON, 0000
RICHARD L. BUCK, 0000
TERRY L. BULLER, 0000
ROBERT W. BURNS, 0000
CHARLES N. BUSICK, 0000
THOMAS D. BUTLER, JR., 0000
GLEN CADLE, JR., 0000
JOHNNIE L. CAHOON, JR., 0000
SAMUEL E. CANIPE, 0000
THOMAS W. CAPLES, 0000
HUBERT D. CAPPS, 0000
PHILIP R. CARLIN, 0000
BRUCE W. CARLSON, 0000
ANTHONY J. CARLUCCI, 0000
MELVIN J. CARR, 0000
JOHN D. CARROLL, 0000
ROOSEVELT CARTER, JR., 0000
MARK A. CENTRA, 0000
WALTER B. CHAHANOVICH, 0000
ROBERT J. CHANDLER, JR., 0000

ROBERT L. CHILCOAT, 0000
MARK J. CHRISTIAN, 0000
DONALD L. CHU, 0000
MICHAEL L. CHURCH, 0000
ALAN D. CHUTE, 0000
EUGENE CLARK, 0000
RICHARD L. CLARK, 0000
ROBERT G. CLARK, 0000
WILLIAM J. CLEGG III, 0000
LESTER L. CLEMENT, 0000
WILLIAM G. COBB, 0000
GERALD W. COCHRANE, 0000
WILLIAM B. COLLINS, 0000
PETER M. COLLOTON, 0000
MARTIN D. COMPTON, 0000
MICHELE G. COMPTON, 0000
CHARLES R. CONN, 0000
JAMES A. CORMAN, 0000
STEPHEN G. CORRIGAN, 0000
JAMES W. CORRIEVEAU, 0000
ROBERT O. CORTEZ, 0000
BILLY J. COSSON, 0000
HARRY E. COULTER, JR., 0000
BRARRY A. COX, 0000
WARREN G. CRECY, 0000
JOSEPH A. CUELLER, 0000
WILLIAM N. CULBERTSON, 0000
WALTER R. CYRUS, 0000
JEAN L. DABREAU, 0000
JOHN A. DAROCHA, 0000
DAVID M. DAVISON, 0000
MICHAEL E. DEBOLD, 0000
ROBERT F. DELCAMPO, 0000
WILLIAM DENEGE, 0000
LYNNE E. DEKIE, 0000
JOSEPH R. DEWITT, 0000
RONALD F. DIANA, 0000
JOSEPH B. DIBARTOLOMEO, 0000
RICHARD R. DILLON, 0000
THADDEUS A. DMUCHOWSKI, 0000
JAMES M. DOBINS, 0000
HARRY C. DOBSON, 0000
MICHAEL F. DOSSETT, 0000
WILLIAM C. DOWD, 0000
JAMES D. DOYLE, 0000
JOSEPH H. DOYLE, 0000
DONALD A. DRISCOLL, 0000
DEBRA A. DUBOIS, 0000
ROGER B. DUFF, 0000
DONALD C. DURANT, 0000
KENT J. DURING, 0000
LOUIS R. DURNYA, 0000
JOHN B. DWYER, 0000
RONALD J. DYKSTRA, 0000
MARK M. EARLEY, 0000
STEVEN D. ECKER, 0000
MARK K. EDER, 0000
GREGORY E. EDWARDS, 0000
KENNETH D. EDWARDS, 0000
THOMAS R. EICHENBERG, 0000
DAVID J. ELICERIO, 0000
DALE G. ELLIS, 0000
KATHLEEN K. ELLIS, 0000
ALLAN L. ENRIGHT, 0000
WILLIAM L. ENYHART, JR., 0000
THOMAS P. ERSFELD, 0000
BEVERLY F. ERTMAN, 0000
GEORGE C. ESCHER, 0000
CARL W. EVANS, 0000
WILLIAM C. FALKNER, 0000
JOHN M. FARENTH, 0000
JACKIE D. FARR, 0000
GERALD T. FAVEIRO, 0000
PETER S. FEDORKOWICZ, 0000
DONALD P. FIORINO, 0000
RONALD A. FLORES, 0000
PATSY M. FLOYD, 0000
DOUGLAS J. FONTENOT, 0000
GERALD W. FONTENOT, 0000
ROBERT G. FORD, 0000
HENRY J. FORESMAN, JR., 0000
BRIAN A. FORZANI, 0000
FOSTER F. FOUNTAIN, 0000
WALTER E. FOUNTAIN, 0000
PETER D. FOX, 0000
STEPHEN R. FRANK, 0000
DALE L. FRANK, 0000
DONALD W. FULLER, 0000
PAMELA A. FUNK, 0000
JAMES L. GABRIELLI, 0000
BERTRAND R. GAGNE, 0000
RONALD S. GALLIMORE, 0000
ALBERT J. GARDNER, 0000
GLENN H. GARDNER, 0000
JAMES P. GARDNER, 0000
RICHARD A. GARZA, 0000
JERRY T. GASKIN, 0000
REGINALD B. GEARY, 0000