

drug dealers in Federal prisons, three-fifths of the total Federal inmate population, and the highest number in history.

There has been a drug-testing initiative. The President ordered Federal prosecutors to seek drug testing of all people arrested on Federal criminal charges, and is seeking \$42 million to fund this initiative in 1997. These tests will help Federal judges determine whether a defendant should be granted bail.

The Justice Department has funded 65 grants, totaling \$8.5 million to help communities establish and expand drug courts that help break the cycle of drugs and crime. The 1994 Crime Act authorized \$1 billion through the year 2000 to support State and local drug courts.

So, Mr. President, people can come down here and make speeches about our President. But at least have the facts. I think this President, and every President, is entitled to the facts. Who is the President that came up with the idea of putting 100,000 cops on the beat? It was this President of the United States of America, Bill Clinton, who came up with the idea that we need more cops on the beat, because it is prevention to have cops on the beat, it is prevention to have community policing. It is the other side of the aisle that wants to rescind that law providing 100,000 cops on the beat and replace it with a block grant, and who knows where the money will go. We want cops on the beat. We are on our way to getting it done. Which President signed the Violence Against Women Act? I am so proud of that because I worked with Senator JOE BIDEN on it for 5 long years. It was this President. And we are going after violence in domestic situations. We are going after the crime of rape. We are working toward making streets safer. Do we have a long way to go? Of course, we do. This is complicated.

Clearly, if we can get drugs out of society, there will be a decrease in crime. We know there is a definite correlation here. We have a President who understands we need enforcement and understands we need very good people to prosecute these cases. We have a President who has cracked down on the border. I come from California, and we are seeing an entirely different situation down there, with large increases in the Border Patrol, and with the U.S. attorney who has just done wonders with the conviction rate of second-time criminal aliens coming back into this country from Mexico. He has prosecuted more of them in 1 year than the previous 5 years altogether.

So when we come down to this floor and we start to use it as a debate over the Presidential race, I wish we would not do it. But if we do it, let us be honorable about it. Let us be factual about it. This is the President who fought so hard to take prevention, effective prosecution, enforcement, interdiction—take all of those aspects of fighting

drugs and putting them into one policy, getting through an effective crime bill, and making sure that in fact we are waging an effective war on drugs. This is the President who understands this issue.

So I want to thank my chairman of the Budget Committee for giving me this opportunity to put into the RECORD what the record truly is. And the fact of the matter is since I have been here all I have heard from many on the other side is a desire to repeal the crime bill, repeal the ban on assault weapons which are used by gangs, repeal the Brady bill which has kept weapons out of the hands of 67,000 people who have had mental health problems in the past. We do not want those people getting guns.

I appreciate this opportunity to correct the record.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution. Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3971 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3965

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in the second degree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes an amendment No. 3971 to amendment numbered 3965.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

In the pending amendment:

On page 30, line 5, decrease the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, decrease the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 30, line 11, decrease the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 30, line 12, decrease the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 30, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 30, line 23, decrease the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 30, line 24, decrease the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 31, line 4, decrease the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 31, line 5, decrease the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 31, line 10, decrease the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, decrease the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 33, line 5, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 33, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 33, line 12, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 33, line 13, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 34, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 34, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 34, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,708,000,000.

On page 34, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,552,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,594,000,000.

On page 40, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,572,000,000.

On page 41, line 5, increase the amount by \$2,355,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 45, line 15, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 45, line 16, increase the amount by \$10,952,000,000.

On page 47, line 9, increase the amount by \$175,000,000.

On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 47, line 13, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 47, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,256,000,000.

On page 47, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 47, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,621,000,000.

On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 47, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,302,000,000.

On page 47, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 48, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,730,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,623,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement the debate on the Bond amendment is limited to 1 hour.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my colleagues, this is a simple amendment. It increases function 700 for veterans by \$13 billion over the period of 1997 to 2002, and to pay for that it increases the reconciliation instructions for welfare reform by \$13 billion which raises the total number under the President's plan from \$39 to \$52 billion.

I think it is time that we get back to talking about the budget which is the subject in front of us today. We have just had a very clear-cut indication in this body that people want to talk about a real budget that does not make drastic cuts in the last year. They said it was a bad idea. This is the first good opportunity to vote on the President's proposal to achieve the balanced budget by taking a tremendous whack out of discretionary programs including those items which he cited as his high priorities in the last 2 years.

I am very pleased that our colleagues unanimously on both sides of the aisle said that did not make any sense, and that we should not go at it in a meat ax way. I think we ought to start taking a look at responsible adjustments to try to bring this proposal back into the realm of reality.

The amendment that I have just offered has a series of numbers. Those numbers ensure VA medical care will not be one of the victims of the President's drastic outyear cuts, and it also restores the cuts proposed for the years 1998, 1999, and 2000 before the trigger—before the cap—hits.

My amendment would bring the VA medical care up to what is included in the Senate Republican budget proposal, an almost \$13 billion add-on. As I said, it offsets this by asking for greater savings in welfare.

Let me address the second part of that first. After 30 years of ever more expensive and less effective approaches to poverty, last year Congress came up with a plan that we sent to the President which he vetoed which would have reformed welfare in a meaningful way. I think our approach struck a fair balance between the role of the Federal Government in providing a safety net and giving States increased responsibilities. You would have saved \$64 billion over 7 years in the process.

Since the creation of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, public aid has been regarded as an entitlement. If you meet the requirements for eligibility, you receive the cash with no strings attached. The current system has been rightly maligned by persons from all walks of life, including researchers, advocates, politicians, and even the recipients themselves. They know the system does not work. The system is impersonal. It is inefficient. It encourages continued dependency.

I am concerned that, if we do not require recipients of public assistance to work, or at least behave responsibly, or take steps to wean themselves from public assistance, our efforts at reform are just going to be another word for more of the same.

Our welfare bill which passed the Senate overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis had a real work requirement. In that bill, we also permitted States to implement reform ideas without undertaking a lengthy and cumbersome waiver process. States who wanted to require welfare recipients to obtain preventive health care for their children, or to ensure their children stay in school and wish to allow recipients to keep more of their earnings from a part time job—all of them a good idea—now have to go through a waiver process from HHS. It is costly, time consuming, and silly.

I have addressed before a silly problem that came up in Sedalia, MO. You have heard me talk about this on previous occasions. But this is the example of what the Federal law, as it now stands, does not permit States to do. The State of Missouri working through their local family services office and the employers in the area decided in Sedalia, MO, to try a pilot program to get people jobs in an expanding new industry in town. People seeking food stamp assistance were sent, if they were able bodied, to the employer for job interviews. If they were offered a

job then they got off the need for food stamps. If they refused to show up, or if they were offered a job and refused it, then the State could sanction them, and did not have to give them food stamps. There was a real incentive for these people to make an effort to get work. A lot of them did get work. Some of them did not like the work that was offered. They went out and took another job. That is fine.

A lot of people in that community who had been depending upon public assistance went back on the work rolls. Two of the people, however, who were sent to the employer they failed the employer's mandatory drug test. When they went back to the State the State could not cut them off of welfare, or food stamps in this instance, because they had failed a drug test. And the State wants a waiver. The State said this is crazy. And they are right. If we want to get people off of welfare and to work, and we prohibit States from saying, "If you cannot get a job because you failed the drug test, then we will pull you off the welfare rolls. We will not give you assistance." That means, if somebody wants to stay on public assistance and get food stamps, or welfare, all they have to do is take drugs. What a perverse incentive.

The State has been battling to get a waiver. My view is the States should not have to get a waiver. The States ought to be permitted to make those commonsense determinations and see what works.

The current system that President Clinton is defending by his vetoes keeps those nonsensical requirements in place.

Where States, despite the best efforts of the Clinton administration to keep control, have been able to implement significant reforms the results have been astounding. Welfare caseloads have dropped to 25 percent from 30 percent in some States including Massachusetts, Indiana, and Michigan. That is why we are here. More families are able to obtain self-sufficiency which has the added benefit of saving the Federal Government money.

As I pointed out, the welfare reform plan that we sent to the President which he vetoed would have saved \$64.1 billion over 7 years. In this amendment before us I am proposing that we save \$53 billion in welfare programs so that we can keep a promise we made to our Nation's veterans who risked their lives for us that they would always have health care.

This, I would think, is not an unrealistic number. The Senate Budget Committee plan calls for \$54 billion in welfare savings. Some of the savings would be achieved in the Supplemental Security Income Program, which, as the fastest growing entitlement, desperately needs reform. We can make these savings by reforming the programs and returning them to the States for them to administer, thereby eliminating huge Federal bureaucracies.

I think the people of America want to see us get serious about welfare reform. If you believe what the President says—he says we want to change welfare as we know it—I think it is time we did what the people want and the President says rather than rely on the President's veto to keep the status quo.

Now, what this will do on the other side, for the Veterans' Administration patients, is to ensure that when they need health care they are not going to be denied. The people who are served in Veterans' Administration facilities around the country are the ones who have been injured in combat overseas and/or those who are medically indigent.

This is where they are cared for—in all of these locations. These are 170 Veterans' Administration facilities across the Nation. Last year, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that we could not have a flatline of spending in veterans affairs because it would result in closure of four of those hospitals. Frankly, there are savings that can be made in the Veterans' Administration, and I think that those savings are being pursued in the health care area by Dr. Ken Kizer and others. But there is no way that an almost 25-percent cut, \$12.9 billion, can do anything but devastate the program. Millions of veterans will not be served. At least a quarter of these hospitals and veterans facilities will have to be shut.

Pick a State, any State. As I mentioned earlier, some of the major States like California would probably have to have three or four closures. My home State of Missouri would have to have at least one closure. All of the States with veterans facilities would be faced with losing some of those facilities, as well as service to many of their most needy people.

Massachusetts would lose at least one; Washington, at least one; Texas, two; Pennsylvania, two, probably three; Illinois, with six facilities, one or two; and Florida, the same position, at least one or two. I do not think that is acceptable. When we asked the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, who came before our committee, to comment on these proposals, he said he could not live with that scenario.

He did not like our scenario, which was a flatline, but I believe they can live with that. But he sure cannot live with a scenario that takes a tremendous whack out of the budget and, beginning after 1997, takes funding for the Veterans' Administration in a precipitous decline. That is why I think we need to have a realistic budget. It is time that we started talking honestly about what our needs are going to be in the future.

We are joined in this concern by a number of organizations which have expressed their grave concern over this. The Independent Budget, a group comprised of Amvets, Disabled Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, wrote to Secretary Jesse Brown on May 14, 1996, which I will submit. I received a copy. My colleagues, chairs, and ranking members of the VA-HUD Appropriations Committee, received it. I will cite to you just the middle paragraph of the letter. It says:

Our Nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. Many of us have opposed budget plans brought up in Congress because we believe they call into question the continued existence of such a health care system. President Clinton's 7-year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs. This is true in view of the fact that we have yet to witness true VA health care eligibility reform.

I send that letter to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, May 14, 1996.

Hon. JESSE BROWN,  
Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Department of  
Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY BROWN: On behalf of AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and Veterans of Foreign Wars, the collective authors of the Independent Budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs, we are writing to inform you of our concern over President Clinton's seven year budget plan as it relates to the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) medical care.

Our nation's sick and disabled veterans deserve a viable health care system devoted to them and their special health care needs. Many of us have opposed budget plans brought up in Congress because we believed that they called into question the continued existence of such a health care system. President Clinton's seven year balanced budget proposal does not provide the funding necessary to meet these needs. This is true in view of the fact that we have yet to witness true VA health care eligibility reform.

We all are aware that we live in fiscally constrained times, and we all support taking steps to continue on the path of deficit reduction. But we cannot, and must not, set budgetary targets for VA medical care that are unrealistic and which are not a clear response to the problems faced by the VA, and the many veterans who rely upon the system. When budget plans do not reflect the true needs of the VA medical system, we will oppose them, and call on others to oppose them.

Sincerely,

KENNETH WOLFORD,  
National Commander,  
AMVETS.

RICHARD GRANT,  
National President,  
Paralyzed Veterans of  
America.

THOMAS A. McMASTERS III,  
National Commander,  
Disabled American  
Veterans.

PAUL A. SPERA,  
Commander-in-Chief,  
Veterans of Foreign  
Wars.

Mr. BOND. I also would note that the American Legion, in a letter to me dated May 10, 1996, states:

After reviewing President's Clinton's FY '97 budget proposal for the Department of

Veterans Affairs, the American Legion is deeply disturbed with the outyear funding levels recommended.

They conclude by saying:

The American Legion strongly believes there are acceptable alternatives Congress should seriously consider before turning its back on American veterans and their families.

Mr. President, that is simply what is at issue here. Are we going to turn our backs on veterans, or are we going to make some responsible choices and say it is time to get serious about welfare reform and make sure we put people to work and use some of the funds that we save to ensure that we care for our Nation's veterans, the elderly, the sick, the war-injured, the medically indigent who need our help and care.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. BOND. I will be happy to yield. I relinquish my time, and I will be happy to yield the time on the other side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I came over to speak on the budget, and I just came out on the floor, and I apologize to my colleague. But if I understand the context, could I ask the Senator, first of all, exactly what cuts are being made in the welfare area? Is this food stamps? Is this the Supplemental Security Income Program? Where exactly are you proposing to make these cuts?

Mr. BOND. I say to my friend, we are proposing in the reconciliation numbers, if you will look at the copy of the amendment, which is not very descriptive unless you have the whole document with you, and I assure him that these change the numbers for reconciliation so that in the reconciliation process—

Mr. WELLSTONE. Is this in food stamps?

Mr. BOND. The Finance Committee will have to make the changes to come up with the numbers which show the actual reforms made. We, on the Budget Committee, cannot make those reforms. The Finance Committee has to make those reforms. This will give them the same directions that the current Budget Committee report, now on the Senate floor, makes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Is the Senator prepared to say that there would not be reductions in, for example, the food stamps or the Supplemental Security Income Program, or does the Senator believe there will be deductions in order to make the target?

Mr. BOND. We are not saying, Mr. President, exactly what the outlines of this welfare reform proposal will be. The Finance Committee has previously presented welfare reform proposals. We presented and adopted in this body a measure taking \$64 billion out of welfare. It was included in the Balanced Budget Act. I would expect that the beginning point would be that point, and if Members wish to change that measure, they can even reduce that by some \$10 billion and still achieve the savings that are necessary.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If the Senator will yield, the Senator is saying now in the

Chamber—just a couple of other questions—that, in fact, there would not be cuts in the Supplemental Security Income and Food Stamp Programs? Because the Senate has gone on record in voting on the proposition I introduced that we would not take any action which would create more hunger among children.

The Food Stamp Program is a major safety net program. Is the Senator prepared to say that we are not going to be taking any action by this offset that would create more hunger among children?

Mr. BOND. This offset is not designed to create hunger among children. I would point out to my colleague from Minnesota that if he were here earlier, he would have seen the drastic slashes that the President's budget proposes in the feeding program for women, infants, and children. This is a program devoted to providing vitally needed nutrition.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President—

Mr. BOND. Since the Senator from—

Mr. WELLSTONE. I did not ask about WIC.

Mr. BOND. Let me show this chart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. BOND. This is the President's proposed spending on women, infants, and children. This drops off the cliff. We propose to continue to fund it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, on the question, could I ask—

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I appreciate the questions, I say to the Senator from Minnesota. I have been asked for my attention by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I ask a question? We had a debate for about an hour and a half about this trigger idea. Lo and behold, we found the position of the Democrats is this budget does not have any trigger in it. You know, the trigger was the President's way of getting to a balanced budget when he did not have a balanced budget. So they have suggested they do not have a trigger.

But I say to my very good friend, sitting over in a little category called function 920, allowances, is \$68 billion in budget cuts. So that was the trigger under the President's budget which permitted him to say, "We are not cutting anything. It is those bad Republicans who are cutting everything, including veterans."

Now the cat is out of the bag. Your budget, the President's budget as submitted by the Democrats—which they are going to vote for, I understand, willingly—it says to get to balance we really have to cut a lot of things we have not told anybody about yet. Right?

Mr. BOND. This is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. This is the Oscar for fiction that I described: We do not have

to cut anything except that big bunch of money that is there. You are suggesting that even cuts more than Republicans expected to cut in our budget, and on veterans you have shown what it does. Is that correct?

Mr. BOND. That is correct, the cuts in veterans are absolutely devastating and would result in closing at least one-quarter of all veterans facilities. To me that is totally unacceptable.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to just make one last observation and a question. The amount of money that you say should be taken out of welfare in the President's budget, Senator WELLSTONE wants to know details. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the bipartisan welfare bill which passed the Senate with 87 votes cuts more in welfare, and had 87 votes, Democrats and Republicans, than the final product even when you take the additional amount out? Is that not correct?

Mr. BOND. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Could I ask one more question?

Mr. BOND. If this has been on our time, I need to reserve the time. I will be happy to respond, if there are further discussions, on time on the other side. But I wish to yield the floor. I will be happy to listen to my colleagues.

Mr. EXON. How much time does the Senator need, I say to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WELLSTONE. How much time is left?

Mr. EXON. How much time do you need?

Mr. WELLSTONE. All the time that is left.

Mr. EXON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for up to 3 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I actually came out to talk about the President's budget versus the Republican budget, but I will say to my colleague from Nebraska I will do that later on.

I did want to, in responding to this amendment, just say to my colleague from Missouri, I have not really sorted out the whole amendment, but I did want him and my good friend from New Mexico to know that, as a matter of fact, the Office of Management and Budget came out with a report saying that that welfare reform bill that passed would, in fact, lead to more poverty among well over 1 million children. So, before we start talking about all these cuts, it would be helpful to know exactly where you intend to make the cuts and what impact it is going to have on the most vulnerable citizens in this country. It is true they do not have lobbyists outside. It is true they are not the heavy hitters. It is true that they are not the big players. But I think we ought to be careful. Again, I have to look at the specifics. But I never did hear a response to my

question as to what impact this would have on what has been a major food and nutrition program.

My second point is it is my understanding from talking to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, that the agreement with the President on the outyears is that each year this will, in fact, be negotiated. The interesting thing is that many of us fought against the last Republican budget which did have the reductions which we thought violated a contract with veterans. As a matter of fact, the President held very strong on that issue.

What I find interesting when I hear my colleague from Missouri talking about veterans is I know what I have been trying to push, which is what I hear from the veterans community, which is health care eligibility reform, which would make a huge difference. So I wonder why it is that all of a sudden we have this amendment out here on the floor when in fact it is not clear exactly who is going to be cut. I cannot get an answer to my question how it is going to affect children in this country.

In addition, what has been left out, from what I heard from my colleague from Missouri, is the very clear understanding between the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, who has been a huge advocate for veterans, and the President, is that of course there will always be negotiation when it comes to the out years because we all know that we take a look at this year by year with a very strong commitment to veterans.

So I take rather serious exception as to whether or not the President has been hanging in there strong for the veterans community versus the Republican budgets that we have had before us.

I say to my good friend from Nebraska, I will not take any more time now. Later on I hope I will have a chance to talk about this budget in overall terms, but I gather we do not have time on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I hope the manager of the bill, the chairman of the committee, could be present because I would like to straighten some things out. We had made an earlier agreement that we would move back and forth.

I thank my friend, the chairman of the committee, for being on the floor.

We made an arrangement. Good-faith arrangements are something this Senator has always lived up to in 18 years in the U.S. Senate. I was to offer the next amendment. I could not do so since the Senator from Iowa was on the floor, got the floor, and was talking as in morning business for 5 minutes. It went on way beyond that.

In the meantime, I have been working diligently with the chairman of the committee to try to work out the increasing number of amendments that

are coming forth. We had discussed this, either off or on the floor. There were private discussions going on in good faith, I thought, with Chairman DOMENICI and myself, as ranking member. I went in to visit, to try to work that out and accommodate everyone. I came back out to find that the Senator from Missouri, probably unknowingly, broke the arrangement. The Senator from Nebraska had been faithfully waiting to offer the next amendment and I thought my prerogative would have been protected, as is customary in this body.

I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not it is true that the Senator from Nebraska was to be next recognized to offer an amendment, under the previous agreement?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, I am quite certain that somewhere in the record it will reflect we were going to your side after we had finished our last amendment.

I do not think we should cast any aspersions on Senator BOND. He came to the floor. Nothing was going on. He was unaware of this. We had been running him down at committee hearings to try to get him here. Frankly, when he first arrived, I told him to sit down and rest, he had hurried over here with such enthusiasm. He is not the great athlete he was 20 years ago. I should not say that. Obviously, he still is.

But what would the Senator like? He will finish his and you have one? It was not ready a while ago, but your staff told me it is ready. Would you like to offer yours and then what? Vote on yours first?

Mr. EXON. What I was hopeful of is that I would offer my amendment, we would have a vote on that, then go on to your amendments and proceed in the usual fashion. That is what I would like to have done. But it seems to me now you have used up considerable time on the time that you had. Is that right, I ask the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Nebraska has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. On the Bond amendment.

Mr. EXON. I simply say what I would like, and I would like to work our way out of this situation—the Senator from Nebraska was expecting to be recognized to offer an amendment, and I would like to have had a vote on that. Then you would go back to your side, and I assume the Senator from Missouri would be next in line?

Somehow we got out of whack. My knowledge of the Senator from Missouri is that he has always been a very fair and articulate person. Maybe he came in here and maybe staff ignored him, maybe staff did not tell him what the proper procedures were and he went ahead. Whatever the situation is, the agreement that we have and entered into has been violated, and I think it is

up to the chairman to say how he wants to straighten it out.

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not want anybody to have this idea that anybody violated anything.

Mr. EXON. That was the result.

Mr. DOMENICI. I propose that we fix it this way: Whatever time is left on this amendment, we complete the amendment. We set it aside, and Senator EXON proceed with his amendment for whatever amount of time you want. When you are finished, we will vote in sequence, voting on your amendment first, but we will do them together so Senators will come down and vote twice, vote on yours first, and then Senator BOND's amendment second.

Mr. EXON. If I understand you correctly, you are suggesting that we finish the debate with the allotted time—

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. EXON. Then allow me to come in and have whatever time I need that can be agreed to, then we will vote on my amendment first and his second, to get back on the right course.

I have no objection to that, and I say to my friend from Minnesota, if he needs additional time, I will be glad to yield. The reason I did not yield unlimited amounts of time before was because I thought it was important that we get straightened out the violation of what I thought was the agreement. Now that we have done that, I yield—

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me get a unanimous-consent agreement on this so nobody will be objecting.

I ask unanimous consent that when the time has expired or yielded back on the Bond amendment, that it be set aside temporarily for the purpose of permitting Senator EXON to offer an amendment; that when the time has expired on the Exon amendment or yielded back, that we will vote on the Exon amendment or in relation thereto first, to be followed by a vote on Senator BOND's amendment, and I also ask at this point that the second vote be a 10-minute vote, since the Senators will be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. EXON. May I suggest one other extension? Maybe we do not have to have a unanimous-consent agreement on this because we generally go with a gentlemen's agreement. Our side would offer the first amendment after the two votes; is that correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. By agreement, that is the way we are doing it. I do not know we should put it in the consent. I do not intend to violate the agreement.

Mr. BOND. First, I was going to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let us get the unanimous-consent agreement.

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, just so I understand, so we do not have another disagreement, the agreement that we have gone back to, to recognize the

agreed-to procedure, that the Senator from Nebraska will go next—I will do that—then we will have the vote on my amendment, then we will vote on the amendment from the Senator from Missouri. After we finish the second vote, then it will be a Democratic amendment up at that time?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is correct.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think we have kicked this one along and around far enough. I am very happy that we have reached an accommodation where we will finish debate on this and then we will set it aside to go to Senator EXON's amendment.

To set the record straight, I was called out of a hearing that I was chairing because it was envisioned that I would offer an amendment at 3 o'clock. I came to the floor. There was a quorum call, and then the Senator from California was speaking. When she concluded, there was no one else around, and I offered an amendment. I figured that we might get on to the business of the Budget Act.

I apologize for preempting the Senator from Nebraska, but I trust that everyone is happy now, that his vote will be ahead of ours, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. May I ask my friend from Minnesota, we may have some other speakers on this amendment, you sought additional time. We have 21 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. EXON. Can I yield 7 minutes, will that be adequate?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That will be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nebraska.

I want to respond to some of the comments of my colleagues on the other side, from Missouri and New Mexico, about the President's overall budget, what has been presented by my Republican colleagues.

I will say that as I look at the Republican's plan, I really do not quite understand what I think is a real disconnect with the people we represent, because as I look at this plan over a 6-year period of time, I see the same too deep of reductions in both Medicare and medical assistance.

Just to talk about this from a Minnesota perspective, I want to make it very clear that in my State, we are the skinny kids on the block. We have kept our costs down. We do not have the same fat in our system and, therefore, the effects of these cuts would, in fact, do harm to the quality of care for elderly people within our State. I am talking specifically about Medicare.

Some of the changes that the Republicans have made in their plan now put even more of an emphasis on the reimbursement to the providers. But in greater Minnesota, Mr. President, as high as 60 percent of the patient payment mix for some of our rural hospitals is Medicare, already below the cost of delivering care.

So I will say what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate in this debate, the numbers cannot drive the policy. The policy has to drive the numbers. This is a rush to recklessness. It will not work for Minnesota and, therefore, I hope that it will be rejected, and I know that people in Minnesota will reject it.

Mr. President, on the medical assistance, I will just say, again, to my colleagues, you have chosen to target some of the citizens who are the most vulnerable in America. In the State of Minnesota, 60 percent of medical assistance, which is what we call it in Minnesota as opposed to Medicaid, goes to people in nursing homes. I ask my colleagues, why do we want to make cuts there?

We have about 300,000 children in my State who receive medical assistance. It is the best safety net program in our State to make sure that children receive health care. Why do we want to cut there?

Then, Mr. President, I see another disconnect. I say to my colleagues here—I see the Senator from California—it was not more than about 2 months ago I had an amendment on the floor. We received 84 votes for it where we restored the funding that had been cut in title I, school to work, safe and drug-free schools, Head Start, and all the rest. Now I see similar kinds of cuts in education and job training.

The cuts proposed in the Republican budget are too extreme, they are too harsh, they are shortsighted, they go beyond the goodness of Minnesotans, they go beyond the goodness of America, and they should be rejected.

Mr. President, then I look to the higher education. I am going to have an amendment out on the floor. It is an amendment Democrats are going to offer, and we will have a vote on it. I will say to my colleagues, once you go beyond the tax credits that go to children and families, anything else you have left over in your budget should go to tax deductions to pay for higher education.

Mr. President, I do not see tax cuts that flow disproportionately to higher income people. I think we ought to reinvest it in education. If you want to talk about a middle-class issue, talk about making sure higher educational is affordable.

Mr. President, I have said it before, at least in committee—I will say it on the floor of the Senate today—I do not think some of my colleagues with their proposed cuts, again, in higher education, understand the squeeze that students and their families feel.

We have students in Minnesota that sell plasma at the beginning of the semester to buy textbooks. We have students in Minnesota working at two or three minimum-wage jobs—it would help if we raised the minimum wage—while going to school. Therefore, it takes them 6 years. We have students in Minnesota no longer 19 living in the dorms. They are older. They have families. They are trying to afford the education to get back on their feet, to be able to obtain decent employment.

I am going to have an amendment out on the floor that will hold all of us accountable and see who is committed to making sure there is affordable higher education.

Mr. President, I want to mention two other amendments that I am going to introduce, one of them which speaks to the question I raised for my colleague from Missouri, by the way, who I think is a great chair of the Small Business Committee. I think we are good friends. We do not always agree on issues.

But I am going to have this time a recorded vote, because I had an amendment at the beginning of this Congress. I could see it coming, that it was the sense of the Senate that we would not take any action that would create more hunger or homelessness for children. And I lost. People voted against that amendment.

The third time around it was voice voted for approval. I wish I had not done that because I think it was dropped in the conference committee, as I remember. As I look at some of these proposed reductions, I see the same kind of action taken.

So this time I am going to have a recorded vote where we go on record that we will not pass any legislation that could create more hunger or homelessness among children; and if in fact the result of some of these cuts is to do just that, then the next year we will revisit the action that we have taken. It is important that the Senate go on record this time with a recorded vote.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to say to my colleagues, we went through the battle on the COPS Program, community policing, and we made sure that it was not block granted. We made sure that there was a focus on community police. I could brag for the next 24 hours, and I only have probably 2 minutes—I ask unanimous consent that I have 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. About some of the work of the police chiefs and sheriffs in Minnesota and the men and women in law enforcement; very creative work to reduce violence in homes, very creative work with some of the kids, at risk kids, some of the kids that have the most trouble in schools, very creative work in some of the neighborhoods and some of the cities, but a program that has been extremely effective in metropolitan Minnesota and greater Minnesota.

I think I may come out with an amendment that makes sure that we in fact have the funding this next year for that program and make a commitment over the 6-year period.

Finally, Mr. President, let me just say that on the President's budget I do not find everything in there to be perfect. I think there is too much for the Pentagon. I think there is too much by way of tax cuts.

If I had my way—but I could never get my colleagues to vote for this; in fact I could not get quite a few Democrats to vote for it; I hardly got any support among Republicans. I want one more time on the floor of the Senate, with 1 minute left, to shout it from the mountaintop.

Why are you so anxious to cut educational opportunities for children, and job training, and not adequately fund community police, but you are more than willing to give away the wasteful subsidies to the pharmaceutical companies, to the oil companies, to the tobacco companies, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera?

Where is the Minnesota standard of fairness? What we have here, with the Republican proposal, is deficit reduction, a balanced budget, one more time, based on the path of least political resistance. You have your deepest cuts that affect those citizens who have the least amount of political clout. And when it comes to the big players, and the heavy hitters, and all the wasteful subsidies that go to so many of these large corporations, you hardly touch it. You hardly touch it. It is not credible. It is too extreme. And it should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield me 2 minutes for a brief statement?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

#### THE DEATH OF ADMIRAL BOORDA

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I take just a few minutes now to advise the Senate that I have just learned of the tragic death of Adm. Mike Boorda, the Chief of Naval Operations.

Since many of us were close personal friends with Admiral Boorda, and have dealt with him on a very close basis, I will take a moment to offer our prayers and very best thoughts to his family.

Admiral Boorda has been a model for our country. He rose through the enlisted ranks to become the leader of our Navy through hard work and perseverance. He was what is known in the Navy as a Mustang. He went in just as an enlisted sailor. He became the Chief of Naval Operations. Along the way, he was a surface warfare officer, and he commanded the U.S.S. *Farragut*, Destroyer Squadron 22, Cruiser-Destroyer Group 8, and Battle Force Sixth Fleet.

Most of us first saw the bright, intelligent and personable style of Admiral Boorda when he took over as Chief of Naval Personnel in August 1988. In 1991 he received his fourth star and became the commander in chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe. As CINCSOUTH, Admiral Boorda was in command of all NATO forces engaged in operations enforcing U.N. sanctions against the warring factions in the former Republic of Yugoslavia. On April 23, 1994, Admiral Boorda became the 25th Chief of Naval Operations.

Over the years, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have known many naval officers, and I have known, since being a Member of Congress, many Chiefs of Naval Operations. I have never known one better than Mike Boorda. The men and women of the Navy loved him.

I know my colleagues join me in remembering Admiral Boorda and expressing our deepest sympathies to his family. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the whip leaves that I may just say a word or two and ask a question of him.

We have had a lot of shocking developments around this place, but none has shocked me more than the statement he just made.

Admiral Boorda was a truly outstanding man, a great friend of mine. In fact, the last time that I saw him was just a few weeks ago. And he stopped in my office, without any notice whatsoever, and he said that "I have nothing on my mind at all except to thank you for all the help that you have been over the years to the U.S. Navy." That is the kind of person he was.

Do you have any details at all on this? This had to be a very sudden affair. Do you know what caused his death? Could you explain a little bit?

Mr. LOTT. We do not know all the details, only what is being reported on CNN and through the Naval Congressional Liaison Office. I understand it was an accident of some sort of gunshot wound, that he perhaps went home at lunch, and this bullet wound was inflicted during that lunch period. And he had been discovered in the last couple of hours. I do not know any details other than that.

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EXON. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska on the same basis.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor in a state of shock. Adm. Mike Boorda, a personal friend, traveled with me to my home State this year. I have spent many times with him in my office and in his office.

We will say a lot about him later, but Mike Boorda was the first Chief of Naval Operations to have been a walk-in enlistee. He was an enlisted man who worked his way through the Navy to the highest position in the Navy, as the CNO and Chief of Staff.