but refused to believe that he couldn't continue to serve the public by turning his attention and expertise as an economist to other public policy issues.

Tom brought a passion to public service. As Chief-of-Staff under Secretary Otis Bowen, he was fiercely loyal to the programs of the Department of Health and Human Services. Tom devoted each day to finding ways to improve upon the services provided to millions of Americans. He was especially concerned with the Medicaid program, and believed that the application of managed care principles could help the poorest of our society. His style was often gruff and ''take no prisoners,'' but his heart was always focused on the right place. His need to be popular fell second to his belief that through hard work he could make a difference to the people served by government.

Seeing the need to get more value from America's escalating health care expenditures, Tom firmly believed in the need for more and better information about what treatments and therapies work. He concurred with visionaries on the need for a significant investment in health services research to bring about more rationale and science-based medical care. He strongly supported my legislation on outcomes research and was a major force to help establish ''effectiveness research'' as a bona fide organizational responsibility of the Department.

I am sorry that we have lost such an unusually dedicated and forward thinking public servant. He put politics aside in order to accomplish goals he thought were in the best interest of the public. he was a man of great ideas, the will to make them reality, and a sense of humor that encased a heart dedicated to the American people.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, one of the things I remember fondly about Tom is that his measure of a man's judgment was often to look up and question, Is he a long-ball hitter? Judging Tom by his own measure, we all must conclude he could hit the home run ball.

More important than his many professional achievements, Tom Burke was a good family man. I want to take this opportunity to offer my condolences to his wife, Sharon; daughters, Rosemary, Heather, and Kerry; and, son, Brendan. Although the love of a husband and father can never be replaced, with God's help and strength, his family will make it through this trying time.

It seems to me that far too often in this institution we get so engrossed in partisan and policy battles that we forget that ultimately it is people that matter. In losing Tom Burke we have lost a good public servant and a good man. We will all miss him.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DR. OTIS A. HERRING

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, with the death of the Reverend Dr. Otis A. Herring on Friday, July 12, the Wilmington, DE, community—and indeed a much larger community of family, friends and faith—suffered a loss we can not help mourn.

It is the loss of a husband and father, a son and brother, a grandfather and uncle, a nephew and cousin—a man who deeply loved and was deeply loved by his family

It is the loss of a inspiring preacher and inspired pastor who devoted 35 years of spiritual leadership of Wilmington's Union Baptist Church and the surrounding community.

It is the loss a morally engaged citizen who spoke fearlessly and worked tirelessly for the less fortunate among us; the loss of a man who created out of his own determined faith and the conscience of the community resources to serve the poor and the disadvantaged.

It is the loss of a friend and mentor, whose example made better people and a better community out of all of us.

But despite that catalog of loss we feel so keenly, Reverend Herring's death is not, in fact, an occasion fit only for grieving.

In the first place, if we can ever be sure that any man has attained the spiritual goal that is the promise of the faith many of us share, Otis Herring was beyond a doubt just such a man.

His memorial service was rightly called a ''Homegoing Celebration,'' for the most important thing about reverend Herring was that he believed. His whole life was an expression of that belief, and even as we sorrow for our loss, we must celebrate the final victory that he never for one moment doubted.

And we celebrate, too, with lasting gratitude, the living legacy of Otis Herring, a legacy that endures because he lived his faith with a steadfastness and a power that literally reshaped the community to which he was so devoted.

It is a legacy that lives in Union Baptist Community Services, a nonprofit organization that Reverend Herring founded and served for 22 years as executive director, and that counts among its neighborhood-designed programs a day-care center, anti-drug outreach, crisis assistance, mentoring and counseling for at-risk youth and families, housing for the disabled, tutoring and job training, a housing corporation, a neighborhood-improvement program, and a food closet.

It is a legacy that lives because Reverend Herring was a leader who called on us to come together as members of one community, a leader who made us not only see but feel our common bond and common obligation to one another as citizens and as children of God.

Reverend Herring's own exceptional citizenship earned wideranging respect and recognition. In addition to high honors from the State of Delaware and the city of Wilmington, he received tributes from numerous organizations and institutions, including the University of Delaware and Delaware State University, the Delaware Businessmen's Association and the Brandywine Professional Association, the News Journal newspaper and the Jefferson Awards, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Mental Health Association, the National Urban Coalition, and many fraternal and civic organizations.

The record of Otis Herring's achievements and contributions, and the list of awards and tributes recognizing them, is all the more extraordinary when we recall that he began to lose his eyesight when he was just a senior in high school, and that he was blind throughout his adult life.

Otis Herring was, in fact, a magnificent irony among us.

He lived in darkness, yet he illuminated the world around him; he was blind, yet he saw his way through life with a clarity both humbling and inspiring to the rest of us; he lost his sight, but he never lost his way, and he never failed to lead us to a higher ground.

As an editorial in Delaware's News Journal paper said, accurately and eloquently, of Reverend Herring, ''His vision of his role in the world was unimpaired.'' And to that I would add only that our vision of our role in the world is brighter, more challenging and more rewarding because of the way he lived his life among us.

In extending our sympathies to Reverend Herring's wife, Carol, to his son, Steven, to his mother, brother, sister, grandson, and loving extended family, we do indeed share their deep sadness and sense of loss.

But we also share their sure and certain faith that, long after the sadness of his death has passed, Otis Herring's life will stand as a triumph and as a neverending cause for celebration.

THE REALITY BEHIND CANDIDATE BOB DOLE'S VOUCHER PROPOSAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, Yesterday Candidate Bob Dole claimed to offer Americans an ''Education Consumer's Warranty.'' Today, we saw the reality behind the claim—a recycled plan called Opportunity Scholarships that gives opportunity to the few at the expense of the many.

Candidate Dole's $2.5 billion plan would pay $500 toward $1,000 vouchers for elementary school students and $750 toward $1,500 vouchers for high school students. States would have to match the Federal voucher.

Candidate Dole's new-found appreciation of the importance of education comes on the heels of a long and distressing anti-education record, including opposition to public school choice and grants for higher education.

Last year, as majority leader, Senator Dole voted to cut $25 billion from education programs that help 52 million students learn reading and math skills, that help teachers to teach, and that prevent violence and drug abuse in school. With strong leadership from President Clinton, Congress rejected those devastating Republican cuts.

Candidate Dole claims that his voucher plan is modeled after the G.I. Bill of Rights and other Federal programs that help students afford college. But in Congress, Bob Dole has a 3-decade-long record of opposition to Federal college aid. In 1965, as a member of the House of Representatives, he voted against the creation of the first

Federal student loan program. Twice in the 1980s, he voted to cut Pell Grants, which he now endorses.

He claims that under his voucher plan, students will be able to go to the private school of their choice. But private schools can decide whether to accept a child or not. The real choice is made by the schools, not parents. The more exclusive the school, the more students will be excluded.

Scarce Federal dollars should not go to schools that can exclude children they do not want. Public schools are already starved for funds. The Dole voucher scheme will inevitably make their plight much worse. We do not have to destroy the public schools in order to save them.

President Clinton and Democrats support true choice—public school choice—where every child has an equal opportunity to go to the school of their choice within the public school system.

President Clinton has been and is a leader in the movement for public school choice, which is supported by a vast majority of Americans. In this year's State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, ''I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school children will attend.''

Candidate Dole has it wrong. Education is a national priority that requires public effort and commitment to benefit the entire population, not just the few.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, July 17, the Federal debt stood at $5,162,069,897,551.43.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $19,456.14 as his or her share of that debt.

REDUCE THE DEFICIT WHILE PROTECTING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY: ELIMINATE WASTEFUL MILITARY SPENDING NOT REQUESTED BY THE PENTAGON

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I rise in opposition to the FY 1997 Defense Appropriation bill. Once again Senate Republicans have sought to include over $10 billion extra dollars on military projects not requested by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Quite frankly, it is fiscally irresponsible to spend more than is needed on wasteful military programs at a time when many domestic programs are being reduced substantially in order to balance the budget.

At the request of the Republican leadership, the Appropriations Committee has authorized $10.1 billion more than was requested. That's right. The majority wants to spend $10.1 billion more than the Pentagon has requested, or than they have indicated they will be able to responsibly use, next year. Much of that figure was not even included in the Pentagon's 5-year plan, or on so-called wish lists that were solicited by congressional defense committees. The Pentagon has said clearly: They don't need these funds now, the projects are not in their 5-year plan, and they're not even on their wish lists.

Mr. President, there is no question that there is waste in the Pentagon. In fact, about a year ago, the Pentagon's own spending watchdog, its Comptroller General John Hamre, conceded that DOD could not account for over $13 billion in spending. It's just been lost in the ocean of paperwork at the Pentagon, and likely won't ever be sorted out. In fact, the Comptroller has all but given up on trying to find out what happened to most of the money, arguing it would be more expensive than it would be worth to account for these funds. It is particularly outrageous that the Appropriations Committee has proposed these hefty increases at the same time that the Defense Department is being called to task for not being able to account for billions of dollars in its own spending.

Waste, possible fraud in Pentagon spending, certainly egregious abuses of basic accounting rules—this is a serious problem, and no one seems to be doing very much about it. Indeed, instead of vigorously overseeing spending in this budget, we are trying to foist off on the Pentagon an extra $10.1 billion in military hardware, new weapons systems, planes and ships, and other spending they have not even requested so that certain Senators can protect jobs in their States that depend on continued high levels of defense spending.

If we pass this bill, my Minnesota constituents will continue to pay their taxes to bolster the treasuries of bloated defense contractors, who are building ships and planes and weapons systems that we don't need, and can't use, and that won't make our Nation any more secure. So that there is no mistake, let me repeat that for those who are listening. We are considering today a defense spending bill that spends a full $10.1 billion more than the President requested in his budget. We are doing this despite the fact that there is no sudden, extraordinary threat to justify such an increase. And many of those in this body who are pressing for such a huge increase are precisely the same people who are out here on this floor, day after day, week after week, month after month, howling about how we simply must get the deficit under control.

They are doing this while at the same time larding defense bills with billions in spending for their local shipyard, or weapons contractor, or plane manufacturer. Have we no shame, Mr. President? Is there no sense of limits in this body when it comes to wasteful and unnecessary weapons programs? Now, controlling the deficit is important, and I have supported responsible, fairminded deficit reduction proposals totaling hundreds of billions of dollars. We heard yesterday that the deficit has dropped from about $290 billion to an estimated $117 billion this year, due largely to the President's fiscal policies. And now we again are faced with outrageous overspending on military programs that are not even supported by the Pentagon.

For the past couple of years, we've heard from many of our Republican colleagues who have sought to look like they were reducing the Federal deficit through various schemes and non-specific formulas. And even when they have offered something specific, they tend to first go after funding for education, Medicare and Medicaid; programs for those who cannot help themselves; programs which protect our air, lakes and rivers, and on and on.

While I have serious concerns even about some of the President's underlying defense spending assumptions which require, for example, fighting two major regional conflicts at one time without help from our allies, at least his budget focuses on research and development, maintaining a high level of readiness, and improving the quality of life of our Armed Forces. We can meet our defense needs fully and responsibly. My question is, Why aren't we applying the same standards to wasteful military spending that are being applied to domestic programs that millions of average Americans rely on?

There are three arguments that I want to make to counter Republican assertions that the President's defense request is too low. First, the appropriations bill provides more to defense, in dollar terms, than last year. This is in stark contrast to the fact that non-defense discretionary spending as a whole is frozen or declining precipitously in many areas.

Second, Republicans are claiming that defense spending in the bill declines in real terms and as such their budget recommendation is actually a cut from last year. Think about that argument—defense spending is declining in real terms. Now contrast it with the Republican arguments as they seek to dismantle domestic spending programs. Do they ever seek to portray their domestic cuts in real terms? Or do they consistently recite that they are spending the same or more in the current year than they did last year. They can't have it both ways. Pick one methodology and stick with it, I say.

Third, the administration estimates that due to lower inflation estimates over the next few years, we can buy as much for our defense dollar as we had planned, but spend about $46 billion less for it than was requested last year. By this calculation, the President's budget request actually represents a long-term increase over last year's defense program.

The bottom line is this: The President's defense budget maintains a strong defense, no matter how the Republicans choose to craft their argument. It takes into account all of our