

a position he loved most to achieve a higher dream.

Today, just moments ago, we are advised of another man in our public service, one of the best and brightest that the Navy has ever had to offer, took leave of life. The reports at this point have not been confirmed. On one network they have indicated that it was a self-inflicted wound. I hope that is not the case. We are trying at this particular point to verify rumors. No such confirmation has been forthcoming at this point. We do not wish to add to the speculation any further than what is on the television at this moment.

I say a few words about Admiral Boorda from a personal point of view. He was a very close friend of mine. He attended my wedding a few months ago. Our relationship goes back several years, at least, when we were in Munich together, the Wehrkunde conference. It was memorable to me because one night while we were there, Sarajevo had been shelled. There was a great loss of life. Admiral Boorda took charge immediately. He ordered C-141's to get to Sarajevo. He did so over the objection of the U.N. command at that point. Akashi could not be reached. They said, wait until tomorrow; do not send any aircraft down. Mike Boorda said, "I am not waiting for anything. Get those planes in there. Get those wounded people out of there and get them to the hospital."

That was the kind of man of action and passion that I came to know and admire. He, over the last several years, demonstrated that time and time again in terms of his commitment to the Navy.

Yesterday, Senator DOLE talked about life being a hardship. Nothing came easy to Senator DOLE. I might say that for Mike Boorda. Life was a hardship as well. He was not born into wealth. He was not a man of privilege, but he is what we call a common man. He rose through the ranks of common men and women to the highest position in the U.S. Navy. He was admired by everyone who ever came within his presence. He was inspiring to those men and women who now served in our U.S. Navy. All of them will be equally stunned and shocked, as we were, to learn of the news of his death. I can only hope that the reports I have heard to date are not correct.

I pray for the members of his family who are alive today and no doubt in a state of shock and grief. I can only indicate to them that every person who has ever been touched by Jeremy Mike Boorda will remember him for the rest of their lives. I can only express my condolences at this moment and hope to have further comments about the life and times of Mike Boorda at a later time.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 8 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes 55 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

We have heard a lot of straw men set up by opponents on the other side. We have heard about all kinds of horrible cuts that would come if we get a responsible budget number for welfare. This body should know that the \$53 billion cut, which we propose in this amendment to include in reconciliation instructions, is equivalent to the \$53 billion cut that was passed by an 87-vote majority in this body when we debated welfare previously.

Now, there could have been as many as 13 Members of the body that did not like what was in that welfare bill. But I can assure you, with 87 Members of this body voting for welfare reform, the horrible, tragic things that we hear about that could happen if we have to achieve reconciliation savings of \$53 billion in welfare are so much smoke and mirrors. What we are concerned about in the numbers is assuring that veterans health care does not take an impossible hit, a \$12.9 billion reduction. There is no way that one can work out.

My colleague from California, who has argued so eloquently for the veterans and has talked about them, did not propose any changes when she voted for the amendment that would slash Veterans' Administration spending by almost \$13 billion in the Budget Committee. The Senator from Minnesota had said we should not worry about the cuts in veterans. We just cannot adopt a budget number that is consistent with the previous welfare reform that 87 Members of this body, on a bipartisan vote, supported when we first passed welfare reform.

Mr. President, budgets are about setting reasonable expectations for Government so that we can carry out our functions in a responsible manner and not continue to add to the deficit. All of the horror stories, all of the very difficult and compelling cases that were cited are not the ones that would be hit by the budget reconciliation proposal that this amendment contains.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. How much time is left on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes for the majority, and 2 minutes 55 seconds on the Democratic side.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the comments of the distinguished chairman of the

VA--HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations, Senator KIT BOND of Missouri. He does a tremendous job. I have watched him through the years. He is attentive, he does his homework, he is impressive, and he gets quite involved in every way and in every issue in a most positive way.

What has been curious to me, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, is the remarkable behavior of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown. He is continually distancing himself and the VA from the President's budget. I understand he testified early last month before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that he "felt the President's budget would be devastating for veterans."

Later in the month, April 24, the Secretary appeared before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I chair, and which I oversee as chairman. In response to a question from my friend, Senator CRAIG of Idaho, the Secretary stated that the VA budget described in a document submitted to the Congress—over the signature of the President and entitled "Budget of the United States of America"—does not represent the policy of the President.

I ask, whose policy does it represent? Did an employee of the Government Printing Office change the numbers for the proposed VA budget on his or her own, making the President of the United States and the Congress the victims of some wild practical joke? Did some cyber surfer hack his way into the White House computer system and change the numbers? Did somebody forge the signature of the President of the United States on a document submitted to the Congress in his name? My Heavens, we may have a real scandal here on our hands.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs told the committee that VA's future medical budget will be subject to annual renegotiation by the President. He tells us he has received the President's assurances that the budget numbers are not binding. Well, that makes quite a puzzle.

The President of the United States has proclaimed to the American people that he will balance the budget in 7 years. His plan, like any budget, includes difficult decisions allocating limited resources between many worthwhile programs.

But, according to the Secretary's testimony, the President does not stand behind the parts of that plan relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There are only 2 ways the President can deliver on his commitment to Secretary Brown. He can increase the VA spending by abandoning the goal of the balanced budget. But the President has made a commitment to the American people to present a balanced budget. We have heard that discussion for several hours. So I am sure that he would not take that course. Or, in the alternative, the President could increase the VA's budget by reducing the budget of other programs.

Does that mean the President has a secret plan to cut non-VA discretionary spending programs in order to fund increases in veterans' health care? I am sure he does not, Mr. President, because his budget also represents a funding promise made to the beneficiaries of non-VA programs.

Mr. President, the veterans' health care budget proposed by the President—when examined through the lens created by the statements of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs—presents the Senate with a remarkable mystery.

Veterans may wonder upon which rock the Senate should build their future, Mr. President—the budget proposed by the President? Or Secretary Brown's hopes that those budget numbers will be changed? That is what he said.

Mr. President, on April 24, Secretary Brown testified that, since 1980, VA's medical care funding has increased 20 percent—after adjusting for inflation. The resolution reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Budget builds on that rock.

So I submit to America's veterans—and to the Senate—that a generous history of increasing funding, combined with already-identified proposals for more cost-effective operation of the VA Health Care Administration, are much firmer rock upon which to build for the future than the administration's budget—a budget Secretary Brown tells us the President has already repudiated.

That, I think, is a most extraordinary thing.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Who yields time? The Senator from Nebraska has 2 minutes 47 seconds.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, when I introduced the President's budget this morning, I indicated that there were several features of the President's budget that I wish to change and would attempt to make changes in. One of those certainly was the fact that the Veterans Affairs allocation under the President's budget was not one that those of us on this side of the aisle were satisfied with. So I thank the Senator from Missouri, who has brought up this matter.

We recall during the deliberations of the Budget Committee that it was something we wished to correct also. We may have some differences of opinion on where the money should come from to do the correction. But I simply say that I think we all agree that a correction has to be made.

This is one of the things I had in mind—without spelling them out—when I said I am for the President's budget, with some changes. This is one of them. I want to say that I am offering an amendment that will precede the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, along the same lines. I am taking the money from a different source. Regardless of where the money comes from, it is something that will probably have 100 votes for to

make a correction in this particular area.

However, after we finish this debate, as agreed to previously, I will offer my amendment and we will vote on that first. It essentially does the same thing as the Senator from Missouri does, but it takes the money to fund it from a different source. We will not need to go into that in any great detail now. We might talk about that when I offer my amendment.

I want to correct one thing before we finish debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. We may be wrong, Mr. President, but I would simply note that we feel—I state this for the RECORD—if corrections are necessary by the offer of the Senator from Missouri, we will certainly cooperate in trying to offer an amendment. We feel that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri attempts to increase spending for veterans, which is a worthy cause. We agree with that. His amendment raises the functional category for veterans. Unfortunately, the amendment as drawn, in our view, would not increase discretionary spending, which I think the Senator from Missouri wants to do; that is, the discretionary spending limits and the appropriations caps as it affects that.

So, in reality, it is our view that the Senator's amendment would merely cut income security and leave the discretionary spending levels just the same as in the President's budget. I am sure that is not his intent. I am just making that suggestion. Is that something that the Senator has agreed with? Should we correct it? If so, in fairness, we would like to give time to do it. If we are not reading this right, please tell us so. I want to call it to the Senator's attention in the interest of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 36 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I guess I had better talk rapidly.

We have raised the caps in the amendment in the copy we have. We would be happy to have staff be sure we are talking about the right numbers. The fact remains that both sides agree that we cannot cut, as the President has proposed, spending on the Veterans' Administration.

I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee for his kind comments. We will have more to say about veterans affairs and the credibility of the President's budget on the next vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside to permit the introduction of an amendment by the ranking member of the Budget Committee and that the amendment so set aside be placed sec-

ond in the order for votes at the end of debate on the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the regular order the amendment is set aside, the amendment by Senator BOND is the second in order, and we now turn to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska with 1 hour equally divided.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

I yield myself what time I may need, and there will probably be others to speak on this.

AMENDMENT NO. 3973 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3965

(Purpose. To cut corporate welfare to fund veterans' benefits)

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] proposes an amendment numbered 3973 to amendment No. 3965.

Mr. EXON. 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 2, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 10, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,920,000,000.

On page 2, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 2, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 2, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 2, line 19, increase the amount by \$246,000,000.

On page 2, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,920,000.

On page 3, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,033,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,124,000,000.

On page 3, line 3, increase 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 47, line 10, 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 \$2,355,000,000.

On page 48, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,187,000,000.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, before I start my formal remarks, let me straighten out any misunderstanding.

Were we not furnished a copy of the amendment. Is that what I understand? I am just trying to make sure that we know where we are coming from.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, we will be happy to show the distinguished chairman. I am sure it is there.

Mr. BOND. If it is there, that is all I need to know. We were concerned it might not be.

You made a change. You made a change in the copy of the amendment after it was given to us. Is that the mixup? The best guess is that we were not furnished the final copy of the amendment. It is no big deal. The fact is it is in there. That is what I wanted.

Can you give us a copy of yours?

Mr. EXON. Yes. We will give a copy of the amendment to the majority. It does the same thing.

Mr. President, this amendment addresses the veterans proposition also. This amendment does much of the same as that intended to be done by the Senator from Missouri. It adds back to veterans the source of funds in the same amount. However, the Senator from Missouri cuts welfare to make up the difference. My proposal would cut corporate welfare. It is this Senator's belief that the majority turns too quickly to reducing projected spending on means-tested programs that go to the heart of the needs of the most needy in our society. Some of that was brought up during debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Some may believe that we are all too eager to cut the neediest programs that we have—those so-called means-tested programs.

I am simply saying, while I consider it a must to better fund the veterans programs almost exactly as the Senator from Missouri has suggested, let us cut corporate welfare to pay for this and keep our reduction in the unnecessary spending under control.

We have had a good debate, I think, on veterans affairs. We do not need to extend the debate for any lengthy pe-

riod of time because I think we would just be repeating ourselves over and over again. What we come down to, therefore, is that the amendment before the body is the amendment which we will vote on prior to voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

At this time, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment presently pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EXON. I simply say, Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time and recognize any of my colleagues who wish to speak in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

With that, I reserve the remainder of our time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would like to be able to enter into a debate on this. But I am still waiting to see what it is the amendment does. I know it deals with veterans. But I am a bit at a loss to know how we should debate it when we do not have the amendment before us. I have been in some difficult situations, but this is probably one of the toughest ones.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. I am happy to.

Mr. EXON. We have the only copy we had of this at the desk. We are making a copy for you. I think the Senator from Missouri is probably justified in wanting to see the amendment. The amendment does exactly what I said it would do; that is, to have the same figures that you have proposed but rather than take the money to make up the difference out of welfare as we know it, we take it out of corporate welfare. But, once again, in the interest of fairness, I suggest that we temporarily stand in recess until a copy can be made and delivered to the majority and give them whatever reasonable time they want.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I suggest we do not need to go into recess. I would make my friend an offer. If he will just tell us what he means by cutting corporate welfare, maybe we can carry out the debate, because I would trust his characterization. I would ask the Senator from Nebraska, does he mean he is raising taxes? Could he be a little more specific about the things we are doing?

Mr. EXON. The Senator, certainly as a member of the Budget Committee, knows full well what I am talking about with regard to corporate welfare. These are moves that we have made over the years that have been prominently under discussion for the last year with regard to the budget negotiations between the Congress and the White House.

If the Senator will refer to the material that I think he now has, page 3 of this year's Republican budget resolution states that in addition to the child tax credit, and I quote, "The committee recommendation would accommodate further tax reform or tax reductions to be offset by the extension of expired tax provisions of corporate and business tax reform."

It continues, "Such receipts could be used to offset other tax reform proposals such as estate tax reform, economic growth, fuel excise taxes or other policies on a deficit-neutral basis."

To outline this further, last year's vetoed reconciliation bill, supported by virtually every Senate Republican, included approximately \$26 billion in revenue increases for corporate and other reforms.

That is what I am talking about. President Clinton has proposed nearly \$40 billion in corporate reforms in his balanced budget submission to the Congress. Although the proposals are not identical, Republicans and Democrats agree that revenue can be raised from this category which is customarily referred to, as I think the Senator from Missouri knows, as corporate welfare.

The committee report to this budget, on page 63-67, describes expenditures in our Tax Code that lose hundreds of billions of revenue over a 5-year period. In that context, the Republican proposal as well as those of President Clinton are modest efforts to reduce loopholes that have allowed corporations to benefit.

That is what corporate welfare is all about. It eliminates corporate welfare to the extent that it is necessary to adequately fund the veterans programs at essentially the same figures that both you and I would like to see. Another way of saying this: What it does is make our tax laws fair for all Americans.

I am not surprised that the first words out of the mouth of the Senator from Missouri were, "Are you going to raise taxes?" If cutting corporate welfare, which I think the corporations are not entitled to during a time when we are strapped for money, if that is raising taxes, call it raising taxes. I think closing unfair corporate loopholes to take care of the needs of our veterans is far better than taking it away from what I referred to earlier, from the general welfare fund that goes essentially to the neediest among us.

I would simply say that these are modest efforts, modest loophole closings. Our amendment ensures that additional receipts from closing corporate loopholes will be used to lessen the cuts on the veterans rather than apply it to help pay for additional tax breaks for the wealthy, which I basically feel is in the mind of the Republican budgetmakers some time down the line.

In any event, whether that is true or not, all that the Exon amendment does is to return to the welfare funds the amount that the Senator from Missouri and others are proposing. And we

think that is good. We are simply saying that rather than to subtract this from welfare, the neediest among us, let us take the necessary funds from corporate welfare that we all know has drawn far beyond due bounds in recent years.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. I yield myself such time as I may require.

We obviously are getting some basic philosophical differences here. My distinguished friend from Nebraska has accused us of reflexively turning to means-tested entitlements.

What we have done, Mr. President, in fact, is to turn to failed programs and say it is time to reform them. The President himself has said it is time to end welfare as we know it. That is why 87 Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, said we need to reform welfare. The system is not serving the people it is supposed to serve—the taxpayers who fund it, the communities that see its impact, or the future generations who hope that we could help people get out of welfare and into productive employment. What we are saying is it is time to reform these programs. We are going to keep saying that because I think the overwhelming body of American citizens knows that welfare needs to be reformed.

By the same token, my friends on the other side of the aisle reflexively turn to tax increases. If it moves, tax it. We are talking about an amendment to the budget presented on behalf of the President by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Let me point out that that bill already has \$36 billion in new taxes in extenders. It raises \$36 billion in extending taxes. It has \$54 billion in other loophole closings. They have already got \$90 billion of tax increases. And the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee says, let us just hit them with another \$13 billion of taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I thought that maybe our friends would have learned something when President Clinton proposed and they voted for the significant tax increases of 1993. I have cited before on this floor the studies have shown that raising taxes in the way that was done in 1993 did not generate the kinds of revenue expected because it discouraged economic activity. It has slowed economic activity, economic growth and jobs in this country, and we have no less of an authority than the President himself, who said at a reception attended by people, I guess, whose taxes he had raised markedly in Texas, that he raised taxes too much.

We agreed with him at the time. Unfortunately, he just did not see it our way until later on. Now we want to take a \$90 billion gross tax increase here and add another \$13 billion to it. Certainly, our budget provides for

changes in the mix of taxation if we need it. That can be done right now.

The chairman of the Finance Committee will offer a bill that may raise some taxes and lower others and shift the mix of taxes. But when we talk about the total burden of taxation, that is one of the problems which is causing our country to slow down, jobs not to be created, and as we get into a debate on the President's budget the one argument I have not heard made about it is that it does not raise enough taxes. But that is really what the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska would do. Are we really in trouble because we do not tax enough? I don't think so, Mr. President.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and vote for the amendment which will follow it.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 22 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. EXON. It may well be we can shorten down the time. We have been trying to move this ahead, move forward.

I did not realize we would be getting into a rehash of what we did 2 years ago with the President's budget. Once again, the Senator from Missouri is certainly entitled to his position. He indicates that the budget that we passed 2 years ago, the President's budget, has hurt jobs creation, has been devastating to the country. Evidently, from what he said, it has hurt employment.

The facts of the matter are that those same things were said in one form or another by those on that side of the aisle during the debate, and we passed that proposition with all Democrats supporting that to get it by, without a single Republican vote in either the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate. The facts of the matter are, as we explained yesterday, that primarily because of that, coupled with the excellent leadership of President Bill Clinton, this Nation has been on a steady, logical growth pattern in all areas.

I remember hearing people on that side of the aisle who attacked that budget at the time saying it would be devastating to the economy of the United States of America, that we would never recover if we passed this. We have more than recovered, we have had one of the most astonishing periods of growth in American economy since that was passed that we have ever seen.

At the same time, coupled with that tax increase package and coupled with the economic growth that we have had under the direction of the Clinton administration, we have seen a dramatic drop, 3 years in a row, of the deficit of the United States of America, from basically \$300 billion a year, now down to \$147 billion.

I did not know we were going to get into a debate all over again on that measure that I voted for, and would vote for again, because I thought it was the right thing to do. In addition to being the right thing to do, we would not be in a position here in the Congress this year, nor would we have been in a position last year, to work toward a balanced budget, were it not for the fact that the Democrats, under the leadership of Bill Clinton, reduced dramatically the deficit which has spurred growth in the United States of America.

So if anyone wishes to take me on for what I did wrong 2 years ago, I am willing to do that because the facts of growth in the economy speak for themselves. I do not generally say how the stock market goes is how America goes, but certainly that is one factor in our economy that we need to look at. I suggest to all that since the development of that sound package by all Democratic votes and not one Republican vote in the House or the Senate, we have seen the stock market break every record that it ever established before.

The people are happy with it. It has reduced the deficit. It has gotten us to the place where we have a chance—although it is still a tough task—to balance the budget by the year 2002. Were it not for that particular measure that is now being criticized—in my opinion irresponsibly once again—we would not be in the shape we are in today of reaching for a goal of balancing the budget by the year 2002, which is something this Senator and many like me have fought for ever since I have been here.

I yield 5 minutes, or whatever time he needs, to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. This is one of those debates, as I listen to it, that I think causes people who are watching from outside the beltway to just shake their heads, because they have to wonder what is this all about? I must say, unless you are a green eyeshade type and spend all of your time poring over the subaccounts of the Federal Government, it is a little confusing.

I think one of the things that perhaps has been lost in this discussion is that if we are looking at a comparison between the various budgets on domestic discretionary spending—and that is, after all, the pool of money from which veterans benefits are drawn and all of the other discretionary spending elements of the Federal budget—the reality is, the Republican budget over 6 years cuts \$296 billion, the President's budget, \$229 billion, so the cuts in discretionary spending in the Republican budget are substantially greater than the cuts in the President's budget.

The issue has been raised, what are the subtotals? When you distribute those reductions, when you distribute them among all the functions in domestic discretionary spending, how do

veterans come out? I think one of the things that has been lost in this debate is that these functional totals are not binding. They are not binding. That is the way the budget process works. There is no requirement that the committees of jurisdiction abide by that functional subtotal.

I ask my colleague from Nebraska, is that not the case? As the ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee, is it not the case that these functional subtotals are not binding?

Mr. EXON. I would certainly emphasize that the Senator from North Dakota is so right. I am so glad he has pointed that out.

Mr. CONRAD. So, we get lost here in the details, but the overarching truth is the Republican budget, over 6 years, cuts \$296 billion out of domestic discretionary spending. The pool of money for domestic discretionary spending is reduced by \$296 billion. The President's budget reduces it by \$229 billion over 6 years. I point out the centrist budget, which a bipartisan group of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, have agreed to, is \$179 billion over 6 years.

Frankly, I would say both the Republican budget and the President's budget have unrealistic reductions in domestic discretionary spending. They are unlikely to ever occur. One of the reasons is, in both of those budgets, that the overall pool of money available for domestic discretionary spending is so sharply reduced that future Congresses are unlikely to adhere to the spending path outlined in either one of those budgets.

The fact is, the bipartisan group, which has tried to put together a budget alternative that would really have some prospects of actually holding course, holding to the course set for a 7-year period, has lower domestic discretionary savings than either of the other budgets. It is also true the President has less in the way of domestic discretionary savings than the Republican budget has. So if people are really concerned about veterans or any other subcategory of the budget, and they are comparing the President's budget and the Republican budget, the President's budget is more adequate, has less reductions over a 6-year period, or a 7-year period, than does the Republican budget.

So if you are concerned about veterans or if you are concerned about education or you are concerned about all of the other elements that are part of domestic discretionary spending, the President's budget is superior to the Republican budget.

The fact is, these functional subtotals that are the concern of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri are not binding. Those are the rules we work on around here. Those totals are not binding.

Somehow I think we are missing the point. We have bogged down in the details in an attempt to score partisan political points. Unfortunately, that is what is happening around here more

and more. We have not gotten into what is the heart of the debate and the discussion, what is the heart of the matter. The heart of the matter is, all of us need to move toward a balanced budget. We need to do that because we are on a course that cannot be sustained.

The Entitlements Commission told us last year if we stay on the current course, we are going to have an 82 percent tax rate in this country, or a one-third cut in all benefits. That is the harsh reality of what we confront. And all of these budgets—all of them—are reducing domestic discretionary spending, they are reducing every other element of the Federal budget from what current law provides in an attempt to move towards fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, I will just say in conclusion, I hope my colleagues will remember, the reality is, the President's budget has less reductions in domestic discretionary spending than does the Republican budget. That is just a fact. And the second fact that is important to remember is these functional subtotals that are the subject of debate here are not binding in any event. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I call on my distinguished friend, how many minutes?

Mr. THOMAS. Five minutes.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute first and just say, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. He has been a great champion for reforming entitlements. He and I agree entitlements need to be reformed.

My amendment proposes reforms in the entitlement programs. The amendment of my friend from Nebraska, Senator EXON, adds another \$13 billion in tax increases. And in looking at the extensive list on page 153 and 154 of tax increases that are already included in the President's recommendation, I am puzzled where they find another \$13 billion. But that is the argument: Do we reform entitlements or raise taxes?

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this is the first time that I have spoken on the budget. I am not on the Budget Committee, I am not an appropriator, but I, obviously, am very interested in this process, perhaps more interested in it as it pertains to the policy direction it would take than specifically in the dollars.

The budget is a document that has more impact than simply spending. The budget document is one that gives us some direction in terms of where we go. It gives us some direction in terms of philosophy. Do you want more Government or would you have less?

I have to tell you that I believe the people in Wyoming think the Federal Government ought to be less expensive, ought to be smaller, we ought to spend

less. It has to do with balancing the budget, and it is interesting to listen to those who have worked so hard through the years: "Balance the budget."

Have you ever heard anyone rise who did not want to balance the budget? I do not think so. It has not been balanced for 25 years. I begin to wonder if all this rhetoric has been so meaningful. But in any event, we need to balance the budget. It is morally and fiscally responsible to do that.

It is a philosophical question if you want to balance the budget. We hear a lot of talk about how we moved the deficit down. How did we do that? By the largest tax increase in the history of this country. I do not happen to think that is the proper way to do that. I think we ought to reduce spending.

Of course, whenever you talk about reducing spending, somebody says, "No, I don't want to reduce it there, I want to reduce it there. I want to reduce it for you, not for me." I understand that. When the average family spends 40 percent of their income in total taxes, that is an excessive amount. So we need to talk about that, and we need to take a look at our goals and see if this really, really does it.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that maybe we get bogged down entirely with all these details, which somebody has to do. But for most of us, it is a direction, a philosophy, it is where we are going, and the budget has something to do with that, a great deal to do with that.

I was very involved in our budget in the Wyoming Legislature. It was much smaller, much easier, same principle. One of the differences was we had a constitutional amendment that said we had to balance the budget. We could not spend more than we took in. What an idea.

So we talk about that Washington has never spent more on bureaucracy than it does now—this administration—never spent less in real dollars on defense since World War II. The tax burden has never been higher than it is now. Americans will pay half a trillion dollars more in taxes because of our tax increase.

I am concerned as well about the backloading. Now I hear, "Well, we all backload." That is true. But the fact is that the Clinton budget backloads much more than the other one, 66 percent of the savings in the last 2 years.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. No, this is the first time I have talked. I would like a chance to do that. Thank you.

So it is backloaded, and no one can argue with that. It is there and perhaps none of it should be backloaded. Of course, it will be when you reduce so much this year, it builds up, and I understand that. But we have to make some tough decisions if we are going to do that, and that is what it is about.

Raising taxes—as I understand, the Clinton budget takes out \$97 billion in taxes, puts back 60, a net reduction of

\$37 billion. That is really not much of a bite; not much of a bite for a country that pays that much in taxes.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, is about 122, I believe; \$500 credit for children. That is a pretty good idea, I think. Permanent; age 18. We do not start with three.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate that, Mr. President. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. CONRAD. One minute.

Mr. EXON. I yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would just like to say to my colleague from Wyoming, I am disturbed by backloading, too, but the reality is the Republican plan has 64 percent of its savings in the last 2 years. So this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Both of them have 82 percent of their savings in the last 3 years. They are both backloaded.

So to come and criticize the President's plan when your own plan does exactly the same thing is a little misleading.

Let me just say—

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

Mr. CONRAD. I think if we were going to be direct with each other, we would acknowledge both plans are backloaded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 16 minutes, and the Senator from Nebraska has 10 minutes.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from North Dakota for his excellent remarks. His statement with regard to the savings that are talked about in discretionary programs is something that I intend to follow up on in my closing remarks.

I will just say at this time that I have been here on the floor since this debate began. I have heard the same things over and over and over again—the Republicans seem to think if they say something enough times, it is true. They have said on many occasions that the President's budget does not balance in the year 2002. I do not know how many times I have refuted that point, and noted that the Republican-appointed head of the Congressional Budget Office says that the President's budget does balance in the year 2002.

The same CBO office says that the Republican plan balances in the year 2002. So if the Republicans are trying

to impeach the written word of their own appointed CBO office, then they impeach the source of their balanced budget as well.

Why can we not be realistic? Both programs are estimated—and I use the word "estimated" with emphasis—by the Congressional Budget Office as reaching balance.

I have heard another myth that is repeated over and over and over again and that is with regard to the terrible backloading, as alleged by the Senator from Wyoming.

I refer to the chart behind me once again. We have had it out here before. I am going to drag this chart out every time I hear on that side of the aisle that there is backloading going on.

This chart has been here before, but the red line on that chart is the President's backloading and the blue line on that chart is the GOP backloading. The years are below, and the numbers are up there.

So suffice it to say, it is not accurate, nor is it fair, nor does it contribute to the debate for me to get up and say, "Oh, boy, there's all kinds of backloading in that GOP budget."

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EXON. I will not yield.

I would be fearful that the Republicans would bring out something like this and show me that what they are accusing the Democrats of doing is what the Republicans are doing. Essentially they are one and the same.

I simply say that I will reserve the remainder of my time for my closing statement. But I just wish that we could keep our debates on something that is realistic, without going overboard and saying things over and over again, things that I do not know how many times I refuted. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Washington, I just want a point of clarification with my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

Does that chart show the President's numbers with or without the automatic trigger?

Mr. EXON. The automatic trigger, we went through that earlier, did we not?

Mr. BOND. That chart, does it show it with or without the automatic trigger?

Mr. EXON. Once again I say, whether it triggers or not, this is an honest chart on honest numbers that has been verified by the CBO.

Are you indicating there is something tricky about these numbers?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the CBO said the only way the President's numbers get to a balance in 2002 is if an automatic trigger clicks in and cuts 10 percent of discretionary spending in 2001 and 18 percent in 2002. I am simply asking whether that chart—and I did not prepare the chart—does that chart present the President's number assuming no trigger or assuming a trigger? Which way is it?

Mr. EXON. I have been advised this is the chart with the figures in it. If I find out differently, I will correct it for the RECORD.

Mr. BOND. I thank my good friend from Nebraska. That is all I wanted to ask, because we have, as he indicated, I think on a bipartisan basis, voted overwhelmingly that we do not want the trigger. We have said, no trigger. We do not want a meat ax.

So the only difference between the President's budget and the Republicans' budget is that the President's budget, by CBO numbers, does not now get to balance—without the trigger, it does not get to balance. Ours does. With that, I will yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in my few minutes, I will make three points. The first point is to agree with my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, by the analysis of the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget does indeed balance in the year 2002. It does, according to the Congressional Budget Office, because of an automatic set of tax increases and spending cuts in the years 2001 and 2002, if the Congressional Budget Office's projections of spending and of the economy are correct.

In fact, Mr. President, the President's budget would balance if the Congressional Budget Office showed half a trillion dollars' difference between now and the year 2000 with automatic huge tax increases and spending cuts in the years thereafter.

If you put in such a trigger, the balance is automatic. The real point is that in the real world, using the same set of figures, it will not reach balance unless that trigger is pulled. We have just voted against the trigger.

The second point I would like to make is with respect to the debate right now on two amendments in front of us. Those two amendments each say that we should not reduce veterans benefits in the way that the President's budget indicates they will be reduced, a little increase in the first couple of years, then a huge reduction thereafter.

The difference is the classical difference between the parties. Republicans restore those veterans benefits by welfare reform. Democrats restore them by tax hikes, tax hikes sufficient so that the President's very modest tax reductions in his budget become a net tax increase over the period of time covered by this budget.

That is a classical difference. People can decide, would they rather support our veterans with welfare reform or would they rather support them with tax hikes? I think that is a relatively simple question.

But, Mr. President, my third point is that I am not sure of the total relevance either of the debate on triggers that the Senator from Nebraska has

spoken of, or even of the two amendments with which we are going to engage now. It is at this point I want to compliment and support the remarks of my Democratic colleague from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, who points out that there is a superior way of going toward either of the proposals that are on the floor here right now, one which I believe we will debate early next week, the first proposal in several years that is in fact bipartisan in nature, the one that most decisively deals with a reform of entitlement programs, that makes them more realistically affordable by the people of the United States and, therefore, is more reasonable with respect to the amount of money that we have to spend on education and the environment and law enforcement and national parks and the myriad of other year-to-year responsibilities of this body.

So in that respect the Senator from North Dakota is right. I have the privilege to work with him. We will later on in this debate be presenting that budget.

I believe the Republican budget much superior and much more honest to the one that is before us right now, and I intend ultimately to vote for it if that is the last vote before us. But I believe the one worked out by this bipartisan group to be markedly superior to any of the others that have been presented this year.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOND). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Let me yield myself up to 5 minutes to also speak on the amendment.

Mr. President, as I look at this amendment that is before the Senate offered by the Senator from Nebraska in response to the previous amendment from the Senator from Missouri, once again I am struck by the approach that is being taken with regard to the President's budget. I talked several times about the President's budget during the course of this debate and tried to point out the extent to which the claims the budget includes relief for America's taxpayers are exaggerated.

Once again we see the approach being taken to make sure taxpayers end up with less. The President's budget claims initially it will provide Americans with \$99 billion in tax relief. When you include the various so-called corporate loopholes and other increased revenues involved with the President's budget, the net tax relief drops to \$36 billion. Then, when you terminate the various tax cuts as triggered in the year 2000, it reduces total tax relief between the year 1996 and the year 2002 to \$6 billion approximately.

Mr. President, \$6 billion works out to about \$1 billion a year, or 250 million Americans working out to \$4 per American per year in the budget that the President is offering. That is not a lot of tax relief by my standards. I think it would not be seen that way by the American people.

Here comes yet another wrinkle. An amendment that would further change the bottom line on taxes with regard to this budget. Indeed, by increasing the revenue side of this equation by an additional \$13 billion, we now eliminate all of the tax relief contained in the President's budget and instead have turned the President's budget, should this amendment pass, into one which would have a net tax increase of \$7 billion. I cannot imagine that is the approach the American people want us to take, to actually increase, on a net basis, the taxes we burden them with.

Some will argue that these taxes would somehow fall on the corporations, the big companies, and so on. I question that, Mr. President. It seems to me the big taxpaying entities have discovered a lot of ways to pass along the taxes to the average working families in America. Indeed, during the recent debate about the gas tax repeal, we were told that the 4 cent repeal would never get to the consumers because the intermediate-stage corporations would somehow find a way to pocket the dollars for themselves. If that is true for the gas tax, it will certainly be true for this tax. If this increase is put into our budget, we will again see the actual people paying for it, the hard-working families of our country.

I have to stand in support of what the Senator from Washington just said, complimenting the Senator from Missouri for his amendment and urging its support and urging our colleagues to oppose an increase in taxes as would be contained in the amendment being offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I simply say to my colleague on the other side with respect to the Senator's amendment, you can close a tax loophole and not raise taxes on any Americans. As a member of the Finance Committee, I have been trying for some time to deal with the question of the fact that 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in the United States do not pay a penny of taxes here.

The question is, how can that be? How do they avoid paying taxes in the United States when they are obviously doing very well here?

Mr. President, the reason is, we have a scheme called transfer pricing in the international tax system that allows corporations to put their taxes or their profits where there are no taxes. Foreign corporations who are in here competing with American corporations have been taking advantage of this loophole in a very significant way to avoid paying any taxes here. That is not only unfair to U.S. taxpayers, that is unfair to U.S. companies who are expected to compete with the foreign en-

terprise that escapes and avoids tax responsibility, that an American-based corporation cannot escape and avoid.

I say that my colleague from Nebraska has come up with a very reasonable way to take care of the needs of our veterans by closing a tax loophole. Now, some of our friends on the other side have never seen a tax loophole they do not like. They have never seen a tax loophole they do not endorse.

There is absolutely no reason to allow foreign corporations to do business in this country and not pay any taxes here. It is not fair, not only to U.S. taxpayers, it is not fair to American corporations with whom they compete.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time we have and how much time Senator EXON has?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 6 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Nebraska has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, without using that time, might I exchange with Senator EXON about where we are going next. If we use our 6 minutes and you use your 4 minutes, are we ready to vote in the sequence that we heretofore agreed to?

Mr. EXON. We are ready. That sequence, just to set the record straight, we would vote on the Exon amendment first and the amendment from the Senator from Missouri second. And I believe, if I remember correctly, the first vote would be a 15-minute vote, and the second vote, I believe it was stipulated by the Senator from New Mexico, is to be 10 minutes. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes, Mr. President, first, I want to congratulate Senator BOND on his amendment and Senator EXON on his amendment, because we are going to have an opportunity here, in about 12 minutes, to vote on 2 proposals.

There could be nothing closer to reflecting the difference between the 2 parties than these two amendments. So, make no bones about it, we will first vote on a Democrat amendment, which will increase taxes, no matter what you call it. You increase taxes to pay for appropriated accounts that are cut, which they are finally admitting in cutting this budget—that is, the veterans of this country. So the first vote is going to be: Do you want to raise taxes to spend more money? The second vote is going to be a Republican vote, and it will be very simple: Do you want to increase spending for veterans by cutting spending someplace else?

We say, yes. We say, the American people are not interested in raising taxes. We already raised taxes 2 years ago, which was the largest tax increase in history. The President has, in his budget, \$90 billion, under the rubric of "corporate welfare"—but it is \$90 billion. Senator EXON says that \$90 billion is not enough to do what we want to do. We want \$13 billion more because



we caught them with the reality that they are reducing the level of expenditures for the veterans of this country by at least \$13 billion, decimating our commitment to the veterans.

As our President is prone to say, we do not want to violate our values. Our values are very simple: Protect the veterans of America. Live up to your commitment. We do not want to violate that value. But I will suggest that the reality of it now is that the President violates that value. But he almost got away with it, with nobody understanding it—except for this amendment today, which clearly now says it, and even the Democrats understand. They understand veterans is cut enough that they want to raise taxes to pay for it.

Now, they were not saying they were cutting veterans just 4 or 5 days ago because, obviously, they just wanted to say Republicans were cutting programs to get to balance. There is a nice little gimmick. The President called it a "trigger." The problem is that the trigger would not work on the floor, because if you have to use CBO economics, and not the President's choice of economics, then you have to pull the trigger, and they did that and they put a giant plug in their budget. That plug, so everybody will know, is a big whopping plug. It is \$32 billion in tax cuts that have to be sunsetted. So we raise taxes \$32 billion after having cut them. That is the first thing in the plug. We add Medicare cuts of \$13 billion, and the President adds spectrum fees of \$6 billion. This is kind of the cornucopia of solving budget problems. Spectrum fee. Mr. President, \$38 billion is in the budget. This says \$6.6 billion more to get to the balance of the President and the balance the distinguished minority manager put before the Senate.

And then is the big ticket item: discretionary cuts of \$67 billion are in this new plug. Pull the trigger and expose the reality and there sits a plug, without which you cannot balance the budget. And \$67 billion of that is in the discretionary programs, such as veterans. And we are trying to fix veterans with this amendment. We do it very simply, very simply. We say, we think veterans ought to get this \$13 billion because we have a high value on our relationship to veterans. We think the welfare program of the country could be reduced by \$13 billion to pay for it. Reduce welfare and turn it into workfare. And even at that, we have not reduced welfare to the extent that the bipartisan welfare reform that cleared this place would have.

So, in summary, we have now exposed the reality of the President's budget. We have exposed the reality of it. He did not want anybody to know that, to really get to balance, we needed \$124 billion, and we now have that before the Senate—a piece of it before us. Do you want to increase taxes to take care of our veterans? Or do you want to reduce welfare to take care of our veterans?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. EXON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, Will Rogers once said, "It's not what he knows that bothers me; it's what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so."

Two points: No. 1, the President's budget proposes more in discretionary spending than the Republican budget. There is no debate about that, and there is no amount of bluster on this floor that can change that.

No. 2, this is not about tax increases. The fact is, if this is a song with unlimited verses—tax increases, I guess—we spend \$2.2 billion to pay companies to shut their American plants and move them overseas. How about shutting that down and using the money in a constructive way? Two men from Florida did a study that says we lose \$40 billion a year by foreign corporations doing business in America that do not pay taxes here, and 73 percent of the foreign corporations doing business in America pay zero taxes.

To close tax loopholes is somehow increasing taxes? No. We are talking about big, fat, juicy tax breaks for some of the biggest enterprises in the world, and we are talking about closing them. Is there anything wrong with that? I do not think so.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute to acknowledge the departure of a truly great American.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this time not be charged to either side, as we have been doing all afternoon.

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

#### THE PASSING OF ADM. MIKE BOORDA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I cannot begin to express how terribly saddened I am by the news of Adm. Mike Boorda's death this afternoon. My heart goes out to his wife, Bettie, and his children, Anna, Eddie, Bobby, and David. I pray that God's love, and the memory of a wonderful husband and father will comfort them in this moment of profound grief.

Mike Boorda was my friend of more than 20 years. He was an exceptional American, the first enlisted man to head the world's greatest Navy. He dedicated his entire adult life to the security of our country. He was a great sailor who loved the Navy beyond measure. He honored the uniform he was so proud to wear and the country he served so well. Most of all, I am grateful for the honor he did me by blessing me with his friendship. We all shall miss him very much.

May God grant him the eternal peace he deserves.

I yield the floor.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I think we should alert all—and I believe the managers of the bill would agree—that we, most likely, will start voting in about 5 minutes, is that right?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. Would the Senator mind if the first vote is 15 minutes, to be immediately followed by a 10-minute vote?

Mr. EXON. No. Let the RECORD show as the Senator from New Mexico indicated. We are going to start voting in about 5 minutes. The first vote will be a 15-minute vote, immediately following, without any intervention, by a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, and that will be a 10-minute vote.

Mr. President, let me wind up briefly within the time I have left. I just find it a little bit odd that the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Missouri continue to complain that the discretionary numbers in the President's budget are too low. This has been mentioned by other Senators in debate, and I had this written down because I wanted to comment on it in closing.

Mr. President, if the President's appropriated savings are steep, then the Republican appropriations savings are positively cataclysmic. That is the point. Over the 6 years of the budget, the Republican budget cuts \$65 billion more from appropriations than does the President. And in the final year of the budget, 2002, the Republicans cut \$13 billion more in appropriated spending in that 1 year than does the President.

The Senator from Missouri knows that the Appropriations Committee will distribute those cuts—not this resolution. Indeed, neither the Republican budget, nor a Republican budget of any kind, contains program-by-program detail for appropriated accounts. The fairest comparison of appropriations in the outyears, therefore, is to compare totals of spending levels.

If I need additional time to close, I take it off of the time I have on the amendment.

In sum and in closing, the Republicans want to cut projected spending on the very poorest in the Nation. We want to plug some corporate loopholes that have been alluded to here and some specifics, and there are many more. We agree. We want to honor our veterans. That is the reason for this Democratic amendment. The real question is whether we want to protect the disabled kids or the corporations who are moving jobs overseas.

Mr. President, I yield any remaining time that I have. I believe the Chair will confirm that we have previously