amendment was rejected, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLARIFICATION OF OPPOSITION TO GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 3963

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, yesterday, during debate on an amendment to cut defense levels in the budget resolution, the senior Senator from Iowa cited certain statements contained in my recent paper on military readiness. I have great respect and friendship for my colleague. However, I must point out that those quotations were taken out of context and were used to give the impression that I supported the Senator's amendment to reduce the defense spending level in the pending resolution.

I want to take this opportunity once again to state very clearly my strong opposition to the Grassley amendment.

First, I strongly oppose any amendments to reduce the level of defense spending in the pending resolution. Last year, I was at the forefront of efforts in the Senate to add funding to the President's defense budget. Ultimately, the Congress added $7 billion, most of which was allocated to modernization programs.

And I strongly supported the Senate Armed Services Committee's bipartisan letter to the Senate Budget Committee requesting a significant increase in the Defense budget. The pending resolution includes the increase we requested.

Second, President Clinton's defense budget request for the coming fiscal year seriously neglects future readiness, putting at risk the ability of our military forces to prevail in future conflicts. Our highest ranking military officers, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, cited the need for increased procurement funding to ensure a modern, ready force in the future. The Senate Armed Services Committee recently reported to the Senate a Defense authorization bill for the coming fiscal year that includes significant increases in the procurement and research and development accounts for future modernization.

Third, the statements cited yesterday by the Senator from Iowa were taken completely out of the full context of my paper. The Senator should re-read the paper in its entirety, in which it is clearly stated that funding for our Nation's military is far too little to fully meet our vital national security needs.

I do believe, as the Senator quoted, that we must look for ways to do more with less. That statement is based both on an acknowledgment of fiscal reality as well as a sense of responsibility to the taxpayers. Regardless of whether we increase the top line of the Defense budget, we have a responsibility to the American people to spend their tax dollars wisely. Every dollar of defense spending should be spent carefully and for programs which enhance the ability of our service men and women to do their jobs, whether they are assigned to combat units, support units, or the Reserve components.

I also believe, as the Senator quoted, that eliminating excess infrastructure is necessary and would free up funds for military modernization. The Department of Defense, with the help of Congress, must continue its ongoing efforts to streamline operations and improve efficiency by eliminating wasteful spending and practices. The Senator from Iowa has been active in promoting financial and other reform efforts in the Department of Defense, and I commend him for his efforts.

However, the Senator seems to have missed the larger point of my paper.

On page 19 of the paper, I clearly stated, as follows:

> There are many approaches to streamlining defense operations and activities that could result in cost savings and which should be done to ensure the best value to the American taxpayer. However, the magnitude of savings from these efficiencies is negligible in comparison to the funding required to modernize and maintain a ready military force.

Finally, let me note this clear concluding statement:

> In all of the decisions we face about our future defense requirements, we must not allow fiscal considerations to be the single, dominant factor. Instead, we must focus on the most cost-effective means of maintaining the military capabilities necessary to ensure our future security. We must pay what it costs for a military force capable of deterring aggression and achieving success in any future conflict. In short, we must be prepared to accept the cost of being a world power.

These statements clearly represent the full context of my paper, which focused principally on a proposal to reform the military readiness system, but also repeatedly cited the need for additional funding for military modernization. I am sorry the Senator from Iowa seems to have missed the point of my paper.

Just like the quotations from my paper, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa missed the mark. His amendment would have done nothing to encourage the Department of Defense to operate more efficiently, if that was his intention. His amendment did not even address alleged Pentagon waste and mismanagement, which would be permitted to continue unabated even if his amendment had been adopted. Instead, his amendment would have cut needed funding for the military modernization programs added by the Senate Armed Services Committee in the recently reported Defense Authorization bill for Fiscal Year 1997.

I voted against the Grassley amendment, which failed by a vote of 57 to 42. I intend to vote against other such amendments to cut the defense function.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only remaining first-degree amendments that will be in order to Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, and that all other provisions of the Budget Act remain in effect, provided that the amendments may be offered by a designee.

The list is as follows:

REPUBLICAN LIST

Chafee/Breaux—alternative budget.
Simpson—SOS accurate inflation index.
Brown/Simpson—CPI.
Brown/Simpson—SOS eligibility ages.
Lott—U.N.
Campbell—at risk youth.
Thompson—delete Presidential check off.
Hutchison—SOS homemaker IRA.
Faircloth—SOS national debt.
Faircloth—welfare.
Kyl—LIHEP.
Kyl—SOS tax limitation.
Kyl—Americorp.
Murkowski—relevant.
Domenici/Gorton—Medicare Part A.
Domenici—Spectrum.
Snowe—SOS tax cut sunsets.
Ashcroft—payroll taxes.
Gramm—SOS Soc. Sec. taxes.
Thomas—biannual budgeting.
Grams—SOS bal. budget/taxes.
Snowe—SOS student loans.
Roth—Amtrack.
Specter—Labor-HHS
Domenici—tax reform.
Jeffords—relevant.
Nickles—unified budget.
Nickles—relevant.
McCain—SOS spectrum.
Helms—SOS education.
Dole—SOS drug crimes.
Dole—relevant.
Domenici—EITC spending.

DEMOCRATIC AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Baucus—SOS essential air service.
Biden—(1) crime; (2) higher education.
Bingaman—(1) EDA; (2) relevant.
Boxer—(1) SOS taxes; (2) Medicaid and nursing homes.
Bradley—EITC restoration.
Bryan—CBO certification.
Bumpers—(1) asset sales; (2) fire walls; (3) mining reclamation.
Byrd—(1) restore infrastructure investment; (2) relevant; (3) relevant; (4) relevant; (5) relevant.
Conrad—relevant.
Daschle—relevant.
Dorgan—relevant.
Exon—relevant.
Feingold—tax cut.
Graham—Medicare solvency waste/fraud.
Harkin—(1) Medicaid changes; (2) relevant.
Hollings—gas tax to highway and aviation trust fund.
Kennedy—(1) spousal impoverishment; (2) seniors abuse; (3) prescription drugs; (4) premium surcharge; (5) Davis-Bacon; (6) worker safety.
Kerrey—(1) SOS reduction CPI; (2) SOS long term entitlement.
Kerry—(1) environment; (2) education, (3) crime; (4) preserve Presidential campaign checkoff; (5) LIHEAP; (6) relevant.
Kohl—SOS crime prevention funds.
Lautenberg—(1) relevant; (2) relevant.
Levin—(1) reduction defense number; (2) drug blocker research money.
Mosely-Braun—SOS budget priorities.
Murray—(1) SOS GSA priority transfer excess property re: education and technology.
Nunn—(1) Long-term entitlement reform; (2) SOS CPI.
Pryor—Glaxol/GATT.
Reid—environment.
Rockefeller—medicare.

Simon—shifting defense spending.

Wellstone—(1) COPS; (2) children's impact; (3) welfare and domestic violence; (4) LIHEAP; (5) SOS education tax language; (6) relevant.

Wyden—(1) SOS eliminating deductibility environmental damage; (2) DOD expenditures.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. The list has been submitted along with that unanimous-consent request. They are both Democrat and Republican amendments.

Mr. EXON. We have agreed to the list. The chairman has submitted that. We agree those will be the only amendments in the first degree.

Mr. DOMENICI. That does not mean, Mr. President, that every one there will be offered. It depends on the offerer or their designee. But we surmise some will not. But there will not be any other first degrees submitted that are not on that list. We have not waived the Budget Act, as we indicated, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have another statement to discuss with the Senate.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 17, 1996, AND MONDAY, MAY 20, 1996

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, May 17, and immediately resume the budget resolution at that time.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Friday, May 17, it stand in recess until 10:30 a.m., Monday, May 20, and immediately resume the budget resolution.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senate.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will consider the budget resolution on Friday and Monday. Since a large number of Senators have indicated they will be available to offer their amendments, no votes will occur either Friday or Monday. Senators who have amendments must offer and debate their amendments either Friday or Monday. It will be the intention of the leadership to conclude the budget resolution by the close of business on Tuesday, if at all possible.

As an example of Senators that have already indicated they will work with their amendments, let me state on Friday—this is not binding in any order—but Senator WELLSTONE will be here at 9:30, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, somewhere around 10 o'clock, Senator BYRD somewhere around 11 o'clock, Senator SIMPSON around noon, Senator KERRY has two amendments, somewhere around 1:30, Senator LOTT in the afternoon, Senator Kyl in the afternoon, Senator GRAMM in the afternoon, Senator DORGAN, and Senator KENNEDY, sometime tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FORD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. FORD. We had worked out on this side an opportunity for the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, to be somewhere between noon and 2 o'clock.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will put that in between Senator KERRY and Senator LOTT, who would go later. Senator MURRAY could be somewhere after Senator KERRY.

Mr. FORD. We would like to reverse that, Senator, and put Senator MURRAY before Senator KERRY.

Mr. DOMENICI. We would have Senator MURRAY coming ahead of Senator KERRY, with his two amendments.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, was putting Senator MURRAY ahead of Senator KERRY cleared with Senator KERRY?

Mr. FORD. Yes, and Senator MURRAY will be speaking in favor of the amendment of Senator KERRY. She has an amendment also. It would work out for her travel plans. We agreed the 12 to 2 o'clock period she could introduce her amendment.

Mr. EXON. This timing is getting rather complicated. Senator KERRY is making a special trip back from Boston and will be in Pittsburgh then he has to go back. He told me he would be here hopefully between 2 o'clock and 3 o'clock. He will be very strapped for time to meet the connection. I simply say as nearly as possible I hope we can accommodate Senator KERRY when he shows up, maybe put him before or after. I did not know about Senator MURRAY.

Mr. FORD. It is somewhere before 2 o'clock.

Mr. EXON. All right. We will do our best to accommodate everyone. I think we have that general understanding.

Mr. DOMENICI. Might I continue. On all the amendments that the Senator from New Mexico just listed, this is not a unanimous consent request, this is a bona fide effort to indicate that these Senators will offer their amendments tomorrow, in somewhat of the order I have described.

Now, Senators are going to be accommodated. We will stay until they are accommodated, and try to use a substantial amount of time. I will not be here after 3:30 but there will be someone here so we get this finished.

Now on Monday, I told the Senators we are doing well on Friday, and on Monday we are doing better. We do not have to have votes because we will have a lot of amendments and stack them in an orderly matter. Senator ASHCROFT, Senator KYL, Senator HARKIN, Senator BUMPERS, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator BAUCUS, Senator LEVIN, Senator SIMON, Senator SNOWE. Senator CHAFEE and Senator BREAUX, the full substitute, they will take 3 hours on Monday afternoon and then they will wrap it up with 1 hour on Tuesday when we sequence them into a voting pattern.

Mr. EXON. What is the time allowed for that amendment?

Mr. DOMENICI. A total of 4 hours equally divided, 3 hours on Monday, and wrap it up with 1 hour on Tuesday.

Then we have Senators BROWN and SIMPSON who will also be ready Monday, Senator ASHCROFT will be ready Monday. Feingold is for Monday.

The last list, starting with Senator HARKIN and ending with Senator ASHCROFT, are Monday amendments in some kind of sequencing related to what I have just described.

Again, nobody is bound to a time but I am really urging and my friend Senator EXON is, and the whip and the minority leader, that we appear and offer them, because that means we will be well on our way to a manageable schedule on Tuesday.

Mr. EXON. I agree. I think it can and will work.

Mr. FORD. May I ask one more question? I apologize for taking so long, but would Senator DOMENICI advise me about the amendment by Senator NUNN on long-term entitlement reform. It seems to me he and Senator BROWN may have a joint amendment. I wanted to be sure that Senator NUNN was accommodated.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, that is known as the Brown-Simpson-Nunn amendment.

Mr. FORD. That will be sometime late Monday?

Mr. DOMENICI. It looks like it is close to 5 o'clock.

Mr. FORD. That would be ideal, sometime around 5 o'clock or after.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask it be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we understand Senator BOXER from California is prepared with an amendment at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3982

(Purpose: To preserve, protect, and strengthen the Medicaid program by controlling costs, providing state flexibility and restoring critical standards and protections, including coverage for all populations covered under current law. The amendment restores $18 billion in excessive cuts, offset by corporate and business tax reforms)

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I thank my chairman