

brilliant sunshine outside the Knoxville Civic Auditorium. He decried an environment of "too much polling and not enough decisionmaking."

"Americans look upon the spectacle of Washington and they do not like what they see," Bush declared. "I agree with them. It's time for a change."

Bush proposed revamping the federal budget process to shift budget-making from an annual to a biennial exercise and to require the president and Congress to agree on spending targets early in the process, to prevent government shutdowns.

Bush also said he would target wasteful spending by restoring a version of the line-item veto and installing a commission to recommend pork-barrel projects for elimination, a nod to one of the favored issues of his former rival Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.). In addition, he proposed soothing partisan tensions by calling on Congress to approve the next president's executive and judicial nominations within 60 days.

Even on their day of bipartisanship, Bush and his supporters took a couple of partisan shots. "All we have heard from my opponent are the familiar exaggerations and scare tactics," Bush told the crowd in Vice President Gore's home state. "Proposals he disapproves of are never just arguments; they're 'risky schemes.' This kind of unnecessary rhetoric is characteristic of the tone in Washington, D.C. It's the 'war room' mentality."

Gov. Don Sundquist (R) introduced Bush by saying of his proposals: "You're right on every one and Gore is wrong."

The likeliest opponents of Bush's proposals are members of Congress in both parties, particularly those in charge of spending legislation. Many of Bush's proposals—biennial budgeting, the line-item veto, the anti-pork commission and limiting the confirmation process—amount to a transfer of power from the legislative to the executive branch. When the House recently attempted to add a biennial budgeting proposal to a budget reform measure, 42 Republicans joined a large number of Democrats in killing it.

The Clinton administration has supported the line-item veto and biennial budgeting, and Gore advisers said most of the rest of Bush's proposals are unobjectionable. But Chris Lehane, Gore's spokesman, sought to undermine Bush's credibility as a reformer. He said that Bush promised to create an office overseeing the reform of Texas government but that, "to date, no such office has been put together."

This is the second time this spring Bush has focused a major speech on changing the tone of Washington. While some of the details in today's speech will resonate more with political insiders, the overall message, as with his earlier remarks at a GOP fundraiser in Washington, is aimed at a broader audience.

"I recognize it's a little dry, but it's a necessary reform," Bush told the crowd. "If anybody pays attention, people in Washington will pay attention." He added: "I don't see this resonating with intensity across America."

Bush said he got encouraging responses from McCain and Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.).

House and Senate members said Bush's ideas would get a respectful hearing on Capitol Hill, although proposals requiring Congress to relinquish power over the nation's purse strings likely would encounter resistance. As for Bush's call for cracking down on pork-barrel spending, Rep. David L. Hobson (R-Ohio), a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, said: "In the abstract it sounds good, but in the real world of government there's always going to be some of that."

Today's speech is part of a package of reform proposals. On Friday, Bush will speak about cutting the budget and making government services more efficient. Among other things, he will propose devoting the off-year in the biennial budget process to examining which government programs should be eliminated.

Biennial budgeting, used in about 20 states, including Texas and Virginia, would free lawmakers to devote more time to other duties. Bush also would write the budget in non-election years to reduce partisan tensions. He told reporters aboard his campaign plane that his proposals would "contribute to fiscal sanity." However, Bush advisers acknowledged, it would be easy for Congress to pass supplemental spending measures, even in non-budget years.

As part of Bush's budgeting proposal, he would require a joint budget resolution to be signed by the president to provide a framework. If Congress and the president couldn't agree, they would use the president's budget or the previous year's, whichever were lower, to prevent a government shutdown. A similar process was used with continuing budget resolutions in the 1980s. The anti-shutdown provision is the one proposal that could draw serious objections from Gore. One Democrat argued that it would "put Congress on autopilot."

Bush's line-item veto provision seeks to avert the pitfalls that caused a similar measure passed by Congress to be struck down by the Supreme Court. Instead of giving the president the power to cancel spending outright, it would allow him not to release certain funds. This is similar to the "impoundment" power used by presidents until Watergate-era reforms took it away because of President Nixon's zealous use of it.

In his speech, Bush decried the "unreasonable delay and unrelenting investigation" in the approval of presidential nominations, an implicit rebuke of Senate Republicans. But he did not recommend that the Senate act on President Clinton's long-delayed appointments.

Bush said the 60-day provision should apply to whoever is the next president. But he seemed to have a pretty good idea of who that will be. "As president, I'm here in Knoxville, Tennessee," he said at one point during his speech.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFFEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, is it the case we are in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me have consent for as much time as I consume in morning business.

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

SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, while we are waiting for the managers of the Defense authorization bill to con-

tinue—I understand they are trying to work out some arrangements on the bill itself—I wanted to make a couple of comments about an issue I intend to raise as an amendment on the Defense authorization bill. At the risk of being repetitious, which I think is probably advantageous in this Chamber, I want to speak again about the issue of using sanctions that are now being employed by the United States of America on the sale or shipment of food and medicine to other countries. Those sanctions are wrong. We ought not use sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to other countries. Yet we are, so far, unable to repeal sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine.

We almost got it repealed last year. Seventy Senators voted to repeal the use of sanctions by the United States on the shipment of food and medicine to other countries—70 Senators voted for that—but we went into a conference and we were hijacked, literally legislatively hijacked by the Members of the House. So we still have sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to many parts of the world.

I also have included this year in the Agriculture appropriations bill, a repeal of the use of sanctions for food and medicine shipments. That appropriations bill will come to the floor of the Senate at some point. But I understand, procedurally, the legislative leaders can hijack it once again with a number of parliamentary approaches. I may very well be in a situation where I, Senator GORTON, who cosponsored the bill in the Appropriations Committee, Senator ASHCROFT, and others, would have a wide majority of Senators and Representatives who believe the sanctions that exist on the shipment of food and medicine to other countries in the world should be repealed. But despite the fact we perhaps have 60, 70, or 80 percent of the entire Congress who believe that, we have been unable to get it done. For that reason, I intend to offer it as an amendment on the Defense authorization bill.

Let me describe just a bit what this issue is. First of all, this is very unfair to America's family farmers. I represent a farm State. Our family farmers are told you should have the freedom to farm. That is the title of the farm bill we have—Freedom to Farm. That all sounds good except farmers don't have the freedom to sell. Our farmers raise grain and they can't sell it in Cuba, they by and large haven't been able to sell it in Iran, they can't sell it in Libya, Iraq, Sudan, North Korea—why? Because we believe these countries are operating outside the international norms. We don't like these countries. We don't like what Cuba does. We don't like the behavior of Libya or Iraq or North Korea. So we say we are going to have a set of sanctions to penalize these countries—economic sanctions. That is fine with me. I am all for creating economic sanctions to try to hurt Saddam Hussein.

But I would say this: Everybody in this Chamber knows when you take

aim at a dictator by imposing sanctions on food and medicine, you aim at the dictator and you hurt hungry people; you aim at a dictator and you hurt sick people; you aim at a dictator and you hurt poor people. It is true in every one of these countries. Sanctions are fine, but we ought never include sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine.

This country needs to understand that and learn that. The legislation I have introduced with my colleagues, Senator GORTON from the State of Washington, Senator ASHCROFT, Senator DODD, and others, is very simple. It says all current sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine shall be abolished within 180 days—gone. This country will not use food and medicine as a weapon.

Second, no President will be able to impose sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine unless he comes to the Congress and gets an affirmative vote by the Congress to do so. In other words, this ends the sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Of course, I am happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. This is a subject in which I have been heavily involved, as have others. Senator DODD and I on repeated occasions have put legislation up, I presume comparable to what the Senator has in mind. I clearly associate myself with the Senate's goals.

As a matter of fact, on the authorization bill for the Department of Defense, there is a Warner-Dodd amendment which asks for the appointment of a commission, to be appointed by President Clinton, drawing on nominees from not only the President but the majority, the Democratic leader, and others in the Congress, to begin to focus on a broad range of policy considerations with regard to the relationship between the United States and Cuba. So I am highly supportive. I have listened to the Senator enumerate a few Senators, and with a lack of humility I ask my name be included among those who strongly support, as I have now for 2 years, with Senator DODD and others, the lifting of particulars. If we are to make any inroads on the Government in Cuba, it has to be done people to people. What better way than food and medicine because if there is anything that does not have the taint of politics, it should be food and medicine. So I commend my colleague.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Virginia, of course, has been involved in this issue. I certainly agree the embargo has not worked. I mean, 40 years of embargo with respect to Cuba, speaking only now of Cuba, ought to tell us that when a policy doesn't work, you should change the policy—especially that portion of the policy that deals with food and medicine. It is immoral, in my judgment, for this country to use food as a weapon. It is not only unfair to our farmers—I have talked

about that at some length—It is unfair to say to farmers we have the freedom to farm but not the freedom to sell. But it is immoral for this country to use food as a weapon. I want to change it.

The Senator from Virginia described the support for this. I don't know if he heard me say I intend to offer it as an amendment on the Defense authorization bill. That will not be deemed a great pleasure by the Senator from Virginia, I am sure, but the only opportunity I have to get this done is to put it in legislation that is going to go to the President.

The legislative leaders have the opportunity in the appropriations process to strip this from the appropriations bill. They did it last year and they are going to do it this year. This year I am not going to sit back and say: That's fine; we do all this work and we get rid of the food and medicine sanctions in appropriations, only to have you hijack it in conference or with some parliamentary procedure, and at the end of the day this country still prevents the sale of food and medicine to the poor people in Cuba and Iraq and Libya. That is not something I am willing to accept. It is not going to happen anymore.

I mentioned previously I sat in a hospital in Havana, Cuba, last year when I visited Havana—sat in a hospital in an intensive care room and watched a 12-year-old boy in a coma. His mother, at a bedside vigil, was holding this boy's hand—and in an intensive care room—there was no beeping going on because there was no machinery or equipment there. This hospital had no equipment for a young boy in a coma in intensive care. The doctor at that hospital said, "We are out of 250 different kinds of medicine; we don't have it. We are just out of it."

And our country says we cannot move medicine to Cuba? We cannot sell medicine to Cuba? We can't sell food to Cuba? It doesn't make any sense to me.

I have been to many of the poor countries around the world. I do not want to be a part of a government that says we want to continue to use food as a weapon; we want to continue to use food and medicine as weapons. That is fundamentally wrong. It is a wrong-headed public policy.

Again, I say to the Senator from Virginia, I do not think he heard me. He has been a strong supporter of these issues. I have great respect for him. He will not be pleased that I intend to offer this as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill at some point. I feel I must do that because it is the only way we will get it done. The legislative leaders intend to strip this out of the appropriations process. The only opportunity for the Members of the House and Senate to express their will is to put this in a bill that is going to be signed by the President.

Do I understand the managers wish to do some business?

Mr. REID. If the Senator will be kind enough to withhold, without losing his

right to the floor, we have a unanimous consent agreement we would like to have entered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WARNER. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent the Senate, at 11 a.m., immediately proceed to consider the following nomination on Executive Calendar: The nomination of Gen. John Gordon to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy, with the time until 11:30 to be equally divided between myself and the ranking member.

I further ask unanimous consent that a vote occur at 11:30 this morning on confirmation of the nomination of General Gordon, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, any statements relating to the nomination appear in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

I further ask unanimous consent that no later than July 12, 2000, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 473, the nomination of Madelyn Creedon to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration. I further ask consent that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided in the usual form. I finally ask consent that following the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination, the President be notified of the Senate's action immediately following the vote, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. No objection, Mr. President. We support this.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, just further administrative observation by myself, I thank the distinguished colleagues on the other side for trying to work it out such that at some point this morning Senator LEVIN and I may move to consideration of 40 or more cleared amendments on the Defense authorization bill. I know every effort is being made to achieve that procedural opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, that effort would be made, as I understand it, immediately following the vote on the confirmation of General Gordon. I am just wondering if that is accurate, so we can inform our colleagues who have an interest in this that the effort which the Senator from Virginia, the manager of the bill, has just described would occur immediately following the vote on the confirmation of General Gordon.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Gordon nomination at this point.