

If that affronted some people, I am sorry it did, but it certainly did not affront me and it would not have affronted me had it been a Democratic administration coming in.

I do not think there is any agency of Government—no one certainly at the congressional level—to give us advice whose views go clear across the length and breadth of Government, all the way across, and is more qualified to give advice than the General Accounting Office.

I know if it had been a Democratic administration coming in, I would have welcomed those transition reports to give a new administration some guidance. Instead of that, their initiative, which they took on their own, seemed to have affronted some people here. And we heard continual criticism of the General Accounting Office ever since that time. Even up to and including one of the reported suggestions after the Republican conference made their suggestions on cutbacks at 25 percent, one of the Senators was quoted as saying he thought they should be cut back 50 percent. That would virtually do away with the fine job the General Accounting Office does for the Congress.

So I hope that we can think about this very carefully as to what we are doing when we cut funds back for the General Accounting Office. I hope they can be permitted not to take a one-quarter cut in this year, all in this year. That would decimate them. It would interrupt all their programs. They are on a reduction of about one-fourth of their work force right now. It started back 2 years ago and will be completed by the end of 1997. That is their target for this, and they are on schedule for it right now.

They can go that kind of reduction in an orderly fashion and accomplish the same thing if just given the time to do it.

I realize the efforts that we try to put forth around here to cut the budget, but if we are cutting the budget with regard to the General Accounting Office to that level, I think we are making a very, very, major mistake and one that we will regret.

If we do not have them, who are we to use for investigations that they have done in the past? I have used them. As chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I used them for quite a number of different projects.

One I will mention. We are all concerned about the nuclear waste across the country, nuclear waste out of the nuclear weapons production program across the country that went for so many years without anybody even looking at it.

Back in 1985, I was at Fernald in Ohio. People wanted me to come out there, and it was one of the first steps in the nuclear weapons process, a processing plant at Fernald, and they felt there were problems there with waste.

I went out not knowing quite what I would find. The situation was worse

than I thought it was. I went to work on that.

Then we asked the General Accounting Office to do a study of the site, which they did. I thought it could not possibly be this bad all over the whole country at the 17 major sites in 11 different States that were part of that nuclear weapons process. It turned out we asked GAO to do studies in some of the other areas, which they did, and what did they find? They found what I had run into at Fernald was only the starting point. What was out there across the whole nuclear weapons complex was a hideous ignoring of what had been going on all during the cold war as we fought to get fissile material and nuclear weapons produced as fast as we possibly could.

We had been just ignoring the waste. Everybody was so concerned, including me, including Members of this body, including most Americans, we were concerned, "The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming." We have to get those nuclear weapons out there fast.

What are we going to do with the waste? Put it out behind the plant and we will deal with that later. That is what we did. This "out behind the plant and deal with it later" was all the nuclear waste that we are now going to have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to clean up.

The organization that has given the best definition of that whole problem all across the country is the General Accounting Office. I add this. Back then, when we first ran into this and had the first GAO reports, we asked for estimates from the Department of Energy as to how much they thought it was going to cost to clean up this whole thing out across the country. This was in about early 1986. They estimated it was going to cost \$8 to \$12 billion to clean these places up.

Better defining as GAO went through this showed in about 2 years it would cost closer to \$100 billion. That was our estimate for several years. Then the cost went up, through better refining of the data, to about \$200 billion and 20 to 30 years to do the cleanup.

Now this past week the Department of Energy has finally estimated that depending on how clean we want to make the sites, the cost will be \$200 to \$375 billion. Some can be done in 20 to 30 years, and some of it may take as long as 75 years as we try to learn how to do it.

GAO is the one who has defined most of this problem and pointed it out. They deserve a lot of credit for having done that.

We could go on. I could talk all night here, all afternoon and all evening about what has happened in GAO on the different projects and what we have been able to save. They have gotten back so many times their cost, the cost of having GAO so many times.

I indicated just my own personal case of requests for information that has resulted in several billion being saved on different accounts that we can document. This \$200 billion I said they

saved since about 1985, I believe it was, they can document. They have follow-up activities that show. These are not some wild pie-in-the-sky estimates to make them look good. They document this with follow-up review procedures to see how much has actually been saved, and \$200 billion over the last 10 years is an enormous savings. Yet at the same time we are talking about whacking them by one-quarter in addition to the reduction they are already making. That would be the most false economy I can think of if we went through with that.

Madam President, I have spoken longer than I usually speak on the floor today, but I think these are very important matters. We talk about pulling back money for the IRS at a time when they are getting their TSM, their tax system modernization in place. That is a mistake. They are getting back far more than what it costs.

If we cut them down on their compliance activities, their follow-up on tax returns, their follow-up to make sure that everybody is paying their fair share, their follow-up to make sure the IETC—the earned income tax credit—is not given incorrectly to the wrong people, when we start cutting back on activities like that, that is a mistake.

I personally would like to see funding increased for GAO and increased for IRS because their track record is that they are getting back more than those additional dollars would cost.

I hope we are not going to, in the interests of balancing the budget here, make some false economies here that will cost more in the long run than it would to fully fund these agencies as requested right now.

I appreciate the consideration of my colleagues. I yield the floor.

BUDGET PROCESS STATUS

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I wish to address the underlying legislation and also generally about how we stand in this budget process, because obviously this piece of legislation has an impact on the budgets generally.

We are about to break here for a couple of weeks, and when we return from this break, we will have a chance to debate the basic budget resolution before the Congress. This rescission package which we are presently taking up is sort of a precursor to that whole debate, the budget resolution of the Congress.

What it all comes down to is an issue of how we preserve the American dream for our children. What this debate is about is whether or not we are going to start putting fiscal discipline into the Congress and into the Federal Government in a manner which will allow Members to avoid an economic catastrophe which is looming over the horizon and which, unfortunately, our children will be the recipient of.

If we do not soon get control over the extraordinary amount of debt which the Federal Government is running up, we will essentially pass on to the next generation a nation which is bankrupt.

In fact, the national debt today stands at about \$5 trillion. It will stand at about \$8 trillion by the year 2010. Today, about every American owes about \$19,000 if we take the national debt and divide it by the number of Americans. As a result, we are essentially creating a situation where the next generation will not have the capacity for paying the costs of Government which has been passed on to them by our generation. We will be the first generation—talking about the postwar baby boom generations that dominates the membership of this Congress—we will be the first generation in the history of this great country which passes less on to our children than was given by our parents. The opportunity to survive and have a lucrative and a prosperous lifestyle will essentially have been snuffed out for our children by our actions.

Federal taxes today consume about 25 percent of the median income of an American. In the year 1970 it was only 16 percent. Combined Federal and State taxes consume about 50 percent of the incomes of an average American. That is today. That is a huge amount of money. By the time that our children begin to earn and produce, unless we get control over the growth of the Government, taxes will consume 84 percent—84 percent of their income.

Now, that is not my number. I did not come up with that number. That was a number that was actually in the President's prior budget, not in the one he presented this year but the one he presented a year ago. He took it out of this year's budget, I suspect, because it was such a startling number he did not want to disclose it again.

Madam President, 84 percent of all the earnings of all Americans will be absorbed simply to pay for the Government as we move into the beginning of the next century unless we do something, unless we begin to bring under control the rate of growth of our Federal Government.

The current spending policies of this Government also directly affects the cost of doing business and the cost of living in this country.

For example, the national debt adds nearly 2 percent to interest rates, and that, of course, directly affects everyone's lifestyle. For example, those 2 percent in additional interest points represents \$900 on the cost of financing a \$15,000 car and represents \$37,000 on the cost of financing a \$75,000 house.

CBO has projected that interest rates would fall, however, if we were able to bring under control Federal spending. In fact, if we were able to balance the budget and put in place a balanced budget, interest rates would fall by fully 1 percent.

In addition, we know if we look into the outyears, what is driving this defi-

cit, what is driving this rate of growth of the Federal Government is entitlement spending. It is not that this country is essentially an undertaxed country, it is not that the people of this Nation do not pay enough in taxes, it is that the people of this country are being asked to spend too much by the Federal Government.

This chart reflects that, and the problem. The green line, which is hard to see, which runs across the middle of the chart, shows what the revenues of the Federal Government are, as we project out into the future years what they have been since 1970 and what they are as we project in future years.

The blue spaces represent discretionary spending. The yellow space represents interest on the Federal debt. And the red space represents entitlement spending.

What this chart essentially says is by the year 2010, we as a Government are going to be spending so much on entitlement programs and interest on the Federal debt that it will absorb all the revenues of the Federal Government. We will not be able to pay for things like national defense, education, roads, libraries, all the services which are discretionary spending. Unless, of course, we wish to tax people at 84 percent of their earnings. Then, around about the year 2015, what this chart essentially says is that because of the force of the cost and the rate of growth of the cost of entitlement spending, this country essentially goes bankrupt.

Ironically, the Medicare system, which is one of the major entitlement programs and which is the primary health care system for senior citizens, that goes bankrupt in about the year 2002, around here. But as a result of demographics and the fact that a large number of citizens in the postwar baby boom generation become senior citizens beginning in about the year 2007, and that group starts to peak around the year 2020, as a result of the huge number of people then receiving benefits under things like Social Security and Medicare, the whole country essentially goes bankrupt in about the year 2015. We end up like Mexico, essentially, a country unable to pay for the operation of its Government and unable to secure or provide a prosperous lifestyle for its people.

All of this occurs not as a result of the fact that people in this country are not paying enough taxes. You would believe they are not paying enough taxes if you listen to many of the Members on the other side of the aisle, that simply raising taxes will address this issue. But that is not the case. As the next chart shows, all of this occurs because we are simply spending too much money. Taxes have remained fairly constant over the last 20 years and will remain constant over the next 20 years as a percent of our national income. But spending has gone up dramatically and stays up and then goes up even more dramatically as we head into the outyears. So it is spending that we

must address and addressing the issue of spending we must also address the entitlement spending.

How has the other side decided to do this? How has the President and his party approached this issue? The President sent us a budget about a month ago which projected \$200 billion deficits for as far as the eye could see—\$200 billion deficits. It added \$1 trillion of new debt, just in the next 5 years, to our children's shoulders. It made no major proposals to control any costs in any of the entitlement programs. Imagine that. Entitlement spending makes up 60 percent of the Federal accounts—60 percent. And not one proposal was made in the President's budget to address any of the entitlement accounts.

It was, to say the least, a political document—not designed to address the substance of the major issue confronting this country, which is the fiscal viability of our children's future; not designed to address the fact that we are facing an impending bankruptcy in the Medicare system and a bankruptcy of this Nation for our next generation—but a budget designed to get reelected in 2 years from now.

I call it the Pontius Pilate school of budgeting. Essentially, the President and his party washed their hands of the issue of addressing the deficit and the issue of controlling spending and the issue of how we protect our children's future, and walked off into the distance and said they would give us \$200 billion deficits for as far as the eye can see.

This, in my opinion, was an outrage, an inexcusable act, and one which clearly did not reflect the need to manage this Government correctly and to face up to what is the most significant issue we as a Government confront.

On the other side, we, as Republicans, have proposed substantive proposals to address this deficit problem. Today we are taking up this rescission bill. It represents specific reductions in spending for the next 6 months, the balance of this fiscal year, reductions in spending which actually exceed in 6 months what the President has allegedly sent up to us over 6 years. He suggested another \$13 billion in spending cuts. We are proposing \$13 billion more—more than \$13 billion in spending cuts in the next 6 months. He is talking about it over the next 5 years and actually does it through budget gimmicks on top of that.

So that is the first step in this exercise, in this critical exercise of protecting our children's future. But the more important step is how we address the major budget for the next 5 years and how we address specifically the entitlement spending that is driving the issue of the deficit.

If you look at the entitlement accounts there are obviously a large number of them. Many people do not understand what they are. Basically, those are accounts where you have the legal right to receive a payment from the Federal Government, unlike discretionary accounts, where the Federal

Government has the option to spend the money. In defense we have the option to spend the money. In education we have the option to spend the money. In building roads we have the option to spend the money. But in entitlement accounts, if you meet certain criteria, you have the right to be supported by the Government or have the Government pay you.

In the entitlement accounts are such areas as Social Security—it is considered an entitlement account although it is really an insurance account—health care, especially Medicare and Medicaid, farm programs, SSI, EITC, pensions for Civil Service and military retirees. Those are some of the biggest ones—welfare. Those are all entitlement accounts.

To begin with, Social Security is something that in the short run is not a problem and we have not proposed doing anything that would impact that in a negative way. Why is that? For the next 7 years, actually, Social Security runs a surplus. Every year more money is paid into the Social Security system than is paid out: \$60 billion this year, by the year 2000 it will be \$100 billion annually. That is a factor of demographics and a tax increase that occurred back in 1983.

After the year 2005 the postwar baby boom generation hits the system. Then Social Security becomes a major problem. But for people who are over the age 50 there is no proposal and there should be no proposal that would impact their Social Security benefit. So we have not addressed that in the short run of the next 5-year budget.

So we take Social Security off the table but we leave—that leaves on the table the other major entitlement issues. Of those health care is 55 percent of the spending, health care accounts.

In the health care accounts we are talking about two major areas, Medicare and Medicaid. Medicaid is essentially a welfare proposal, where moneys come out of the general fund to support people who cannot afford their own health care and their own long-term care; Medicare is an insurance proposal for the most part, where people pay into it through their earnings. What we propose, as Republicans, is not to cut Medicare, not to cut Medicaid. There has not been any proposal to do any of that. What we propose is to change those programs to make them deliver a better service to the people who are receiving them and, in the process, slow their rate of growth.

Today the Medicare and the Medicaid accounts are growing at about 10.5 percent annually—10.5 percent. That is three times the rate of inflation. It is actually about 10 times the rate of inflation in the health care community in the private sector. Last year the health care community in the private sector actually had a negative rate of growth. So it is actually 10 times that. But it is three times the rate of growth of the general economy. That is simply too fast and it cannot be afforded.

What we are suggesting is we should slow that rate of growth from 10.5 percent down to about 7 percent. That is still twice, in the Medicare area, twice the rate of growth of inflation.

How do we do that? How do we slow that rate of growth? We are going to do it by suggesting to senior citizens that they should have more choices. In fact, we are going to say to them essentially we are going to try to give you the same type of choices a Member of Congress has. That seems pretty reasonable to me. They do not have that today. Today most seniors function out of what is known as a fee-for-service service in health care. Why? Fee for service is where you go out, hire your local doctor, you know him personally, and you pay him personally, and you pay whoever he refers to personally. It is a one-on-one type of relationship to health care. Most seniors in the fifties, sixties, seventies when they were growing up, that was the health care provided in this country, about the only health care, and they were comfortable with it. So the culture of senior citizens today use the fee for service. It happens to be fairly expensive. In fact, it is the most expensive form of health care. It is why health care is growing so fast as a function of cost.

So we are going to say to seniors, I hope, as a way to control the rate of growth of cost, if you want to stay with fee-for-service, fine, do that. We are not going to limit your ability to do that. You can keep that program. But if you as a senior decide to choose a program which is captivated, where the fee for that program is fixed, you go and buy the program at the beginning of the year, they supply you all your health care needs, and the needs they supply are the same as you get as under your fee for service, if you go into that type of program, and that type of program costs less even though it supplies the same type of care—it has to supply the same type of care as you get today—if that program costs less, and it probably will, these are HMO's, PPO's, we are going to let you, the senior, say keep part of your savings. In other words, if it costs \$5,000 to get fee for service and you can go out and buy into an HMO for \$500, you get to keep 75 percent of the \$500 you saved. That is a pretty good deal for seniors. They are going to get the same, probably better, health care in many areas and it is a good deal for the Federal Government. Why? Because it gives us a predictable amount of cost for health care and its rate of growth.

We know that if we can move people out of the fee-for-service system into a captivated system, we can in the out-years save a dramatic amount of money and be assured of the rate of growth. We can afford, instead of the 10-percent rate of growth, closer to the 7-percent rate of growth which we need to reach.

It also creates a huge attitude in the marketplace where you will see competition rise, and you will see seniors

given all types of choices. Who knows what will come forward. The market has imagination. They will be able to get programs today that we cannot conceive of, probably offers to give them drugs, long-term care, and probably offers to give them all sorts of different opportunities that they continue to have today under their present plan.

That is a result of marketplace forces competing for those dollars, as a thoughtful senior out there purchasing and make the senior a smarter purchaser. As a result the Federal Government and the seniors are the winners. We will see a reduction in the rate of growth. That is one approach which we will take. We call that creating a better program.

Medicare was created in the 1960's. It is a sixties health care program. It no longer functions in the present climate effectively as a way to deliver health care. We need to change it. Unfortunately, the forces of the status quo which have dominated this place for the last 30 years resist any type of change. But this type of change is needed in order to bring these costs under control, and in order to assure that our children have an opportunity to have health care and that the Medicare system does not go broke so that our seniors get health care after the year 2002. Medicaid accounts, and the welfare accounts, two major entitlements where we have essentially said—and I think most people would agree with this, especially in welfare—the Federal Government has failed. If there is an example of the failure of the liberal welfare state, it is welfare. We have created generations of dependency and despondency. People are locked into their system and told they cannot be productive citizens, and if they try to be they are beaten down by a bureaucracy which says you are not capable of being productive. We are going to keep you in this atmosphere, this endless cycle of dependency on the Federal Government and on the Federal dole. It has not worked. Welfare is a failure. The vast majority of Americans know that. The only folks who do not seem to know that are some of our more liberal colleagues who appear to be tied inexorably to this holdover from the concepts of the past.

What we are going to suggest is that the States should have the responsibility of managing the welfare systems, and they are willing to do it. Given the imagination, the creativity and the flexibility the States have shown in all sorts of areas, release that sort of enthusiasm and energy on the issue of welfare reform and Medicaid, and you will see programs which are better. You will see the recipients and the people who need the care and the assistance get better care, better assistance programs, and the States feel they can do it at less cost. We will design these programs in relationship in conjunction with the Governors so that they will be Governor-driven, so to say. They will be imaginative. They will be

creative, and bring to the process a much better view and a much better approach to welfare and to Medicaid. We will get a better program, and we will get it for less money again because the States freed of this huge overhead of Federal bureaucracy can deliver more for the dollar, deliver it for less because they do not have to comply with all of this endless paperwork and bureaucracy.

As Governor of New Hampshire, I knew that if I did not have to comply with an overwhelming morass of Federal red tape and the number of people that we had to keep on the payroll just to comply with the absurd regulations, the massive regulations that were coming out of Washington, that I could have taken that dollar and gotten more dollars out of my welfare for recipients who needed it, make sure the folks who did not need it did not get it, make sure the people who you had to help transition out of welfare were helped transitioned out of welfare, and in the process do it for considerably less and be more efficient. The Governors feel that way too. That is why they have supported this initiative.

So we will undertake that process in reforming that type of program. In other entitlement accounts we can take the same type of approach—imaginative, creative approaches which will slow the rate of growth. That is what we are talking about; slowing the rate of growth of these entitlement accounts. Why? For two simple goals. First, to make sure that these programs work a lot better because they are not working today very well. But, second, to make sure that we do not bankrupt our children's future. That must be one of our primary thoughts.

So as we go forward in this budget debate, we need to be sure that we understand what is at risk here. We can follow the course which has been laid out by some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle which is to resist every proposal that comes forward to impact any of these programs, and to say that it is wrong—wrong to change one "i" or change one "t" as it has been dotted and crossed for the last 20 years. But we can attempt to go in and fundamentally change and reform the manner in which Government is delivered in this country, to slow the rate of growth of Government, to downsize the size of the Federal Government, to return power to the States, the power to the people, to have a Government which understands the delivery of these programs to be significantly improved through delivering them at the State level, and with the programs that we retain here make sure we take a number of imaginative, more creative approaches such as giving choice to our seniors in the area of health care. Those are the types of changes we need to undertake in order to assure that our children have some opportunity for a prosperous lifestyle.

If we make those choices here on this rescissions bill, and when we come

back on a budget bill which would substantially reduce the rate of growth over the next 5 years, then we will see a budget that will come into balance. That is what this black line means. The red line happens to be the President's budget as it is projected out over the next 5 years, with the \$200 billion deficits, continuous \$5 trillion new debt. But the type of budget we are going to propose will be a budget that will lead us to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Yes. The decisions will be challenging, and I suppose the votes will be defined as tough, hard-to-make votes. But they really are not. They really should be fairly easy votes because what we are talking about here is how to reform this Government so that it delivers the services it is supposed to deliver, but delivers them in a manner which can be afforded not only by our generation but by the next generation which is going to have to pay for the costs which we are passing down to them.

I believe we can accomplish that. I believe we must reject the debate tactics which we have heard on this floor for the last few days which has essentially demagogued every cut as an act that shows no compassion to whatever constituency has been identified for the moment and acknowledge the truth of the matter, that if we are truly concerned about our children—and there has been so much rhetoric from the other side about this program or that program being an issue of caring for children and compassion for children—if we really care about our children, then we have to be willing to address the deficit and the fiscal crisis which we are facing today and the fact that we are going to pass into a bankrupt Nation if we do not act and act quickly and act now.

We should also reject the view that all compassion is retained here in Washington, that the only people who can run a program that really is caring and thoughtful is some small cadre of bureaucrats aided by their assistants here in the Congress of the United States out of Washington. How arrogant that is. How elitist that is. It assumes that Governors are not compassionate, State legislators are not compassionate, that the people on the main frontline of the issue, the folks in the towns and cities across this Nation who deliver these programs do not have the compassion to manage them themselves; they must be told how to do it by this cadre of self-appointed experts here in Washington.

That theory of compassion holds no substance. It is not defensible. This debate, when you hear those terms, is not about compassion. This debate is about power. That is all it is about, the fact that there are folks in this city who have built their careers around the capacity to control the dollars which flow back to run these programs. And they understand that when we move these programs back to the States and

the dollars back to the States, they will lose that power and they do not like it. And so they mask their fear of losing that power or they cover up their desire to retain that power with this inflammatory language about compassion which on the face of it is not defensible because it presumes that they are the only ones who possess such traits and that elected officials at the local level and at the State level cannot equal their level of compassion, which is absurd.

So as we move out back to our States over the next couple of weeks and we discuss the issue of the deficit and of the budget, and as we take on issues such as this rescission package and later this budget itself, I think it is absolutely critical that we be honest with the American people, that we explain to them that if action is not taken very soon on bringing this deficit under control, on bringing the rate of growth of this Federal Government under control, our senior citizens will find a Medicare system that goes bankrupt in the year 2002 and that our children will find a nation that goes bankrupt in the year 2015, 2020, somewhere in that range; that we will have passed on to the next generation a nation that is unable to supply them the opportunities for prosperity and hope that we were given by our parents. And as I said at the beginning of this talk, it is not right and not fair for any generation to do that to another generation.

So I hope that as we go forth over these next few weeks we will honestly discuss what is truly at risk here, and what is at risk is the future of our children.

Mr. President, I yield back the time.

Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT. 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. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, we have a solemn responsibility the people have given us. It is a responsibility to control the spending of this Government, to bring it in line with the concept of balance, to somehow manage the resources of this Government in a way which would not continue to jeopardize future generations.

You and I are keenly aware of the fact that every man, woman, and child in the United States of America has a debt of about \$18,000, every family of four a debt of about \$72,000.

We have before us a rescission bill, this measure to try and rescind certain spending items which we think we can afford not to spend—as a matter of fact, we cannot afford to spend. These are items which ought to be cut.

The freshman class of the Senate in this body in the last several days has forwarded additional cuts that would

allow us to save additional resources. The original proposal for rescissions in the Senate was about \$13.3 billion, and this Senate just a few evenings ago in an act of rather courageous judgment decided that we would defer an additional \$1.8 billion in spending by deferring the construction of a number of courthouses around the country.

I think it is important for us to look carefully at the proposal of the freshmen Senators that would provide for another \$1.3 billion in spending reductions. That money would be available for future generations because it would not be an encumbrance of debt placed upon them. And the kinds of places in which there are projected cuts are places where we can afford to trim back spending, not the least of them is the AmeriCorps of President Clinton, the so-called volunteer arena where people are paid significant sums of money in order to go and volunteer.

What is interesting about AmeriCorps is that it has been costing the American citizens an average of \$30,400 per volunteer.

Now, most people do not think of \$30,400 price tags on volunteers. We think of volunteers as a part of a great American tradition of giving. This is part of the great American governmental tradition of spending. Not only is it \$30,400, a lot of that just goes into the bureaucracy to support those so-called volunteers. As a matter of fact, the data we have indicates that \$15,000 of each one of those \$30,400 items goes into the bureaucracy and overhead and administrative costs to support the volunteers. That only leaves \$15,400 remaining. So that money then supports the so-called volunteer.

But it is interesting to know where the volunteers work. The volunteers, 20 percent of them, one out of every five of them, works for the Government. And frequently these individuals are not really volunteering in the traditional area of volunteer service in America at all. It is just a back-door way of bringing more people into the bureaucracy.

So the AmeriCorps Program is a program that ought to be carefully looked at. And when the freshman class proposed, in response to the mandate of the American people, that we cut an additional \$206 million from the AmeriCorps Program, it was a worthy thing to consider.

Now there are those who have come to say to us, "Well, volunteering is noble; volunteering is wonderful." It is noble and it is wonderful, but it is very expensive if you accept the administration's definition of a volunteer. Here you have volunteers in the State of Alaska averaging over \$40,000 apiece in terms of cost. I know there are a lot of folks in my home State that would consider that kind of volunteering a great opportunity.

So, I would just say that when we have come forward with the potential of cutting \$206 million from the AmeriCorps Program, I think we have

come forward with a reasonable way to say that we ought to restrain spending, to rescind this appropriation so that we do not unduly jeopardize future generations with debt.

Another important area they are recommending and we are recommending for rescission is the area of foreign operations, in the area of our generosity to countries overseas. The original recommendation of the Senate was that we would have a foreign operations cut of \$100 million. That represents about an eight-tenths of 1 percent cut. The House had recommended \$191 million. If we were to move from the eight-tenths of 1 percent, or \$100 million, figure to the \$191 million figure, we would only be moving to about a total of 1.4 percent cut in the so-called foreign operations budget.

Now, this foreign aid that we give to other countries can be important, can be in the national interest. But let us not suggest to the entire world that the American people are the only people that are going to have to act responsibly in the area of restraining spending. Other countries around the globe are going to have to participate with us, as we tighten our belt in order to reach a balanced budget, in order to have the kind of fiscal restraint and financial responsibility that our children are demanding of us. As a matter of fact, not just our children and their yet unearned wages, but the people across America are demanding of us.

Incidentally, I think countries around the world are demanding that we act responsibly. If you will look at what has been happening to the American dollar on world monetary markets recently, we have been in a free fall. We ought not to have the picture of George Washington on the American dollar. We ought to have a parachute, if we are going to continue to see its value plummet.

Why does the American dollar plummet on world markets? I think it is a lack of confidence in the discipline of this Government to restrain its spending. And we ought to be restraining spending. So if we do restrain spending and if we are in a position to restrain spending in such a way as to protect the future of America and stabilize the world economy, our restraint of spending the additional \$91.6 million in foreign operations will be a great benefit not only to us in balancing the budget, but of great benefit to the world because we will have helped create an environment of financial stability.

Well, there are a whole range of things that are a part of this proposed rescission bill. It includes everything from public broadcasting, to the foreign operations, to the AmeriCorps, to the Legal Services Corporation, a variety of items, all of which at one time or another, or some of which even today are laudable things, but things we simply cannot afford.

Mr. President, I believe the American people expect us to live within our resources. The question is not, Is it

something you want? The question is, Is it something that we should be spending for, especially in light of the fact that we do not currently have the resources?

When you and I sit down at our kitchen table to develop the budgets that we must have with our family, we ask more than the question: Is this a good thing or is it a bad thing? We have a list of good things that we might like that would be a mile long. We look at the catalog, whether it be from Sears or Lands End, or wherever it was that we are looking at. There are all kinds of good things there.

The question is not whether they are good things. It is whether or not they are a priority for us, whether or not we really have the wherewithal to engage in this kind of activity.

Now those who have come to attack the committee's proposed reductions have suggested that we are cutting children; that we are somehow injuring young people. They have elevated horror stories. They have elevated very sad scenarios, suggesting that we are heartless and compassionless.

This has been done irresponsibly, in my judgment, because, as a matter of fact, we are responsibly addressing these problems.

One of the things that was projected for reduction and rescission was the WIC Program, Women, Infants, and Children. It is a nutrition program. There was a modest reduction there, I think, of \$35 million.

There is a great outcry as a result of that modest reduction, saying that this was heartless, it was compassionless, it was going to be taking food from the mouths of women, infants, and children, and it was going to be destructive of the future because people would have lower levels of nutrition.

The truth of the matter is this money was to be rescinded from an unallocated, undistributed surplus in the Women, Infants, and Children Program. The surplus was about \$150 million. And to reduce the surplus by \$35 million, from \$150 million to \$115 million, would not impair the nutrition, not impair the health, not impair the safety, not impair the standing of any of these individuals.

But it is important for us to impair the deficit. And we need to look carefully at the way we are managing resources, even resources that are devoted to things of relatively high priorities, even resources that are devoted to things like health and the like. If they are not being utilized, if they are in unallocated and undistributed surplus accounts, let us make sure that we do not leave that resource there or otherwise fail to rescind it so that we occasion additional spending somewhere else.

We have come in response to the voice of the people last November. As one of the newly elected Senators, I know my colleagues and I, when we came to add our voices to the voices

that were asking for rescission of unnecessary spending, we knew we were doing that representing the American people. We were doing that because the people are demanding responsibility in Government. They were demanding reasonable, but tough decisions. They were demanding we restrain the growth of Government. They were demanding that we limit the kind of jeopardy into which our children will go because the debt is higher and higher and higher.

We are not talking about an environment where the debt is going down and down and down. The President has proposed debts of \$200 billion a year as far as he is forecasting.

As a matter of fact, the data from which he is creating the forecasts is data that is now coming out of OMB. A year ago, it was represented that we would be using data from the Congressional Budget Office, but that data is not nearly as favorable to the President as the OMB data is.

The OMB data suggests the deficit would only be about \$200 billion—only about \$200 billion—next year and the year after and the year after and the year after. But the Congressional Budget Office data indicates that the deficit is substantially greater, hundreds of millions of dollars greater in the outyears than the President's forecasts have indicated.

So we are not talking about a circumstance or situation where it does not matter whether we are cutting, it does not matter whether we are rescinding. It does matter. It matters not only to taxpayers today, but it matters to the young people of tomorrow.

An ordinary family, the father, the mother, no matter how deeply they go into debt, they simply cannot provide or mandate that the youngsters will some day have to grow up and pay that debt. There is a rule against that in America, you cannot be held responsible for the debt of another. No matter how reckless I might be, I cannot create debts my children would have to pay off.

However, there is an exception to the rule. The Congress can incur debt that the next generation will have to pay off, and we have been incurring that debt at an incredible rate. Now each family of four faces a debt of \$72,000, and it is growing and growing and growing.

We have the opportunity in this body to say we will stop some of the spending, we will stop the hemorrhaging where we can, we are going to restrain this outflow, and it is time for us to restrain the outflow.

We will restrain it in terms of the AmeriCorps Program, yes, the so-called volunteer program that costs \$30,000 per volunteer. We will restrain it in the area of foreign operations and foreign aid. Yes, if we are going to have some belt tightening in this country, other countries around the world should share in that belt tightening as well. We will restrain it even for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting,

which is an institution of great wealth, but is an institution which ignores that great wealth and continues to draw upon taxpayers' resources and which ought to be able to use that wealth to avoid having to draw on taxpayers' resources.

We need to make sure that we even implement the rescission cuts which the President of the United States has asked us to implement. When we first started this debate on rescissions, we were going to ignore over \$300 million of cuts that the President asked us to make. It is time for us to knock those earmarked special projects out. Those are the projects which the President next year, under a line-item veto, will have the authority to knock out.

He said this year that he would like for us to knock those out, and I think we ought to accommodate the President in that respect and knock out that kind of spending. If we do, we will be responding constructively to the mandate of the people. If we do, we will be responding constructively to what they have asked us to do in the election last year. I believe that is very important. They have asked us to be responsible in restraining spending.

The Senate has an opportunity, as a result of the report of the committee and the amendment offered by the freshmen Members of the U.S. Senate, to rescind the expenditure of resources, the expenditure of which will drive us deeper and deeper into debt.

Mr. President, it is time for us to accept the challenge of the American people to respond constructively to rescind unnecessary spending and to devote the proceeds of the rescissions to the reduction of the Federal deficit. That is the mandate of the people. It is the opportunity which we have. I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NATIONAL 4-H DAY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 100, a resolution submitted by me proclaiming April 5 as National 4-H Day; further, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the resolution and preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the resolution be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The Democratic side has agreed to this request.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 100) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 100

Whereas the Senate is proud to honor the National 4-H Youth Development Program of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service for 85 years of experience-based education to young people throughout the United States;

Whereas this admirable Program seeks to provide a learning experience for the whole child (including head, heart, hands, and health) and help children of the United States to acquire knowledge, develop life skills, and form attitudes to enable the children to become self-directed, productive, and contributing members of society;

Whereas the 5,500,000 urban, suburban, and rural participants in the Program, ranging from 5 to 19 years of age, hail from diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds and truly represent a cross-section of the United States;

Whereas the Program could not have achieved success without the service of the more than 65,000 volunteers who have given generously of their time, talents, energies, and resources; and

Whereas throughout proud history of the Programs, the Program has developed positive roles models for the youth of the United States and (through its innovative and inspiring programs) continues to build character and to instill the values that have made the United States strong and great: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) proclaims April 5, 1995, as National 4-H Day;

(2) commends the 4-H Youth Development Program and the many children and volunteers who have made the Program as success; and

(3) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I was pleased to submit Senate Resolution 100 proclaiming today, April 5, 1995, as National 4-H Day. As part of the Cooperative Extension System, 4-H is a program of informal education for youth. It is open to all interested young people, age 5 through 19, regardless of race, sex, creed, or national origin.

The mission of 4-H is to help youth acquire knowledge, develop life skills, and form attitudes that will enable them to become self-directed, productive, and contributing members of society. This mission is carried out through the involvement of parents, volunteer leaders, and other adults who organize and conduct educational experience in community and family settings.

4-H gives young people the opportunity to contribute to food production, community service, energy conservation, and environmental protection. In addition, they learn about science and technology and participate in programs that help them with employment and career decisions, health, nutrition, home improvement, and family relationships. In the process, 4-H youth apply leadership skills, acquire a positive self-image, and learn to respect and get along with others. As a result of international cooperation with 82 countries, 4-H is also contributing to world understanding.