

Approximately 5.5 million young people participate in 4-H. The program has almost 50 million alumni.

The 4-H's are:

Head—clearer thinking and decision-making; knowledge useful throughout life.

Heart—greater loyalty, strong personal values, positive self-concept, concern for others.

Hands—larger service, work-force preparedness, useful skills, science and technology, literacy.

Health—better living, healthy lifestyles.

The 4-H pledge is:

I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service and my health to better living, for my club, my community, my country, and my world.

The 4-H motto is: "To make the best better."

Mr. President, this organization provides positive and nurturing experiences for our country's youth. Many of our Members have served in 4-H. I am pleased to inform you that 4-H'ers from all over the Nation are visiting Washington today.

Senator HEFLIN, a cosponsor of this resolution, and I would appreciate passage of this resolution in acknowledgment of the fine contribution members of this organization make to our society.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I actually will be brief, Mr. President. I, between other work, had a chance to hear some of my colleagues speak on the floor. Since they are not here now, I do not choose to get into a major debate. Others Senators are not here. Hopefully, we can do that at the right time.

Just a couple quick points for the record, Mr. President. We have for now, several days or at least the last day and a half, been at an impasse. I just want to set the record straight.

One or two of my colleagues were talking about the delay and the, if you will, filibuster of this rescission bill. Actually, I think it was yesterday morning, I came out with a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. I made it very clear that I was willing to vote on it, was more than willing to have a time agreement. But the majority leader then came out and second degreed that amendment.

For those watching, second degree means that his amendment took precedence over my amendment.

From that point in time, we really have been pretty much at an impasse. The amendment I brought to the floor of the Senate yesterday dealt with the Women, Infants, and Children Pro-

gram, nutrition standards, all of which, by the way, is quite relevant to this rescissions bill, since there are proposed cuts in the WIC Program.

The majority leader's second-degree amendment dealt with Jordan.

At that point in time, Mr. President, we have been pretty much at an impasse, but it is certainly not because Senators like myself and others do not want to move forward. We do.

There has been another amendment which has taken up a good deal of the time this week by my colleague from New York. That amendment deals with Mexico—financial assistance to Mexico.

Mr. President, the rescissions bill of proposed cuts, we have had some debate about that. There has been some discussion of the minority leader's amendment which I think is a very important corrective step in restoring some funding for programs that are really not programs—bureaucracy—but perhaps that really make a difference. Children's lives, senior citizens' lives—just name it.

Mr. President, by and large the last 2 days have been pretty much an impasse, but it is not because on the part of Democratic Senators that there is not a willingness to move forward. We are more than willing to move forward.

I did not second-degree my amendment. I wanted to have an up-or-down vote. I did not have an amendment that dealt with aid to Jordan on the rescissions package. That was not my decision.

I just want the record to be clear when Senators come out here and say, well, where are they? Why are we not moving forward? I would be pleased to. I had an amendment that was in a sense only a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, but it did not deal with Women, Infants, and Children, did not deal with nutritional standards, did not deal with children, and those are some of the programs we are talking about and debating.

Second point, Mr. President, some of the discussion about Medicare, tonight is not the night to really go into this in great detail or depth, but I feel like some of the comments of colleagues deserve a response—a brief response. I fear that it is just too easy for Senators to come to the floor about the statistics and data about Medicare, and then make the argument that this is the area that we really have to kind of make the cuts.

Mr. President, a couple of points. In the State of Minnesota, with some of the projected cuts that we will be discussing if not today, certainly during this session, those cuts can amount to as much as \$10 billion for Medicare and Medicaid. By the way, about 40 percent of Medicaid is for the elderly in nursing homes.

I can just say, and I speak to my colleague from Minnesota, that if we talk to people in rural Minnesota and we ask them what that will mean either in

terms of less reimbursement for some of the hospitals and clinics that already struggle because of the inadequate reimbursement, or if we add to copays or deductibles or make seniors pay more out of their pockets, we will across-the-board from senior citizens and the care givers, get the same response: Its impact will be devastating.

Mr. President, I would just raise two points. Point one, I wonder why some of my colleagues who talked about the dangers of rationing when we were talking about universal health care coverage last Congress, now when we talk about just the focus on Medicare and Medicaid and the need for deep cuts in those programs, are not talking about rationing.

Quite clearly, in the absence of overall health care reform, in the absence of some courage about how to contain costs—and by the way, I think we have to contain costs to have universal coverage—if we just target Medicare and Medicaid, then we are guaranteeing that there will be rationing: by age, by disability, and by income.

I can assure Members that those citizens that would be most affected by these proposed cuts are going to be the citizens who are going to have a very bold and I think clear voice. Not because there are some awful special interests but because they have every reason to raise questions.

The Medicare program, imperfections and all, passed in 1965, has made a huge difference for me. I can say that as a son of two parents with Parkinson's disease. For my mother and father, who were not exactly wealthy, Medicare was the difference between being able to survive and financial disaster.

The Medicare program is not perfect. There are imperfections. There are imperfections to all public and private sector programs, but I think that most view Medicare and Medicaid, both passed in 1965, as steps forward, made our country a better country.

Now, I am not opposed to reform at all. But I do want to make it crystal clear that in the projections that have been laid out here, and what is to be done, I have noticed a certain silence, and that silence is deafening on two counts.

Number one, based upon the criteria of "Well, aren't you going to then be rationing?" And, number two, "What about containing costs within the overall health care system?"

When the Congressional Budget Office scored these different health care plans last Congress, the one proposal to contain costs that really got a very strong score, that really made sense, I say to my colleague from Utah whom I respect and who I know is immersed in this debate, the one proposal that did extremely well was to put some kind of limit on insurance company premiums.

No question about it, in terms of the effectiveness of such a proposal as a

part of overall cost containment strategy. It was taken off the table immediately. Taken off the table immediately. I wonder why? Sure, the insurance industry has a tremendous amount of power.

I would just say to my colleagues before we start talking about all senior citizens herded into managed care plans, forgetting fee-for-service period, I thought choice was an important issue. And before we start talking about the way we contain health care costs is target Medicare and Medicaid, we should be sure that we are intellectually rigorous and that we are very honest in our policy choices. We also look at other ways of containing costs.

I will just say to my colleagues, we can take a look at the CBO studies last Congress when they looked at a lot of different proposals, and I see no reason in the world why, in fact, insurance company premiums are not on the table as well in terms of where we try to put some kind of limit as a Senate strategy of cost containment.

Last point, a discussion about welfare. I am just responding to some of what I heard on the floor today. I apologize to colleagues that are not here. When there will be time for debate there will be debate. Nothing that I will say will be personal. Nothing that I will say on the floor right now will be at all hard hitting because I think people should be on the floor to have a right to respond to whatever we say.

I do think that the concern that I have, at least about some of what is in this rescissions package which is cuts in this year's budgets, much less some of the proposals in the future, vis-a-vis some of the block grant, is not flexibility.

That is not the concern I have. The concern I have is that in real dollar terms, when we look at some of the proposed cuts, I really think that the effect of those cuts on too many citizens, and I will start with children, is too much in the negative.

Again, whether it is the insurance companies and their premiums, that somehow that is not on the table when we talk about how to contain health care costs, but we want to target Medicare or Medicaid, same thing here.

Whether it is school lunch or school breakfast or whether it is WIC, or whether it is just the child care block grants programs right now, all that is on the table, clear proposed cuts; but on the other hand, subsidies for oil companies or coal companies or tobacco companies or insurance companies are not on the table.

I think there has to be some standard of fairness, Mr. President. I think that is what people in Minnesota and the country are interested in. I think everyone is aware we have to get our fiscal house in order, although I think there are different views about how to do that. I think we have to have balance.

There has not been an effort on the floor of the Senate on my part, and I do not think on the part of Democrats, to slow anything up. I wanted a vote on the amendment I introduced yesterday.

I will go back to that and end on this. I wanted a vote on the amendment I introduced yesterday morning, which was a long time ago. I did not choose to second-degree that amendment. That was not my amendment on Jordan and financial aid to Jordan. That was the majority leader, the Republican Party. That is his choice—skillful legislator—he did so. Ever since, we have essentially been tied into a knot.

That is really the story of the last 24 hours in the Senate. I look forward to when we get back to this debate. I hope that we can have some good debate on this rescissions package. I yield the floor.

SENATE VOCABULARY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have had to learn a new vocabulary since I have come to Washington. I would like to explain to people of America and particularly the people of Utah about this vocabulary, because they may have been watching this debate and have not learned the things that I have had to learn since I have been a Senator.

When I came to the Senate, I came naively from the private sector thinking that the word "cut" meant that we would spend less on a program than we were previously spending.

Indeed, when I talked to my children and I say, "We are going to cut your allowance," that means we will give them less money per month than we were giving them before. When my wife and I sit down and we say we have to cut our household budget, that means we will spend less this month than we were able to spend last month. That is what the word "cut" means to me in the outside world.

When I come to Washington, however, I had to learn, as I say, a new vocabulary. I learned that the word "cut" does not mean that we spend less this year than we spent last year. In many instances, in Washington vocabulary, the word "cut" means that we spend more this year than we spent last year. But you do spend less than someone promised that you might spend at some future time.

So, I have had my staff look through this rescission bill to help me understand this vocabulary, and they have come up with the list of cuts, Washington style, and then compared those to cuts as the term is used outside of Washington. I would like to share a few of those.

One that caught my attention—I got letters from Utah saying, "Senator, this rescission bill will cut \$42 million from Head Start. I do not want to do that. I am a very strong supporter of the Head Start Program."

Mr. President, \$42 million, under my definition of the word "cut" means

that we would spend \$42 million less this year on Head Start than we would have spent last year. However, in Washington terms that \$42 million cut means that we will only spend \$168 million more this year than we spent last year.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Two questions to the Senator, and I appreciate the graciousness of my colleague.

First of all, and I do not remember the exact statistics, maybe he can help me out on this, is it not true that right now, those children who are eligible to benefit from Head Start, we only right now, in current appropriations, cover maybe half or a little more than half of those young children?

Mr. BENNETT. Like the Senator from Minnesota I do not have those figures at my fingertips. I do know that the Head Start Program from fiscal 1990 to fiscal 1995 has had a 128 percent increase during that period, and as I said in my statement, in this rescission bill it will have a \$168 million increase over fiscal 1994, for a total of \$3.492 billion.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Let me try—if my colleague will take another question. This gets to the semantics about cuts, because I do not think either one of us are trying to be clever. I think it is an honest difference of opinion.

Mr. BENNETT. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, the background of the context seems to be the following. I do not have it precisely.

First, we say, with Head Start, we intend to do exactly what the title of it is, give a head start to children who come from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Second, even though we say that, we have never funded the program anywhere close to the level where those children who really could benefit from such support get such support.

Third, my colleague says the fact that this is an increase over what is now, over the funding right now, means you cannot call it a cut. But if every 30 seconds a child is born into poverty in this country and the demographics are such and the trend line is such that by definition you have more and more children who are in need of Head Start and you are not funding it anywhere near up to the level to keep up with that increased need, then, in fact, that is a cut. That is a cut by any way in which I think you would imagine it.

In other words, I say to my colleague, my family, we were living on a salary—take my salary when I was teaching, \$40,000 a year. And by the same token, then the next year there was an increase in my salary, but it went up just a few percentage points, but the cost of living went up, in terms of food, in terms of utilities, in terms of housing, so in real dollar terms we