

Nation's Governors and legislatures have been willing, but there is only one person who stands in the way of Medicaid and welfare reform. His name is Bill Clinton. He is the President of the United States. He said he was for reforming these two programs when he ran for President 4 years ago. But it has been 4 years and nothing has happened and nothing did happen until Republicans gained control of the House and Senate.

It should be very clear to our colleagues and the American people, this Republican Senate and the Republican House, the Nation's Governors, and many of our Democratic friends in the House and Senate are in agreement on what needs to be done. Will the President of the United States get that message before this next Presidential campaign? If he does not, my suggestion is that the American people will send that message loud and clear, because we should not have to wait until 1997 to reform welfare and Medicaid.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 1296

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum be waived with respect to the cloture vote this morning on the Murkowski substitute amendment; and further, that Senators have until 10:30 this morning in order to file second-degree amendments to the substitute in accordance with rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Finally, Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, to simply announce that Senators should be alert that the cloture vote will be at approximately 10:30 this morning.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

AMERICANS CONDEMNED TO
FUTURES WITH NO HOPE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I want to echo and underscore the remarks of my good colleague from Arizona. I do not know of any issue in the country for which there is more unanimity or agreement than the current status of our welfare programs. You can go to any community, any State, any region, any city, and, as I said, there is a unanimity that this program has failed.

Sometimes in the discussions, we fail to acknowledge what that means. What that means is that hundreds of thousands of Americans have been condemned to stunted futures with no hope, no real education, no real prospect for opportunity in a life as we have come to know to be synonymous with being an American.

You can do anything as long as it is different and it would be better. Every statistic that we have endeavored to

improve with these massive welfare programs, with the exception of one piece of data, is worse today and not just a little worse, but dramatically so. Every condition of the target of the welfare programs is worse, not better. We have higher teenage pregnancies, we have more single-member households, we have less scores in our education programs. It is all worse.

What makes it even more difficult to comprehend is that we have spent more of the Treasury of America on the War on Poverty than we spent on the Second World War, the First World War, Vietnam, Korea, and the Persian Gulf combined. We, essentially, prevailed on those battles, but we have lost the war on poverty. That means that there are millions of Americans today for whom the future is bleak, and we owe our fellow citizens more than this condemnation that we have created in our own country.

To put in context a response, a contemporary response, the President of the United States went to the American people in 1992 and, in his successful bid for the Presidency, said, "This condition must stop. This condition must come to an end. Welfare as we know it will not continue."

He was elected President. He had a majority in the House and the Senate, and in the 103d Congress, the Clinton Congress, nothing happened. Welfare, as we know it, is as it is—unchanged.

Then we come to the 104th Congress and this new majority, and an extensive Welfare Reform Act was passed in the House and in the Senate and sent to the President, the President who had promised the American people that he would end welfare as we know it. Instead, what he ended was welfare reform in the dark of the evening when he vetoed the Welfare Reform Act, which he has now done twice.

So you have to begin to get the picture that if you did not do anything when you were in charge of the Congress and then you vetoed welfare reform twice subsequently, there may be a lack of interest in true welfare reform.

He is running political advertising as we speak today in the Nation's capital, and that advertising says that he is for welfare reform. I only suggest to the American people, at least to this point, there is a massive difference between the rhetoric and the words of the campaign and the actions and the deeds of governments, because we are today going into the final year of this administration, and there is no welfare reform, there is only a record of blocking and stopping.

The bill that went out of the Senate had over 80 votes, Republican and Democrat. He claimed it should be bipartisan. It was, but still vetoed, stopped.

At the end of the day—and I am going to yield in a moment to the Chair—at the end of the day, this is all about American citizens. I do not think history is going to look very kindly on America for what it did to these people

across our land, mostly in our large cities. They are virtual ghettos, prisons from which escape is almost impossible, and that should guide our actions. These programs should be changed if we care about our fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I will be able to take your post for a moment. I know you want to make some remarks as well.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

GETTING OUT FROM UNDER THE
REDTAPE OF THE FEDERAL
GOVERNMENT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, the freshman class of the U.S. Senate made a trip around the United States to talk to different groups, different gatherings. We went all the way from Philadelphia to Knoxville, to Minneapolis, to Cheyenne, WY. One of the things we talked about, probably more than anything else, was welfare reform, changing the system as we have come to know it since the 1960's.

The Senator from Missouri, Senator ASHCROFT, was with us during this. He came up with some evidence from the State of Missouri that I thought was quite remarkable. He was talking about the administration of the Medicaid program, how they have been able to file and get out from under the redtape of the Federal Government. The year prior to their being able to administer the Medicaid Program with the amount of money that they had, they reached some 600,000 families throughout the State of Missouri. The next year, or the year following the year that they were able to take over the total jurisdiction and control and administration and come out from under the redtape of the Federal Government—and this was done, I might add, under a Democrat administration, a Democrat director of the department of human services for the State of Missouri—they were able to use that same amount of money and reach 900,000 families. In other words, 50 percent more services were given to families just by eliminating the unnecessary trip and expense and redtape of the Federal Government.

I believe it has been our policy to get as many of these things back to the local level. Having served myself in the State legislature, having served as a mayor of a major city, Tulsa, OK, for three terms, I can tell you that the closer you can get to the people at home, the better a program will be administered.

On welfare, we spent some time looking at the welfare system. The President of the United States, when he ran for President, when Bill Clinton ran for President of the United States, he had a pretty good welfare reform system. In fact, the welfare reform system that

he advocated during the time that he ran for President of the United States had work requirements, had elements in it that were precisely the elements of the welfare reform package that passed the House of Representatives and then passed the Senate by a vote of 87 to 12. It was a shock to everyone, even on his own side of the aisle where 60 percent of the Democrats voted to support this, when he came out and vetoed it. I would like to think that America woke up during the demagoguery of the Medicare reform. I know that many—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair notifies the Senator that his time has expired.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY. One minute.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me just comment that many editorial writers around the country that normally are more of a liberal persuasion came out and editorialized in favor of the Republicans and the fact that we recognized that we have a system that was going into bankruptcy. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the RECORD, the two editorials from the Washington Post that made this very clear. The names of the editorials are "Medagogues" and "Medagogues, Cont'd."

The last sentence of the second editorial reads, "The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong." And America thinks it is wrong.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1995]

MEDAGOGUES

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear to block the cuts in projected Medicare spending that are the core of the Republican effort to balance the budget in the next seven years. They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's crummy stuff.

There's plenty to be said about the proposals the Republicans are making; there's a legitimate debate to be had about what ought to be the future of Medicare and federal aid to the elderly generally. But that's not what the Democrats are engaged in. They're engaged in demagoguery, big time. And it's wrong—as wrong on their part now as it was a year ago when other people did it to them on some of the same health care issues. Then, they were the ones who indignantly complained.

Medicare and Medicaid costs have got to be controlled, as do health care costs in the economy generally. The federal programs represent a double whammy, because they, more than any other factor, account for the budget deficits projected for the years ahead.

They are therefore driving up interest costs even as they continue to rise powerfully themselves. But figuring out how to contain them is enormously difficult. More than a fourth of the population depends on the programs for health care; hospitals and other health care institutions depend on them for income; and you cut their costs with care. Politically, Medicare is especially hard to deal with because the elderly—and their children who must help care for them to the extent the government doesn't—are so potent a voting bloc.

The congressional Republicans have founded the skeptics who said they would never attack a program benefiting the broad middle class. They have come up with a plan to cut projected Medicare costs by (depending on whose estimates you believe) anywhere from \$190 billion to \$270 billion over the seven-year period. It's true that they're also proposing a large and indiscriminate tax cut that is a bad idea and that the Medicare cuts would indirectly help to finance. And it's true that their cost-cutting plan would do—in our judgment—some harm as well as good.

But they have a plan. Enough is known about it to say it's credible; it's gussy and in some respects inventive—and it addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse. What the Democrats have instead is a lot of expostulation, TV ads and scare talk. The fight is about "what's going to happen to the senior citizens in the country," Dick Gephardt said yesterday. "The rural hospitals. The community health centers. The teaching hospitals. . . ." The Republicans "are going to decimate [Medicare] for a tax break for the wealthiest people, take it right out of the pockets of senior citizens. . . ." The American people "don't want to lose their Medicare. They don't want Medicare costs to be increased by \$1,000 a person. They don't want to lose the choice of their doctor."

But there isn't any evidence that they would "lose their Medicare" or lose their choice of doctor under the Republican plan. If the program isn't to become less generous over time, how do the Democrats propose to finance it and continue as well to finance the rest of the federal activities they espouse? That's the question. You listen in vain for a real response. It's irresponsible.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1995]

MEDAGOGUES, CONT'D

We print today a letter from House minority leader Richard Gephardt, taking exception to an editorial that accused the Democrats of demagoguing on Medicare. The letter itself seems to us to be more of the same. It tells you just about everything the Democrats think about Medicare except how to cut the cost. That aspect of the subject it puts largely out of bounds, on grounds that Medicare is "an insurance program, not a welfare program," and "to slash the program to balance the budget" or presumably for any purpose other than to shore up the trust fund is "not just a threat to . . . seniors, families, hospitals" etc. but "a violation of a sacred trust."

That's bullfeathers, and Mr. Gephardt knows it. Congress has been sticking the budget knife to Medicare on a regular basis for years. Billions of dollars have been cut from the program; both parties have voted for the cutting. Most years the cuts have had nothing to do with the trust funds, which, despite all the rhetoric, both parties understand to be little more than accounting devices and possible warning lights as to program costs. Rather, the goal has been to reduce the deficit. It made sense to turn to Medicare because Medicare is a major part of

the problem. It and Medicaid together are now a sixth of the budget and a fourth of all spending for other than interest and defense. If nothing is done those shares are going to rise, particularly as the baby-boomers begin to retire early in the next century.

There are only four choices, none of them pleasant. Congress can let the health care programs continue to drive up the deficit, or it can let them continue to crowd out other programs or it can pay for them with higher taxes. Or it can cut them back.

The Republicans want to cut Medicare. It is a gutsy step. This is not just a middle-class entitlement; the entire society looks to the program, and earlier in the year a lot of the smart money said the Republicans would never take it on. They have. Mr. Gephardt is right that a lot of their plan is still gauzy. It is not yet clear how tough it will finally be; on alternate days you hear it criticized on grounds that it seeks to cut too much from the program and on grounds that it won't cut all it seeks. Maybe both will turn out to be true; we have no doubt the plan will turn out to have our other flaws as well.

They have nonetheless—in our judgment—stepped up to the issue. They have taken a huge political risk just in calling for the cuts they have. What the Democrats have done in turn is confirm the risk. The Republicans are going to take away your Medicare. That's their only message. They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense; the Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. It's absolutely the case that there ought not to be a tax cut, and certainly not the indiscriminate cut the Republicans propose. But that has nothing to do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I would like to, if I could, get a few housekeeping measures out of the way. First, so that the RECORD can clearly reflect who is doing what to the bills that are before us at this moment, this is a bill that contains 33 titles. Every Senator should know that the Senator from New Jersey would not oppose moving 30 of those titles now, pass them by voice vote. I do not oppose them. I do not have holds on them. They can be moved now. If they are not moved now, someone does have a hold on them. It is not me.

I also make the other point that the distinguished chairman alluded to saying that these bills in this package have been on the calendar for over a year. Well, maybe some of them have been, not all of them. Indeed, there are some bills in this package that have not even been reported from the Energy Committee. There was no vote in