

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

had less of a standard of living than I had before, that would be a cut.

If the trend line is many more children are eligible so we are now losing ground, is that not a cut from what the program is about?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has given us the theoretical, with respect to his own employment which may or may not constitute a cut. He has not produced any figures in it. But ultimately the basic disagreement here has two points.

No. 1, with respect to his issue regarding Head Start, is it not a cut because we have not fully funded it? That is based on the assumption that money alone will solve the issue of poverty that he raises when he talks about the number of children being born into poverty every year. That is a managerial decision involving an analysis of Head Start and its contribution, how well it works, how often it does not work, what the various problems are, what problems are addressed by Head Start, what problems are not. That is not the issue I am talking about here.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Let me finish my point here, if I may. I am not talking about that because that is not what is going out over the television to the American people. I am responding to letters, not addressing the question of whether Head Start is adequately funded or inadequately funded; whether it is being properly managed or improperly managed; whether it is achieving its goal or not achieving its goal. I am getting letters saying, "You are cutting back Head Start by the rate of \$42 billion. Senator, we do not want to cut Head Start from its present level. We do not want to cut Head Start from the job it is currently doing."

The point I am making is that we are not cutting Head Start back from its present level. The semantics of Washington are deceiving the American people by leading them to believe things are happening that, in fact, are not happening. And Head Start in this rescission bill does, in fact, receive an increase of \$168 million, more than it had in fiscal 1994; and over the total period of time from fiscal 1990 to fiscal 1995, it has had a 128-percent increase.

I want to say to the people of Utah and the people throughout the country who are saying, "Do not cut us back \$42 million from last year's level," we are not cutting back \$42 million from last year's level. Begin to understand the Washington mentality and the Washington vocabulary. When we use the word "cut" on this floor, we do not mean what 99 percent of the American people think we mean, and we do not mean what 99 percent of the American people themselves mean when they use the word "cut." That is the point I am trying to make. If the Senator wants to debate with me the issue of the efficacy of Head Start or the wisdom of Head Start on the adequacy of funding

for Head Start in terms of what it does, that is a separate issue for a separate time.

If the Senator has a further question on the issue, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I appreciate that. Actually, this will be the last question because I want to enable my colleague to go forward with his remarks.

First of all, I would say to the people of Utah who have written the letter to you that I honestly and truthfully believe that they have a fine Senator. The Senator's reputation here for fairness is unsurpassed by anyone else.

Second, I want to say to my colleague, I think that, however, he is deceiving himself in making the case, the semantic case about cuts. Because it does not seem to me to be that strong kind of high ground you are standing on here—though you are considerably taller than I am—when we understand first, that right now, though we say we want children from disadvantaged backgrounds to have a head start, we do not anywhere near come close to fully funding it and second, in addition, unfortunately, it is the reality that we continue to see a dramatic rise in the poverty of children. Every 30 seconds a child is born into poverty in our country, and then third, we have a budget which was going to increase the funding for Head Start and that now has been cut back. That is exactly what this rescission is, a cutback.

So based upon a program that is inadequately funded, that deals with the most important goal we could have, a head start for disadvantaged children, with more and more children, unfortunately, being disadvantaged, I do not see how my colleague can take any comfort in the very remarks he has made.

Why would you want to trim this back at all? Why would you not want to expand the funding? What is the case for any kind of rescission in the Head Start area?

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I appreciate his comments and I reciprocate the personal friendship that we have because we do have a genuine personal friendship even though on the political spectrum we are probably about as far apart as we can get. But one of the delightful things that comes out of the service of this body is you become friends with people with different pasts, different attitudes, different backgrounds, different parties as well as different parts of the country, and you form the warm personal friendships that the common experience of serving in this body gives us. I thank the Senator for his comments. I do say that perhaps we should have the debate as to whether or not Head Start is the logical way to spend money in an attempt to eradicate poverty or, if there are other places to spend it more effectively I think that is the debate for another day and another time.

I will return now, Mr. President, to some of other items that are on this list that I think appropriately belong in this debate.

Here is one, Goals 2000. That was in the debate last year with respect to education. We are told that there is going to be a \$55.8 million cut in Goals 2000. Well, after that cut, the Washington vocabulary which is applied to the bill, we find that the increase for Goals 2000 is \$224 million more will be spent on Goals 2000 in fiscal year 1995 than was spent in fiscal year 1994.

So people who are worried about that, "Gee, you are cutting back Goals 2000," be reassured we are spending \$224 million more on Goals 2000 than we did last year.

Chapter 1, this is a very emotional area. If the Senator from Minnesota was concerned about Head Start, I am sure he is very concerned about chapter 1 children. In this bill, there is a cut, Washington style vocabulary, of \$80.4 million. However, be reassured those of you who are afraid that there is going to be an \$80 million cut from the level spent in 1994, the actual number spent in fiscal year 1995 will be \$321.6 million more in fiscal 1995 than was spent in fiscal year 1994. The total spent on chapter 1 money is \$7.1 billion. Again, Mr. President, \$321 million more this year than last, not the \$80 million cut that a lot of people think they are protesting.

The Eisenhower Professional Development State Grant, a \$69 million cut. I list this in the name of fairness because this is the only one on the list where I cannot say, in fact, we are going to spend more in 1995 than we spent in 1994. The effect of this action in the rescission package will be that the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grant Program will be frozen at the same level in 1995 as it was in 1994. So if you are concerned about that, you can be reassured there will be exactly the same amount of money this year as there was last year.

There are more on the list. I will just touch a few of them. School to Work, people say, "Oh, there is a \$15 million cut in School to Work. We love School to Work." In fact, School to Work has more than doubled in fiscal year 1995 over the level it had in fiscal year 1994. So if you like School to Work in fiscal year 1994, be reassured there is more than double the money available in fiscal year 1995, and so on it goes on through.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I will leave this issue without getting into the merits of the cuts, or the Washington style cuts, rather, that we have been debating here. But I think it is something that everyone in America needs to understand. In these programs I've listed, we are not talking about

cutting back from prior levels, as many people are afraid we are. We are simply talking about holding down the increases, increases that in many cases, as I say, are double what they were last year, which seems to me in many cases that is enough.

To my colleagues who say, no, these problems are so pressing that even a doubling of the money is insufficient to solve the needs, I share with you my perspective from the experience I have had in the business world, which is that many times the worst thing you can do to a promising program or a business circumstance, product development activity, is to give it too much money too fast. There are many times the temptation to say, "Oh, this problem is not solving itself fast enough. Let us give it more money. This problem is not moving as rapidly. Let us fully fund it." And you push money at a problem at such a rate that the managers of the program simply cannot absorb it and spent it intelligently.

I served, Mr. President, in the executive branch. I can tell you the most hectic day in the life of anyone who serves in the executive branch is the last day of the fiscal year because on that day the spending authority expires, and all effort is exerted to get the money spent before the year ends. And money is being pushed out the door as rapidly as it possibly can be because they live on a use-it-or-lose-it circumstance. They say, "If we do not spend the money this year, we will not get the same appropriation next year." Then the managerial data come back. And they say, "You know. We had to spend it so fast that we had to take care of this artificial requirement that we do it by the end of the fiscal year that we spent it badly, we spent it sloppily, in many cases we spent it in a fashion that was counterproductive to the program we were supporting."

That is the real reason for these rescissions, Mr. President. As a Member of the Appropriations Committee I can assure you and the American people that we went through these programs, and said, "Where is the money that is not likely to be fenced in 1995 for intelligent management reasons? And, if we can find money of that kind, let us rescind the budget authority and only give them the amount of money they can intelligently and properly spend as good managers." And for that we are being accused of cutting vital programs and throwing people out into the snow, and all of the other rhetoric that has come along on this floor.

I hope, Mr. President, that the information developed by my staff and available to readers of the RECORD following my remarks will make it clear that in many programs, we are not cutting, we are simply rescinding money that could not be intelligently spent and properly spent during this fiscal year, and, in fact, in the programs listed we are funding at a level equal to, or in some cases double, that of the level of fiscal year 1994.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### WHEN IS A CUT A CUT?—LIST OF CUTS THAT INCREASE FY 1994 APPROPS

[As Contained in Rescission Bill]

Program	Proposed "Cuts" (millions)	Increases over FY94 (Total: Approp w/cut <sup>1</sup> ).
JTPA: Adult Job Training .....	\$33	\$33 million increase 3.4% increase over FY94. Total: \$1.02 billion.
JTPA: Title III: Dislocated Worker.	135.6	\$142 million increase 13% increase over FY94. Total: \$1.3 billion.
School to Work .....	115	More than doubled. Total: \$110 million.
Employment Service (One-Stop Career Center). Healthy Start .....	120	Doubled. Total: \$100 million.
Head Start .....	12.5	\$10 million increase. Total: \$107.5 million.
Child Care Development Block Grant.	142	\$168 million increase FY94—\$3.324 billion. Total: \$3.492 billion (128% increase FY90-95).
Goals 2000 (Title III) .....	18.4	\$33.6 million increase. Total: \$926 million.
Disadvantaged (Chapter 1) ...	155.8	\$224 million increase. FY94: \$92.4 M. Total: \$316 million.
Eisenhower Professional Development State Grant (Education).	180.4	\$321.6 million increase. Total: \$7.1 billion.
Education Infrastructure <sup>2</sup> .....	69	Freeze at 1994 level. Total: \$251 million.
	20	\$80 million increase. Total: \$80 million.

<sup>1</sup> 20 percent reduction of increase.

<sup>2</sup> New program: Fed's should not fund this at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and at 7:17 p.m., the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair; whereupon, at 9:06 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FRIST).

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the pending bill, H.R. 1158, and immediately proceed to a vote on the pending Dole amendment, as modified, without any further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Hatfield amendment No. 420, in the nature of a substitute.

D'Amato amendment No. 427 (to amendment No. 420), to require Congressional approval of aggregate annual assistance to any foreign entity using the Exchange Stabilization Fund established under section 5302 of title 31, United States Code, in an amount that exceeds \$5 billion.

Daschle amendment No. 445 (to amendment No. 420), in the nature of a substitute.

Dole (for Ashcroft) amendment No. 446 (to amendment No. 445), in the nature of a substitute.

Wellstone amendment No. 450, to express the sense of the Senate that before the Senate votes on block granting WIC to States the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry should investigate whether there is any improper food industry lobbyists' involvement in the transfer of WIC into State controlled block grants.

Dole/McConnell modified amendment No. 451 (to amendment No. 450), to establish debt restructuring and debt relief for Jordan.

AMENDMENT NO. 451 TO AMENDMENT NO. 450

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 451.

The amendment (No. 451) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask that following the disposition of the Dole amendment, the Senate proceed to vote on the Wellstone amendment, as amended, without further debate.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 450, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 450, as amended.

The amendment (No. 450), as amended, was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask that the cloture vote scheduled for Thursday occur at 2 p.m. and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the two leaders with several other Members have been working in good faith all day to reach a compromise with respect to the consideration of the Daschle and Dole/Ashcroft amendment. I hope to reach a unanimous-consent agreement early tomorrow which would allow us to complete action on this bill by noon or shortly thereafter with no further amendments in order. Therefore, Members should be on notice that votes can be expected to occur during Thursday's session of the Senate including final passage of the rescissions bill.

Also, the Senate is expected to consider and pass the paperwork reduction conference report, H.R. 1345, D.C. financial board. I understand there may be some amendments. They are trying to work those out. I also understand it is