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 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.

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 Program, 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. Childrens' 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