

kids. Yes, it is a nuisance for those who used to pollute. But it is a better policy for our country, to stop the pollution, and make that cost a part of the cost of doing business.

Now, we have a lot to celebrate, including successful clean air and clean water regulations and safe food regulations. We also have the opportunity, I think, to celebrate the success of a Medicare program that works. Yet, rather than celebrating the success of a program that works, we are now seeing that program under attack.

This is a more and more curious, yet in some ways predictable, I think, agenda that I watch in this Congress. The Contract With America is the foundation of the agenda, and the Contract With America is billed as a set of new directions and new ideas. In fact, there is nothing new about it at all. It represents the same old tired ideas, the ideas that somehow if the big get more, the little will be helped.

Bob Wills and the Texas Playboys, back in the 1930's, had a song with a lyric that stated it pretty well: "The little guys pick the cotton and the big guys get the money; the little bee sucks the blossom and the big bee gets the honey." So it is with the agenda now in Congress.

I could talk about the agenda at some length. I actually want to talk about Medicare. This is one part of it, in the Washington Post article "Curbs on Media Mogul," "Congress Moves to Ease Media Ownership Curbs, Could Reshape Industry." What does this mean? That Congress is taking action to eliminate the restrictions on how many television stations one person or corporation can own. I guarantee in 10 years we will have half a dozen companies owning almost all of America's television stations. Good for our country? I do not think so. Good for a few rich companies and investors? You bet your life it is.

Regulations—we ought to deal with silly and unnecessary regulations, but we ought not retreat on clean air, clean water, and safe food regulations in order to satisfy the appetite of the wealthy and the big interests. It does not make sense to me.

"Food Stamp Block Grants Eyed as a Way of Breaking Welfare Reform Stalemate." Some have an agenda of deciding that hunger is not a national issue. So we will decide we will not have a national food stamp program, we will have 50 State programs, if they choose to use the money for that. Curious agenda, in my judgment.

"The Treasury Subcommittee of House Appropriations Votes To Decide To Make It Easier for Felons To Purchase Guns." It is a curious and strange agenda but part of the same pattern. Same tired old ideas.

Line-item veto—we voted for a line-item veto bill here in the Senate. I voted for it. I have voted for it a dozen times in a dozen years. Yet, we are now told by the Speaker of the House it does not look like we will have a line-item veto bill this year.

Last week, a little article in the paper says "Gingrich Gets \$200 Million in New Pork." Now, we will not have a Democrat President that will get a line-item veto to veto this sort of thing. Why? Because some who talked about the line-item veto are much more interested in producing pork than they are in producing a line-item veto.

But I wanted to speak just for a moment about Medicare. I think the Medicare Program is a success. Yes, we have some financing problems in the outyears. Part of the reason that we have those financing problems is because of the success of the program. People live longer in this country today. They have better health care than they had previously. In fact, on a monthly basis, we now have 200,000 new Americans each and every month that become eligible for Medicare. That does cause some real strain.

But the success is this: 40 years ago we had less than 50 percent of our senior citizens who had any health care coverage at all. This year, it is 99 percent of our senior citizens who have health care coverage.

I have been to plenty of places in the world where there is no health care coverage for senior citizens. I have seen the sick and I have seen the dying who have no access to health care because they are poor. In many countries, that means 95 or 99 percent of the people. I have been to those countries.

I have seen the hospitals with dirt floors—to the extent they are lucky enough to get to a hospital—with dirt floors and no doors in the tropics down in Central America. I have seen the worst of medical conditions.

Most importantly, I have seen what it does to people when they grow old and have no access to health care. I saw it in my hometown before Medicare, at a time when my father asked me to drive an elderly gentleman to the hospital in Dickinson, ND, who was dying; a fellow with no money, no hope, an elderly man, no health insurance. Still, as he was 2 or 3 days away from death, he was worried about how he would pay a hospital bill.

Part of that has changed because we put in place in the mid-1960's a Medicare plan. I might say those in my party—I was not here then—those in my party who had the courage and foresight to fight and vote for it, had to do so at the expense of being called a bunch of socialists by a lot of folks who were not willing to vote for it.

I think we ought to celebrate the success of the Medicare Program and what it has done for our country. This is a year, and this is a week, the anniversary of the 30th year of the Medicare Program, that has advanced the interests of our country and its seniors.

I say to those who believe that we ought to give a big tax cut, the bulk of which go to the rich, and decide we need to cut Medicare, and they do not relate to one another, it is pretty inescapable to me when you advance a tax cut, the bulk of which go to the

wealthiest Americans, and say to senior citizens, "We are sorry, we cannot fully fund Medicare," that the tax cut for the wealthy comes out of the Medicare Program. We can do better than that. We can decide together what we voted on in the 1960's as a Congress has been enormously successful for the elderly people in this country—for all of America, for that matter. We can decide not to threaten the Medicare system, but decide to work together to strengthen it.

That is a matter of public will. I hope the American people would decide that there is something to celebrate here in programs that work; most especially, the Medicare Program. I hope in the next 2 or 3 months, as we sort through this fiscal policy dilemma, we will decide not to embrace the radical agenda that says a tax cut for the rich—that they claim will help the rest—at the expense of total and adequate coverage for America's senior citizens who need it, earned it, and respect it. I yield the floor.

MR. DOLE. Mr. President, is leader's time reserved?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MR. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask that I may use some of my leader's time without interfering with the ongoing debate on lobbying reform. We are making progress on lobbying reform. I appreciate that. I hope we have will have a unanimous vote for a strong bill.

BOSNIAN ARMS EMBARGO

MR. DOLE. Mr. President, the opposition to lifting the United States arms embargo in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been an elaborate exercise in buying time.

It has been more than 11 months since the Senate last voted to lift the arms embargo in Bosnia. Following that vote, the administration worked with the distinguished Senator from Georgia on a compromise—the Nunn-Mitchell provision—which ultimately was adopted.

The Nunn-Mitchell compromise essentially provided time, time for the Bosnian Serbs to sign the contact group plan; time for UNPROFOR to improve its performance; and time for the administration to work out a multilateral lift of the arms embargo.

That is what it was supposed to do. Any one of these things have occurred not because of the lack of good intentions on the part of the Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, I might add, because he certainly expected these things to happen.

Mr. President, 11 months later the situation is far worse than when the Senate last voted 58 to 42 to unilaterally lift the arms embargo in Bosnia. Thousands have died, tens of thousands have been forced from their homes, homes which were in the U.N. safe havens. Tens of thousands more are facing the same fate in Bihać, Sarajevo, and Gorazde. Furthermore, NATO is

dangerously close to losing what credibility it still has, and the United States is no closer to exercising leadership in a new direction.

President Clinton called me last week to ask for more time—he asked me to delay the vote on the Dole-Lieberman legislation until after the London meeting. And certainly we were pleased to oblige the President. Wherever we can, we want to work with the President of the United States, particularly in foreign policy areas.

But now the London meeting has come and gone and there is no change on the ground in Bosnia. The London conference did not result in a reaffirmation of the U.N. obligation to defend the U.N. safe havens. The conferees wrote off Srebrenica and Zepa, vowed to protect Gorazde—at some point, that point not being clear—and declined to respond to the dramatically worsening situation in Bihac and Sarajevo.

So I guess what they have said, in effect, is if there are six safe havens we may be willing to protect one—one out of the six.

Yes, there were modifications to the dual key arrangement, but the dual key remains. The bottom line is that the London meeting did not result in significant change in approach. It did not result in a new policy. It essentially reaffirmed business as usual with the possibility of a few displays of force sometime in the future.

So the commander of the Bosnian Serbs, General Mladic—who, interestingly enough, was delivered the London conferees' ultimatum in Belgrade—is probably not shaking in his boots, but more likely laughing all the way to Bihac.

Today there are reports of more NATO military planning. But planning was never the problem. Executing those plans was and still is the problem. This debate has never been about policy options, but about political will.

It is high time the Clinton administration abandon its flimsy excuses for the United Nations' pitiful performance, shed the false mantle of humanitarianism, and face the reality of the U.N. failure in Bosnia.

I intend to take up the Dole-Lieberman legislation tomorrow and hope we can vote tomorrow and have a clear-cut vote. It is not a partisan vote. It is supported strongly by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is the Senate of the United States speaking, not BOB DOLE, not JOE LIEBERMAN, not a Democrat, not a Republican—but the U.S. Senate. The clock has run out and now is the time for the United States to fulfill its role as the leader of the free world, do what is right and what is smart. Now is the time to pass the Dole-Lieberman legislation.

We have an obligation to the Bosnian people and to our principles, to allow a U.N. member state, the victim of aggression, to defend itself. I listened to George Stephanopoulos at the White

House yesterday on television, saying if we lifted the arms embargo, as proposed by myself and Senator LIEBERMAN and other Republicans and Democrats, we were going to Americanize the war. How? All we are suggesting is to give these people the right to defend themselves as they have under article 51 of the U.N. Charter. We are not asking American ground troops, not suggesting American ground troops, not suggesting American involvement. But the spin machine at the White House is saying, "Oh, this is going to Americanize the war." Nothing can be further from the truth.

Let me again reiterate, this is a Senate effort—not a Republican effort, not a Democratic effort, but a bipartisan, nonpartisan effort—to protect the rights of innocent people, an independent nation, a member of the United Nations, which under article 51 of the U.N. Charter has the right to self-defense. In 1991, we imposed an illegal embargo on Yugoslavia. There is not a Yugoslavia anymore. It is gone. It is now Bosnia, it is now Serbia, now Slovenia, now Croatia—it is no longer Yugoslavia. The embargo has been illegal from the start. We have, in effect, tied the hands of one side and said, OK, you cannot have any heavy weapons, but you go out and fight the aggressors, and, if you lose, we will provide humanitarian aid.

I just suggest we have gone on long enough. I have great respect for the U.N. protection forces who are there. Two members of the French force lost their lives over the weekend; one was seriously wounded. Others have lost their lives in this effort—British, Dutch, Pakistanis—a number have lost their lives. But it has been a failed policy, and I believe it is time that the world recognize the policy has failed and time to give these people, the Bosnians, an opportunity to defend themselves.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the majority leader might yield for a brief question?

Mr. DOLE. Sure.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the majority leader's yielding. I have been struggling with the question of the resolution. I have not decided whether to support the resolution this week or not, but I ask the question: If the will of the Senate were to agree to this resolution, which would then result in a changed course with respect to Bosnia and potentially a rearming of the Bosnian Moslems, does the Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, feel that ultimately American troops would be required to help extricate the U.N. forces at some point?

Mr. DOLE. Of course none of this would take effect—we would not lift the embargo—until they were gone. But I would be willing to support the President to extricate the U.N. protection forces. It seems to me, as a mem-

ber of NATO we have that obligation. I know the views of the American people are very mixed, as I saw in the polls. But in my view, after they have been removed—if we have to help extricate them, I think we should. We should support the President in that effort.

Second, when it comes to training the Bosnians, we helped the Afghans. We did not send anybody to Afghanistan. We helped train. We provided weapons. The same in El Salvador. I believe that can be done without Americanizing anything. Plus, what they want, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, are Russian weapons. They are familiar with Russian weapons, and they are readily available. So I am not certain they would need a great deal of training.

But it just seems to me—and it is not just because I watch television, it is not just because I visited there 5 years ago when all this was just beginning to ferment—I think anybody, any objective observer, would say no, no U.S. ground troops. We could even question airstrikes, but certainly no Americanization. But, finally, let us give these innocent people a chance to defend themselves. That is all they are asking.

I thank my colleague from North Dakota.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to offer my very strong support for S. 1060, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

This legislation is similar to that reported out by the Governmental Affairs Committee, which I was privileged to chair during the last Congress. Senators LEVIN and COHEN, in particular, deserve our words of high praise for their diligence and persistence in tackling such a thorny area and coming up with an effective and pragmatic bill.

Mr. President, there is blessed little credit given to those who bring up things like this. There is a lot of opposition. But these are the things in the committee we used to jokingly call the "grunt work" of Government—the grunt work of Government—the good Government issues that too often are not brought to the floor, and when they are brought to the floor, usually cause very little attention to be paid.

Senator LEVIN was President of the Detroit City Council before he came to Washington. I have heard him talk many times about how he came in here with a burning purpose of doing regulatory reform, for instance. We have been having that on the floor the last couple of weeks.

Now on lobbying reform, ethics in Government matters. That may be a column note someplace, a short column note at the very best, usually, on items like this. But they are items which become vitally important for long-term