

would have to forfeit a third, a half, a tenth, some portion of their water to be allowed to get a renewal of the existing permit to cross Federal ground. This was ironic because some of those permits predated the existence of the Forest Service itself.

This approach was taken by the Forest Service, localized in Colorado, and not, at least at that point, in other States, thankfully, by other departments of the Federal Government. You can imagine this would cause enormous chaos. There is a law and body of case law that relates to this and recognizes States rights in this area.

Let me emphasize, Mr. President, this phenomenon occurred where there was no change whatsoever anticipated in the use of the water or the means of transiting the Federal ground at all. All of us understand that there are important laws on the books that grant broad authority and grant new permits to either use or cross Federal ground. But this phenomenon had occurred at a point where they were talking about simply renewing an existing permit with no change whatsoever. The policy literally called into question then the water rights throughout almost all of the State.

As a matter of fact, if followed in other States, it could have endangered not only water rights throughout the entire West but property rights for States and citizens and municipalities throughout the entire Nation because, of course, once one is allowed to extract or extort concessions based on renewal of an existing permit without any changes, almost every city in the Nation has some vulnerability.

This, I think, makes the policy clear that that kind of extortion will not take place.

I want to thank both the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Arkansas for their help in crafting this limitation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his amendment and for his successful negotiation of the amendment with the administration. We are happy to recommend the approval of the amendment and hope the Senate will support it.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, let me just echo the words of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. The Senator from Colorado and several communities in Colorado have a very difficult problem in renewing easements and rights-of-way on municipal water supplies which cross Federal lands. Those are up for renewal.

I happen to come down very strongly on the human needs side when issues like this arise. It is not that there are not other problems that can and should be addressed in order to accommodate the future of those lines for the benefit of both parties, and that is the reason I personally favor and the administration favors the provision in this amendment that as long as both parties voluntarily agree to changes which

are beneficial to both, that is fine. But frankly, the Federal Government and Forest Service should not have the right to be arbitrary or capricious in renewing these rights-of-way which are critical to the very existence of some of these communities.

The Senator from Colorado has my gratitude for offering it, and I am happy that we were able to work out this language. We have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2690) was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BUMPERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. PRESSLER. Thank you, Mr. President.

MISLEADING ADS TO SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, there have been a number of ads run on television and newspapers regarding senior citizens programs in my State of South Dakota and, I understand, around the country. These ads are very misleading. They wrongly allege if current plans by the majority in Congress are carried out, certain people will not be able to get care for Alzheimer's disease or nursing care or medical treatment. These are scare tactics.

In my own case, I have taken great interest in senior citizens. In fact, my father, unfortunately, died of Alzheimer's disease. I have an Alzheimer's foundation. I am active on the board of the Alzheimer's association nationally and in my State. I have been a champion of senior citizens. I am very concerned about their welfare. That is why I was concerned greatly when Medicare's trustees—a majority being members of President Clinton's own cabinet—declared earlier this year that Medicare would go bankrupt unless we do something about it—we who hold responsibility.

A general plan to protect and preserve Medicare has been put forth by those courageous enough to be involved with it. I serve as a member of the Fi-

nance Committee, and I have been a part of the development of this plan. Our plan would not cut Medicare, but would slow its rate of increase from about 10 percent a year, which is well above inflation, to about what President Clinton once called for 2 years ago, about 6 percent, twice the inflation rate.

Now, Mr. President, it seems strange to me that all these baseless ads imply—and they list me by name in my State—that Senators who are trying to save Medicare are somehow forgetting senior citizens and people with Alzheimer's disease. I resent that deeply. As one who had a father die of Alzheimer's disease, I will not take a back seat to anyone regarding the care of senior citizens. I also do not intend to sit idly by and let Medicare go bankrupt. Nor will I allow our fiscal house be dismantled in order to protect well-intentioned, but wasteful or inefficient Government programs. We cannot go around promising everybody everything.

We have a huge deficit that threatens our children's future. We also have a Medicare system its trustees' have predicted will go broke if we do not do something about it. We can save Medicare by reforming Medicare. We can save Medicare by finding greater efficiencies, and eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. It means we have to use new telecommunication methods and other medical technologies to lower costs. It means we have to encourage greater choice in the kinds of medical services available to seniors, which would also lower costs. We can do all these things and more without cutting Medicare, but by slowing its growth rate in order for Medicare to be there for seniors well into the next century. And that is very appropriate.

Now, we should take a look at who is running these ads, at least in my State and maybe around the country. Who is disseminating this false information?

First of all, one of the sets of ads is being funded by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Of course, one wouldn't know that by listening or reading the ads, because the ads are being run under a different name, the so-called Save America's Families Coalition. Another is run by the so-called American Health Care Association. I think that there should be truth in advertising here. Who are really behind these ads and what is their agenda?

Let me say that I know there are many sides to American politics. However, more and more, ads are being run on television and the radio and in the newspapers by front groups that try to hide the true source. It is hard to know by the disclaimer exactly who is behind these ads.

And so, Mr. President, I would say as one who comes from a family who has seen the tragedy of Alzheimer's disease firsthand that I am very, very concerned. I am concerned about our Nation's seniors. I have fought for our

seniors from the very first day I took office as a U.S. Congressman. And I will continue to fight for them as a member of the Senate Finance Committee. My resolve is stronger than ever. Our first priority for seniors is simple: to preserve and protect Medicare. I have just come from a meeting working on a comprehensive plan to save Medicare. I would hope that instead of running Medi-“scare” ads, these liberal special interest groups would offer real solutions to what President Clinton and every Member of Congress believes is a very severe problem. I would like to see their ideas, their plans specifically.

All of us will have to stand on the Senate floor soon and vote up or down on these issues within the next few weeks. At that time, our views and our votes will be known. Before that occurs, I hope all those behind the current ad campaigns will step forward and join in a constructive effort to save Medicare. This issue is too important for our seniors, and they deserve a constructive dialogue and debate.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, would the Senator from South Dakota withhold that motion?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes, I will.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed as in morning business for 2 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I understand where my friend from South Dakota comes from. But there is part A and part B under Medicare. Part A, we talk about the trustees and their reports. They gave us two reports. One is a \$136 billion surplus today in part A; but in 7 years it will be down to minus \$6 billion. Under part B, there is \$17 billion in surplus today; and 7 years from now it will be \$25 billion in surplus.

The President has put out that he would want \$89 billion in part A to make Medicare solvent for 10 years, and he has asked for a little bit more to make Medicare solvent. We agree with the problems of solvency. The President has three members on the board of trustees, or the commission, that reports to all of us annually. And so we have given a proposal. We do not want to take \$270 billion out over 7 years. We do not want to cut another \$240 billion out of Medicaid.

So when you look at that, the reduction in the budget comes out of health care—comes out of health care. And something, in my opinion, has to be wrong when we are looking at children to be hurt, we are looking at the elderly to be hurt. And yet the headline in the Nashville Tennessean is, “The GOP

Plan Has Coddled the Rich and Socked It to the Poor.” That is big 2-inch headlines across the banner of that newspaper.

So when you say we have not given a program, it is out there. It is out there. And we are not scaring our old folks. We are trying to protect them. So, a little bit—a little bit is a whole lot better than trying to reach a tax cut. \$240 billion is a figure we all want to remember—\$245 billion. That is a tax cut. When you cut the expenditure of Government to balance the budget, that is one thing. And we are all for that. I am for it. But then you say you want to give a tax cut, that means you have got to cut more.

So the problem now is not balancing the budget; the problem now is \$245 billion that will be a tax cut. If we can get around to not using that or not giving it to the ultrarich, I think the balanced budget and the programs would go through very smoothly.

There is no big argument about making Medicare solvent, no argument at all, but it is giving a \$245 billion tax cut to the most wealthy in this country while you take a big hunk out of Medicaid.

And I see the Alzheimer’s patients under Medicaid, I see the Alzheimer’s patients under Medicare. There are a lot of people in this Chamber that probably can use Medicare. I am of that age, others of that age. But the problem results in a \$245 billion tax cut. If we did not have that, we would not have the problem. The ads would not be running. We would already have the appropriations bills out. We would be waiting for the conference to come back. We probably could meet our deadline of October 1 for the budget.

I understand my time is probably up, and I thank the Chair for his friendly greetings.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to thank the managers of the bill for the increase that they have given to the WIC Program. I think the WIC Program is an outstanding program, and I think it is worthwhile. Its value has been evidenced by the fact that the distinguished managers of the bill have given it a very nice increase for the upcoming year.

So I want to thank the senior Senator from Mississippi and the senior Senator from Arkansas for the additions to the WIC Program which they provided in this legislation.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator please withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me just thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his generous comments and his support for the provisions of the bill which he described. It is very difficult in this time of diminishing access to funds under our allocation and budget resolution to keep this caseload up to the existing level. It has been done with the full cooperation of the other members of the subcommittee.

We recognize that it is an important program. It is a program that saves money, I think, in terms of health care costs and learning deficiencies that would occur were it not for the proper nutrition at these ages.

So I appreciate very much the Senator noticing the hard work that was put in on this subject.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, what the WIC Program is, for those who do not know, it is a nutrition program, as the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi said, a nutrition program for women, infants, and children.

Furthermore, invariably, at least in my State, it takes place in a setting where you might say it is one-stop shopping, where a mother can come and her infant child will be cared for and, in addition, can get some nutrition advice from experts.

As the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said, this is really proven out to be a money saver in the long run. If we can keep these infants healthy and get them off to a good start, savings to the Nation in the form of medical care are very, very significant in the long run.

So I am happy this was able to be worked out the way it was.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we were successful in getting Senators to cooperate in identifying the amendments that remain to be offered to this bill. We are prepared now to seek unanimous consent to limit the amendments on the bill to those which we will read. These have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

I now ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only