

We will do a disservice to the United States ability to influence the progress and future of a country which is important enough to us that we have just invested almost \$2 billion and the lives of thousands of U.S. uniformed and civilian personnel, and we will have lost the opportunity to demonstrate our serious commitment to assisting a country which is trying to go through some of the most difficult transitions—from tyranny to democracy, from anarchy to a civilized society, from misery to poverty with dignity.

Those are our challenges. Those challenges are only going to be met if we do it on a bipartisan basis. This Senate met that challenge in times past. In 1948, when many felt it would be impossible for a divided Government—with a Republican-controlled Congress and a Democrat in the White House, a Democrat who appeared to be vulnerable and therefore should be exploited by emphasizing differences—men of the stature of Senator Arthur Vandenberg recognized that the American national interest was in unifying behind policies that would serve our Nation's need to constrain the expansion of communism. We followed the enlightened leadership of Senator Vandenberg, and now, 50 years later, we see the fruits of that policy by the collapse of the Soviet Union and our ability, through almost a half a century of bipartisan commitment to that policy, to have avoided the need to use nuclear power and an excessive amount of United States military force in order to achieve that objective of the collapse of the Soviet Union and communism. We need to use that example as our standard as we set our policy for Haiti.

Mr. President, there are very real consequences if we continue a policy of treating Haiti as a partisan domestic political issue rather than an American foreign policy opportunity. We do not need to ask ourselves what will happen if we allow the progress that has occurred in Haiti to wither. We have already seen what will happen. We will see it again on our beaches with the dead bodies of Haitians who tried but failed to make it to our shores. We will see it at the tarmac of Guantanamo with hundreds of tents of refugees who have been able to survive and are awaiting their fate in limbo as they were just 3 years ago. We are not playing our role today in termination of a constructive American policy toward Haiti.

I am concerned that within the Senate we see a blocking of humanitarian assistance which will be critical to this next stage of Haiti's development. Assistance in the form of health care, funding that will be needed to procure essential medical supplies, vaccines, and for the operation of health clinics throughout Haiti is being held up by this Congress. The shutting down of humanitarian programs will exacerbate adverse conditions in Haiti and could contribute to further economic and political instability.

Equally disturbing, it has become fashionable to denounce Haiti's efforts to make a transition to democracy. If the question is, were the elections that were held in 1995 a standard of perfection by a mature democracy, the answer is clearly no. If the question is, were they the fairest, most accurate reflections of the opinion of the Haitian people in the 192-year history of that country, the answer is, with as much energy and confidence, yes.

We need to build on these successes, and we must do so in a bipartisan manner. I support the efforts of Congress to assist and demand that there be performance, performance in areas such as investigation of political murders. But I also ask us to recognize the reality of the situation. We are asking a government, whose President told us in person-to-person communication in this very Capitol just a few days ago, that his government had reached the point of financial stringency, that it could not pick up the garbage. To now expect that this government is going to have American or Western European standards of sophistication in forensic investigation is to ask what is not going to exist.

We must work with the people of Haiti and with their government. If we fail to do so, we will, again, see the kind of pictures that we saw in the very recent past of U.S. Coast Guard ships picking up overloaded small wooden boats with refugees reaching out for salvation. We will see, again, the pictures of the butchered citizens of Haiti, like the man dragged from the Catholic church during mass.

At that point, we will ask ourselves not whether we scored appropriate political points, but whether we serve the national interest.

It is ironic that at the very time Congress is about to turn again to the question of illegal immigration and how to frustrate its imposition on the United States, that we are close to bringing about a crisis on an island which has been the source of so much of that illegal immigration. Clearly, one of the most fundamental things that the United States can do to reduce the amount of illegal immigration is to turn serious attention to assist in the social and economic development of those countries which are the most likely sources of illegal immigration.

We have made progress on that front as it relates to Haiti. Illegal immigration is down by over 20 times in the last 3 years. The question is, are we going to lose this momentum or are we going to build on the progress that we have made?

During the period of military rule in Haiti, as has been the case for decades previously, Haitians, in a time of desperation, stripped the country's hilly terrain of trees in order to make charcoal for heat and for cooking.

Today, actions by the Federal Government and the White House and the Congress threaten to cause a mud slide that will bury the progress that Haiti

has made with our cooperation and assistance over the past 2 years. It is our challenge to see that we can plant trees and stabilize the soil of Haiti so that, together, the people of Haiti, the people of the Western Hemisphere, and particularly the people of the nation which has been their longest and truest friend, the United States of America, can look forward to a new century of prosperity, a new century in which at least the people of Haiti have realized the goal of moving from misery to poverty with dignity.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are considering Senate Joint Resolution 21.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PERFORMANCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, since March 19, I have been delivering a series of statements on the Senate floor. The common thread of my statements is my observation of the President's performance in office. I have concluded that he is not setting a good example for the people whom he serves. Basically, I mean that he does not perform in office commensurate with the rhetoric.

This also soon becomes an issue of the failure to show moral leadership, which basically means that you do what you say you are going to do. It is the single most important attribute of any President. I have quoted Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the floor of this Senate on this issue many, many times. One of his President leadership flaws is the fact that he says one thing and yet does another.

Last night, I had an opportunity to talk about a clue that I discovered as to why the President of the United States might say one thing and do another. I quoted from last week's *Time* magazine article, which quoted the President's senior adviser, George Stephanopoulos. His quote was just three words: "Words are actions." So if the President says something, that means that is what people know he is going to do. In other words, you say something, the President either thinks it is happening or he wants us to think it is happening. I have not quite discovered which one it is, Mr. President.

Yesterday provided a further case in point to illustrate what I am saying.

Yesterday, we celebrated Earth Day across the country. There is nothing wrong with celebrating Earth Day. There has been great progress made in this country on the environment, and maybe it would not have been made without annually remembering the things that come about through Earth Day and the movements connected with them.

Also, it has become kind of a political event, as well. The TV news shows were full of slick photo ops of President Clinton and Vice President GORE cleaning up the C&O Canal outside of Washington and visiting a national park. They also took the opportunity to campaign against Republicans on the issue of the environment.

Never have I seen an Earth Day used for such pure politics as it was yesterday by the President. The President would have us believe that the only thing standing between the public and dirty air and dirty water is President Clinton himself. If you would listen long enough to the President, you would think that his environmental record is unblemished. Unfortunately for the President, the facts belie the image that he is trying to present.

I want to briefly show this by discussing two items that were brought to my attention yesterday that clearly illustrate that President Clinton's deeds are different from his rhetoric. First, the director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Mr. Larry Wilson, sent a letter to my office regarding President Clinton's fiscal year budget proposals for the Army Corps of Engineers. The letter states: "The President's proposal will have substantial adverse impacts on several environmental programs important to my State. One of these programs focuses on habitat restoration, which is vital to supporting endangered species. This program will be shut down due to the President's administration budget proposals." This is an environmental issue, and the President is cutting the budget. That belies the fact that yesterday he was out saying the great things he was doing about the environment.

As President Clinton demagogues against Republican programs to reform the Endangered Species Act, he is shutting down an existing program that has actually been successful in saving endangered species. Again, his rhetoric does not match his words.

Other programs that will be shut down affect the wetlands in my State. There are several wetland restoration and enhancement projects that will be terminated if the President's budget is adopted. According to the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, these projects not only provide critical habitat for wildlife, but they also provide hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreational opportunities for all Iowans. As the President talks about his initiative to protect national parks, he is jeopardizing these same resources in Iowa with his budget proposals.

The second item that I will discuss concerns an article in this morning's Washington Post. It says that the President, out on the C&O Canal, talking about the good he does for the environment, is saying one thing, but there is an Agency of his Government, in his administration, that is causing environmental damage in another place.

This is where the Sierra Club alleges that the U.S. Government is responsible for illegal dumping of PCB's, lead, mercury, and arsenic in the Anacostia River right here in Washington, DC. The Sierra Club is a group that often supports the President on his environmental initiatives and is often critical of Republican proposals. So, it is very unusual that this organization would question this administration on an environmental issue.

Yet, the Sierra Club is alleging that the Washington Navy Yard and Southeast Federal Center are violating the Clean Water Act and polluting this local river.

Mr. President, I can tell you that if a family farmer was thought to have violated the Clean Water Act, that farm would be shut down immediately. I know of cases in Iowa where the EPA showed up armed and without warning to close down small businesses because of potential violations of environmental laws. Yet, the Federal Government remains the biggest polluter in the country and is not subject to the same rules that apply to small businesses and family farms. This is hypocrisy. This is a double standard.

President Clinton should stop playing politics with the environment. The public health is too important to be used as a campaign issue. The more politics he plays, the less he is able to bring fairness and uniformity to our Nation's environmental laws. I urge the American people to look behind the political demagoguery that was characterized on Earth Day and take a good look at the deeds of this administration. You may find that, once again, President Clinton's action falls short of his rhetoric.

This country is suffering from a severe bout of cynicism. That is exactly why we have this legislation on the floor regarding term limits, because term limits are the people's expression of dissatisfaction with Washington, DC, with the Congress, and with other institutions of Government. The cause of this is that politicians say one thing and do another. This has reflected an absence of moral leadership over time of our elected officials. Usually the public does not discover this until they have come and gone. I want to lay the record out right now because we need accountability right now. We need leadership right now.

What we do not need now is the same old "say one thing and do another" routine. To stop the growth of cynicism and the fact that we must restore trust of the American people in our institutions of Government, we in Washington need to show the American peo-

ple that they can trust our words, that our words not only can be trusted, but our words are followed up by actions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two documents I referred to be printed in the RECORD, the newspaper article and the letter from the director of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 23, 1996]

NEW MEDICARE TRUST FUND DATA SHOW
UNUSUALLY LARGE SHORTFALL

WASHINGTON, April 22.—Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund lost \$4.2 billion in the first half of the current fiscal year, according to new Government data, which suggest that the financial condition of the program is worse than projected by Administration officials last year.

The trust fund, which pays hospital bills for the elderly and disabled, lost money last year for the first time since 1972. But the loss for all of last year was only \$35.7 million.

The new data show that the losses are growing. In the first half of the current fiscal year, from October 1995 through March of this year, the trust fund spent \$60.5 billion and took in \$56.3 billion, a shortfall of \$4.2 billion, the Treasury said.

There is little chance that the trust fund will actually run out of money. It still contains more than \$120 billion, and Congress would almost surely act to rescue the program before it ran out of money. But the new data provide fresh evidence that, after months of acrimonious debate between the White House and Congress, Medicare remains a budget problem of immense and growing proportions.

Chris Jennings, a special assistant to President Clinton for health policy, said today that the new numbers were not surprising. "They indicate the need to move forward, balance the budget and enact some changes in Medicare that will strengthen the trust fund," he said. "Republicans and Democrats should work together to address the problem."

In a letter to Congress last week, Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin suggested that Congress and the Administration resume discussions to reach an agreement on Medicare and the budget.

Republicans proposed many changes in Medicare last year to help control costs, but President Clinton said the changes would hurt beneficiaries. Republicans may hesitate to put forward new proposals after they were bloodied in that battle. Representative Bill Archer, the Texas Republican who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, said, "The President preferred to scare seniors and play politics instead of saving Medicare."

It is not entirely clear why the hospital trust fund is running out of money faster than expected. One factor, Administration officials said, is an unanticipated increase in the number of admissions of Medicare patients to hospitals, but that does not explain all of the discrepancy.

The new losses accelerate a trend that started several years ago, when spending by the hospital trust fund began to increase faster than the money coming into the fund. The Administration had predicted that the amount of money in the trust fund would increase by \$4.7 billion in the 1995 fiscal year, which ended Sept. 30, but instead the trust fund spent \$35.7 million more than it took in.

Likewise, the Administration predicted last April that the trust fund would take in

\$45 million more than it would spend in the current fiscal year. But that now appears highly unlikely. Treasury Department data show that the trust fund has lost money in five of the last six months.

In the first half of the last fiscal year, from October 1994 to March 1995, the trust fund lost \$135 million.

Any trust fund money not immediately needed to pay hospital bills is invested in Government securities. The amount of such holdings has declined, to \$126.1 billion on March 31 from \$129.9 billion on Oct. 1, 1995.

If nothing is done to change the financing and design of Medicare, losses from the trust fund are expected to grow from year to year. Payroll taxes account for most of the trust fund's income, and no tax increases are scheduled under current law. Unless President Clinton and Congress arrive at a long-term budget deal, Federal officials said, there is no reason to expect a significant reduction in the rate of growth of Medicare spending.

But no such deal is in sight. In this election year, lawmakers and Administration officials are wary of any action that might offend elderly voters by restricting Medicare spending.

Last year, Republicans proposed vast changes in Medicare to slow the program's growth. But the proposals were included in a bill to balance the Federal budget, and Mr. Clinton vetoed that bill in December, saying it contained "the biggest Medicare and Medicaid cuts in history."

Republicans said their proposals were needed to prevent Medicare from going bankrupt, but Democrats said the changes would devastate the program and push beneficiaries into health maintenance organizations.

The new Treasury data do not indicate when Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will run out of money. In April 1995, the Administration predicted that the trust fund would be depleted at some point from October to December 2002, but it now appears that the money could run out earlier because the trust fund is spending more than expected and is taking in less than expected.

Senator Pete V. Domenici, the New Mexico Republican who is chairman of the Budget Committee, said he believed that the trust fund would run out of money by May 2001.

Roland E. King, former chief actuary of the Health Care Financing Administration, which runs Medicare, said today that he believed the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund "will run out in late 2000 or early 2001." Richard S. Foster, who succeeded Mr. King as chief actuary, said he could not discuss the financial condition of Medicare without permission from top officials at the Department of Health and Human Services, and such permission was not given today.

Under Federal law, the trustees of the Medicare trust fund, including four Administration officials, were supposed to submit a report to Congress on the financial condition of the program by April 1. But Administration officials say that report has been delayed because of Government shutdowns and snowstorms last winter and will probably not be issued until late May or early June.

Some Democrats have played down the significance of the losses from Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. Representative Pete Stark, Democrat of California, said, "The past is littered with inaccurate forecasts of Medicare's demise." Moreover, he said, "The Democrats will not let Medicare go insolvent."

Hospital executives and Medicare officials said they were puzzled by the recent increase in admissions. James D. Bentley, senior vice president of the American Hospital Association, said tonight, "Hospital admissions of Medicare patients are rising more than could

be explained by growth in the number of beneficiaries—but not enough to account for all of the unexpected increase in Medicare spending."

[From the U.S. Senate—Republican Policy Committee, Apr. 23, 1996]

TODAY'S NEW YORK TIMES DEMONSTRATES URGENT NEED TO SOLVE MEDICARE'S IMPENDING CRISIS, NOW

Today's New York Times front-page article (on the reverse side) once again reveals the Medicare Part A trust fund's uncontrolled hemorrhaging. It remains uncontrolled because the Clinton Administration decided to play "Medi-Scare" with Medicare last year. Clinton vetoed the plan from Congress that would have allowed it to grow at twice the rate of inflation and would have kept it solvent for the next generation. In contrast, President Clinton's latest unbalanced budget—his ninth, scored last week by CBO—would barely keep the current trust fund solvent through fiscal year 2002.

Medicare's Hospital Insurance trust fund, commonly known as "Part A," has lost \$4.2 billion in the first half of FY 96 [says the New York Times, citing government data].

This compares with a loss in the first half of FY 95 of \$135 million, and the Clinton Administration's prediction that Part A would run a \$45 million surplus for FY 96.

These losses indicate that Medicare's bankruptcy is even closer than the 2002 date the Administration reported April 3, 1995.

Because the Administration has still not produced a report this year, we must rely on outside estimates. Budget Committee Chairman Domenici has stated Part A could be bankrupt by May of 2001; former chief HCFA actuary Roland King predicts bankruptcy as soon as late 2000.

Clinton's latest budget would only push bankruptcy back a year beyond its last year's estimate. According to CBO under his budget—without utilizing for gimmick of cost-shifting \$60 billion to the taxpayer—Part A would be barely solvent in FY 2002 (\$1.5 billion) and would be bankrupt by FY 2003.

In contrast, Congress' Balanced Budget Act would have preserved Part A beyond 2010—when Baby Boomers begin retiring—while allowing spending to grow at twice the inflation rate.

While the Republican party in Congress wants to protect Medicare for the next generation, Clinton wants to abandon it to the next Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Des Moines, IA., April 10, 1996.

Re Mississippi River Environmental Management Program (EMP) and Missouri River Fish and Wildlife (F&W) Mitigation—Effects in Iowa of the President's FY 1997 Budget Request.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: I want to alert you to the impacts that the Administration's FY 1997 budget proposal will have in Iowa with regard to two programs administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: (1) Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation and (2) Mississippi River EMP. The President's proposal will have substantial adverse impacts on both of these programs which in recent years have been operating at close to full authorized funding and providing long-awaited benefits to Iowans. I urge you to do whatever you can to restore the appropriations in FY 1997 to levels that equal or at least come closer to the amounts available in prior years.

The Corps has explained their priorities for funding which are navigation, flood control,

and environment projects. While we understand how the Corps developed these priorities, their application results in a disproportionate impact on projects that are important to Iowa. For example, funding of only \$100,000 for mitigation projects on the Missouri in the Omaha District, means projects on hold for years while habitat restoration is viewed as a key way to resolve historic conflicts between uses while enhancing support for endangered species. The Mississippi River EMP is slated for cuts of nearly \$4 million in FY 97, and projections are for cuts of about \$7 million for FY 98 and nearly \$11 million in future years. These levels will delay projects for years while threatening the viability of an essential long-term monitoring effort.

It has been difficult for us to obtain information as to whether the Administration's budget cuts are greater for the North Central and Omaha Divisions than for other regions. If these divisions suffered proportionally greater reductions than other divisions, it could help to explain the difficulty that they have had trying to meet all of their obligations and ensure the timely completion of Iowa projects.

MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION

Mitigation was authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to satisfy the federal requirement to mitigate for the loss of fish and wildlife habitat with the construction of the navigation and flood control works on the river in Iowa and the other lower basin states. Appropriations commenced in 1989. While the program includes land acquisition, that has been less important in Iowa than habitat development. The state already owns numerous sites along the river that can be improved by the mitigation program. The Corps of Engineers has purchased some land adjacent to existing public land as required to make the habitat development projects work. Mitigation is critical on the Missouri River if the Corps is going to make progress in supporting endangered species. There is a terrible shortage of fisheries habitat in the lower river. These conditions have economic consequences as well, since the lack of habitat reduces the quality of the fishery. The net result is less recreational opportunity on the river, which impacts businesses that provide goods and services along the river.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation has received as much as \$8 million a year, which was fairly evenly split between the Kansas City and Omaha Corps Districts. The administration's budget for FY 1997 includes \$1.6 million for mitigation, of which \$1.5 million is programmed for the Kansas City District and only \$100,000 for the Omaha District. Iowa projects are in the Omaha District, so Missouri River fish and wildlife mitigation will essentially come to a halt in Iowa. The discrepancy among the two districts is based upon individual district priorities. Fish and wildlife mitigation requires more than a token \$100,000 in the Omaha District.

The following are the specific projects programmed for work in FY 97 that will not happen if current funding levels remain:

Blackbird/Tieville/Decatur Bend near Onawa is an \$8.8 million project that includes 3,500 acres and 11.8 miles of wetlands and river side channels. The definite project report (DPR) is complete, design and engineering is near completion, and construction was programmed in begin in Fall 1996 and be completed during FY 97.

California Bend near Missouri Valley just north of Council Bluffs is a \$785,000 project to restore a running side chute connected to the Missouri River. The plans and specifications are close to completion and construction was scheduled for FY 96 and 97.

Winnebago Bend near Sloan is a \$1.3 million project to add water into a rapidly disappearing wetland. It too was programmed for FY 96 & 97 construction.

In addition to the improvement or creation of critical habitat, all of these projects would provide hunting, angling and outdoor recreation opportunities to Iowans along the Missouri River.

The Corps' report proposing these projects was completed in 1981. With nearly two decades of delays, the lack of habitat continues to frustrate efforts to maintain several fish species. It would be most unfortunate to lose the momentum that has developed as these projects have moved this close to construction.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (EMP)

EMP was also authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and has become a model program for the restoration of fish and wildlife on big rivers. Its authorized funding is \$19.4 million per year and it has been receiving that amount in recent years. It too is a program that has taken a long time to attain solid momentum, but is now providing increasing benefits. EMP contains two primary components; (1) habitat rehabilitation and enhancement projects (HREP) and (2) long-term resource monitoring (LTRM). The Administration's budget contains \$15.6 million for EMP in FY 97, which is not devastating in itself. Our concern lies with the Corps' projections in FY 98, 99, and 00, which are \$12.4 million, \$8.7 million, and \$9.8 million, respectively. Reductions of that magnitude will have serious adverse implications in Iowa.

EXAMPLES OF COMPLETED HREPS IN IOWA ARE:

Bussey Lake dredging near Guttenberg—Dredging will improve the fishery by providing deeper water, diversity of habitat and wintering-over areas.

Brown's Lake restoration near Green Island—This area has been protected from sedimentation by dike improvements and a water control structure. A deeper channel through the project and dredging in the lake have improved the fishery, while the dredge spoil was collected on site to create terrestrial habitat. This project along with the improvements at Green Island will be beneficial for both hunting and fishing.

Big Timber backwater rehabilitation and pothole creation near Muscatine—Dredging at this site restored an area that was nearly completely filled in with sediment.

Lansing Big Lake side channel closures—This project is designed to decrease sedimentation and flow rates in the lake to maintain its currently very popular panfishery. We are currently proposing some follow-up work in Lansing Big Lake to further assure project objectives are obtained.

Iowa's Princeton HREP project near Princeton is hit the hardest by the proposed change in funding. This project is designed to create new wetlands and improve the dike system for waterfowl management. The construction contract was close to being let to a minority contractor. Our local DNR biologist was ready to issue a news release explaining to local hunters that Princeton would be closed this fall due to construction. The Corps is considering delaying construction until late 1997. Making this decision at the last minute is inefficient and will cost time and money if the Corps decides to shelve the project. Because of great interest in this project by local hunters and others who live along the river, the delay will cause many to become extremely upset.

Iowa's Lake Odessa EMP project near Wapello is currently undergoing planning, engineering, and design. The Corps has informed us that it will complete this work,

but will not construct the project under current EMP authorization. The Lake Odessa HREP project would therefore only become reality if authorization for EMP is extended beyond 2002.

HREP projects for Huron Island near Burlington, Molo Slough near Dubuque, and Peosta Channel also near Dubuque were also programmed to be completed under the current EMP authorization. The Corps is now considering deletion of these projects completely from EMP.

The Long-Term Resource Monitoring (LTRM) element of EMP is collecting data on Mississippi River water quality, aquatic and floodplain habitat, microinvertebrates, and fisheries. LTRM also evaluates the physical, chemical, and biological responses of habitat projects. This program was designed to identify trends and support decisions about river management including such projects as the current navigation study.

Iowa DNR operates one of six monitoring stations that are located throughout the river. Iowa's station is in Bellevue and is staffed by six permanent employees and typically hires up to five seasonal workers during summer months. These are all state employees, but funding for their salaries and operations comes totally from federal EMP dollars. Reductions in the LTRM budget will likely occur because of overall EMP cutbacks, which means that Iowa's station in Bellevue and its employees will be affected. It is important that data gathering not be curtailed to the extent that the integrity of the data base created over the past several years is jeopardized. In addition, the loss of jobs at the station will impact the economy in Bellevue due to the loss of employment. Bellevue along with other cities along the Mississippi will see reduced recreational activity as the maintenance of the natural resources of the river are neglected.

Budget reductions are difficult, and we understand that there will be some impacts on programs that we believe to be important to the long term viability of the natural river systems. It appears that the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation and Mississippi River Environmental Management Programs are expected by the Administration to bear proportionally greater budget reductions than other programs. We also fear that the North Central and Missouri River Divisions are taking a greater share of cuts than those in other parts of the country. This further harms Iowa projects. If budget reductions that are currently being proposed happen, Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation in Iowa will come to a complete halt, Mississippi River EMP habitat projects in Iowa will be delayed and some will be eliminated. The Bellevue monitoring station will face cuts that could mean its demise with the added cuts proposed in future years. As noted above, reductions in these efforts will have economic as well as natural resource consequences that should not be underestimated given the Corps' own study showing an annual value of recreation in the Upper Mississippi River basin of over \$1 billion. We ask for your help to do whatever you can to assure these programs and their respective projects in Iowa are not forced to take on more than their fair share of setbacks.

Sincerely,

LARRY J. WILSON,
Director.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes. How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes 56 seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

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

MEDICARE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, about a year ago the President appointed trustees for the Medicare fund to study Medicare, to project its problems, its solvency, and everything like that. A year ago, six trustees of the Medicare fund—and these are four people in the President's Cabinet and two citizens, one Republican and one Democrat, so altogether there would be five Democrats and one Republican—unanimously said that the Medicare program would be bankrupt in the year 2002. They also said that Congress should take immediate action to keep the long-term viability of Medicare. They asked the Republican Congress to take action to do that. We did that.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 is this 1,800-page bill, which took 13 committees over an 8-month period of time to put together, the first Balanced Budget Act passed by Congress in a quarter of a century, to balance the budget in 7 years. Part of this document is not only doing what President Clinton's trustees of the Medicare system asked us to do, to save it from bankruptcy, but we also gave senior citizens of America a choice that if they did not want to have traditional Medicare, we would pay for other forms of health care delivery. We would take their money and pay for it, so that they could have something if they wanted something different than Medicare. That is all in this document.

In November of last year, we presented the President of the United States not only the balanced budget, but also provisions to save Medicare, to strengthen Medicare, and to give people on Medicare, for the first time in 30 years, a choice of their medical care.

The President vetoed it. The President vetoed those Medicare reforms. He wanted people to believe that we were cutting Medicare. He was on television every day on these paid ads saying that "Republicans are cutting Medicare." Under the Balanced Budget Act, Medicare would have grown at 7 percent every year. What we are spending on Medicare per beneficiary is \$4,900 this year, and in 7 years we would have been spending \$6,700 per Medicare recipient. Maybe it is even closer to \$7,000 per Medicare recipient. So, obviously, we were not cutting anything. We were saving Medicare from bankruptcy. We were extending the life of it for another 9 or 10 years.

Well, the President vetoed it. One person is standing in the way of doing what his trustees said should be done, what the people want done, and what the Congress did. The President of the United States vetoed the first balanced budget act passed in a quarter of a century, balancing the budget in 7 years, and saving Medicare, as his trustees said. Well, the President kind of ignored what his trustees said.