

are learning that Operation Uphold Democracy was not the resounding success President Clinton led us to believe. The bottom line, it seems to me, is that America's military cannot achieve what the people and leaders of Somalia and Haiti refuse to do. This so-called nation building is fanciful rhetoric for fleecing the American taxpayers.

I had hoped and prayed that President Clinton had learned his lesson from Somalia, and Haiti, but President Clinton has already landed several hundred Marines, from Camp Lejeune, NC, inside Liberia. More than 1,600 Marines and 1,900 sailors on warships are awaiting further orders.

But, Liberia is in, quite literally, a state of anarchy, and I fear there is little the United States can do about it. Consider, Mr. President, that since 1990, American taxpayers have given Liberia—a country of 3 million people—at least \$429 million of foreign aid, according to A.I.D.—and President Clinton proposes to forgive Liberian debt to the American taxpayers. And what has all this assistance accomplished? Since the outbreak of the civil war in 1989, intensive fighting has been the cause of the United States having to evacuate Americans and others from the country on three separate occasions. tens of thousands of Liberians are dead and thousands more fled.

Tragically, the lives saved by \$429 million in U.S. foreign aid are today being gunned-down at the hands of heavily armed drunken teenagers, looting the capital city of Monrovia, raping and killing for sport. The so-called leaders in Liberia, as in Somalia, are bloodthirsty warlords who are more vicious criminals than national leaders. In fact, one warlord, Charles Taylor, escaped from Plymouth County Jail in Massachusetts in 1985.

Mr. President, on April 15, the Foreign Relations Committee was assured that if United States Marines went into Liberia, they would only be protecting the United States Embassy and assisting with evacuations, although all Americans who have asked to leave are already evacuated. The Sunday Washington Times, however, reported that several hundred Marines landed in Liberia over the weekend, and that they "would be able to provide humanitarian assistance." This makes me very concerned about mission creep.

Congress does not want United States Marines hunting down Liberian warlords, as in Somalia, or picking up trash on the streets of Monrovia, as in Port-au-Prince. Mr. President, there are no United States interests in Liberia worth the life of even one United States service man or woman.

I have written President Clinton to raise a number of questions about his policy. Congress and the American people deserve answers. Of course, I pray the President does not get the United States into another Somalia or Haiti.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the President be

printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 22, 1996.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In response to the most recent outbreak of violence in Liberia and the mass evacuation that followed, I note that the Administration has undertaken a comprehensive review of its policy toward Liberia. Congress is also fully aware of the likelihood of further humanitarian tragedy in Liberia.

With the unnecessary deaths of eighteen U.S. servicemen in Somalia (October 3, 1993) lingering on our minds, the landing of several hundred U.S. Marines in Liberia over the weekend has Congress to be all the more concerned about developments in Liberia—and, frankly, the Administration's response to that crisis.

Administration officials briefed Congressional staff this past week about the situation in Liberia, but a number of important questions went unanswered. The Foreign Relations Committee will appreciate prompt answers to the following questions:

(1) What is the exit strategy for the U.S. troops currently in Liberia?

(2) Under what rules of engagement are U.S. servicemen in Liberia operating?

(3) As humanitarian concerns are necessarily incidental—as important as they may be—what the U.S. national interests in Liberia, besides protecting U.S. citizens?

(4) What interests in Liberia are worth risking the life of one American citizen?

(5) Inasmuch as Liberia is in anarchy, why should any U.S. Embassy personnel remain?

(6) To whom is the U.S. Embassy accredited?

(7) If U.S. Embassy personnel remain, what kind of security will they have?

(8) Has the U.S. Government received any assistance with evacuations or security from France, Britain or any other country?

(9) What countries have overseas bases in African countries in proximity to Liberia?

(10) How many people, and from which countries, have been evacuated from Liberia by U.S. forces?

(11) How many private Americans and U.S. citizens working at the Embassy remain in Liberia?

(12) Do any United Nations Development Program personnel remain in Liberia?

(13) Are personnel from any United Nations agency on the ground in Liberia?

(14) To date, what is the total cost of the evacuation effort?

(15) How many U.S. Navy vessels have arrived off Liberia, and how many Marines and sailors does this represent?

(16) Under what circumstances would these Marines go into Liberia?

(17) Is an expanded role for U.S. military forces being contemplated? If so, please explain.

(18) If a contingent of U.S. forces goes into Liberia, from where will they be supported?

(19) What would such an operation cost?

(20) Given the state of anarchy in Liberia, and the individuals with whom diplomats are forced to deal, how does the Administration expect to influence events?

(21) To date, how much U.S. funding has ECOMOG received, including equipment, and how effective has it been?

(22) To date, how much U.S. funding have the countries of ECOWAS received, including equipment, and how effective has it been?

(23) As Nigeria has been decertified on account of noncooperation in the fight against illegal narcotics, how does the Administration intend to provide funding to Nigerian troops, which make up a majority of ECOMOG in Liberia—will the Administration seek a waiver in order to provide funding or equipment to Nigerian forces?

(24) How much money and equipment does the Administration propose giving ECOMOG and ECOWAS, and from where will the funds come?

(25) Since the outbreak of the civil war in 1989, how much U.S. Government assistance has gone to Liberia?

(26) Since the outbreak of the civil war in 1989, what is the total amount of international assistance that has gone to Liberia, including from United Nations agencies and all international financial institutions?

(27) Have any of the Liberian warlords ever been wanted, or are currently wanted, in the United States for any violation of law? If so, please explain.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

JESSE HELMS.

MEDICARE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 2 years ago, the Medicare trustees—three of whom are members of the President's Cabinet—reported to President Clinton and Congress that Medicare would be bankrupt by the year 2002.

From the day the Medicare trustees issued their report, Republicans have worked to preserve and strengthen Medicare. We proposed to do this not by cutting Medicare—but by slowing its rate of growth. Under the Republican plan adopted by Congress, annual spending per Medicare beneficiary would increase from \$4,800 this year to more than \$7,200 in 2002.

If you believed what President Clinton and some of my friends on the other side of the aisle had to say, however, you would have thought that instead of increasing Medicare spending from \$4,800 per beneficiary to \$7,200 per beneficiary, Republicans were trying to throw America's seniors out on the streets. And to the President's credit as a public speaker, a lot of Americans believed what he was saying.

There is, however, a very big difference between leading and misleading. Republicans chose to lead—and we suffered in the polls because of it. President Clinton chose to mislead—and he gained in the polls because of it.

But as a story in this morning's New York Times makes very clear, the President's gain came at the expense of the millions and millions of Americans who depend on Medicare.

The story reveals the fact that Medicare's hospital insurance trust fund, which pays hospital bills for the elderly and disabled, lost \$4.2 billion—that is billion with a "B"—in the first half of the current fiscal year. Those losses are more than 100 times larger than the \$35.7 million loss the trust fund experienced all last year.

The \$4.2 billion loss is also in stark contrast to the rosy scenario coming out of the White House last year. As part of their attempt to lead the public

to believe that Republicans concern with Medicare was "much ado about nothing," they predicted that the Medicare trust fund would take in \$45 million more than it would spend in the current fiscal year. Obviously, the White House was as off base in its economic projections as they were in their political accusations.

The article also reports that Roland King, former chief actuary of the Health Care Financing Administration, which runs Medicare, said that after analyzing these new numbers, he believes the hospital insurance trust fund will not run out in 2002 as the trustees originally projected. Instead, it will run out in 2000 or 2001.

I am sure that a number of Republicans are tempted to say "I told you so," this morning. But saying that will get us no closer to the solutions necessary to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

And so, Mr. President, this Senator stands ready to work on a bipartisan basis to save, preserve, and strengthen Medicare. It is my hope that in the face of these alarming new numbers, the President will choose the path of leading rather than the path of misleading.

SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE: THE SENATE'S FIRST ENVIRONMENTAL LEADER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President. As all senators know, former Senator Edmund S. Muskie passed away on March 26, two days before his 82d birthday. Senator Muskie served in this body from January, 1959, until May 1980, when he resigned to become Secretary of State in the Carter administration.

As a freshman Senator, Ed Muskie ardently desired a position on the Foreign Relations Committee. He was disappointed to be appointed to the Public Works Committee instead. But his loss proved to be the Nation's gain. As a member of the Public Works Committee, later the chairman of the Environmental Pollution Subcommittee, Senator Muskie became the chief architect of America's first environmental laws.

At the funeral service for Senator Muskie, his protege and former chief of staff, George Mitchell, who took Muskie's Senate seat and went on to become the Senate majority leader, delivered a wonderful tribute to Senator Muskie's environmental leadership. I would like to share his remarks with the Senate today by asking unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

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

REMARKS OF GEORGE MITCHELL

Jane, Steve and Lexi, Ellen and Ernie, Melinda and Eddie, Martha, Ned and Julia, and other members of the family, Cardinal Hickey, Bishop Gerry and other members of the clergy, President and Mrs. Carter and other distinguished guests and friends of Ed Muskie. Senator Muskie once said that he didn't like being called "Lincolnesque" but

it fit. With his lanky frame, his long and craggy face, his powerful voice, he was an imposing figure. He was loved and trusted by the people of Maine because they saw in him the qualities they most admire, independence, fairness, the lack of pretense, the willingness to speak the truth even when it hurt. He was plain spoken even blunt at times and they admired him for it. He had his faults and he made mistakes as do all human beings but he conquered his faults and he learned from his mistakes and as a result, he became the greatest public official in Maine's history and one of the most effective legislators in our nation's history. He accomplished much in a long and distinguished career. In that impressive record, nothing surpasses what he did to protect America's natural environment.

Harry Truman once said that men make history, not the other way around. In periods where there is no leadership society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better. Ed Muskie changed things for the better. When he went to the Senate, there were no national environmental laws, there was no environmental movement, there was hardly an awareness of the problem. Industries and municipalities dumped their wastes into the nearest river and America's waters were, for the most part, stinking open sewers. The air was unhealthy the water polluted, Ed Muskie changed that.

It's one thing to write and pass a law, it's another thing to change the way people live, it's yet another and a far more difficult thing to change the way people think. Ed Muskie did that. With knowledge, skill, determination and patience he won approval of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act and America was changed forever for the better. Any American who wants to know what Ed Muskie's legacy is need only go to the nearest river. Before Ed Muskie it was almost surely not fit to drink or to swim or to fish in, because of Ed Muskie it is now almost surely clean. A source of recreation even revenue. Despite the efforts of some to turn back the clock, these landmark laws will survive because the American people know what a difference he has made in their lives.

It has been said that what we do for ourselves, leaves this world with us, what we do for others remains behind. That's our legacy, our link with immortality. Ed Muskie's legacy will stand as a living memorial to his vision. It is his immortality.

Each of us could say much more about Ed Muskie's public career but we are here today to pay tribute to Ed Muskie the man, so I would like to say a few words about the man who was my hero, my mentor, my friend. Thirty-four years ago this week, I received a telephone call that changed my life. It was from Don Nicoll, Senator Muskie's Administrative Assistant and close friend who is here today. He invited me to come up to Capitol Hill to meet the Senator who was looking for someone from Maine to fill a vacancy on his staff. To help him evaluate me, Don asked that I prepare a memorandum on the legal aspects of an issue that was then being considered by the Senate. I prepared the memo and went up for the interview. I thought the memo was pretty good, but unknowingly I had made a huge mistake. I reached a conclusion that was the opposite of the Senator's. I had never met him but he didn't bother with any small talk. Within minutes of our introduction, he unleashed a ferocious cross-examination. He came out from behind his desk, he towered over me, he shook his finger at me and he took my memo apart, line by line. I was stunned, so intimidated that I couldn't control the shaking of my

legs even though I was sitting down. I tried as best as I could to explain my point of view and we had what you might call a lively discussion. As I left he said the next time you come in here, you'll be better prepared. That's how I learned I'd been hired and I sure was better prepared the next time.

Ed Muskie was even more imposing intellectually than he was physically. He was the smartest person that I ever met with an incisive analytical mind that enabled him to see every aspect of a problem and instantly to identify possible solutions. He challenged everyone around him to rise to his level of excellence. No one quite reached his level, but those who took up the challenge were improved by the effort. Those who know him learned from that relationship, those of us who worked for him, most of all. Just about everything I know about politics and government I learned from him. Just about everything I have accomplished in public life, can be traced to his help. No one ever had a better mentor or a better friend.

No discussion of Ed Muskie would be complete without mention of his legendary temper. After he became Secretary of State, a news magazine in an article described his temper as entirely tactical, something that he turned on and off at will to help him get his way. I saw him a few days later, he showed me the article, in fact he read it to me, and then he said laughingly, "all these years you thought my temper was for real." Well, I said, you sure fooled me, and a lot of other people. I think the reality is that it was both. When he yelled at you it was terrifyingly real, but you could never be sure that it wasn't also a tactic to move you his way, to get you to do what he wanted done and that's the way he wanted it and liked it.

Almost as unnerving as one of his eruptions was the swiftness with which it passed and was forgotten. He was a passionate man and expressed himself with emotion. His point having been made, he moved on, he didn't believe in looking back or nursing grudges and maybe that's how he got past the disappointments he suffered. It surely also helped that he was a secure man, confident in, and comfortable with his values. Those values were simple, yet universal in their reach and enduring in their strength. They were faith, family and country. He was constant in his faith. He was comforted by it and he was motivated by its message. The prayer printed on the back of the program today written by Senator Muskie more than a quarter century ago with its emphasis on compassion and tolerance was the essence of his faith. He was totally devoted to his family, especially to Jane. They would have celebrated their 48th anniversary in May and for all those years, she supported him, she comforted him, she helped him. He was a passionate believer in democracy and especially in American democracy.

I have the privilege of traveling all over Maine and all this country with him. Back when I was on Senator Muskie's staff we didn't have the resources available today so we used to share a motel room in small towns all across Maine as I drove him from one appearance to another. And I can recall the many times he spoke of his Father who he greatly admired and who he was very much influenced by. His Father was a Polish immigrant who, like many others who fled from tyranny, flourished in the free air of this blessed land. No person I have ever heard and few in our history could match Ed Muskie's eloquence on the meaning of America. Once in public office, his profound respect for American democracy led him to act always with dignity and restraint, lest he dishonor those he represented. As a result, he was the ideal in public service, a man who accomplished much without ever compromising his principles or his dignity. Character is