

These operations would not have been possible without the support of the French Government, in particular regarding the obtention of temporary permits for the accompanying adults.

I hope that this information answers, at least in part, your concerns which we entirely share about the fate of the children (and other members of the civilian population) who are caught up in the daily horrors of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

With best regards,

GERARD DUMONT,  
*Consul General.*

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I do not know if anything can be done. But I think we ought to do everything we can to save these children, if possible, in this horrible, horrible situation in which they find themselves. Obviously, these would only be volunteers.

Let me say for those who have fears of the religious implications, because these are mostly Moslem children, though not entirely. There are a number of Bosnian families in the United States as well as in Western Europe who, I am sure, would be willing to take these children—not all of them obviously, but many of them would—so that they could be raised in homes where there is a Bosnian culture and a Moslem background. So the religious factor should not be a barrier to going ahead.

Again, Mr. President, I do not have any good answer. But I do think this idea of somehow saving these children, or as many of them as we can, is just a sound, simple, humanitarian thing to do. I hope that somehow we can do something.

#### LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to talk about the bill that is on the floor.

Mr. President, I think that we are coming to a very important time in this Congress, and that is the time that we are going to be dealing with reform of our lobby laws, and later the gift laws that apply to Members of Congress.

Mr. President, it is important that we have Government in the sunshine.

The bill that is before us, lobby reform and lobby control, is an important one, and we have passed a similar bill in previous Congresses. Last year, I voted for a bill that would have required more disclosure of lobbying efforts without in any way though infringing on the right of individuals to seek an audience or a time with their Members of Congress.

We do not want to do anything that would keep a teacher who happens to be a member of a teachers organization from directly contacting a Member of Congress. But there are many lobbying

activities that may now not be disclosable that should be disclosable. I know the Members of our parties on both sides of the aisle are working on a compromise right now, and I hope we can come up with something that will provide public information of everything that is going on, every contact that is being made by a registered lobbyist or someone representing a lobby group. I think it is very important that the people of this country know who it is seeing Members of Congress when we are talking about important legislation.

We are also going to be taking up gift reform, and that is another important issue. I think it is important we have contribution limits, and we do have contribution limits. And I have voted to make those contribution limits even lower. We also have limits on how much you can take in a gift, which may be a T-shirt or it may be a basket of fruit or it may be something very small but that someone gives you just as they would give you if you worked in any office.

I wish to just say that those are appropriate limits. We do now have limitations which I think are very appropriate. I think we must be very careful as we go into the debate on gift ban not to go to such a level that you would then be able to be prosecuted for something which would really be inadvertent.

For instance, if you go to a zero gift, then presumably if you have coffee and doughnuts or a lunch with someone who happens to be a friend who may also work for a corporation or may be a teacher, then are you going to violate a ban on gifts?

I do not think anyone who is thinking rationally believes that just because you talk to someone or have lunch with someone or dinner with someone or a group gives you a T-shirt that is going to affect the way you vote on important public policy issues. These are things that happen in offices all over our country. It is the way people show normal appreciation for a friendship or for working together on some kind of issue. So I think we have to be very careful to make sure we do the things that would keep you from being able to abuse the ability to receive a gift without going to such a length we then allow for selective prosecution by people who do not have good will or for inadvertent things to happen that do not mean anything but nevertheless would put you in the position of a technical violation.

Mr. President, I just think as we go forward we need to keep in mind that everyone wants openness in Government, reporting of things that are received, without in any way, though, keeping a normal person from being able to contact or have the minimal ability to send a flower or a T-shirt to someone who they have worked with on an issue and had a good result or want to show some appreciation.

I go to functions across my State, and I may go to the chamber of com-

merce and make a speech to a chamber of commerce banquet. They will send me flowers or they will send something from the city, a cup or something. I appreciate that. I think it is a nice gesture. It makes me think of that city. I have things all over my office, cups and candy jars and things from the city of Lamar, from the city of Gainesville, or the city of Houston, or the city of Dallas. We cannot stop normal behavior, normal appreciativeness, contact with chambers of commerce or teachers or unions. That just does not make sense.

So I hope we will keep the common-sense test as we go forward. I do not think anyone believes that being able to have the normal course of business is in any way prohibiting a fair look at legislation.

So I just hope common sense will be the test, Mr. President. I think it is very important that we make improvements. I think we are doing that. I think as we go along and we see what works and what does not work or what is falling through the cracks we will take the steps to close those loopholes. That is what we are trying to do, and I hope we will have a good result. I hope we will have a big lobby reform vote today, just like we did last year. It was something like 96 to 5 that the lobby reform bill passed last year, but then it got hung up in conference, and it got changed and did not pass.

So I hope we can pass a good bill this year; that it will go through conference and that it will be an overwhelming, bipartisan effort to close the loopholes we have in the law today. But let us make sure we have enough common sense that an inadvertent error which really does not make a difference does not cause someone who does not have good will or good intentions to be able to prosecute or in any way build something up so that it makes a criminal out of a public servant.

It is not easy to be in public service at this point in time, and I certainly do not want to harass people who are just trying to do what is right by having some kind of law that would allow a technical violation. So let us go forward in a positive and bipartisan way and see if we cannot work to close the loopholes that are there and have sunshine in Government. That is what we all want, and that is what I think we can come to agreement on if we will just look at the big picture and put common sense in the equation.

I thank the Chair.

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. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, what is the pending business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 1837 to the bill, S. 1060.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be set aside and that I be allowed to offer an amendment.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1838

(Purpose: To amend title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require a more detailed disclosure of the value of assets)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1838.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

#### SEC. . DISCLOSURE OF THE VALUE OF ASSETS UNDER THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

(a) INCOME.—Section 102(a)(1)(B) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in clause (vii) by striking “or”; and  
(2) by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

“(viii) greater than \$1,000,000 but not more than \$5,000,000, or

“(xi) greater than \$5,000,000.”.

(b) ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F) by striking “and”; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

“(G) greater than \$1,000,000 but not more than \$5,000,000;

“(H) greater than \$5,000,000 but not more than \$25,000,000;

“(I) greater than \$25,000,000 but not more than \$50,000,000; and

“(J) greater than \$50,000,000.”.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the amendment is somewhat straightforward. What it does is attempt to update the categories that we have for disclosure. It does not attempt to give full valuation or more accurate valuation of the lower amounts. What it does do is address the cutoff we now have in the statute. Right now someone may have an asset worth \$100 million but would report it only as above \$1 million.

A recent article in Roll Call, I think, illustrates some of the ambiguities of our current disclosure statutes. They listed the top 10 lawmakers they felt had substantial assets serving in both the House and the Senate.

As the chart adjacent to me shows, what resulted from our disclosure was something of a misrepresentation, if you assume Roll Call's numbers are correct. Let me emphasize, I do not know that Roll Call's estimates are correct. They may well be incorrect.

What is quite clear is that our disclosure categories are not complete. An asset worth \$150 million, or perhaps even more, is reported on the disclosure form simply as over \$1 million.

Is there a difference in the potential conflict of interest, is there a difference in the significance of assets that might be \$200 or \$300 million versus \$1 million? I believe so. Such substantial amounts tend to indicate control, tend to indicate the level of interest that is quite different than simply something that might be above \$1 million as is shown on the disclosure form.

This amendment adds new categories. There is nothing magic in what we suggest. We do provide modest relief from that \$1 million limit. It creates a category of \$1 million to \$5 million. It creates a category of \$5 million to \$25 million. It creates a category of \$25 million to \$50 million and a category of over \$50 million.

The amendment does not attempt to cover all possible values. Someone could well criticize it for not having more subcategories. It could well be criticized because it does not differentiate assets over \$50 million. But it is meant to provide at least some additional definition to these categories that have become so inadequate in terms of disclosing accurately assets that we require to be reported.

Being in a statute form as it is, it will apply not only to the Senate but to the House of Representatives and to the executive branch as well.

I think the amendment is straightforward. It is meant to give us a clear picture in our disclosure forms and more accurately alert Members and the public to potential conflicts of interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not trying to stop the Senator from offering his amendments. But those who have a vital interest in this particular part of the legislation that we are debating here this afternoon are not available. I am caught in the position of protecting this side without having the advice and counsel of those Senators that are now negotiating to try to work something out.

I am not trying to prevent the Senator from introducing amendments. But pretty soon we will have three or four amendments out here, and I am not sure where we are going to be. That

will be the pending amendment when they come back, and they may want to go back to the original amendment. There may be a unanimous consent agreement which can be reached.

Will the Senator give me an opportunity to check before he offers his amendment and let me see if there is any disagreement with what he is trying to do?

Mr. BROWN. Surely.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Mr. President, if my colleagues are going to continue to discuss this subject for a bit, I intend to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business, unless it interrupts the flow. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wanted to speak on the floor briefly today because this is the week of the 30th anniversary of the Medicare Program. I indicated last week, and will again this week, that I think it is important at a time when so much of our country talks about what is wrong with our country, for us occasionally to talk about what is right and what works, and to talk about success.

We have been talking for the last several weeks about regulatory reform. I have come to the floor to talk about the fact that most people probably do not know in the last 20 years we have made enormous progress in cleaning America's air and water.

We now use twice as much energy as we did 20 years ago, yet we have cleaner air in America. We have cleaner water, rivers, streams, and lakes in America than we had 20 years ago. No one 20 years ago would have predicted that would be the case.

Why is that? Is it because the big corporate polluters in America who are dumping this into our airshed and the water—the pollution, effluence, and the chemicals—because they woke up and said, “I know what I ought to do for America. I ought to stop polluting.” That is not what happened.

What happened is Congress decided that the American people deserve and want clean air, they want clean water, and we will put in place regulations that require it. We wrote regulations in this country that said polluters have to stop polluting.

We have had enormous success as a result of it. It is a healthier place to live, better for us and better for our