

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

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 incapable 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 Bihac, Sarajevo, and Gorazde. Furthermore, NATO is