

dangerously close to losing what credibility it still has, and the United States is no closer to exercising leadership in a new direction.

President Clinton called me last week to ask for more time—he asked me to delay the vote on the Dole-Lieberman legislation until after the London meeting. And certainly we were pleased to oblige the President. Wherever we can, we want to work with the President of the United States, particularly in foreign policy areas.

But now the London meeting has come and gone and there is no change on the ground in Bosnia. The London conference did not result in a reaffirmation of the U.N. obligation to defend the U.N. safe havens. The conferees wrote off Srebrenica and Zepa, vowed to protect Gorazde—at some point, that point not being clear—and declined to respond to the dramatically worsening situation in Bihac and Sarajevo.

So I guess what they have said, in effect, is if there are six safe havens we may be willing to protect one—one out of the six.

Yes, there were modifications to the dual key arrangement, but the dual key remains. The bottom line is that the London meeting did not result in significant change in approach. It did not result in a new policy. It essentially reaffirmed business as usual with the possibility of a few displays of force sometime in the future.

So the commander of the Bosnian Serbs, General Mladic—who, interestingly enough, was delivered the London conferees' ultimatum in Belgrade—is probably not shaking in his boots, but more likely laughing all the way to Bihac.

Today there are reports of more NATO military planning. But planning was never the problem. Executing those plans was and still is the problem. This debate has never been about policy options, but about political will.

It is high time the Clinton administration abandon its flimsy excuses for the United Nations' pitiful performance, shed the false mantle of humanitarianism, and face the reality of the U.N. failure in Bosnia.

I intend to take up the Dole-Lieberman legislation tomorrow and hope we can vote tomorrow and have a clear-cut vote. It is not a partisan vote. It is supported strongly by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This is the Senate of the United States speaking, not BOB DOLE, not JOE LIEBERMAN, not a Democrat, not a Republican—but the U.S. Senate. The clock has run out and now is the time for the United States to fulfill its role as the leader of the free world, do what is right and what is smart. Now is the time to pass the Dole-Lieberman legislation.

We have an obligation to the Bosnian people and to our principles, to allow a U.N. member state, the victim of aggression, to defend itself. I listened to George Stephanopoulos at the White

House yesterday on television, saying if we lifted the arms embargo, as proposed by myself and Senator LIEBERMAN and other Republicans and Democrats, we were going to Americanize the war. How? All we are suggesting is to give these people the right to defend themselves as they have under article 51 of the U.N. Charter. We are not asking American ground troops, not suggesting American ground troops, not suggesting American involvement. But the spin machine at the White House is saying, "Oh, this is going to Americanize the war." Nothing can be further from the truth.

Let me again reiterate, this is a Senate effort—not a Republican effort, not a Democratic effort, but a bipartisan, nonpartisan effort—to protect the rights of innocent people, an independent nation, a member of the United Nations, which under article 51 of the U.N. Charter has the right to self-defense. In 1991, we imposed an illegal embargo on Yugoslavia. There is not a Yugoslavia anymore. It is gone. It is now Bosnia, it is now Serbia, now Slovenia, now Croatia—it is no longer Yugoslavia. The embargo has been illegal from the start. We have, in effect, tied the hands of one side and said, OK, you cannot have any heavy weapons, but you go out and fight the aggressors, and, if you lose, we will provide humanitarian aid.

I just suggest we have gone on long enough. I have great respect for the U.N. protection forces who are there. Two members of the French force lost their lives over the weekend; one was seriously wounded. Others have lost their lives in this effort—British, Dutch, Pakistanis—a number have lost their lives. But it has been a failed policy, and I believe it is time that the world recognize the policy has failed and time to give these people, the Bosnians, an opportunity to defend themselves.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the majority leader might yield for a brief question?

Mr. DOLE. Sure.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the majority leader's yielding. I have been struggling with the question of the resolution. I have not decided whether to support the resolution this week or not, but I ask the question: If the will of the Senate were to agree to this resolution, which would then result in a changed course with respect to Bosnia and potentially a rearming of the Bosnian Moslems, does the Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, feel that ultimately American troops would be required to help extricate the U.N. forces at some point?

Mr. DOLE. Of course none of this would take effect—we would not lift the embargo—until they were gone. But I would be willing to support the President to extricate the U.N. protection forces. It seems to me, as a mem-

ber of NATO we have that obligation. I know the views of the American people are very mixed, as I saw in the polls. But in my view, after they have been removed—if we have to help extricate them, I think we should. We should support the President in that effort.

Second, when it comes to training the Bosnians, we helped the Afghans. We did not send anybody to Afghanistan. We helped train. We provided weapons. The same in El Salvador. I believe that can be done without Americanizing anything. Plus, what they want, as the Senator from North Dakota knows, are Russian weapons. They are familiar with Russian weapons, and they are readily available. So I am not certain they would need a great deal of training.

But it just seems to me—and it is not just because I watch television, it is not just because I visited there 5 years ago when all this was just beginning to ferment—I think anybody, any objective observer, would say no, no U.S. ground troops. We could even question airstrikes, but certainly no Americanization. But, finally, let us give these innocent people a chance to defend themselves. That is all they are asking.

I thank my colleague from North Dakota.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to offer my very strong support for S. 1060, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995.

This legislation is similar to that reported out by the Governmental Affairs Committee, which I was privileged to chair during the last Congress. Senators LEVIN and COHEN, in particular, deserve our words of high praise for their diligence and persistence in tackling such a thorny area and coming up with an effective and pragmatic bill.

Mr. President, there is blessed little credit given to those who bring up things like this. There is a lot of opposition. But these are the things in the committee we used to jokingly call the "grunt work" of Government—the grunt work of Government—the good Government issues that too often are not brought to the floor, and when they are brought to the floor, usually cause very little attention to be paid.

Senator LEVIN was President of the Detroit City Council before he came to Washington. I have heard him talk many times about how he came in here with a burning purpose of doing regulatory reform, for instance. We have been having that on the floor the last couple of weeks.

Now on lobbying reform, ethics in Government matters. That may be a column note someplace, a short column note at the very best, usually, on items like this. But they are items which become vitally important for long-term

Government in this country and how our people look at Government, because we live in an age when, for whatever reason, people have lost confidence in their Government.

There is a pervasive cynicism, if not outright skepticism, about the integrity of Government institutions to carry out and serve the public's interest.

Part of this distrust is the perception that Congress in particular is beholden to special interests and that ordinary people cannot rise above the din of lobbyists having special access to and currying favor from Members of Congress or top officials in the executive branch.

I personally do not subscribe to this view. I feel it is more myth than reality. However, as long as the perception is there, doubt and suspicion will linger.

In my view, the issue is about access and accountability. We want to return power to the people. At long last, everyone will be able to know who is paying what to lobby whom on which subject and on which issue. Whether it is a special tax loophole or a pork barrel project, people want to know what is going on. The sunshine is always the best disinfectant.

I am sure that most of us would much rather be talking and meeting with those who elected us—our constituents—than some smooth-talking lobbyist. I, for one, was elected to represent the people of Ohio. And they are who I want to hear from and will always give top priority to.

This bill provides for the effective disclosure of paid lobbyists who are trying to influence Federal legislative or executive branch officials in the conduct of Government actions. It also affords us the fullest opportunity for citizens to exercise their constitutional right to petition the Government.

Nothing in this bill whatsoever would either restrict or prohibit our constituents from writing, from calling, or from meeting with us. Senators LEVIN and COHEN have clarified that. They have also removed the so-called grass-roots lobbying provision which was used to thwart our efforts to get this bill enacted into law prior to adjournment last year.

This legislation makes commonsense reforms in the registration and disclosure process. It replaces the myriad of lobbying disclosure laws—some with giant loopholes—with a single, uniform statute covering all professional lobbyists. It also streamlines the disclosure requirements to ensure that the public is provided with meaningful information, not some undecipherable code. The legislation also establishes a workable system to administer and enforce compliance with this act.

I think we are at a crucial crossroads, in my view, over the role of Government and people's respect for it. I believe this bill will enhance the public's awareness of and confidence in the functioning of their Government. It

makes sure that public officials are accountable for their actions. I think it will discourage lobbyists and their clients from engaging in less than proper activities.

Let me say this about lobbyists. I do not turn lobbyists away. I welcome their information a lot of times because a lot of times they can give you details of or insight into this particular area of expertise that is welcome and should be considered. But to try and tie that lobbyist up with whether they made a contribution or not is absolutely wrong.

In short, effective lobbying disclosure would ensure that the public Federal officials and other interested parties are aware of the pressures that are brought to bear on public policy. Now more than ever, so to speak.

At a time when major health and safety laws or regulations are being debated on the Senate floor, the public is entitled to know what lobbyists we are meeting with in the back rooms, who they are representing, and why they are here. Are they just passing through to say "hello?" Are they here to persuade us to offer or support an amendment to benefit a particular business or industry?

Effective public disclosure will build confidence in this body and erase the doubts and suspicions that the public is shut out from the people's business.

So I think the changes proposed by Senators LEVIN and COHEN are sensible and they strengthen the workings of the bill. They deserve our credit for leading this effort, though I regret we were prevented from acting upon this last year.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, has a quorum been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in progress.

Mr. GLENN. I withdraw the request for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Ohio.

Mr. President, with regard now to the status of the situation on the floor, we are on the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Brown amendment No. 1838 is the business at hand.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from Colorado, may I ask that his amendment be withdrawn. My amendment should not take 5 or 10 minutes, unless the Senator from Colorado wishes to go forward.

Mr. BROWN. It would be appropriate to temporarily set it aside.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily set aside and that we go forward with this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my friend from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 1839

(Purpose: To prohibit certain exempt organizations from receiving Federal grants)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] proposes an amendment numbered 1839.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

An organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not be eligible for the receipt of Federal funds constituting an award, grant, contract, loan, or any other form.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, that amendment is rather succinct.

I believe that the amendment I have just put forward embodies an absolutely critical component of any truly meaningful lobbying reform. The amendment is identical to a bill which I was pleased to introduce with Senator CRAIG last Friday which has already attracted over a dozen cosponsors.

By unanimous consent, Mr. President, we now split the underlying legislation into two complementary components—lobbying reform and gift ban legislation. I think all of us must agree that the issue of lobbyists' gifts to Senators must be dealt with in any attempt to protect the ethical framework of our activities here. I commend my friend from Michigan who came here when I did, Senator LEVIN, and many others who have worked so diligently on these issues of lobbying and gifts—and Senator MCCONNELL and so many others.

But my amendment gets to the heart of another major piece of the puzzle, one which we have inadequately dealt with thus far. This is the other side of the coin. This is about Congress' gifts to lobbyists in the forms of grants, loans and other benefits.

Very simply, Mr. President, my amendment would forbid the delivery of Federal grant money to any 501(c)(4) organization—501(c)(4). Please hear that very seriously constricted and limited impact. This is an absolutely vital and fundamental and long overdue reform.

I trust my colleagues may be fully aware of the relevant sections of the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to tax-exempt organizations. If so, they will see why this reform is absolutely necessary, and should be, I think, uncontroversial.

First, let me assure my colleagues who may be wary upon initially hearing of this legislation. This amendment does not affect charities, nor any of the other tax-exempt groups which Members will certainly wish to protect, and should.

This amendment would not affect any organization that is organized

under section 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(5) or 501(c)(6) or any of the other 25 categories, or maybe more, if I recall, of the Internal Revenue code. And I would remind my colleagues that 501(c)(3), which is not affected by this legislation, this amendment—this is the one that encourages activities, that are, and I quote directly from the code, 501(c)(3)'s are not affected by this amendment, are to "Relieving the poor and distressed," or for "Advancing religion or education." Thus, this amendment would not affect the Salvation Army, nor any other of the educational institutions in your State or any "charities." Nor would it affect the tax-exempt groups that file under 501(c)(5) or 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code. These organizations include the labor organizations, and business organizations, groups such as the chamber of commerce, and the AFL-CIO—not dealt with here; no impact at all.

This amendment deals very directly with section 501(c)(4) only. You can read that, the big lobbyists, the big boys and girls, and quite a list. That is the category that some organizations have chosen to file under when they want to spend an unlimited amount of money on the lobbying of the Congress. Unlike a 501(c)(3) which has a floating cap on how much can be spent on lobbying, there is no such cap on a 501(c)(4), none.

This means that an organization under 501(c)(4) can under current law enjoy a tax exemption, enjoy receiving the Federal grant money and enjoy spending untold millions—that is the number, untold millions—lobbying the Congress. This is huge loophole benefiting the powerful lobbyists at the expense of the collective interests of our citizenry. It is small wonder that we have such difficulty here casting votes to benefit the average citizen and Americans when we are simultaneously subsidizing the programs and activities of some of our largest lobbying groups. This is a reform that absolutely must be made, and soon. And there is no better place than I think the time today because there is a fundamental basic incompatibility between the current construction of 501(c)(4) law and the delivery of Federal grant money.

I feel, after looking at it as carefully as I can, that rather than to design the limitations on the lobbying, or other advocacy activities of the 501(c)(4) organizations, that we should simply acknowledge that this is not the provision of the Tax Code under which altruistic, caring, charitable groups file. They do not file under 501(c)(4). But rather, this designation attracts those groups that are organized principally to lobby the Federal Government, and do so without financial limitations.

There are, of course, and be assured, countless fine organizations doing good work and good works, organized under 501(c)(4) of the Tax Code. And if they wish to continue their administration of Federal grant money, certainly we

should encourage them to file as a 501(c)(3) or any other available provision of the Tax Code.

My amendment would not prevent the truly altruistic groups from doing just that, but if they wish to enjoy the benefits of 501(c)(4) and also enjoy the special privilege to lobby just as many bucks as their bank account will allow, then they should not be paid off in Federal grant money.

I hope we might receive bipartisan support for this amendment, good bipartisan support. I have heard some of my colleagues take the floor at other times during this year to state that such lobbying activities should not be underwritten by the Federal Government. I have heard some on the other side of the aisle say that the NRA in particular should not be receiving Federal grant money. Many concur.

So this is the Senate's chance to put an end to these conflicts of interest. I hope the Senators on both sides of the aisle will support this needed reform and vote to curtail the delivery of grant money to these, the most powerful lobbying groups and organizations in America. It is really a fundamental test of our sincerity in removing the decisionmaking process from obvious conflicts of interest. I ask my colleagues for their support with regard to the amendment.

Mr. President, I will yield to Senator BROWN whenever he wishes the floor, but let me speak another few moments.

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I was listening with interest to the discussion of Medicare and these issues that confront us, what we are going to do—the ancient litany of a tax cut for the rich, and this type of activity. I just want the American people to be certain that they remember that Medicare will go broke in 7 years and Social Security will go broke in the year 2031. It would be very helpful if they could come forward and tell us what we should do about that.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wyoming leaves the floor, I listened carefully to the explanation of his amendment, and I wanted to commend him for what I think is an outstanding amendment, a very important contribution to the underlying legislation. I fully intend to support him and encourage this effort. I wish to thank him for his leadership in this area.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky. No one has been more vitally involved in these issues than my friend from Kentucky, Senator McCONNELL. And those are powerfully reliable words. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Currently the Simpson amendment No. 1839 is pending.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it is not my intention to preclude further debate on the Simpson amendment. Obviously, I join him in the hopes that it will pass and be accepted. But would the Senator be comfortable if I temporarily set it aside and move back to the Brown amendment?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily set aside the Simpson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1838

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, are we now considering the Brown amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the Brown amendment is now the pending business.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it is my intention to offer three amendments for consideration of the body. The first one, as we have spelled out, is the reporting categories; that they are meaningful in reporting the value and, as we have already discussed, a current limitation of closing the valuation at \$1 million could be very misleading.

The second amendment I hope to offer is one that deals with qualified blind trusts. Currently, the statutes under which we operate provide that a recipient or beneficiary of a qualified blind trust is allowed under a qualified blind trust to be advised of the total cash value on a periodic basis.

Our amendment, the second amendment we will offer, simply would make it clear that if one is advised of their total cash value, under the statutes, of a qualified blind trust, that total cash value—not the value of the assets underneath but the total cash value—is disclosed.

The third amendment is one that will deal with personal residences that exceed \$1 million. While there may be very few of these—at least I do not anticipate there would be very many—there is a tax implication which was passed by previous Congresses in regard to valuation of a residence. That tax rule that Members are familiar with involves financing of a personal residence in excess of \$1 million and imposes limitations or, to be more precise, limits the deductibility for tax purposes. Inasmuch as that tax provision exists and raises potential conflict of interest for Members voting who might come under that provision, the third amendment would provide for the reporting of personal residences in excess of \$1 million.