

By the same token, some gifts become a way of life. I am going to step on some of my colleagues' toes when I say this, but, frankly, there are things permitted by the rules today that we simply ought not to permit. The legislation that is being crafted now, I hope, will prevent this kind of activity from occurring and, as a result, will deal both with the problem of undue influence and the problem of public perception.

I speak of one example, and that is attendance at charity events. Mr. President, you know charities love to have us in attendance. They love to put our names on the invitation list, on the honorary committee. It lends credence and credibility. We all support charities in that way. We will attend the dinner to lend our support and attend the charitable event.

Obviously, the group will many times ask us to come as a guest of theirs. We do that and we do it willingly and, obviously, that does not buy anything in terms of votes. That would continue to be permitted.

But the other kind of participation in charitable events is not so benign. That is the charitable golf tournament or other things as well, but I will use the golf tournaments.

As I say, I will step on some people's toes. The fact of the matter is, when someone flies us a couple of thousand miles away to a resort community to play golf because our presence there somehow makes it a more attractive event for the people who are paying money to attend but we get the free evening and the meal and the drinks and all the rest of it and the free golf game and, frequently, a free putter, whatever, that goes beyond simply lending our name and presence to an event that has a charitable purpose.

I think it is wrong and, therefore, I support the kind of reform which would preclude us from accepting recreational benefits in conjunction with our participation in these kinds of charitable events.

Again, Mr. President, I am just singling out this one example to illustrate the difference between the kind of things that have historically been felt to be OK and we do not think anyone would criticize us for doing, supporting a charity, and, on the other hand, those kinds of things which have crept into the Senate business over time to give us benefits that the general public does not have.

Most people do not get invited to charitable events and given a free putter and a free trip and free meals and, most important, the free golf game. The tee costs of this are significant.

So the rule I support says if you want to participate in a charitable event, be our guest, but you have to get there on your own and you have to pay your own costs for participating; they cannot give that to you. If they want you to attend the dinner with them, fine, but you cannot go there for the purpose

of getting some benefit that ordinarily people do not get, such as a free golf game and a free trip to a resort community.

That is the kind of thing which, frankly, gives us a bad name, and it may or may not, in some cases, lead to the argument that there has been undue influence created as a result of the people who are actually paying for the event.

So, Mr. President, I think my time has expired. I simply want to begin this debate by saying we will have some tough choices, but we have to enact reforms. It is the only way that we will prevent undue influence, on the one hand, and, second, end some of the perception problems that the Senate has, and at the end of the day our Government can exist and function only so long as the people have confidence in it, and that means confidence in the people who represent them. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR BYRD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues for Senator BYRD today. He was celebrated for casting his 14,000th vote in the U.S. Senate. I know this is a time when it is popular sport to denigrate both the body politic and politicians. But we ought to understand that our country for nearly 200 years has been served by a wonderful array of statesmen and women who have often provided decades of service to preserve and strengthen our democracy.

When I hear these days of the slick ideas that some people put forward in order to solve the political dilemmas in our country, whether it is term limits or some other quick fix, I am reminded of the history of our country. I am reminded of the history of service by Clay, Calhoun, Webster, Goldwater, Humphrey, Taft, yes, BYRD, and DOLE, and so many others, who come and serve, often with great distinction, and contribute a great deal to our country.

It is not purely an accident that our country has become a world power, a country that tackles problems most other countries will not even admit exist, a country that is incredibly self-critical from time to time, but nonetheless a country that has progressed in many areas beyond most countries in the world. It is not an accident.

It results, I think, partly from the genius, inventiveness, and risk-taking ability of those in the private sector in a capitalistic system, who advance this country's interests. But it also results

from the judgment and compassion and wisdom of the line of leaders that stretches back 200 years, leaders who were willing to serve in the public sector and help create a democratic form of Government that works—and works better than any in the previous history of the world.

So I wanted, today, to stand and commend and pay tribute to Senator BYRD. I did not know much about him. I did not know what to think about him, frankly, before I came to the Senate. I obviously knew about him, read a lot about him, and watched him work. But I have had an opportunity now to study more closely his contributions to this Senate, and he, in my judgment, has created a lasting legacy of great significance to this body. He, of course, has many years yet to serve. But let me join Republicans and Democrats today in saying congratulations to someone who has devoted so much time to performing his duty for our country.

LIFTING THE ARMS EMBARGO IN BOSNIA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want, for a brief moment, to comment about the vote yesterday on lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia. I did not speak at great length on the issue, but I was enormously troubled by it. We have voted on this a number of times in the past, and I have always resisted lifting the arms embargo, not because I did not want it to be lifted; I did, but I felt it inappropriate for us to do so unilaterally.

Yesterday, finally, I decided to vote to lift the embargo. As I said, I was enormously troubled by that vote. It was a difficult decision to make. But I felt it was a necessary decision to make. We cannot, it seems to me, sit by week after week and month after month and watch what is happening in Bosnia to innocent victims of that war. This is a war in which one side is heavily armed and the other side is prevented from getting sufficient arms to defend themselves. And I believe that we are doing something that represents the right course in that region of the world.

It is true, I think, that lifting the arms embargo will mean more arms in the region and perhaps an acceleration of the war. That may be true. But it is also true today that the Serbian army is marching in Bosnia, and it is moving into safe havens where the Bosnian Moslems have turned in their heavy weapons. When somebody says, "Why did the people not defend themselves?" it is because they could not get weapons with which to do so.

It is clear that the United Nations and UNPROFOR could not keep the peace. It is hard to keep peace where peace does not exist. You presumably can keep the peace if you have peace. But there is no peace in Bosnia.