long for those who wish to visit the memorial immediately because of the large crowd expected at the dedication.

By last week, the advisory board was receiving about 2,000 telephone calls an hour because of overwhelming interest in the memorial and related events, a spokesman said.

For local veterans, such as Donnelly, the memorial will be a final resting place for his memories. Besides the fear and the fighting, there is the food that Donnelly will always associate with the war: the Spam, Babe Ruth candy bars, black olives and saltine crackers he and other soldiers devoured when they were not on the front line.

His most enduring the memory is of the bone-chilling winter cold, when temperatures often plunged well below zero.

''That's why I say the first miserable rotten night we have here, when it's cold and rainy and snowy,'' Donnelly said, ''I want to go down [to the Mall] and walk through those statues, because that's what it was like.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business, I believe.

If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

CONGRESSIONAL GIFT REFORM ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1061 which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) to provide for congressional gift reform.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair. S. 1061 is the so-called Congressional Gift Reform Act; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased we have now returned to the gift reform issue, and before us is the congressional gift reform bill which has been cosponsored by Senators COHEN, GLENN, WELLSTONE, LAUTENBERG, FEINGOLD, BAUCUS, and MCCAIN.

I ask unanimous consent Senator BINGAMAN be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair. Was my unanimous consent agreement relative to Senator BINGAMAN adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it was.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this bill will put an end to business as usual when it comes to gifts that come to Members of Congress and to our staffs and employees. It will end the so-called recreational trips for Members who play in charitable golf, tennis, and skiing tournaments. It will put an end to the meals paid for by lobbyists and others, put an end to the free tickets to sporting events, concerts, and theater events.

Under the current congressional gift rules, Members and staff are free to accept gifts up to $250 from anybody, including lobbyists. Gifts under $100 do not even count. So we are free to accept an unlimited number of gifts from anybody as long as they are worth less than $100 in value and we do not even have to disclose them. And meals do not count either. They are unlimited, regardless of their dollar value, and do not have to be disclosed either. Members and staff are free to travel to recreational events such as golf, tennis, and ski tournaments.

That is the status quo. That is business as usual. It simply is not acceptable anymore. The public has lost too much confidence in Congress. More than half of the American people surveyed think that decisions in Washington are made by special interests.

The other day we adopted lobby reform, which is the first of three major steps that we must take in the area of political reform to help restore public confidence in this institution.

The next two steps are bigger steps. One relates to gifts and the other relates to campaign finance reform. Last year, when we debated this gifts bill, we had Washington restaurants telling us that if lobbyists could not take Members out to meals, the restaurants in Washington, a lot of them, would close. People were saying that the Kennedy Center would go under if lobbyists could not buy tickets for Members of Congress.

What a terrible indictment that all would be, if it were true. Can it really be that we accept so many free meals and tickets that entire industries are dependent upon our continuing to accept such gifts? I hope not. And I believe not.

S. 1061, which is the gift reform bill now at the desk, contains tough new congressional gift rules that were included in last year's lobby disclosure bill. This bill, our bill, would prohibit special interests from paying for free recreational travel, free golf tournaments, tennis tournaments, ski holidays, and put an end to unlimited football, basketball, and concert tickets.

Members of this body will no doubt remember, just as the public will no doubt remember, just how close we were to resolving this issue in the last Congress, when the conference report on S. 349 was killed by a last-minute filibuster. At that time, the opponents of the conference report raised a number of substantive concerns relating to the lobbying reform portion of the bill, which we now have successfully addressed in separate legislation. However, the opponents of the bill at that time stated strongly and repeatedly that they had no objection whatever to the gift provisions in the bill. Those are the same gift provisions that come before us today.

As a matter of fact, the majority leader, Senator DOLE, stated that he supported the gift ban provision. ''No lobbyist lunches, no entertainment, no travel, no contribution to the defense funds, no fruit basket, no nothing. That is fine with this Senator, and I doubt many Senators partake in that in any event,'' the majority leader said. And other Senators made similar statements of their commitment to the quick enactment of strong gift rules.

On October 6 of last year 38 Republican Senators cosponsored a resolution, Senate Resolution 274, to adopt a new tough gift rule included in the conference report that I referred to on S. 349.

The bill before us today contains these same rules changes that the vast majority of us voted for just a year ago in May 1994, and said that we still support it last October.

So now we are going to be put to the test. If we really mean what we said last May and again last October, did we mean it when we said we wanted to put an end to the unlimited meals and tickets and recreational travel, or is it going to be business as usual in this town?

The issue here is whether we can even go out to dinner with lobbyists. The question is who is paying? Who is paying for the theater tickets? Who is paying for the tickets to ski slopes?

This issue and related issues have been thoroughly debated over the last few years. It came close last year, and we are coming close again this year. This issue is not going to go away until we do the right thing. The issue will not go away until we enact new, tough gift rules. The issue will not go away until the gifts go away.

We do not need these gifts. We addressed this bill in the spirit in which we ran for office. We are going to do what the public wants us to do, and that is to get this issue behind us once and for all with strong, new gift reform.

Mr. President, later on this afternoon I expect that an amendment is going to be offered in the form of a substitute. This substitute will bring us even closer to the executive branch rule on gifts. That rule is pretty simple rule—no gifts over $20 and few aggregate gifts even under $20 so that you cannot accept anything over $50 total from one source in 1 year. That is the executive branch rule. It has worked. It is simple. It is understandable. And that is what will be in the substitute. It is going to be a simpler approach than is in the underlying bill because the substitute will not make a distinction between whether or not a gift, food, whatever is received here or back home. The underlying bill made that distinction because it took a slightly different approach on the basic issue of what gifts are acceptable.

But the substitute which will be offered makes no distinction between whether the gift comes from lobbyists or nonlobbyists. It is a $20 rule the way it is in the executive branch.

So you do not need those kind of distinctions because of the simplicity of the rule, and the fact that it has

worked in the executive branch. And it is an effort to pattern our rules more closely to the executive branch rule, and to make it simpler so that we do not have distinctions as to whether or not the person giving the gift has been registered, which requires them to keep track of everybody who is registered on a computer as a professional paid lobbyist.

It does not make the distinction between whether or not the gift is here or back home. That is the distinction which is difficult for many people in different States. Those distinctions are not in this amendment which will be offered in the form of a substitute. Instead, this is a simple, clear underlying executive branch approach—no gift under $20; gifts under $20 are aggregated. They count so that you cannot take more than $50 in any one year. That is what the executive branch does.

Obviously, with the exceptions that we have in here for close personal friends, for doughnuts, coffee, mementos, caps, hats and the little things which we get of nominal value, those continue. They are in the underlying bill. The substitute will not touch those exceptions. We have lots of exceptions in the current rules. It is not anything novel to have 15 or 20 exceptions to the general rule because that is what we have in the current rules to take care of getting a pen from somebody. If you go to a VFW hall and somebody gives you a pen, that is acceptable under the current rule. That is acceptable under the underlying bill. That continues to be acceptable under the substitute. Those exceptions that are set forth in this underlying bill which has been pending before us for a long time and were before us last year continue in the substitute.

I have worked to help craft that amendment in the form of a substitute. And I support it. I think it is strong, tough gift reform. It has some advantages in terms of being simpler and more understandable with fewer difficulties in terms of administration because it does not require the maintenance of the record on the thousands of registered lobbyists that hopefully will register under our new lobbying registration law.

Again, it eliminates that distinction which is difficult for many depending on what State they live in to make the differential between receiving something back home and receiving something in the adjacent State.

Let me close by repeating some portions of editorials which succinctly state the problem that we face and hopefully the solution which we are going to achieve this afternoon or tomorrow.

From the Detroit Free Press of May 13:

> We do not believe that most Members of Congress are inherently corrupt or readily corruptible, but the role of special interests in Washington has become so troubling that Congress simply must set higher standards. It will be a slow process. But the gift ban is an important step towards getting Congress' house in order.

Mr. President, I am going to conclude at this point by simply reiterating one point which I think is the central truth of the substitute amendment which is going to be adopted. It basically adopts the approach used in the executive branch. They have lived with it. It works. I think we can live with it. And after we do, and after we get used to it, I think we are all going to feel that not only are we better off but that this institution will reclaim some of the support which has been lost in the public.

Gifts are not the only reason that we have lost some of that public support. There are a number of reasons for it. But this is one of the number of steps which we can take in order to increase public confidence in this institution which we have all sworn to uphold.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, the Senate unanimously voted to enact strict lobbying reforms. That vote signaled the intent of this body to listen carefully to the concerns of the American people. Today we have an opportunity to act on another reform measure—the gift ban.

This bill, which was introduced by Senators LEVIN, COHEN, and WELLSTONE, seeks to prohibit Members and staff from receiving gifts. Simply, Members and staff will not have the opportunity to accept meals, privately financed trips, contributions to legal defense funds, or any other gifts from lobbyists. That does not seem like an unreasonable request to me. The American public has called for an end to business as usual in Washington, and this is a big step on the road to reform.

In the last Congress, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to pass a virtually identical gift ban bill. Unfortunately, it was killed by a filibuster. But the need to adopt these reform measures has not diminished. There is strong support from the public. There is strong support from the Congress. And there is an unquestionable need to take this action.

Mr. President, this debate is more than banning gifts—which clearly is long overdue. It is about restoring the faith of the American public in the political process. We need to remember that we are here as representatives of our constituents. That we were elected to work for the interests of our neighbors, not receive gifts from special interests. We must put ourselves in the shoes of our neighbors. Would they be asked out for free lunches? Would they be offered all expense paid trips to speak? When we can look our neighbors in the eye, and know that we do not have special privileges, then we are on the correct path to reform.

The time has come to pass this long overdue measure. We must have real reform to help preserve the integrity of the process. We must have real reform to help restore the faith of the American people.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the gift reform bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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, at the appropriate time I will offer as an amendment the measures which were adopted earlier this week in the lobbying reform bill. Those lobby reform amendments dealt with loopholes in our disclosure.

Currently, there are a number of loopholes in our disclosure procedure. Two of them were plugged by amendments to the lobbying reform bill, and it is my intention to offer those two amendments as rules changes for the Senate. They are pretty straightforward.

One is to change reporting categories. Right now reporting categories cap out at $1 million, so an asset that might be worth $50 or $100 million is reported as simply being worth over $1 million. My rule change would simply allow for a more complete disclosure of the asset value by creating some new categories: $1 million to $5 million, $5 million to $10 million, $10 million to $25 million, $25 million to $50 million, and assets above $50 million. There is no magic in those numbers. They are purely arbitrary. They are simply meant to give a little more accurate disclosure in terms of the asset value.

The second amendment will be combined with the first and will deal with the loophole of the qualified blind trust. Currently, the law and the rules in effect allow Members who have a qualified blind trust to be advised of the net cash value of that blind trust but do not require disclosure of that value. The rule change simply indicates that in the event the trust instrument provides for the beneficiary or Member to be advised of the value they have in a qualified blind trust, then that has to be reported.

These are two important changes because they will give a much more complete picture, and, frankly, they will apply the same rules to people who are not wealthy enough to afford a blind trust or a separate trustee; it will apply the same disclosure practices to people who can afford an independent trustee and those Members who are not wealthy enough to have an independent trustee and qualified blind trust—simple equity, simple fairness in applying the same rules to all Members of this Chamber, whether wealthy or not wealthy.

It seems to me, while we are all hopeful of lobbying reform, adding these changes to the Senate rules will assure these important reforms are adopted regardless of what happens to the lobbying reform bill.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. 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. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask that I might proceed as if in morning business for the next 10 minutes.

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

KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, like many others, I had the privilege this afternoon to go down to the mall for the dedication of the Korean War Memorial, and it was an extremely impressive ceremony.

I urge any who might have the opportunity to visit that memorial to seize upon that opportunity. There are a series of figures, 19 in all, I believe, in a very haunting memory of what took place in Korea. Each of the figures has a poncho, while they are soldiers, marines advancing in a loose formation, and I think the way the figures are designed it gives an impression of the climate of Korea, the arduousness of the climate. It brings back memories of the very coldness that was in Korea in the winter, and in the summer the extreme heat that took place there.

It was my privilege to serve in Korea in the summer of 1951, the fall of 1951, the winter of 1951 and 1952, and during that time I had the opportunity to serve as a rifle company commander in the Marines in D Company of the 7th Regiment of the 1st Marine Division. We were defending the steep hills in the eastern section of Korea.

What are some of the memories that I have of those days? First, Mr. President, what comes to memory is the extreme competence of the young marines with whom I was serving. I guess I was old compared to them; I was 27 at the time, and these young enlisted men, most of them were 19 or 20 years old. But what struck me was not only their ability to endure extreme hardships, whether the hardships of the march or the hardships coming with the dangers that were involved, or the hardships of the coldness and the heat that I just described, but also the competence that they displayed.

When you said to a young group of six Marines, the oldest being 20 years old, that they were to take a patrol down in front of our lines, go deep down, cross the river, go up on the other side and scout out the enemy territory, they listened carefully, and absorbed their instructions to carry them out without a phrase of objection or reticence or fear. And all of that reflected I think not only on their background but the wonderful training they had received from the Marine Corps and the competence that each of them had.

As we dedicated that memorial today, one asked oneself: What is being achieved here? It seems to me we all have to remember that those who died were young and they had no wives; they had no children; they had nobody to remember them. And so we look on the memorial as a way of remembering those who did not have the benefit of their own families to remember them. So we are all their families. That is the way we recall those who served there.

I think one of the points that came from the talks today struck home with me, both from President Kim of Korea and President Clinton. They stressed that what took place in Korea was that for the first time in the postwar years the surge of communism was stopped and a line was drawn. The President of Korea said that this was the start of the falling of the Berlin Wall. Sure, that came many years after, but this was what started it all. So it made it all seem very, very worthwhile.

So, Mr. President, I urge all who do have an opportunity to avail themselves of the opportunity to visit that memorial. There is an eeriness to it, but I think that is correct. I think it will bring back for those who have been to Korea many memories, and for those who have not, it will bring to their attention the fact that more people lost their lives in Korea in those short 3 years, than did in the entire Vietnam war, which lasted some 10 years. And I think it is so fitting that at last we do have a memorial for that war.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before the Senator from Rhode Island leaves the floor, I would like to say a few words. I was just passing through the Chamber when I heard the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island speaking.

I had on my schedule to go to the ceremony today, but there was a full Appropriations Committee markup of two bills, so I was unable to do that. But I think it would be wrong if I did not say something about my feelings toward the Senator from Rhode Island based upon his experiences as a marine in both the Second World War and, of course, the Korean war.

I have expressed briefly to the Senator on another occasion the experience I had of reading a book. I was Lieutenant Governor of Nevada, and during the time that I was Lieutenant Governor, the Governor of Nevada, Mike O'Callaghan, was a Korean war veteran who lost a leg and was severely wounded in other ways. Governor O'Callaghan was also my high school government teacher. So, I had a tremendous curiosity about that war. And I saw a book review of a book on the Korean war called ''The Coldest War.'' It was the first real definitive work on the Korean war, written by James Brady, a reporter for Newsweek magazine, who was also a marine in Korea. It was a wonderful book talking about the coldest war.

The hero of the book was JOHN CHAFEE, a captain in the Marine Corps during the Korean conflict. And James Brady, who still writes for Newsweek, could not cover his respect and admiration for his superior in that war, JOHN CHAFEE. And I would recommend to all the Members of the Senate to read that book about the Korean war.

It is important that there has been attention focused on this conflict as a result of our dedicating that memorial today. It is a war that a lot of us do not understand what a difficult war it was. In Korea, 1 out of every 9 men that went to Korea lost their lives; in the Second World War, 1 out of 12; the Vietnam conflict, 1 out of 19. It was a place where, if you pick a place not to have a war, you would go to Korea where they fought the war. It was these very big mountains, coldest weather you can imagine.

So, I say to my friend from Rhode Island that, on behalf of the U.S. Senate and the people of America, I extend my appreciation to you. You are what is good represented in this country. You have dedicated your life to public service. You have dedicated your life on two occasions to serving your country in uniform. And you did it very valiantly, for which I am and the rest of the American public are grateful.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his very generous comments. I appreciate those. I would say that it was very nice of Jim Brady to say the things he did about me in his book. But, as in all circumstances, there are plenty there who did a lot more than I did.

So, again, I thank my good friend from Nevada, whom we are very privileged to have on the Environment and Public Works Committee. It is an interesting book. It does portray, I think, so well the harshness of the climate, which the Senator from Nevada just talked about. And that was brought home in statues that are there of these figures. These figures are not marching smartly forward. They are covered with their ponchos. They are trudging with their heads down. I was there today looking at it. And if there is one thing I must have said 1,000 times—when you have these units, you say to them constantly, ''Don't bunch up. Don't bunch up.'' There is something about marines when they are marching. They want to get together. And of course, that increases the chances of more people being injured when mortars and artillery come along. So you try to keep them spread out. And I could see myself saying to these groups, ''Don't bunch up.'' I will say this, the figures were apart. But I could just hear myself saying, ''Spread out. Spread out.'' So they are fairly