
**VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994-
-CONFERENCE REPORT (Senate - August 25, 1994)**

[Page: S12487]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 3355, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3355) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow grants to increase police presence, to expand and improve cooperative efforts between law enforcement agencies and members of the community to address crime and disorder problems, and otherwise to enhance public safety.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken earlier about the crime bill before us, and I would like to do so again. I do it because I am a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I was one of the conferees who has experienced some very long and difficult conferences on this crime bill. I have seen the debate over 6 years of trying to get a crime bill passed, but I have also seen the work, sometimes until 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning on the committee of conference while we tried to put one together. We are now basically in the 11th hour of the Senate session. We are very close to the time that the Senate will recess for the fall elections, and we see the culmination of 6 years of work on the threshold of passage.

I say that, Mr. President, because if we do not act now, how are we ever going to pass a crime bill? If we proceed in the manner that many of our Republican colleagues have suggested, then basically we are saying we are not going to enact a crime bill this year.

We ought to understand that we have the opportunity and the ability to pass a crime bill now. Or, we can follow the delaying, obstructionist tactics we have seen here and pass nothing. In fact, I think it is fair to

say that many are trying to kill this crime bill. It is a two-House strategy that seeks to send the issue back to the House where it will be delayed, where it ultimately will die. We can play this Ping-Pong match for the rest of the session. The Forrest Gump kind of Ping-Pong would be nothing compared to what we would do here, and the crime bill will stay in orbit between the two Houses of Congress and it will never come down from orbit and land on the President's desk for his signature. We have seen us move from what had been a procedural dodge to a full-fledged obstacle course in the efforts to obstruct and actually defeat and destroy this crime bill.

Instead of playing procedural games, the Senate ought to stand up and vote. Vote for it or vote against it. But do not duck the issue anymore.

Republicans have told us that they will not allow Senate action on this crime bill without a supermajority or without a filibuster. If that is the case, then we ought to just put in a cloture petition. We ought to then vote for cloture, even if we have to do it this weekend. We ought to vote for assistance to victims, to local police, to battered **women**, to abused children, to hard-pressed State correctional systems, to fighting drugs, and to fighting and preventing violent crime.

That is what we are voting on. Let us vote for those things and not hide behind some procedural figleaf. If people really want to end this, then set up a vote; up or down on the merits, majority wins; do it today.

Mr. President, I hear from people in Vermont. I hear from people all over the country. They say, 'Don't you folks have the courage to stand up and either vote for it or against it?' If you do not like the crime bill, vote 'no.' If you like it, vote 'yes.' But do not hide behind this procedural flimflam, because the procedural flimflam allows every Senator to go back home and say, well, I liked this or I did not like that, but they never have to be on record.

Now, we all speak of the courage of our convictions when we run for office. Let us have the courage of our convictions once we get here. Let us vote 'yes' or vote 'no.'

Look at the legislation on which we are voting. It is supported by every major law enforcement organization in the country--the police, the district attorneys, the State attorneys general, the sheriffs, corrections officials, and a host of mayors and Governors, both Republican and Democrat alike.

I spent nearly 9 years in law enforcement myself, Mr. President. This is a good bill. Is it a perfect bill? No. But I have not seen many perfect bills in 20 years here. It is one heck of a lot better than what we have, and it does not deserve being put behind this figleaf of a procedural motion by a

minority of Senators who want to kill the bill but do not have the courage to vote against it or a majority of votes to beat it on its merits.

That is really what we have. We have a minority of this body who want to kill this bill, but they do not have the courage to try to defeat it by just voting against it in a normal vote. They want to have it both ways. They want to say how tough they are on crime, but even after the culmination of 6 years of work, they are not going to let the Senate vote on a crime bill. Well, that is wrong, and I think the American people see through it.

Look what has happened. It is opposed by many in the Republican Party and by those who oppose the ban on assault weapons, and they are putting up procedural barriers and maneuvers so they can stop this bill.

Now, if somebody does not want us to ban assault weapons, then just stand up and vote against this bill. But do not pretend that you are standing up to uphold the procedures of the Senate. Baloney.

I heard one of my distinguished colleagues say we have to do this because money was added in a conference report and we could not allow this to go through without a vote requiring a 60-vote supermajority to win. That same Senator stood on the floor of the Senate 3 weeks ago and voted for foreign aid to a middle eastern country that was added in a conference report at 3 o'clock in the morning. It was never voted on by the House nor the Senate. But it was foreign aid to the Middle East. That Senator stood up and voted for it. There was no procedural motion there; no procedural hurdle of a 60-vote requirement. It was a huge amount of money. The Senator did not stand up and say, 'Well, gosh, we have to stand up for the procedures. We have to have a 60-vote point of order on this measure as it comes through.' No. The Senator was perfectly willing to vote for foreign aid without setting up the procedural motions.

But now we are talking about giving aid to the American people in their streets, and in their cities and towns where they are facing crime. And the same Senators are saying we have to have a procedural vote to stop this one.

Why is it perfectly OK to vote without such a procedure for foreign aid but not for aid to the American cities and towns and to the people who fear crime? I think that is wrong. I think it is wrong. It makes you think that there has to be another reason. Could it be some powerful lobby is pulling the strings and calling the shots? No pun intended.

We have a bill 6 years in the making. It has been considered by the Senate, by the House, by the House-Senate conference, passed by the House and now comes to rest at our door. A clear majority of Senators support it. We should not be maneuvering to avoid our responsibility to vote. If you do not want this bill, vote 'no'. If you want the bill, vote

`yes'. But do not vote `maybe.' That is what we are doing here. Senators are elected and paid to vote `yes' or `no'. They are not elected and paid to vote `maybe'. But we have a distinct number of Senators who want to vote `maybe' on this bill. That is wrong. It should not be done.

We have been debating this for 6 years, and during that time many Republicans are saying somehow they are blocked out of this. That is not true. They have influenced the shape and content of this bill. I have been on the floor and heard this debate. I have seen Republican amendments accepted that are part of this bill. I have seen Republican amendments accepted in the Judiciary Committee that are part of this bill. I have seen Republican amendments accepted in the conference that are part of this bill. There are many aspects of the bill that Republicans have supported in the past--more money for police, money for prisons, tougher penalties, death penalties.

As I said earlier this week, the bill bears the mark of Senator Biden's tireless efforts. But it also reflects the influence of many Republican Senators who have been working--at least until now--to do something about crime. It includes many of the initiatives that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for years have been arguing are necessary to reduce crime.

Why can we not go forward now? We know--every one of us knows--this is the only crime bill that could be passed this year. After crime legislation was filibustered for over a year in the 102d Congress, now in the 103d Congress we have legislation that passed the Senate and the House. The House approved it in a bipartisan vote. We had one of the most difficult House-Senate conferences that I have served on in 20 years. And the only step that needs to be taken for us to send it down to the President for his signature is for us to vote for it.

I think it is time to vote. Vote it up or vote it down. Do not vote `maybe'. The bill has funding for police, prisons, tougher penalties for violent offenders. It is going to help both urban and rural areas. Eighty percent of the bill is spent on police and prisons. Only 20 percent is spent on prevention. The funding breakdown is \$13.5 billion for Federal, State and local law enforcement; \$9.7 billion for corrections, \$6 billion for prevention programs. It has \$1.5 billion more in prevention money than was in the bill which 95 Senators supported last November. But that is because we go with 6 years and not 5 years. And as the majority leader noted, in the years that are common to both bills, it actually spends less than the bill which passed 95 to 4.

Let us look at what the prevention programs are. Almost a third of it is for the **Violence** Against **Women** Act. This is legislation that people in my State strongly support. This is a provision that is also strongly supported by a number of Senators in both parties.

Prevention programs--I know from my own time in criminal justice and law enforcement where, incidentally, Mr. President, I had the highest conviction rate of any prosecutor in our State. So I am not saying this from some Pollyannish view at all. I know it is one thing to get convicts for crimes that have been committed. But we are all a lot better off, victims and society alike, if you can prevent the crime from happening in the first place.

You have drug treatment, drug education, antigang programs, Boys and Girls Clubs, mentoring programs--these things unfortunately in today's society are needed and can help.

I think probably the clearest example of those who know it will help are the police themselves who strongly support these type of programs. And if a Senator feels so strongly about them that he or she thinks that they undermine the other police, prisons, penalties, and enforcement provisions, he or she can always express that view by voting against the bill.

But it is not realistic to say we are going to scrap the whole thing and start over again. It took us 6 years and one Congress full of filibusters to get it this way, and now we have a de facto filibuster, if not a de jure one, going on. It is not fair to the victims, the police, and others who will benefit. To start over with this bill, as every Member of the Senate knows, is not going to happen and cannot happen.

So I see, Mr. President, a number of Senators on the floor who wish to speak. I will yield the floor. Again, we have a chance to vote either `yes' or `no'. Some Senators want us to vote `maybe.' That is not what the American people want. A vote is what the Senate deserves.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

[Page: S12489]

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President, for that recognition.

Mr. President, I want to begin by commending our Republican leader, Senator Dole, for his proposal late yesterday afternoon on how this matter can be considered.

We can go to a vote on waving the point of order on the budget. But in an effort to get a fair and understandable and agreed to way to consider this matter, our Republican leader came up with a suggestion that we set the conference aside, bring up a Senate concurrent resolution, and that amendments be in order to that.

The leader proposed 10 specified amendments. He went over them, he explained them. The ranking Republican on the committee, Senator Hatch, went into some more detail on those amendments. Four of those amendments would cut out specific amounts of pork, specific programs, 4 of them, totaling about \$5 billion; 6 of the 10 would put back some of the strong crime provisions that had been included in the bill when it passed the Senate last year that 95 of us voted for.

Just one example in the Senate bill: It was agreed to overwhelmingly that there should be stiff mandatory sentences for people that hire juveniles to sell drugs. What a heinous crime. I mean, you have drug pushers going out and using children to sell drugs to affect and destroy the minds of our children. Everybody is for that. But somehow, somewhere, mysteriously, in the conference it disappeared. Who is opposed to strong penalties against drug pushers hiring kids to sell drugs to kids? Nobody is going to stand up on the floor of the Senate and say `Oh. I do not want to have strong penalties on drug pushers using kids.' Nobody will do that.

That amendment would pass probably unanimously 100 to nothing. But it is gone. So we have 10 specified amendments, 4 knocking out pork, and it is going to be hard to say that these items are not pork. Clearly they do not help us fight crime in the real world. Six of them would put back strong criminal punishment provisions.

The agreement that was offered would allow 1 hour--not a filibuster, but 1 hour--to debate each of these 10 amendments, and it could be less, equally divided. Both sides would have to say have a vote. Some of these, I presume, would take not that much time and perhaps would be taken without a vote and by agreement. At the end, there would be a cloture vote, but it would not be dragged out, filibustered. Just cast your vote. And if any of those amendments were passed--any one of the 10--then that Senate concurrent resolution would go over to the House.

That is one of the reasons I wanted to speak today, because there is concern about and misrepresentation, I think, about what the rules allow in the House. I wanted to talk a little about that because I spent 16 years in the House, 8 years as the Republican whip and 14 years on the Rules Committee. I spent 14 years on the Rules Committee. So I paid a lot of attention over the years to the rules. Nobody is really an expert on what might happen. It always depends on what the leadership wants to do and, certainly, what the majority party wants to do. But I would like to clear up and clarify what I believe would happen when it went back to the House.

Many times, when I served as the Republican whip, we would get to this point where the House said, `We have taken our action; good-bye, Senate, good luck,' and they left town. I always said, `That is great; let

us take it to the Senate. Let us vote and leave.' They are smart. They voted and left, and here we are.

But what would happen in those conditions if, in fact, the Senate made some alterations in the bill--generally, it was not something that would completely gut a bill--it would come back to the House, the House leaders would run their traps, usually through the whip, to make sure there was not an objection to various provisions, and it was accepted and we all went home.

In this case, the House would be in pro forma session, I believe, tomorrow. But on Monday or Tuesday, they could come back into a regular session, run their traps, and accept this language very quickly, very routinely. It is done all the time.

You might say, well, there will be an objection from one side or the other. I am willing to work with our colleagues on the other side to try to get some understanding, some clarification of what they might do. But if somebody objects, there is a very simple procedure. It is called the Rules Committee. And anybody who thinks that the leadership over there--the Speaker--cannot control what happens on the floor of the House with an iron grip has not paid any attention lately. They just quickly go up to the Rules Committee, and maybe they would not do it Monday or Tuesday, but on September 8 which, by the way, is 2 weeks from today, and really you are talking about 10 days from when they could run their traps and get it cleared. At the most, in 10 days, the Rules Committee would meet and they would come down to the floor of the House with a closed rule.

So all of your fears can be calmed now. There will not be any amendment allowed by Southern Democrats or Republicans on the gun matter. The rule will not allow that. It will be an absolutely closed rule. And for those that might be concerned on the other side that there would be a racial statistic amendment by the Black Caucus, do not worry, the Rules Committee will not allow that. The Rules Committee would report a rule to the floor that would provide for one vote on this Senate concurrent resolution.

Somebody said, 'Wait a minute; Republicans still have the option for a motion to recommit with instructions.' Under this procedure, the conference rule would not be subject to that. The normal motion to recommit would not be available to the minority or to even a minority of the Democratic Party. No. One vote. So when people say this is going to be a Forrest Gump ping-pong match, it will not be. It certainly does not have to be. It could be, if everybody wants to keep kicking it back and forth. So we could send it back over there, and the House could say: We are not taking that. We are adding amendments. And they could kick it back. What is the tragedy? We are going to be back here September 8 or 12 anyway.

This is an important issue. There are some provisions in this crime package that I am for and I would like to see passed. But I do not think you will see the ping-pong match of the 10 amendments that we have offered, 2 or 3 of them, or all of them. If all of them are accepted, I think you will find the House will have a procedure to have a vote on that and be done with it. I wanted to talk a little bit about that, and I want to repeat my offer to work with the handlers of the bill, or anybody, to talk to our colleagues on the other side, to get a clear understanding of what, in fact, they would do.

Let me come back now to the Senate and some of the complaints we are hearing. 'Methinks you doth protest too much.' Just give us a vote. Give us a vote. You know, it has been debated back and forth; yes, that is one of my concerns. Major provisions that we voted on in this the Senate last year, major provisions that deal truly with crime and criminals in this country, have been taken out. And any of you that have ever been to a conference between the House and Senate on bills like this--this bill or other bills --know it is quite an experience. If you think it is an open and fair procedure, you have not been there lately.

You talk about how this issue has been debated for 6 years, and do not worry, the conference is open and fair. In the conference 2 years ago, the conferees were called on a Sunday afternoon to come back to the conference, called from a football game to meet on Sunday afternoon, and they rammed it through. What happens every 2 years--and seems like every election year--is the Senate passes a good crime bill; it gets overwhelming votes; it goes to the House, and they pass a bad, weak crime bill, like in this case, a crime bill that is soft on criminals and tough on taxpayers. They will not give it up. They think the way to fix crime is to have more social welfare spending. I do not think there has been any proof that that is the solution to crime.

Anyway, the House has a very weak crime bill. Or as they did this past year, or in the past 6 months, they split it into pieces. They did not want to have one solid bill. They passed several pieces, and then they merged it and took it to conference. And then in conference, it really goes to the dogs. Strong crime-fighting provisions are taken out, pork is added, and when it comes back, it is a whole different animal.

So that is why we are saying it has been substantially altered. The allegation is made that 'You just do not want a crime bill.' Baloney. I will tell you, that is not true. Yes, this is about gun control--approximately 180 of them--but it is also about unnecessary spending, \$13 billion of which will be added to the deficit. It is pork, any way you want to describe it. And it is about toughening up the penalty on criminals in this country. That is what it is all about.

Last year, when the Senate passed this bill, it was not 100 percent perfect. There were provisions in there I did not like, provisions I had voted not to have in there, provisions I had voted to knock out. I did not think that the funding was really very legitimate then, but it was spongy, it was marginal--maybe the funding could have been found for that. Now the years have been changed but, in fact, by changing the years, it makes it even worse and the spending has been increased.

But when the bill passed the Senate, I voted for it. If we improve this bill and add these 10 amendments, I think you will find that this legislation will pass overwhelmingly. It will not be unanimous, or 95-4, but it will be a pretty substantial vote, I am sure of that.

As to the majority leader's proposal, his counter yesterday--and I understand maybe there is another counter on the table--he said just give us a vote on the crime conference report; we will send it on down to the President, and we will have a bill-signing ceremony and you guys, if you do want to offer your amendments, we will play games with you and, of course, it will not amount to anything. Nobody will be looking, nobody will care, and the bill will go nowhere.

Great. We just want to have debates and offer amendments on the floor for our health. No, we want legitimate amendments to be offered and to be available for the Members to consider in this conference report.

So when it is suggested that we move the conference report and then we will have these amendments offered on a separate bill, that is not a legitimate offer. Nobody is going to buy that--not even the press. They bought a lot of this stuff that has been put out about 100,000 cops on the street. Anybody who knows this bill knows that is not true. That is not about to happen. Most cities are going to look at it and say, gee whiz, I am not even going to participate in that.

So let me just emphasize again, this is about pork. It is about the Government trying to provide funds for social programs through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Department of Health and Human Services, grants that are determined by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or HHS based on a formula that is extremely questionable.

So, yes, this is about spending, that we do not need to spend that money, and it is not going to help us fight crime. Some of the preventive spending is fine. I realize that we have to fight the immediate problem of crime with tough criminal penalties and with more prison facilities. But we have to look to the long-term future, what can we do to help move young people away from a life of crime.

I am prepared to think about that and work on that as long as we make sure that the programs we have are directed specifically in fighting crime. Many of these programs that are included are not in that category.

But the thing that offends me the most is the strong crime provisions in many instances have been eliminated or reduced in their effectiveness. I cannot understand my colleagues who say, boy, we need gun control, we need to take 178 or 180 guns away from the American people, the law-abiding citizens, but we do not want to toughen up the penalties on criminals who commit their crimes using a handgun. That is unacceptable.

There is a breakdown in communication somehow. Do you mean it is OK for a criminal to commit a crime using a gun, that we do not want tougher penalties on him so the criminal gets to use guns but the law-abiding citizen has his taken away? I do not understand the juxtaposition there. I would imagine every Senator would vote to toughen up the penalties on criminals who commit crimes using a gun. That was taken out mysteriously. It just disappeared.

So we are asking for an opportunity to vote, too. When the majority leader says let us just vote, that is our response--let us just vote. Let us vote on these amendments. Let us see what happens. Perhaps the Democrats will vote in lockstep, with one notable, courageous exception, hopefully more, but at least one will stand up and say, 'I am not buying this garbage; I am not buying this pork; I am not buying this soft on criminal stuff'--at least one. But maybe the rest of them will vote in lockstep against every one of these amendments.

If you defeat them all, we will concede the vote. We will go ahead and go to final passage. There will be no further effort to block it. But we are going to go down with our colors flying on this one. If you think that we have the hottest horseshoe in this case, I think you are mistaken.

The American people have figured this out. This is just another giveaway program, another lard-invested Federal program for programs that are not really going to help prevent crime or fight crime, and the tough criminal provisions, many of them taken out. In fact, the things that the American people really want to change in fighting crime are not even in this bill--no habeas corpus reform; no limits on the endless appeals of convicted felons, convicted violent felons, who have been sentenced to death. No, that is not in there, not even in there. And good faith arrests and seizing of evidence by police, that is not in there. Local law enforcement people who do a great job, they work hard, they arrest and charge a criminal, they get evidence, and the evidence and the criminal are both released on technicalities. 'Oh, you didn't say exactly the right magic words under the exclusionary rule.' No, that is not in there. The

things we really ought to be doing in fighting crimes are not here, but the big spending programs are here.

So, I just ask again, Mr. President, we get a process we can agree to. I do believe our leaders are negotiating in good faith, and there are offers and counteroffers. I assume we are going to come to some sort of agreement here where we will be able to get votes on amendments and then move to final passage. We could do it today. We certainly could do it up or down by noon tomorrow.

We are not interested in endlessly filibustering this issue. We are not trying to take this deal, this thing, whole hog or not, at all. We are not going to do that.

Also, when the allegations are made, oh, it is the minority that is blocking this; it takes a supermajority to allow us to vote, we all know what the rules are here. It is different when you are on the other side of the issue. When it came to product liability, you know a filibuster was fine. When the majority leader, Senator Mitchell, back in the late eighties was blocking capital gains by using this same 41-vote procedure, or the requirement that it took 60 to stop the debate, it was OK then.

This is not a subversion of the rules. This is the way the rules operate. This is the way the U.S. Senate operates. If you have 60 votes to waive the point of order, let us get it on. If you do not have it--and I do not believe you do--then let us come to an agreement on some amendments we can offer. Let us have our vote. Let us have our final passage.

The House will accept our judgment, and there will not be a way that it can be pulled apart in the House. And I will be glad to work with one and all to make sure that we can make that arrangement.

Then we can all say we passed a better crime bill, one that had a lot of the pork taken out, although probably not all of it, and one that, yes, does have strong penalties on the criminals. Then we can all go home and say we were bipartisan, our leaders worked together, we did the right thing for America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Akaka). The Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. Lott], yields the floor.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada, [Mr. Reid].

**VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994-
-CONFERENCE REPORT (Senate - August 25, 1994)**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the floor and received a couple phone calls from some of my friends in Nevada. I had been talking there about night hoops, night basketball, and in the process of making the speech referred to George Allen, the famous football coach for the Washington Redskins and other professional football teams. However, I misspoke and referred to him as a basketball coach.

The record should be clear that I know that George Allen was a football coach, one of the greatest, that George Allen was famous also for saying that the best defense is a good offense.

My apologies to my friends in Nevada for their thinking I had a lack of knowledge of the athletic world.

Now, Mr. President, I have heard my friend from Mississippi, who I served with in the other body, a person I have the greatest respect for, talk about the crime bill, and there are certain things that I agree that he stated.

But, of course, what I do not agree with is the fact that we all know that the Senators on the other side of the aisle are attempting to kill the crime bill, and I say to my friend from Mississippi and the other Members of the other party that this bill is not a perfect bill, but it is a real good bill, the best we ever had in recent times in dealing with crime.

For many reasons, I agree with those who support the crime bill. For example, there are law enforcement agencies and officers all over the State of Nevada that support the crime bill as there are national police groups like the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the National Sheriffs Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and four more pages.

I agree with them. This is good legislation.

ANTI-ABORTION ADVOCATES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the reason I stand on the floor today is as a result of concern I have, which was highlighted by a network news interview this morning between two antiabortion advocates. One of the

advocates called for the use of lethal force against those who disagreed with his view on abortion.

As a result of that, Mr. President, I rise to speak on the issue of **violence** in the abortion debate. And I think it is timely during the debate on the crime bill, because there have been a number of unnecessary deaths--murders--because people disagree with the political views of others.

I rise to speak on the use of certain tactics by those involved in the abortion debate. Specifically, I repeat, Mr. President, I am talking about tactics which promote or call for the use of lethal force against those who oppose their views.

What concerns me today is the tactics used by extremist groups associated with the recent massacre that took place in Florida. So today I am going to introduce a sense-of-the-Senate resolution condemning these tactics.

Why is a resolution of the U.S. Senate necessary, Mr. President? It is necessary because, in spite of the murders, there are still letters being circulated, faxes being sent, speeches being given on this very unreligious advocacy.

I have here in my possession a letter written to, 'Dear Fellow Pro-lifer.' I am only going to read parts of it.

'Greetings in our Lord Jesus Christ!'

What a terrible way to start a letter that deals with death and murder.

The purpose of this letter is simple and straightforward. It is to inform you of the ministry of the pro-life organization 'Defensive Action' and to, hopefully, get you involved * * *.

Five days after the killing of the abortionist in Pensacola, David Gunn, I appeared on the Phil Donahue show to declare that Gunn's killing was biblically justifiable.

He goes on to say:

I spend a considerable amount of time in conference with pro-life leaders, pastors, scholars and others in seeking to promote this vital biblical truth.

Almost makes you sick to your stomach, Mr. President, to hear these words.

I have also been on numerous radio talk shows and had several local newspaper articles written on me and the principles I am proclaiming. Defensive Action has also faxed hundreds of press releases proclaiming the justice of Shelly Shannon's defense of the unborn in Wichita, Kansas.

He goes on to say, and of course this had to be someplace in a communication like this:

If you can send a gift to help offset some of the expenses we have and will incur in proclaiming this truth, we would greatly appreciate it.

There has to be a call for money.

If you are interested in making a monthly contribution so we can continue to promote these truths, we would also greatly appreciate that. Either way, please pray for this ministry and those incarcerated for using force * * *. Any contributions should be made out to Defensive Action. Thank you.

Now there are other publications. I have only read one. Here is another one, part of a petition, and they are floating around the country.

We, the undersigned, declare the justice of taking all godly action necessary. . . including the use of force. We proclaim that whatever force is legitimate to defend the life of a born child is legitimate * * * We assert that--

And it goes on to state the killing was justified and then, sadly, Mr. President, people have signed this indicating that they are a part of religious organizations.

These tactics, as I have indicated, Mr. President, include the solicitation of signatures on petitions that expressly support and justify the use of murderous **violence** against those who oppose their views.

The individuals and groups behind these letters and petitions are violent extremists and their actions ought to be condemned by this body. That is what the resolution I am going to introduce later today will do.

What I find most odious and most shameful about these tactics is that they are often employed by groups claiming to be organized religions carrying out God's will.

Poignantly, the most eloquent statement renouncing this came recently from Cardinal O'Connor of New York when he said: `If someone has an urge to kill an abortionist'--now this is a Catholic Cardinal speaking--` If

someone has an urge to kill an abortionist, let him kill me instead. That is as clearly as I can renounce such madness.'

End of quote by Cardinal O'Connor. Cardinal O'Connor's statement, Mr. President, is what I think religion is all about and what it should be, not death to those with whom we disagree.

All of us are familiar with the heated nature of the abortion debate. There is no doubt that this debate elicits some of the strongest emotions that we feel as human beings. However, Mr. President, it is imperative that the discussion be maintained on the playing field of reasonable debate and peaceable dialog. And there is no doubt that these inflammatory tactics drive this debate far beyond this forum.

I do not believe that the U.S. Senate can remain silent and allow extremist forces to fan the flames of hatred and **violence**. I believe that the great 18th century Irish writer, Oliver Goldsmith, said it best in his only novel, 'The Vicar of Wakefield': 'Silence gives consent.' It is incumbent upon the U.S. Senate to make it unmistakably clear that such tactics are shameful and are to be condemned by all reasonable men and **women**. Without quick condemnation of these outrageous tactics, I believe that **violence** will continue.

Mr. President, passionate and vigorous debates on abortion is healthy. These debates represent a participatory and functioning democracy at work. I personally do not always relish these debates. However, I think it is important that I not shy away from the debate here this day. I believe that my pro-life opinion is well known. And while others may disagree with the views that I hold, I hope they respect the fact that these are convictions that I have. However, I also believe just as deeply that this gives me the authority to stand and condemn the tactics now being employed by extremist elements of the pro-life movement.

This debate regarding abortion will continue, as it should. However, it should be conducted and controlled by parties that have respect for the common dignity of all men and **women**, all mankind. We must continue listening and dialoging and debating. And we must be vigilant in condemning tactics--as I am today, and I ask my colleagues to join with me--tactics that steer us away from what I believe our country and our democracy is all about.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Chair

Mr. President, in just 2 weeks, my two kids--like millions of kids across this country--will enter their freshman and senior years of high school.

I remember well, Mr. President, when I entered my senior year of high school. My concerns in those days were my family, my future, and my friends.

My kids have those same concerns. But they also have others.

When I went to school, I remember at the beginning of the school year seeing on car bumpers and on billboards the school safety campaign slogan: 'School's Open, Drive Carefully.'

Well, at the beginning of the 1994-95 school year, that slogan seems almost quaint.

This year's slogan is much more complicated and much

more threatening. It should be something like: 'School's Open, walk carefully, look at your classmates carefully, pick your sneakers carefully, wear certain colors carefully, consider working in a postal facility or a San Francisco law firm carefully, ride on the Long Island Railroad carefully, play on certain California school yards--like Stockton's--carefully, consider eating in fast food restaurants carefully, and, most importantly, today, watch the Senate of the United States very carefully. Through a procedural sleight of hand, a minority of this body wants to eliminate the assault weapons ban in this bill.

In 1967, when I entered my senior year of high school, one of the most popular songs of the day was Simon and Garfunkel's: 'Sounds of Silence.'

For America's children in 1994, the 'Sounds of Silence' has been replaced by the sounds of sirens. The sounds of ambulances filled with critically wounded kids, victims of drive-by shootings, racing to emergency wards, where our doctors and nurses train for combat duty.

If you are a kid in America today, fear of guns is part of your life. It is no protection to be a Senator's son or a policewoman's daughter.

You fear guns. You have seen guns. You have known **violence**. Kids your age--and younger--have been killed in school, outside of school, near school, at school dances, at schoolmates' parties. You name it; it has happened.

In my hometown of Seattle, there is a group of mothers who have formed a group called MAVIA, Mothers Against **Violence** In America. Yes, even in America's most livable and most beautiful city, **violence** has reached an intolerable level.

I have been a Seattle mother for 18 years. As you can imagine, we are not the sit-back and take-it type. Over those 18 years, I have fought for pre-school programs.

I have baked cakes and conducted book sales so that kids in my community would have greater in-school and after-school resources.

I have worked as a school board member and president and as a State legislator to provide greater opportunities for all of Washington's children.

And in 1994, look at the progress we as a society have made: Our moms today are not organizing Mothers Clubs to provide scholarship money, expanded libraries or new computer equipment for our kids as they should be.

Mothers in Seattle have organized for something much more basic: their children's personal safety from guns and **violence** .

And we in this body, the world's greatest deliberative body, can help them: we can get the assault weapon ban enacted and this crime bill passed.

I know there are things in the crime bill conference report with which all Senators can find fault. There are features of this bill that I do not favor.

I have spoken on this floor many times of my dealing with gang youth throughout my State. These are kids who have no sense of belonging other than to the very gangs, which terrorize our communities.

For those kids, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of prison.

What kids today do not understand is why we, the adults in the U.S. Senate, do not act. In Tacoma, young girls told me they joined gangs because they feel adults do not care about them.

If we do not act on this bill, there will be an

outcry in this country the likes of which we have not heard since the time of the Vietnam war.

When I was first in the State legislature, I was in the minority and I realized that I had to reach across the aisle to get any of my bills passed. And so I did.

I applaud the other body for working together in a bipartisan fashion to put together this crime bill conference report. I particularly applaud those Members like Congressman Mike Castle of Delaware, who put partisan concerns aside and worked to fashion a bill that the House could pass, that we could pass, and that the President could sign.

Further, I express my admiration for the Mayors of the Nation's two largest cities, Mayor Giuliani and Mayor Riordan, for their commitment to make the streets of our country, in New York, in Los Angeles, and in Seattle and Spokane safe for our kids once again.

And I ask the question, which my kids ask me: Is there no Mike Castle or Rudy Giuliani in the U.S. Senate?

Is there not one or two or three of the minority members of this Chamber who will put people above partisanship and our children above their personal and political ambitions and help us finally vote out the assault weapon ban?

We have been told over and over and over again by some minority members that this is not about guns. Senator Hatch has said almost verbatim: 'We're not touching the gun ban.'

But the truth emerged in yesterday's debate. When the majority leader was questioning the minority as to why we needed a cloture vote--60 votes--to pass this bill, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Stevens], in his usual blunt and forthright and truthful manner, said this is about guns.

His reply to the majority leader question was: 'That is guns. That is guns. We want a chance to see who is violating the second amendment, but we are willing to do it whenever you are ready.'

I say to my colleagues who say this is not about guns: Your argument is dead.

I know there are brave and good people on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber. I know--and all of America knows--that there were 10 brave Republican Members of this body who voted for the assault weapons ban. You know who you are. We know who you are.

Please join us today to get something done to make our kids feel safe. To let our kids be kids again.

Today too many kids look at us and say we adults do not care about them.

As a Seattle mother, who knows from experience, nothing would be better than telling they are wrong. I want them to know we do care. Let us show them we care about them first and foremost.

Many Members of this body are counting the days until we leave town. I, like many other parents in this Nation, am counting the days until my children start school again. They are fewer and fewer.

I implore my colleagues to pass this bill with the assault weapons ban intact today, so that when that first day of school gets here, I can send my kids off knowing we have taken a step in making their world a safer place.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

[Page: S12493]

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mrs. MURRAY. Yes, I will.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I first want to thank the Senator from Washington for her kind comment concerning my statement yesterday.

But what is so strange about the cloture process? We had 43 votes against the Feinstein amendment. From my point of view, I, and those of us who represent the people who believe this is the first step toward taking away all guns, indicated we would want to have some comments about that provision of this bill prior to final passage.

We do not want to filibuster. We have already indicated we will enter into a time agreement to limit the amount of comments we make and have a cloture vote. That is we are ready to have a cloture vote. We are not asking for anyone's consent.

What is the difference between that and the time I stood here on the floor and listened to Senator Metzenbaum for 2 days? We had to have the Vice President in the seat of the President of the Senate to table

hundreds of amendments, one by one by one. We are not filibustering like that. As I said yesterday, all we want is a record vote to show who supports the second amendment. That is the only way we can get that vote, on a cloture motion.

Why is it that somehow or other, when one of us does this on this side, it is some cause celebre for the other side? Why does the Senator not even mention the fact that we have indicated we will cut short the procedure to prove we are not filibustering? We have said we will agree to 1 hour on each side before the vote on the cloture motion. We know the cloture motion will be laid down the minute we start talking. That has been done before. We are not filibustering.

If there is some way to--you want to approach it another way--we wanted to offer an amendment to delete the Feinstein amendment. The Senator from Maine, the distinguished majority leader, said, no, no, no. He came out and waved that around, every one waved that around for 3 hours.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, point of order, is a question being asked?

Mr. STEVENS. This is a question. This is a question. I oppose the Senator's entering into this.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Point of order, is a question being asked, Mr. President?

Mr. STEVENS. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I am asking the Senator from Washington, why is this a cause celebre when we are merely exercising the right of every Senator of the United States?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the question from the Senator from Alaska because, again, I think it proves the point. I have no objection to the request for a cloture vote.

What I have objected to is that I have heard over and over again that this, the 60 votes, has nothing to do with the guns, has nothing to do with the assault weapon ban. I think the Senator from Alaska has pointed out quite directly that there are Members who do object and they are going to require a cloture motion vote because of the assault weapon ban that is in the bill.

I thank the Presiding Officer and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Just for a question. I thank the Chair.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I have been here for quite a while now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized by the Chair. Mr. D'Amato.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I do not intend to take too much time but I do intend to point out something. I am tired of hearing what my objection is to passing the bill as it is, based upon other people's assumptions that it relates to assault weapons and other weapons. That is not the fact. That is absolutely not the case. I read editorials--I do not know where these editorial writers in the Daily News get their information, that I am opposed to this bill carte blanche.

I am opposed to certain provisions, and I think we can improve this bill. I think, for example, some of the sentencing provisions, some of the provisions as relates to seeing to it that when people use guns, they go to jail and they are not just let back out on the street.

The sexual predator provisions that were tightened up by the House as a result of Congresswoman Molinari, they assailed it, they chopped her up, they went after her because she said `no', and she was right to say `no', and she got some improvements in the House bill. And we still can do better.

This bill started out as a crime bill. We had tough provisions. We had provisions that said if somebody used a gun in the commission of a crime, automatic, 10 years; shoot the gun, 20 years; kill someone, death penalty--dropped out in conference--out.

Let me tell you what we have in here. We have a pig in a poke--pig in a poke. My mama said, `Don't buy a pig in a poke.'

I will tell you, some of the leadership on the other side want to get partisan. I think they are partisan. I think the President, all he wants to do is yell about guns and a hundred thousand mythical police--mythical. There will never be 100,000 new police added as a result of this bill, and I have not seen one newspaper yet take it up and say, let us look at the facts, let us look at numbers. It does not work out that way. Impossible.

If every community put up their 25 percent match, if every community did--and they will not and they cannot, and most mayors tell you they will not do it--you cannot get over 30,000. You are not going to get 20,000, and I am not suggesting to you that 20,000 is not better than none. But do not deceive the people to get up with impunity and say, 'There's going to be 100,000 more police.' People want more police. They want to feel safe. It is just an extraordinary deviation from the truth. Some people are strangers to the truth. It is built into their character, in their nature. We see it, when you can get on TV and say 100,000 more police. There is not a scintilla of truth. Where are the great editorial writers? Do they talk about that? No. No.

This bill is loaded with pork and fat, and so let me say something right here. We have done some good things and we have gone into the social area, but we have been tough on crime. **Violence** against **women**, \$1.8 billion. It has some social ramifications but important. It is a crime. When you batter **women**, we are going to go after you. Should be.

But let me give you one example. I think it is the second biggest piece of lard in here--the Local Partnership Act. Nobody knows what it is. Is it based on statistics? No. \$1.6 billion. My mama told me, 'Alfonse, don't buy a pig in a poke.' That is what we are doing. Here it is. Old piggy and he is at the trough--at the trough--billions of dollars worth of pork, billions, billions. And we used here this little piggy went to market, had a little thing about that.

Man, this piggy is down there. He is eating, and that is your money, taxpayer money, and they have a right to know if it is really being spent to fight crime because they are willing to build prisons, they are willing to help local law enforcement, they are willing to go after the gangs, and they are willing to crack down on domestic **violence**.

Boy, he is getting big, and let me tell you something, billions of dollars. We should not be talking about it; we should be limited to one amendment--one amendment. Because we try to trim, somehow it is wrong.

Who can tell me about the Local Partnership Act and what it does? I can tell you a little bit about it--\$1.6 billion that was stuck in in the House. It started as an economic stimulus package from the Congressman from Detroit, Congressman Conyers. They trimmed it down.

Let me tell you, in awarding money--by the way, it is \$1.6 billion. That is a lot of money. Let us use it to fight crime. Let us use it to build prisons. Let us use it to hire some of the police that we have not provided enough money for. Not to oink, oink and pig it up back in the local municipalities.

Let me tell you something, this bill has no relationship whatsoever to crime. The formulas are based on population and not crime rates. It is based upon other statistics--local contributions, local taxes, so that, for example, the city of Dallas, which has a higher crime rate than that of Detroit, gets \$1 for \$13 that go to Detroit. Let me ask you, is that a crime-fighting package, LPA? Do we really want to say we should not even have amendments, should not be allowed to offer them here, somehow that is un-American?

Do the editorial writers of the daily news really think that we should not even examine \$1.6 billion--this is only one little aspect of the oink, oink. Maybe they think and maybe their mother never read them the rhyme, 'Little Piggy Goes to Market,' you know, comes back with whatever. I say and the American people say, we ought to pack up this little piggy and send him right back home without that money, cut that \$1.6 billion--cut it. It should not be there.

That reminds me of another famous riddle, a little rhyme, and I will conclude with it. I think it makes the point. It goes like this:

[Page: S12494]

**VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994-
-CONFERENCE REPORT (Senate - August 25, 1994)**

President Clinton had a bill, e-i-e-i-o,

And in that bill was lots of pork, e-i-e-i-o.

New pork here, old pork there, here a pork, there a pork, everywhere a pork pork,

The President's bill cost much too much,

And it must be chopped.

With a chop chop here and a chop chop there,

Chop that pork off everywhere,

Then we'll have a bill that's fair, e-i-e-i-o.

[Applause.]

Mr. President, I thank you and I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we have been witness to lots of interesting things on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the last one, the display of the barnyard. It is a barnyard all right, but it is not the big pig we are looking at. It is other stuff and if it looks like it, feels like it and it smells like it, we know what it is.

Mr. President, the Senate has a big decision before it today. We will permit politics and gridlock and pictures of Porky the Pig to delay enactment of the crime bill, or we are going to pass this legislation without wasting any more of our time, the public's time or the public's money.

There is nothing more important to any one of us than the personal safety of our families, of our kids, of our wives, our husbands, our parents, our brothers, and our sisters. One does not have to have a crystal ball in front of them to sense the primary concern of the people in this country. I have walked the beat with policemen in New Jersey. I talked to people about their fear of crime in their stores and in their living rooms.

Safety is the most basic responsibility of a Government to its citizens. The minority of Senators--the minority of Senators--in this body who are blocking this legislation ought to listen to the American people. They ought to meet with the people who are shot at, some families who lost members on the Long Island Railroad by a maniac with a gun, assault-type weapon, rapid-fire weapon.

The Senator in the chair, the distinguished colleague from Arizona, and I all served in the military. I carried a carbine. I was supposed to kill the enemy, but I could not get as many shots off with my carbine as some of these guys can with one of these rapid-fire assault weapons.

So they ought to listen to the families who lost kids in school where they should have been learning instead of dying. That is what they ought to do. Let them tell the pork stories to those kids, those nursery rhymes.

Let us put the police on the street where they belong. They ought to hear the families who are afraid to let their children play outdoors or walk to school. They have to hear the families who are worried about their personal security, the elderly who triple lock their doors at night, look around, make sure there is nobody there, all kind of devices to alert somebody. Look what has happened with the burglar alarm business, security business in our country. We are turning into a fortress because we will not stop the criminals dead in their tracks.

They ought to talk to people who worry about their security when they go to work, go out to shop or just go for a drive. They ought to listen to America's brave police officers who struggle to protect the public from criminals who are often better armed than they, the police, are.

Mr. President, contrary to others who do the arithmetic differently, the bill says, and the bill will, put 100,000 new police in America's neighborhoods and on their streets.

Yes, it is going to require some matching funds from the communities. That is the way it ought to be. The average cost of putting a patrol person out there is about \$24,000, and if you divide it into the rough \$8 billion, you get 100,000--you get more.

In my State of New Jersey, it means 2,800 more officers walking the beat, making the streets safer, and making it more dangerous for the criminals. It will put felons behind bars where they belong with a "three strikes and you're stuck inside" provision, funding for new prisons, and incentives for States to stop letting prisoners out early.

In my State of New Jersey and across the country, criminals serve on the average just half of their original sentence. As a matter of fact, it is in the low 40 percent. When a criminal gets a light sentence, it is often not the judge's fault. There is simply no room in our State prisons or our county prisons or our city jails for more inmates. This bill provides the funding we need to make sure that criminals can be locked away until they no longer pose a threat to the safety of our society.

Mr. President, this bill, thank goodness, will ban 19 types of assault weapons--guns that were manufactured originally for the battlefields, not the neighborhood or not the street corners. It will limit gun possession by juveniles, making playgrounds and schools safer for America's children and freeing parents from the daily anxiety of whether their children will be able to come home from school alive and safe.

It will enable law enforcement officials to alert the community when a sexual predator is in town so that parents can better protect their children from the type of tragedy that befell two families in New Jersey not too long ago--a 7-year-old child raped and murdered by a sexual

predator with a reputation and a record for sexual offenses. Had the neighborhood known about this guy, just perhaps, just perhaps, Megan Kanka would be alive today. But we ought to make sure that the Megan Kankas of the future have an extra chance of surviving rather than permitting these sexual deviants to wander the neighborhoods.

It will allow evidence of a defendant's prior sex offenses to be admitted in Federal trials so that repeat offenders will be punished with the stiff sentences they deserve.

It includes a special section to protect **women** from sexual and domestic **violence**, including funding for emergency shelters so that **women** who are threatened by an abusive husband can escape with their children to a safe haven.

Mr. President, last week I visited a coalition center for **women** who have been battered and sexually abused. Rape is among the least reported crimes. There is a reason for it--because if they report it, they are liable to pay for it with their lives because they cannot escape their environment. There are children often involved and there is no other place to go. We have to be able to help, Mr. President, by having that \$1.6 billion available for the **Violence** Against **Women** Act.

The bill contains prevention programs that will give children and young adults a safe alternative to the dangerous world of drugs and guns and crime.

With all of these provisions to fight crime and to make life safer for American families, why, Mr. President, are some in this Chamber trying to kill this bill? A television comedian remarked last week that he could not understand how an anticrime bill could face defeat in the House of Representatives. This was before they passed it out. He asked the question, half in jest, but what a message: Did the criminals have such great lobbyists, he asked? Unfortunately, the answer is yes. Mr. President, the answer is yes.

I do not suggest for a moment that anybody in this body wants to defend criminals, but by the action that they are taking, by their unwillingness to put this bill into place and get more cops out there, get the prisons built, get those assault weapons off the street, they are aiding and abetting, again I say without intention, but that is the net result.

Criminals do not have to come to town. They do not have to come to Washington because, deliberately or otherwise, they have one of the best funded, most powerful organizations in town fighting their cause for them, an organization that is willing to scuttle a comprehensive crime fighting package in order to pursue their own extremist, narrow, special-interest agenda, an organization that bought television time and ran

distorted ads attacking the prevention provisions of the crime bill without even mentioning the real reason they oppose this comprehensive crime fighting package, an organization whose chief lobbyist was quoted a couple days ago saying they `want to screw the bill up, and anything that screws the bill up,' so they said, `is fine with them.'

Mr. President, how much longer will we allow the tainted money of the National Rifle Association to drown out the cries of the American gun victims and their families?

When will Congress recognize the NRA lobbyists for what they are?

[Disturbance in the visitors' galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend, please. Galleries are precluded from responding to Senators' statements. Will the Sergeant at Arms please restore order in the gallery.

[Page: S12495]

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the admonition is right, even if they agree with me. We thank them.

Mr. President, how much longer will we allow the National Rifle Association the privilege of determining what legislative action happens in this body?

When will the Congress recognize the NRA lobbyists for what they are--a core of committed ideologues who shut their eyes and ears to the fact that 15,000 Americans were killed by firearms in 1992? The NRA repeatedly says, `Guns don't kill people; people kill people.' Of course, it needs a person to pull the trigger. But you cannot pull the trigger if you do not have a gun in your hand. So that is true, but it is also inaccurate and insulting.

Sweden has people; great Britain has people; Japan has people. But in 1990, Mr. President, handguns killed just 13 people in Sweden, 22 people in Great Britain, and 87 people in Japan. I remind everybody the United States, in the United States we lost 10,500 people in 1990. And I will repeat it for the Record, just to make it clear. We lost 10,500 of our citizens to guns in 1990; in Japan, 87 people--they are about two-thirds our size--22 people in Great Britain, and 13 people in Sweden. Why? They have people who are angry, people who are maladjusted. What they do not have is the gun to pull the trigger.

The problem is not that we have too many people in America. We just have too darn many guns. You have not ever heard of a drive-by-stabbing or seen any headlines about aggrieved employees going back to

their office where they were detected committing multiple murders with baseball bats. Or have you not heard stories about a child who gets a gun from the father's drawer and commits suicide in a desperate moment? That child is not a criminal, but that child took her life. We have seen it too many times in the State of New Jersey and across this country. The bottom line is, Mr. President, fewer guns mean fewer deaths.

The NRA opposed the Brady bill. They even opposed a tax on the black talon, ammunition so diabolical that its manufacturer voluntarily took it off the market. But the NRA objected to that tax.

Mr. President, anybody--anybody--can wait 5 days to get a gun permit. A sportsman can wait. A sportsman does not need a black talon to hit a target or kill a deer. And there is no sport that requires the use of an assault weapon. Let us be honest.

Let us be honest. There may be a lot of sportsmen who belong to the NRA. But leadership of the NRA is sporting within innocent American lives. No one is trying to take away their guns or eliminate the second amendment. But we are trying to save lives and have more order in our society. We do not want to lose our kids to random shootings. We do not want our families assaulted by someone bent on criminal activity. We want to save lives. We want better controls in the sale and use of lethal weapons.

Mr. President, 14 children are killed by gunfire each day in the United States; 14 American children whose lives might be saved by tougher gun laws.

Every hour in America 360 guns roll off the assembly line. We are not trying to stop the line. But we are trying to prevent criminals from getting their hands on assault weapons. We are trying to protect the police who protect us. We are trying to hear the truth rather than the fabrications of the NRA.

Seventy percent of the American people support an assault weapon ban. The least we ought to do is listen to 70 percent of the people and not be misguided by dishonest special interest threats.

Mr. President, it is embarrassing in the U.S. Senate these days to disgrace itself with these obstructionist tactics. When the crime bill passed last year, 95 Senators voted to approve it. Now, suddenly my friends in the Republican Party have abandoned the bill. I hate to be cynical, but it seems to me that their concerns are more about the bill's effect on political fortunes than its effect on the safety of the American people.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to deny the American people a reasonable crime bill for partisan reasons.

We are holding this bill hostage in Washington. Worse than that, we are holding families across this country hostage in their homes.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will pass the crime bill without further delay so that we get the cops on the streets, criminals in jail, and assault weapons and guns out of our neighborhoods.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I see my distinguished colleague from Utah on the floor, and also my friend, Senator Wellstone from Minnesota, who has been patiently waiting for a long period of time as well.

Mr. President, first of all, I would like to say that those of us who did not have the pleasure of witnessing the singing of the Senator from New York, although it was not illuminating, it was certainly entertaining. And perhaps a little entertainment might be in order at this seemingly more partisan and bitter period of this session of the Senate.

I would urge my colleague from New York to perhaps take some singing lessons, however, before he entertains us again.