

which the proliferation and use of chemical weapons is a real and growing threat. United States leadership played a critical role in the successful conclusion of the Chemical Weapons Convention. United States leadership is required once again to bring this historic agreement into force. I urge the Senate to demonstrate the U.S. commitment to abolishing chemical weapons by promptly giving its advice and consent to ratification.

And, in a bipartisan show of support for the treaty, the Senate passed by voice vote a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling for rapid action on the convention earlier this year.

Mr. President, When I started my statement today, I recalled the horrors and widespread use of chemical weapons in World War I. They were real. They affected people. They killed people. They injured, and they damaged people. In response to those horrors the world community developed the Geneva Protocol, which banned the use of chemical weapons.

However, although the Geneva Protocol was passed in 1925, the U.S. Senate did not recommend its ratification until 1975. We must not let 50 years pass before we act on the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Mr. President, I extend my appreciation to Senator BINGAMAN for bringing to the attention of the Senate last week the matters that were held up in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I also extend my appreciation to the majority leader for working to bring these matters to the Senate floor.

One of the things that was part of that agreement was that this treaty would be reported to the Senate floor no later than April 22. That is good.

I urge the chairman of the committee, however, to schedule action on this convention as soon as possible so that the Senate can vote on this quickly and do it without regard to partisanship. It is important that we bring this matter to the floor of the U.S. Senate. Chemical weapons are a scourge, and they should be eliminated.

I appreciate the patience of the Chair and other Members of the Senate for extending me an additional 5 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and certainly not on this issue—but I come to the floor to speak. I would prefer if you could allow this Senator 10, and then go back to the issue, if you would not mind. Is their objection to that?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

#### BAN ON MILITARY-STYLE WEAPONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, it would appear that the leadership of the other House is threatening to repeal the ban on military-style assault weapons. They promised to hold a vote before the end of the year.

According to information from the Speaker's staff, he is apparently hoping to sneak the repeal through the House of Representatives in the rush to finish business before the Christmas holiday. Although this may work in the House, it will not work in the Senate.

I wrote this legislation. It was incorporated into the 1994 crime bill. It was passed by both the House and the Senate after substantive and prolonged debate. It has been in place for just 14 months. It passed with bipartisan support. It is my commitment, if this comes to the floor of the Senate, to wage the mother of all filibusters, to keep the Senate in session throughout the holiday break, if necessary, if the attempts to repeal this legislation move forward.

This legislation specifically protects legitimate weapons used for hunting and recreational purposes. Congress can either side with the citizens of this country who are overwhelming in number who want assault weapons off their streets or they can side with the National Rifle Association whose selfish "I want it my way" persists no matter what. The choice should be clear to all of us.

For the purpose of those who are new to the Congress and for those who may have forgotten some of the facts brought out in the debate in the last session, allow me to summarize why this legislation is so important.

First, removing military-style semiautomatic assault weapons has the widespread support of our citizens. A Los Angeles Times national poll conducted between October 27 and October 30 of this year showed that 72 percent of the American people support maintaining the ban on assault weapons. There is bipartisan support for this legislation. Presidents Reagan, Carter, Ford, and Clinton endorsed this legislation during its debate in 1993. Republican and Democratic elected officials from around the country endorsed it, including Republican mayors Rudolph Giuliani of New York and Richard Riordan of Los Angeles. Every major law enforcement group in this Nation, groups of both rank and file and law enforcement management, oppose the repeal. And groups representing 90 million Americans have endorsed the ban on assault weapons. These include physicians who have seen what assault weapons do to human flesh, educators who live daily with the militarization of our schools, clergy who counsel the victims, victims who have seen their loved ones torn apart, trauma physicians whose emergency rooms look like military hospitals, and a strong majority of the American people who say "enough is enough" in this gun-happy country.

My home State of California knows all too well the tragedy of assault weapons. There are incidents that really led to my resolve to make this the main priority of my legislative agenda in 1993, and I want to go through them.

In 1984, in California, a man by the name of James Huberty walked into a McDonald's in San Ysidro with an Uzi. He killed 21 people including 5 children; 19 were wounded.

In 1989, an unstable drifter, with a weapon modeled after an AK 47, walked into a Stockton schoolyard and, for no reason, fired 106 rounds. Five children were killed, 29 were injured.

Then on July 1, 1993—and this did it for me—a lone gunman carrying two Intratec TEC DC-9 semiautomatic weapons, a pistol and 500 rounds of 9 millimeter ammunition walked into the Pettit & Martin law firm on the 33d floor of 101 California Street, a Heinz-designed high rise in the middle of downtown San Francisco. He opened fire. Eight people died, six were wounded.

This is the specific action which galvanized it for me. I think the American people need to know a little bit more about it and how this happens.

These were the weapons he carried. These are the 50-round clips, the 30-round clips he carried, and so on.

This is the gentleman—this is Gian Luigi Ferri. He did not buy these weapons in California because California had a law. He went across the border to Nevada and bought them. He died on the stairwell of this building. He was only stopped when he was trapped in the stairwell between floors after an employee pulled the fire alarm and that locked all the doors so he could not escape.

This is what Pettit & Martin looked like. These are the shattered windows of the office, the bullet holes through the windows—indiscriminate shooting. And then we get to the victims. These are a few of the people who died that day. Specifically, Jody Jones-Sposado, 30 years old. She was the first victim killed by Ferri. She worked part time at a Lafayette, CA, company which organizes corporate conferences. She was just visiting 101 California Street on July 1 to file a deposition. She was shot five times. She left a husband, Steve Sposado and a 9-month-old child at the time by the name of Meghan. Both Steve and Meghan came back numerous times to testify on behalf of this legislation.

This is a young attorney, Jack Ber- man, 35 years old. He was representing Judy Sposado, who lies next to him in the photo, when he was killed by Ferri. He was a young labor lawyer. He was preparing for his first trial. He was about to celebrate his third wedding anniversary with his wife Carol just 1 month later. The two have a baby boy.

This below is Mike Merrill, whose wife and children I have had the pleasure of meeting. Mike was a vice president of the Trust Co. of the West. He was shot through the glass of his window as he sat at his desk. You can see

his cup of coffee. You can see his computer is still on. Ferri, though, shot him. Mike crawled under his desk, and Ferri returned, shot through the desk and killed him.

Mike's wife Marilyn and two children, Kristin, 5, and Michael, 3, now reside in Alamo, CA, in the dream house that Mike helped to design.

Now you know why I feel so strongly about this legislation. There is a reason why so many, from so many walks of life, have stepped forward to lend their support for this legislation. Our police officers, our children, our family members, are being gunned down by revenge killers, drug dealers, gang members, carrying military-style assault weapons.

No question about it. The AK 47 is the gun of choice among gang members. They are killed on street corners, in high rise office buildings, in front of shopping malls, in fast food restaurants. In the last 15 years, in Los Angeles, 9,000 people have died as a result of gangs—9,000 people.

Here are a few facts. According to a search of newspapers throughout the country conducted by my office, in the last 7 months, since it was rumored that the House would try to repeal the assault weapons ban, there have been 76 incidents involving assault weapons in 25 States in which 37 adults were killed, 40 were wounded, 7 children were killed, and 6 were wounded; 9 police officers were killed including 1 FBI agent, and another 3 were wounded.

The assault weapon is also the gun of choice if you are going to go up against a police officer. If he is carrying a six-shot .38, he does not have a chance.

In both California and throughout the Nation we are seeing police officers outgunned. Here the assault weapon again gives the edge to the perpetrator. No incident better conveys the danger of being a police officer than what happened on November 13, 1994, in San Francisco.

This is James Guelff, a 38-year-old San Francisco police officer, an outstanding police officer, often the first to the scene of a crime. I attended his funeral.

He had received a call that there was a man with a gun at an intersection. He raced in this squad car to the intersection. He was armed with a six-shot service revolver. The gunman that he faced at the intersection had more ammunition than the entire compliment of 104 police officers that eventually came to the scene to try to stop him.

The only way he was stopped—because he was clad in a Kevlar vest and a Kevlar hat—was because of the angle of the bullet that was able to penetrate him and eventually kill him.

I want to read a statement written about this by the commander, Richard Cairns, the captain of police, regarding this incident:

I implore you to do all in your power to stop this attack on the legislation that will save police officers' lives in our country. I am not a person that can be described as an

“antigun” fanatic. To the contrary, I am a person who believes in the right to bear arms but we do not need assault weapons that are strictly people killers.

I have seen firsthand the damage these weapons can inflict, as a 20-year-old soldier in Vietnam . . . , to seeing too many shooting victims on our streets as a San Francisco police officer for 25 years . . . , myself being a shooting victim of a barricaded suspect . . . , and witnessing firsthand the carnage at 101 California and finally, holding Officer James Guelff in my arms trying to keep him alive after he was shot at Pine and Franklin Streets.

I must say that I am an outdoorsman, a hunter, I enjoy my trips to the mountains to carry on the great heritage of hunting and camping. But you will find no Uzi's, TEC-9's, AK-47's, or other such weapons of war in my house.

In February 1995, a rookie police officer by the name of Christy Lynne Hamilton, a 45-year-old mother of two, just 4 days on the job—she had been voted the rookie of her class—was gunned down by a 17-year-old boy armed with an AR-15 assault weapon.

On March 28, 1995, Capt. James Lutz, a 30-year veteran of the Waukesha, WI, Police Department died in a hail of bullets from a Springfield M1-A assault rifle when he intercepted two fleeing bank robbers.

In November of that same year in Washington, DC, an angry young man armed with the same TEC-9 assault pistol took the elevator to the third floor of the Metropolitan Police Department where he shot and killed three police officers.

On March 8, 1995, in Chicago, a rookie police officer, Daniel Doffyn, was killed by a known gang member armed with a TEC-9 assault pistol.

On April 26, 1995, in Prince Georges County, MD, officer John Novabilski was working at a local convenience store as an off-duty uniformed security guard when an assailant armed with a MAC-11 assault pistol shot him 10 times.

These and other senseless deaths are chronicled in a report entitled “Cops Under Fire,” prepared by Handgun Control, Inc. This chart, first of all, shows the number of law enforcement officers killed with assault weapons or guns sold with high-capacity magazines from January 1, 1994, to September 30, 1995. If you look at this, you will see, of all the weapons traced, 36 percent were with assault weapons or firearms with high-capacity magazines. Mr. President, 36 percent of the officers killed since January 1, 1994 have been with assault weapons. You cannot tell me this legislation will not make a difference.

The report also makes it clear, and this is very interesting, that the bad guys know how to find these weapons. A 1991 survey of 835 inmates in 4 States—these are inmates now—found that 35 percent of them reported owning a military-style or semiautomatic rifle, and 53 percent of them who were affiliated with gangs reported owning a military-style weapon. That is 53 percent of gang-oriented inmates in pris-

ons in four States. That should tell us a lot about how these weapons are used on the streets.

Let me for a moment describe what this legislation actually did and did not do.

The law stopped the future manufacture of 19 specific kinds of military-style semiautomatic assault weapons. They looked like this. Also, the copy-cat versions of those weapons.

The law specifically protected 670 guns that have legitimate hunting and recreational purposes. Each one is listed. It stopped the future manufacture of large-capacity ammunition feeding devices that hold more than 10 rounds. In my view, that is the most important thing.

If you have a five-shot revolver, when the individual reloads, you have a chance to get to him and disarm him. If you are carrying 50 rounds in a semiautomatic military-style assault weapon, you have no chance. Someone could enter this Chamber and wipe out 50 people and you could not get to him to disarm him.

In addition, the legislation grandfathered assault weapons manufactured prior to the law's enactment. It exempted sales for law enforcement purposes, it required a study by the Attorney General and it sunsets after 10 years.

So, as you can see, it is moderate, it is reasonably drawn and it is a fair effort. If I had my way, I would ban the possession of assault weapons anywhere in the United States of America, but there were not going to be the votes for that. This is a moderate law.

There is also evidence that the ban is working. Similar State laws, which have been in place longer, are showing signs of success. In Maryland, the ban on assault pistols and high-capacity magazines of more than 20 rounds led to a 55-percent drop in assault pistols recovered by the Baltimore Police Department.

In Connecticut, the chief of police of Bridgeport has credited the State assault weapons law with reducing assaults with firearms by 30 percent.

Nationally now, this legislation has only been in effect for 14 months, but we are beginning to see a decrease in the use of assault weapons.

In 1993, the year before the ban went into effect, just 19 specifically named assault weapons accounted for 8.2 percent of all traces. In 1994, the year in which the ban became effective, these traces for these 19 weapons fell to 6.3 percent. And since the ban became effective on September 13, 1994, through the end of last month, the share of traces represented by all assault weapons fell to 4.3 percent.

Thus, we have seen a decrease in the likelihood that criminals will obtain one of these weapons, and one of the very real reasons for that is that the price is going up because of the shortage of the weapons. So they are not as easy for a criminal to obtain.

The use of these guns to kill police officers has also been decreasing. In

1994, when the law was not in effect for most of the year, the Handgun Control study found that assault weapons accounted for 41 percent of police gun deaths where the make and model of the weapon were known.

In 1995, this proportion has fallen to 28.6 percent, a 30-percent decrease.

So cop killings with these weapons are down. Criminals have not switched from killing police with assault weapons to killing them with other guns. Police deaths from guns in 1995 are running 16.5 percent below the 1994 pace.

Yet, despite the hard facts, despite the sound reasoning, despite 72 percent of the American people wanting to sustain this ban, here we are once again waging the same battle. I am really amazed, and I have to ask people: What hunter needs an assault weapon to kill a duck when most States limit the number of bullets in a clip to three?

What hunter needs an assault weapon to kill a deer when most States limit the number of bullets in a clip to seven, and I think only one does 10?

What target shooter needs a weapon of war to enjoy the sport?

Indeed, who besides drug dealers and hit men, revenge seekers and lustkillers find any utility in weapons intended to kill as many people as possible as quickly as possible? And how on Earth can we turn our backs on law enforcement's leadership and rank and file throughout this country?

So I urge every American to join this crusade. We must prevail. If the issue is raised in the Senate, I promise that the reasons to preserve this legislation will be exhaustively detailed for the RECORD time and time again. I promise that the stories of every victim of an assault weapon shooting that we can find will be told on this floor and that the horror that these weapons are bringing to our streets are made known.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that some personal statements from family members who have lost loved ones to assault weapons gunfire be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lindsay Hempel, who, as a 15-year-old school sophomore, saw friend, Mark Goodin, murdered:

"I was talking to my mother when a cop walked over to make sure I was ok. As he walked over I heard one of the boys say Mark had died. I asked the man and he said, 'Yes, your friend has died. I'm sorry.'

"When I heard that, my stomach dropped. I looked over to Mark and all I saw was a bright yellow bag that they covered him with. The first thing that came to my mind was that I prayed and Mark still died. But then I realized that since I was so sure that he was going to be alright, he is. He's in a place where nothing this terrible can happen.

"Later, I found out that the bullet that killed Mark went through the trunk, through an ice chest and into his back. He died instantly. The gun used was a Yugoslavian assault rifle. The cops told us that we are very lucky that the bullet didn't go

through Mark and into Kevin who was sitting in the passenger seat. They were also surprised that all of us are still here today.

"I think that it is really sad that there's a chance that when your kids go out at night, or any time at all, they may never come back. You shouldn't have to even think that that is even possible, but it is."

Margaret A. Ensley, founder of Mothers Against Violence In Schools (MAVIS):

"My son was murdered while he was trying to get an education. Something is wrong when we can no longer view schools as a sanctuary for our children. Maybe your attitudes about gun control would be different if one of your children were hurt or killed by a gun.

"Our children are afraid to go to school, movies, libraries and parks. We must give them back their childhood. We can't if everyone is armed.

"To Senator Dole and others in support of overturning this weapons ban, I say the only thing that makes me a victim of violent crime and not you, is not economics, religion, culture or beliefs. The thing that separates us is circumstance. Don't walk in my shoes before you decide to do the right thing."

Carole Montgomery, on the death of her husband's brother, Theron:

"I am writing this letter to you to show my family's support for the Assault Weapons Ban. My husband's brother was murdered by a crazed gunman who went out and legally bought an assault weapon for the sole purpose of killing. My brother-in-law worked at NBC in New York City.

"He was trying to point this madman out to the police when he made eye contact with his murderer and was shot once in the back. He died four hours later on the operating table. Everyone in New York City has called him a hero, but it is of no solace for the people he left behind.

"We are appalled that Congress is trying to overturn this ban. Theron was murdered a few weeks before the ban went into effect. Had it been in effect, maybe my brother-in-law would still be alive."

Carole Ann Taylor, on the death of her 17 year old son, Willie Browning Brooks IV:

"One bullet fired from that AK-47 struck my son's back, as he opened the screen door to his friend house. Willie dialed 911 for help. That call was the last living act he finished, before collapsing from the gunfire.

"Five months short of his eighteenth birthday, one bullet, fired from an AK-47, shattered my whole being. An assault weapon of mass destruction and someone with access to it ended Willie's dream of becoming an adult and a productive citizen in this America we call civilized.

"My last memory of my child, that slips within my dreams, is my son laying on a gurney, eyes half opened and lifeless.

"Why? I ask, as any mother would.

"I ask this 104th Congress, as well as Senator Bob Dole, 'Was I in error to raise my son to live in a civilized society or would military training for war have been more appropriate in sustaining his life?' If in fact this is a civilized society, the assault weapon must remain on the ban list.

"I cannot bring the son I loved so much back no matter how long I cry or pray, but I can, in his precious memory, work to save others from gunfire.

"My son Will Browning Brooks looked to me for parental protection and guidance, and as his parent as well as a citizen of the United States, I am looking to you, the 104th Congress, for protection and guidance.

"Willie's death by gunfire is not acceptable to me. Not even one death by gunfire should be acceptable to any of us. These assault weapons have no place in any town, city or state in America."

Kenneth Brondell, Jr. letter to Senator Dole on the death of his sister, Christy Brondell Hamilton, a Los Angeles Police Officer:

"On February 22, 1994, my sister, Los Angeles Police Officer Christy Brondell Hamilton, only four days out of the Police Academy, was shot and killed. She was slain by a 17 year old boy who had first killed his father. The boy called the police to summon them to the scene with the intention of 'killing some cops.' He then used his father's Tec-9 Assault Rifle to take his own life."

"I served in Vietnam. I am a Firefighter and the son of a retired Los Angeles Police Sergeant. I have pictures of direct ancestors who were veterans of the Civil War and World Wars I and II. My family knows what weapons are for and we have used them.

"The notion, however, that anyone who wants to own a war rifle can purchase one and thereby have the ability and even the right to determine who among us should live and who should die is incredible to me.

"Sadly we cannot stop all violence, but the assault weapons ban has made a step toward limiting the access of these tools of war from those who would threaten the safety of us all. The world will be a better place if one more police officer completes his or her watch, if one more commuter has an uneventful ride, and if one more office worker returns home at the end of the day.

"Will the Congress of the United States repeal the assault weapons ban and help turn our cities into the likes of Belfast or Beirut? Our Democratic Government works. Civilians have no need to hold the power of violent insurrection against the United States. From the Civil War to Waco, Texas, our democracy has rebuffed violent overthrow and anarchy. The tools of war only serve to harm those who the government is charged to protect.

"Please save innocent lives. Please spare others the grief that my family has known. Support the ban on assault weapons. One of the lives you save may be someone you love."

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that a list of law enforcement leaders supporting the need for this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

- LAW ENFORCEMENT OPPOSING A REPEAL OF THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN
- Combined Law Enforcement Association of Texas.
- Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.
- Fraternal Order of Police.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police.
- International Association of Police Officers.
- National Association of Police Organizations.
- National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.
- National Sheriffs Association.
- National Troopers Association.
- Police Executive Research Forum.
- Police Foundation.
- California State Sheriff's Association.
- California Police Chiefs Association.
- Alameda Police Chief Burnham E. Matthews.
- Alameda County Sheriff Charles C. Plummer.
- Auburn Police Chief Michael A. Morello.
- Bear Valley Police Chief Marcel J. Jojola.
- Campbell Police Chief James A. Cost.
- Carmel Police Chief Donald P. Fuselier.
- Chino Police Chief Richard Sill.

Delano Police Chief Gerald M. Gruver.  
 Dixon Police Chief Rick C. Fuller.  
 Downey Police Chief Gerald C. Caldwell.  
 El Monte Police Chief Wayne C. Clayton.  
 Exeter Police Chief John H. Kunkel.  
 Escondido Police Chief Michael P. Stein.  
 Fremont Police Chief Craig T. Steckler.  
 Gardena Police Chief Richard K. Propster.  
 Glendale Police Chief James E. Anthony.  
 Half Moon Bay Police Chief Dennis K. Wick.  
 Hawthorne Police Chief Stephen R. Port.  
 Huntington Beach Police Chief Ronald E. Lownberg.  
 Imperial County Sheriff Oren R. Fox.  
 Irvine Police Chief Charles S. Brobeck.  
 Irwindale Police Chief Julian S. Miranda.  
 Laguna Beach Police Chief Neil J. Purcell.  
 La Habra Police Chief Steve Staveley.  
 Lodi Police Chief Larry D. Hansen.  
 Lindsay Police Chief Bert H. Garzelli.  
 Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block.  
 Manhattan Beach Police Chief Ted J. Mertens.  
 Menlo Park Police Chief Bruce C. Cumming.  
 Montebello Police Chief Steve Simonian.  
 Monterey Police Chief F.D. Sanderson.  
 Morgan Hill Police Chief Steven L. Schwab.  
 Newport Beach Police Chief Bob McDonnell.  
 Novato Police Chief Brian Brady.  
 Oakland Police Chief Joseph Samuels, Jr.  
 Oxnard Police Chief Harold L. Hurtt.  
 Palm Springs Police Chief Gene H. Kulander.  
 Patterson Police Chief William D. Middleton.  
 Petaluma Police Chief Dennis DeWitt.  
 Piedmont Police Chief Jim Moilan.  
 Pittsburg Police Chief Willis A. Casey.  
 Placer County Sheriff Edward N. Bonner.  
 Redding Chief Robert P. Blankenship.  
 Rialto Police Chief Dennis J. Hegwood.  
 Richmond Police Chief William M. Lansdowne.  
 Sacramento Police Chief Arturo Venegas, Jr.  
 San Buenaventura Police Chief Richard F. Thomas.  
 San Carlos Police Chief Clifford Gerst.  
 San Diego County Sheriff William B. Kolender.  
 San Luis Obispo Police Chief James M. Gardiner.  
 San Mateo County Sheriff Don Horsley.  
 San Francisco Police Chief Anthony Ribera.  
 City and County Police Captain Richard J. Cairns.  
 Santa Ana Police Chief Daniel G. McCoy.  
 Santa Barbara Police Chief Richard A. Breza.  
 Santa Clara Police Chief Charles R. Arolla.  
 Santa Cruz County Sheriff Mark S. Tracy.  
 Santa Cruz Police Chief Steven R. Belcher.  
 Santa Paula Police Chief Walter Adair.  
 Seal Beach Police Chief William D. Stearns.  
 Sonoma Police Chief John P. Gurney.  
 Sonora Police Chief Michael R. Efford.  
 South Pasadena Police Chief Thomas E. Mahoney.  
 Suisun City Police Chief Ronald V. Forsythe.  
 Tiburon Police Chief Peter G. Herley.  
 Tracy Police Chief Jared L. Zwickey.  
 Twin Cities Police Chief Phil D. Green.  
 Ventura Police Chief Richard F. Thomas.  
 Walnut Creek Police Chief Karel A. Swanson.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Congress should not and must not repeal the assault weapons ban. I thank the forbearance of the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for just a few moments I would like to speak about the budget and the happenings of this weekend on all the talk shows and the Presidential and Vice Presidential messages that were delivered to the American people.

I guess I can tell you, Mr. President, while I remain not surprised by the message of our President and Vice President, I can tell you that I am highly disappointed, for it is they who over the weekend threatened a Government shutdown if they could not get their way with the Federal budget. They would like to argue that it would be the fault of the Congress, but it was Congress that sent to the President this last week a budget, and it was the President who vetoed that budget, and then sent to the Hill a budget that was not even within the agreement that he had struck less than 2 weeks ago. As a result of that, he now proposes for the Congress to reconvene a budget conference with nearly a half a trillion dollars of difference between the White House and the Congress of the United States.

The Washington Post, which is not known for its conservatism, I thought made an important observation in an editorial on the 12th when they said the President's latest budget proposal, his third this year—in other words, twice he has not been able to get it right—is a disappointment. Even the Washington Post says it “\* \* \* is a disappointment. It retains the basic weaknesses of the one that he put forward in June that it pretends to supplant. Mr. Clinton continues to back away from the serious part of driving down the deficit. He tries to balance the budget wearing a Santa [Claus] suit, and the simple fact is that you can't.”

Mr. President, I will tell you that the revelation over the weekend that there might be another \$100 billion worth of spending, while the American people watch what you say and listen to what Congress says, they happen to fear that kind of Santa Clausism right on the eve of Christmas, because they are very fearful that the party that now clings to its past underpinnings of being spendaholics can simply not get away from it.

The budget you have sent to us, Mr. President, clearly is reflective of the fact that the Democrat Party of America today cannot get away from the old habits that it had in the past, and that was, the solution to every problem was a new Government program and a huge chunk more spending of the Federal budget or, more importantly, the money of the taxpayers of this country.

So, Mr. President, the American people on the eve of Christmas are watching and saying, “What will the Con-

gress do? What will the President do? Can they strike a budget agreement this week? Will they develop a continuing resolution that goes on after Christmas? Will they be able to break with the past and truly begin to reduce the debt and the deficit bringing the Government's budget into balance? Will they really remember that the taxpayers of this country are being taxed more than ever in the history of our country?”

And yet, when we work the numbers a little bit, and we find an extra \$100 billion between now and the year 2002, there appears to be no consideration to apply it to deficit, only to apply it to a Government program, largely because we have heard nothing but whining and crying out of the White House over the last month that we are destroying all these marvelous Federal programs, when in fact none of them is being cut; only the rate of increase is being reduced to try to bring the budget into balance.

Mr. President, I challenge you to go dry, to take an Alcoholic's Anonymous approach to this—in other words, cold turkey it. That is what the American people are asking for, that you do not keep asking for more and more money, more and more spending, more and more of their hard-earned money, but leave it where it is. Come to the table, balance the budget, and start thinking on the positive side of a balanced budget instead of the negative side that somehow some Government program might be cut.

What is the positive side? Well, as you know, Mr. President, there are many, many positives. A lot of us have talked about it in the last few days here about the ability of families to have more money to spend or to save, about the ability of the economy to grow and have a greater level of jobs, to see our unemployment rate continue to go down. Mr. President, I really believe that is what the American people would like to hear as a message from Santa Claus on Christmas, is that the budget is going to be balanced, that we are going to stay within our spending limits and that what new moneys might be found could be applied to the deficit.

So, ho, ho, ho, Mr. President. It is not time to fool the American people with your Santa Claus tactics that somehow you can just keep on spending and keep on giving and the world will get a lot better. It will not work unless you make the tough choices, and the tough choices are to balance the budget and give the American taxpayers some consideration by a reduction in their overall tax rate.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
 Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

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