

community, a fully integrated community, with a minority African-American portion, about 30 percent, living side by side, house to house, and everybody getting along well.

Mr. President, last weekend, we heard about an incident—and I had the occasion to visit the victim, a woman named Gillespie, 66 years old, who had her car hijacked by two young men who, as she described it to me, is an incredibly courageous woman, fighting back against all odds, because she was shot right almost in the middle of her face just at the eyebrow line. She had a black-and-blue mark. The bullet is still apparently lodged in her head. She will have lost the sight of one eye, but she is going to live. And she is remarkably strong.

I was there to visit a trauma unit at our University Hospital and Medical School in Newark. She said she cannot understand why she was shot. She said, "I was ready to surrender my car." It was in the evening. She went to visit her daughter in the suburbs. She said, "I was ready to surrender my car. I was ready to surrender my pocketbook." She said, "I did not want to fight with these two fellows." She said not a word was exchanged. The only thing that was exchanged was a gunshot, a gun pointed at her head, and the trigger pulled. And she had enough strength and enough courage to get to a telephone and the police, in quick response, from Montclair, NJ, were able to capture two young men. These men, by the way, Mr. President, had no previous record of criminality—young men; one was 17, one was 19. One already finished with high school; the other was in high school. These were not the traditional criminals. These were not the people who we talk about when we say, "Guns do not kill people; people kill people."

Mr. President, we are hearing ruminations on this floor about removing the ban that exists on assault weapons—a ban that was fought over day after day, hour after hour before it became essentially a part of the crime bill that was passed and signed last year by the President of the United States. We hear now that that bill is being reviewed, perhaps, with the purpose of removing the ban on assault weapons. It almost is shocking beyond belief that we, at this point in time, could be talking about removal, repeal of a ban on weapons that were designed to kill people, to be used by military and law enforcement people. And we are discussing it because the NRA has a gun at the head of this Congress. The NRA has a gun at the head of this Senate. The gun reaches into the pocketbook, Mr. President. That is where the power comes from. It is the power of the purse used to pervert and to twist the intentions of the American people, and to analyze the second amendment in such a way that it permits every loony in the world, in the States, and in this country of ours to get their hands on a gun. The Brady bill was fought against so hard here. I read in

the paper recently, it stopped 45,000 applications for gun ownership from being executed. And we fought tooth and nail here. It was like a battle over whether or not we continue to operate as a democratic society. We fought over that, and—how many escaped we do not know, but 45,000 people were denied applications for gun ownership.

Mr. President, I do not know what it is going to take to stop this gun mad necessary. I hope it does not visit families here. Though, we have had it. The Senator from North Dakota watched his wife being taken away by a man with a gun at her head, not far from the Capitol, where we have multiple police departments. He was powerless because the man had a gun and was able to blow his wife's head off. What is it going to take for our society to respond and say "no" to the NRA, that we are not going to let you own this country, we are not going to let you own this Congress. We ought to turn out every Congressman and Senator who supports the NRA, unless there is a change in their attitude.

Mr. President, it is a terrible day, terrible occasion when we have to reminisce about those who lost their lives. Anybody who saw the victims talking to Colin Ferguson this morning, where one woman who lost her husband and her son was shot, to be permanently disabled, this young man weeping uncontrollably because his life had been torn apart. I hope that we do not have to recite in the years ahead those who are victims of gunfire—random gunfire, in many cases, and botched burglaries.

Mr. President, people say that it is not guns, that it is people who do the killing. But if you look at the United Kingdom, look at Japan, countries westernized in their customs like ours, and you see that in our country 13.5 thousand people died from gunshots, and in the other countries just mentioned, the numbers are less than 100. One of those populations is two-thirds of ours—Japan. I believe they had less than 100 people die by gunshot. In the United Kingdom the numbers were less than 100. In Canada they were less than 50. But we here in the United States, who want to protect the rights under the second amendment for people to own guns, are not standing up for people to be able to live freely, to walk down the street. In Los Angeles, it is said that most of the gunshot damage done is done by drive-by, random shootings. If there are no guns around, I assure you that we would not see the damage, because it is awful hard to have a drive-by clubbing or a drive-by stabbing.

It is time that we woke up to the problem that we have here and get rid of this menace for the safety and well-being of our children, our families, our homes, our stores, and our businesses, and get on with letting this democracy perform as it should.

I thank the Senators from Nebraska and Indiana for giving me these few minutes.

A TRAGEDY IN MONTCLAIR

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, yesterday in Montclair, NJ, four people were gunned down and a fifth was wounded when a man entered a postal substation and opened fire. Montclair is a wonderful community. It is like so many other towns in New Jersey where neighbors know each other, care for one another, and are proud of the community spirit that they share. That should not change, even in the wake of this tragedy.

What occurred yesterday also reminds us that there are no town borders around violence. Montclair, West Caldwell, Franklin Township, Piscataway—it finds us all. It is always senseless. It is always painful.

I offer my deepest sympathy to the families and friends and neighbors of each of the victims of yesterday's violence. I have just talked to the mayor and the police chief and they have apprehended the individual they think could be responsible. I applaud them for their action.

My sympathy goes to the families of these victims.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 356 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I brought up amendment No. 356 last night and it was laid aside.

I ask unanimous consent that we return to that now. It is my understanding that the managers have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EXON. Please proceed. I was not aware that this had been cleared now. I have no objection.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I will reiterate that there is no objection on either side to this. It has to do with changing the rules for emergency spending bills. It is making sure that extraneous matters are not attached to them, as has happened in the past. I understand both sides have agreed to voice vote on that.

Mr. COATS. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I just say to the Senator from Wisconsin that we think it is a meritorious amendment. It is consistent with the goals and the intent of the line-item veto legislation before us. We are happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 356) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank the managers and all the people that were involved in this amendment. It is an excellent example of bipartisan cooperation to, in effect, try to prevent the pork from getting over to the President in the first place. The line-item veto is about getting rid of those items after the President has them on his desk. I think this will prove to be a useful tool in eliminating some of the things that have happened in Congress that have been held up really to public ridicule. I am grateful to the Senators who helped move it along.

AMENDMENT NO. 402 TO AMENDMENT NO. 347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now before the Senate is amendment No. 402.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin for an excellent amendment, well presented. I am very pleased that it has been accepted on the other side.

We are moving along very well now. As I understand it, from conversations I have just had with the Senator from Indiana, the manager of the bill on the other side of the aisle, the lockbox amendment that I presented last night has now been cleared on each side.

What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment No. 402.

Mr. EXON. With that, I would like to call up that amendment for a vote at this time. We have finished debate on the amendment. I believe it has been cleared on each side.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, we have had trouble putting our fingers on 402. I want to make sure amendment 402 is the lockbox amendment.

Mr. EXON. I think we can assure the Senator that it is the EXON lockbox amendment.

Mr. COATS. I had just heard a minute ago that it was not. That is why I wanted to verify that.

We are satisfied, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 402) was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Indiana, the floor manager, for his help on this.

Mr. President, I believe we have made really good progress. Last night and so far today, we have either adopted or tabled seven amendments. The majority has inquired with regard to

three amendments on their side, and we are attempting to work those out.

Beyond that, I think that there are in the neighborhood of only 8 or 10 amendments left that I know of here. So that is excellent progress.

I would simply take this opportunity to once again state what I stated this morning. And after my statement this morning, we had some good cooperation. So I would simply alert all Senators to the fact that we are now moving very, very aggressively and very, very quickly. I urge Senators who have amendments that are outstanding or, if there are any—hopefully, there are not—if there are any we do not know about, I think this would be an excellent time for Senators to come to the floor and offer any amendments that any Senator on either side of the aisle has on the measure before us so we can keep the momentum going and not get slowed down to where we sag back into situations that we have been in before on bills where we think we are moving and all at once we slow down and seemingly never get started up again.

So I certainly urge any Senator, this is a very, very good time to come forward with the 8 or 10 amendments that we believe are serious amendments that are pending. This would be a good time to move on them. Certainly, it is not a time to go to third reading, but this is a time I think for everybody to understand that, with a little cooperation, we can stay away from any consideration of a cloture vote. As far as I know, the cloture vote has not been vitiated yet, has it?

Mr. COATS. It has not.

Mr. EXON. I am advised that the majority leader has not vitiated the cloture vote. That is currently scheduled, I believe, for 5 p.m. I believe we will not need that if the feeling of the majority leader is that we are making sufficient progress. But that is a possibility.

So since it is now about 3:22, this would be a excellent time for someone to come over and offer an amendment. I would be very glad to have someone show up.

I have been advised I was wrong on the 5 o'clock time. The 5 o'clock time was to have been for 1 hour of debate and the vote was scheduled to be at 6 o'clock, as presently scheduled.

We hope somewhere along the line in the next hour or so we might have a chance of going to the majority leader and having that vitiated. But I think it all depends. The first thing the majority leader is going to ask is, "Well, how are you coming along?" I suspect my friend from Indiana would agree with that.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would agree with that. We obviously hope to be able to vitiate the cloture vote that is now scheduled for 6 p.m.

We are making excellent progress on these amendments. We hope that Members will come to the floor and con-

tinue to offer amendments. Our goal is to expedite the debate and consideration of this bill that is before us.

We have had considerable debate not only on this particular issue but on similar issues for the past several years. I think Members have had an ample opportunity to express their thoughts and opinions.

We now actively encourage those amendments. Obviously, as the Senator from Nebraska said, the more amendments that we can consider before 6 o'clock, perhaps the more favorable consideration the majority leader can give to that vote which is ordered for 6 p.m.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions on the majority leader's amendment be vitiated; that the following be the only first-degree amendments remaining in order to either S. 4 or to Senator DOLE's amendment; that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments following a failed tabling motion; that all amendments on this list must be offered by 10 a.m., Thursday, March 23; that upon the disposition of these amendments, Senator DOLE's substitute amendment, as amended, if amended, be agreed to; that the bill be read a third time, and at that time there be 2 hours of debate under Senator BYRD's control; and that upon the conclusion or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on final passage of S. 4, as amended, with the preceding all occurring without any intervening action or debate, and that no motion to recommit be in order.

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

Mr. DOLE. Let me indicate the list which I will send to the desk: One amendment by Senator BINGAMAN, two amendments by Senator BYRD, two by Senator DASCHLE, one amendment by Senator MURRAY, one amendment by Senator EXON, one amendment by Senator GLENN, one amendment by Senator LEVIN, one amendment by Senator DOLE, one amendment by Senator ABRAHAM, one amendment by Senator MURKOWSKI, one amendment by Senator HATCH, one amendment by Senator D'AMATO.

These are relevant amendments. One is a substitute, others relate to authorized programs or exemptions, and one is a fencing amendment. We can provide further details if any of our colleagues want details on the amendments.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend many of the Senators whose cooperation was important in receiving this agreement.

We started out with a large double-digit list and we are now down to virtually a single-digit list with as many Republican as Democratic amendments. I am very hopeful that we can work through these amendments.

For the information of colleagues, I intend to offer our substitute this evening, and hope we can have a good debate on that. I am sure we can work through many of these, even with time agreements, but I do appreciate the accommodation by many Senators. I appreciated having the opportunity to work through this agreement with the majority leader.

I think this will allow Members to do what we have indicated we would like to do, and that is reach final passage this week.

I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators, and I look forward to the remaining debate on the amendments that have just been listed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his cooperation. I think he is correct. I think it is in a condition now where it can be passed, maybe late tomorrow night if not sometime early Friday.

I would hope following disposition, as I have not yet discussed it with the Democratic leader, one thing we have to do is the self-employed tax matter. Maybe we could start on that Friday. I will discuss that with the minority leader later. I asked Senator PACKWOOD to check with Senator MOYNIHAN to see if they would be available on Friday.

I would ask my colleagues if they have amendments, certainly, this would be a good time to offer amendments because the Democratic leader has indicated later today he will offer the substitute. I urge my colleagues on either side of the aisle if they have amendments, I am certain that the managers would be happy to engage them in debate. Perhaps we can dispose of four or five additional amendments before late afternoon.

Mr. DASCHLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ACCEPTANCE OF YELTSIN INVITATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, yesterday President Clinton announced his ac-

ceptance of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's invitation to participate in Moscow's anniversary of the 50th anniversary of V-E Day.

He has accepted this invitation, despite the fact that I—and many of my colleagues concerned about the foreign policy implications—urged him to seek another time for a summit.

I continue to believe that his participation in this commemoration does not further American interests in Europe and in our relationship with Russia.

First, this commemorative event is morally ambiguous. I recognize the valor and sacrifices of the Russian people in their defense against Nazi aggression. However, it is equally important to remember that the Soviet leaders, through the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact laid the foundation not only for World War II, but also for Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe during the cold war.

Joseph Stalin unleashed Soviet forces against Poland in collusion with the Nazis, and during the first 2 years of World War II the Soviet Union provided the Nazi Reich with strategic war materials as well as with political and propaganda support.

Moreover, the Soviet Union committed war crimes as brutal as those of the Nazis.

One need only to recall the Soviet's massacre of thousands of Polish officers at Katyn; the deportation to concentration camps and murder of thousands of civilians, including Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Tatars, Chechyns, and others. After World War II, the survivors in Eastern Europe did not benefit from freedom and liberty, but were subjected to the brutal hegemony of the Soviet Union.

If the President persists in going to celebrate the end of World War II in Europe with the Russians, I believe he should at least make some reference to the fact that the United States, as a whole, has not forgotten these, or any, crimes committed during the war.

The second reason why we encouraged the President not to accept this invitation is because the commemoration in Moscow will reinforce the growing nostalgia among some Russians for the Soviet past and its imperial ambitions, not to mention the leader who epitomized all this, Joseph Stalin.

The presence of the President of the United States risks further legitimizing such nostalgia, thereby encouraging Russians to concentrate on reacquiring great power status at a time when Moscow should be directing its efforts and energy inward, toward democratic and market reform.

Third, this invitation arrives in the midst of the war in Chechnya. President Clinton's participation in this celebration will convey American indifference to the atrocities committed against the Chechny peoples.

Indeed, Moscow's management of the Chechny autonomy movement is depressingly reminiscent of the policies that Stalin, himself, used to terrorize

the peoples incorporated into the former Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I strongly support efforts to deepen American-Russian relations. Indeed, this is especially important today as both nations adjust to the post-cold-war era. However, the symbolism associated with the Moscow celebration makes it a poor forum through which to pursue the type of relationship the United States must have with Russia.

But since President Clinton has made his decision, I hope he will emphasize the following themes in the course of his Moscow meetings:

The President should speak forthrightly to the Russian people, not hiding the fact that America condemns the brutal use of military force against Chechnya. Human rights is an international issue. If Russia avows to be a member of the community of democracies founded upon respect for inalienable human rights, it must live up to those standards.

The President should make clear that America is more interested in the future of Russian democracy than in the fate of a single leader. I hope that President Clinton will spend his time not only with government officials and the leadership of the Russian Duma, but also with Russia's leading supporters of democracy.

This must include members of Russia's beleaguered press and those democratically minded legislators—particularly Sergei Kovalyov, the former Human Rights Commissioner who was most recently relieved of his duties because of his courageous criticism of the Russian Government's Chechnyn policy.

In order for a true strategic partnership to evolve between the United States and Russia, Moscow must abandon hegemonic aspirations, particularly those toward the non-Russian nations of the former Soviet Union.

In this regard, I applaud the President's decision to visit Ukraine. A Kiev summit will be an important signal of America's commitment to assist the consolidation of Ukraine's newly attained independence. In light of Ukraine's intertwined history with Russia, the success of Ukrainian independence and integration into the Western community of nations will be a critical determinant of Russia's evolution into a post-imperial state.

Finally, I hope that the President will emphasize that NATO enlargement will contribute to greater peace and stability in post-cold-war Europe.

By further ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, NATO enlargement should allow Moscow to spend more of its energy on the internal challenges of political and economic reform. I hope that our President will underscore the fact that Moscow cannot and will not have any veto over the future membership of NATO.

Mr. President, although I regret President Clinton's pilgrimage to Moscow, I believe that if these three