

an assault weapon and shot eight people and killed my son's best friend John Scully. On that day, I swore to ban these weapons. Now we have to have the fight all over again, a fight that we thought was over, a divisive, difficult fight. And they are celebrating with the circus. I do not understand it.

Who else loses with the contract? Have you ever heard of the gag rule? That is another fight we already had—the gag rule. A poor woman goes into a family planning clinic and cannot be told her options if she is pregnant, cannot be told her options, cannot be told that she has a right to choose in this country. We fought that fight, and President Clinton lifted the gag rule. He said he thought women should have all the facts known and they should make their own choice. It is up to them to decide. It is a difficult choice, but a woman should be able to make that decision. They are celebrating over there. In their contract, they are bringing back the gag rule, treating women like second-class citizens, as if we do not know what could hurt us.

So it is very clear who the winners and who the losers are. The winners? The very wealthy who get tax breaks, the corporate polluters, the big infant formula companies, the criminals, those who oppose the right to choose. They win in this contract. Really, the billionaires who will walk out and renounce their citizenship to get a tax break are the big winners because we ended that tax break. And what happened in the Republican conference committee? They took that out. Who else wins? The broker-dealers who cheat, who do not take their fiduciary responsibility to their clients seriously.

Those consumers, those investors will have a court system that probably does not let them in the front door.

I believe in a system where David can meet Goliath in the courtroom and let the system work.

They believe in a system where David cannot get in the door. They have something in that contract called "loser pays." It is an English system. It is not the American system. It says if you go into court and you lose, you pay the other guy's attorney's fees. How many of us as small investors would take that chance?

We are going to stop that here in the Senate, but it is in the contract. And the Republicans are celebrating with the circus.

So I hope, in this brief time, I have expressed clearly who the winners are and who the losers are. I can add to the losers the senior citizens, who will see Medicare cuts, huge Medicare cuts. And senior housing cuts.

We could not even get our Republican colleagues to protect Social Security when we took up the balanced budget amendment. We said, "Take Social Security out of that and protect it." We could not get a vote. We lost it on a party-line vote.

So while the celebration is going on there with the circus, I just hope the American people will ask a question like that little girl asked me in school: "Senator, what happens if you cut my school lunch? Who gets that money?"

I ask the American people to ask the question: Who benefits from this contract? And read the fine print, because they are not going to show it to you. You are going to have to work to find it out.

I hope that I have been of help in making the point that overall, this contract is not helpful to the American people.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

[Disturbance in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will restrain.

Mrs. BOXER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE?

THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending, though Congress has failed to do so for the past 50 years.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,876,206,792,345.50 as of the close of business Tuesday, April 4. This outrageous debt, which will be saddled on the backs of our children and grandchildren, averages out to \$18,510.16 on a per capita basis.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, yesterday, my colleague from South Dakota, Senator PRESSLER, stated on the Senate floor that the administration was working through my office to block consideration of S. 652, the telecommunications bill. This statement was flat out wrong, and while Senator PRESSLER subsequently corrected his statement for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the press has reported the inaccuracy. This issue is sufficiently im-

portant that the mistake needs to be pointed out.

I have spoken with the Vice President concerning telecommunications reform legislation. The Vice President stated, as he apparently indicated to Senator PRESSLER, that the administration would like to see the bill improved in a couple of different areas. However, the Vice President did not ask, nor did I offer, to block consideration of the bill.

I am committed to passing a telecommunications reform bill, I am eager to see the benefits of technology and communications services—the so-called information superhighway—extended to all parts of this country, especially rural areas like my own State of South Dakota.

The telecommunications bill is sweeping legislation addressing complex problems, and highly technical subjects. While I have taken no steps to block the bill from coming to the floor, I sympathize with those of my colleagues who desire the opportunity and time to study it. With the Senate schedule set for the balance of the week, and with the time provided by the upcoming Easter recess, Senators will have the chance to evaluate the proposal in detail prior to its coming to the floor.

Again, let me reiterate, I have not sought to block consideration of S. 652. Our ranking member on the Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS, stands ready to proceed. Indeed, as Senator PRESSLER noted, every Democrat on the Commerce Committee voted for the bill at markup.

I believe my intentions in regards to this matter are clear. I simply take this opportunity to reinforce my position that a telecommunications reform bill is among the most important legislation the Senate will consider this year.

THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING OF JIM BRADY

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today I would like to tell you a story about criminals and guns. It is about someone—let us call him John Doe because the B-A-T-F says it cannot disclose his identity—who in 1978 was convicted of criminal reckless homicide. He killed another driver while driving drunk. Although, as a convicted felon, John Doe was prohibited by law from buying guns, he purchased a handgun from a gun dealer in December 1993. Then, only 1 month later in January 1994, he purchased another. On both occasions he walked out of the gun store fully armed.

How could he do this? He lied on his forms and no one conducted a background check. A few weeks later John Doe tried to increase his arsenal yet again by purchasing a third handgun. But this last time he was caught—thanks to the background check that is now required under the Brady law.

Mr. President, last week marked the 14th anniversary of the vicious shooting of President Reagan and Jim Brady by John Hinckley. And last month marked the first anniversary of the effective day of the Brady bill.

Critics claimed that Brady would mark an end to personal freedom, and that felons and drug traffickers would never buy guns over the counter. But 1 year after enactment, the sky has not fallen. And the Brady law—for the most part—is accomplishing its goal: Keeping guns out of the hands of criminals and drug traffickers, while not unduly inconveniencing law abiding gun owners.

According to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, over the past year in the 29 States covered by Brady, the law prevented approximately 40,000 firearms purchases. Indeed, when States with their own background checks are added in, B-A-T-F estimates that law enforcement denied up to 70,000 gun purchases in the past year. That means fugitives, rapists and murderers have been stopped while trying to purchase guns.

Statistics from my State support these conclusions. Wisconsin, which has its own 2 day waiting period and background check, has blocked more than 800 convicted felons from buying handguns in the past 3 years. And keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, Mr. President, is the most effective form of prevention—as well as the best way to ensure the safety of the community.

But while the background check and waiting period have stopped gun sales to criminals, authorities need to do more to prosecute the criminals who try to buy guns. CBS news found that only 551 people had been prosecuted in 19 States. And according to the Washington Post, fewer than 10 have been prosecuted federally. These figures just do not add up. We need to do a better job of putting these people behind bars.

In my opinion, if you lie on the Brady Act form you should go to jail. Period. That is the law.

Mr. President, the police chiefs, sheriffs and other law enforcement officers know the real truth: The Brady law has proven to be an effective tool in helping to keep handguns out of the wrong hands. And the American people agree: The latest CBS News/New York Times poll found that 87 percent support the Brady law.

In conclusion, Mr. President, on this anniversary all of us should express our gratitude and appreciation to Sarah and Jim Brady. We would not be where we are today without their hard work.

RECESS UNTIL 12:45 P.M.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:45 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:18 p.m., recessed until 12:44 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled

when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ASHCROFT).

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Hawaii wants to speak for 5 minutes. Let me indicate there are some negotiations going on back and forth between the leadership, myself, Senator DASCHLE, members of our staff, the presiding officer, and others. I think it is going to be at least, probably, another 45 minutes before we have any response. They presented us an offer, we presented a counteroffer. Hopefully, we can reach some agreement. If not, it will probably slow things down a bit.

My view is those who have not yet filed—I guess there is a 1 o'clock deadline for filing amendments—even though we may be in recess they be permitted to file their amendments.

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

Mr. DOLE. After the remarks of the Senator from Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent that we stand in recess until 1:45.

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

The Senator from Hawaii.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR—S. 678

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tom Menjin be granted the privilege of the floor while I give a statement regarding the introduction of a bill. Mr. Menjin is a Congressional Fellow in my office.

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

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 678 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RECESS UNTIL 1:45 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m. recessed until 1:44 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GREGG).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as if in morning business.

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

COMPETITION AND THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, a year ago we were in the midst of a momentous debate in this institution over the reform of our Nation's health care system. At that time, one of my concerns was that dramatic changes were taking place in the prescription drug marketplace. A number of prescription drug manufacturers had begun to experience competitive pressures arising from the growth of generic drugs and managed care. But disturbingly, one of their strategies was to coopt or, if possible, eliminate the sources of that competitive pressure.

In the days that have followed, we have seen some extraordinary changes in the drug marketplace. There has been a wave of multibillion dollar mergers and acquisitions which, according to a recent issue in the Wall Street Journal, "promises to create industry giants." This remarkable consolidation has profound consequences for American consumers.

A few days ago, in fact it was April fool's day to be exact, the Associated Press reported that corporate merger activity broke all records last year and extended its frenetic pace into the first quarter of 1995—with the drug industry leading the way.

Mr. President, in the past 3 months alone, the drug industry by itself has carried out some \$23 billion in mergers and buying out their competition worldwide.

We read just the other day, for example, about Glaxo's \$14 billion hostile takeover of Burroughs Wellcome, both major drug giants. This deal will create the world's largest pharmaceutical company, in the wake of other giant deals like Hoechst's anticipated \$7.1 billion purchase of Marion Merrill Dow, American Home Products' \$9.7 billion buyout of American Cyanamid and Hoffmann-La Roche's \$5.3 billion acquisition of Syntex.

Brand name companies have also been investing heavily in biotechnology, generic and over-the-counter drug companies. Ciba purchased a \$2 billion stake in Chiron, and SmithKline Beecham recently just bought Sterling for \$3 billion. Hoechst spent a paltry half a billion dollars on a generic company called Copley.

These are remarkable figures, Mr. President. And if we simply add up the cost of just a sampling of some of these recent mergers and acquisitions, we will find that they total \$54 billion.

In the last 15 months, \$54 billion has been spent by giant pharmaceutical companies buying up and acquiring their competition. That is an interesting figure when we compare it to the research and development that is planned by the entire prescription drug industry for the year 1995: \$14.9 billion