

I am proud to know him, proud to have supported him, and I am delighted that the Senate has given him a unanimous vote of approval.

I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I should like to join my dear friend and once again my chairman, the Senator from Oregon, for having so graciously handled this important, if not indeed, Mr. President, urgent, nomination at the earliest possible time, in the second week of the Congress.

The Committee on Finance met this morning. We may have hit upon an innovation, Mr. President. This morning we voted to confirm Mr. Rubin, and then we asked questions of him. This evening we voted to confirm him and then we are making speeches about our action. This might expedite procedures very considerably.

But this is a fortunate moment; at a time when a Secretary of the Treasury is urgently needed, we have a message which goes out to the Nation and to the world that an officer of the Cabinet with fullest confidence of the Senate has been confirmed directly.

Senator PACKWOOD was kind enough to mention the work of Mr. Rubin as chairman of the National Economic Council for the past 2 years. It would not be wrong to note that during that period we have created 5.6 million new jobs in the Nation. We have had an average growth of real gross domestic product of 3.5 percent. We have had an extraordinary recovery in which the rest of the world we hope will now join with us. And we have had 3 years running a declining deficit, the first time it happened since the Presidency of Harry S. Truman coming off the Second World War.

I would note sir, Mr. Rubin will be the 68th Secretary of the Treasury. Of these 13 have been from New York. We might also add Nicholas Brady and Douglas Dillon, but they chose to live in New Jersey.

But this is a special moment for all of us. I congratulate the Secretary as he now is.

I thank the chairman.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent we return to legislative session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business.

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

PHIL TAWNEY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, let me read you the opening line of a story in this morning's Missoulian:

Phil Tawney, a staunch wildlife supporter, environmental activist and a Democratic party mainstay for more than two decades, died in Missoula, Monday afternoon of complications from leukemia.

It is a short, stark, sentence. It gets the essential facts. It is good journalism. But this time, it leaves out everything.

Phil Tawney was a big man. A man whose soul was great enough to unite and transcend opposites. In Phil, passion for the great cause, united with reason and judgment in the details of legislation. Deep concern for the future joined with great joy in the present. Boundless idealism, met practical, hands-on knowhow.

As much as any person I have known, Phil represented what I believe is best about Montana. If you knew Phil, you were inspired by his love of Montana, his idealism, his integrity, and his courage in battling the leukemia that took his life.

Phil's Montana was Normal Maclean's Montana: A land of vast open spaces, and mist hanging in narrow mountain passes; of biting winds in the winter and dazzling sun in the Big Sky summer; of the elk hunts Phil took each fall; of snow that crunches under your boots, and muscular fish hanging at the bottom of streams so powerful that even a man as big and strong as Phil has trouble keeping his feet. Phil did as much as any Montanan of our time to preserve this land for his children and ours.

For over two decades—from the day in 1973, when at the age of 23, Phil and his wife Robin founded the Montana Environmental Information Center until yesterday—Phil was perhaps the leading influence on our State's fish, wildlife, and habitat protection programs. His ideas on stream preservation and mine reclamation became Montana law, and models for the Nation. Most recently, as a lawyer for the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, he worked with me to preserve thousands of acres of elk habitat north of Yellowstone National Park.

Through these years, Phil was always the source of good humor and steady, solid advice. He believed in people.

And throughout his involvement in politics and the conservation movement, he understood something we could all live by in this town. He understood that reasonable people could disagree without being disagreeable.

All this would have been extraordinary by itself. But Phil also had a successful legal practice. He served with distinction as the executive director of the Montana Democratic Party. And most important of all, Phil was a devoted husband to Robin and father to his children Land, Mikal, and Whitney.

He was always thinking about what he could do for somebody else. For a friend. For his family. For posterity.

Never for himself. And perhaps because he never thought about himself, while his life may have been short it was fine and full. That is why, as Missoula Mayor Kemmis said last night, somehow Phil always made you feel good about just being alive.

Mr. President, it is a terrible loss. Phil Tawney takes leave of his family and friends much too soon. But with us forever is a mighty legacy, and a challenge to match his commitment and achievement with our own.

I imagine Phil departing with a smile and some words of encouragement for the rest of us—like Valiant at the close of the Pilgrim's Progress:

"My sword, I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought his battles, who will now be my rewarder." So he passed over, and the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

JOHN BLOOMER

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to inform my colleagues that this morning the president pro tempore of the Vermont Senate was killed in an automobile accident. He was a good friend of mine and will long be remembered.

In my home State of Vermont, a calling to join the legal profession has historically been taken as a calling to public service. No family has taken that more seriously than the Bloomers of Rutland, VT.

Asa Bloomer, legendary trial lawyer and rhetorician, served his community well in the Vermont State Senate. In his heyday, in the 1950's and early 1960's, he was the acknowledged single source of power in the Vermont Senate. He rose to the rank of president pro tempore, a post he held at the time of his death, in 1963, suffering a heart attack in the legislative halls. He was a close friend of my father's, and brought me into close contact with the Bloomer family.

Quite naturally, his older son Bob, a lawyer, followed his father to the senate where he served with distinction. Then his brother, a fellow lawyer and good friend, John Bloomer, ran for, and was elected to, the Vermont Senate; 2 years ago he was elected as was his father, as president pro tempore of the senate. He held that position until this morning, when enroute to the State House in Montpelier to preside at an important meeting of his judiciary committee, his life was tragically taken in an automobile accident. His dedication to his tasks in Montpelier

was well measured by the fact that his failure to appear for the very start of the meeting was taken by his colleagues as a dire portent of bad news. John Bloomer was never late.

A pall was immediately cast over the State House as the Vermont and American flags were lowered to half staff in the brilliant sunshine of a chill and crystal clear subzero Vermont morning. John Bloomer, Republican senator, was immediately remembered as John Bloomer, dear friend.

Margaret Lucenti, a liberal Democrat who served well with John as clerk of his judiciary committee, said, "He was just a wonderful human being, a friend to everyone."

For me, a fellow member with John of the Rutland County Bar Association, he was a dear and trusted friend. I knew him for as long as I can remember. I will never, ever forget him.

He was a true inspiration to all of us who knew him. John Bloomer was a man of strong convictions that were always tempered by compassion. As we remember his long years of service to Vermont, we will fondly recall his countless deeds of kindness to fellow Vermonters.

My sympathies go out to his wife, Judy, to his brother, and to all his four children and to his countless friends, of which I am proud to count myself one.

He well carried on the Bloomer family tradition of service to the State of Vermont. Our State will miss him, as a tireless public servant and as a caring and concerned human being. And I will miss him as a true friend.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of S. 189 and S.J. Res. 14 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

HOMICIDES BY GUNSHOT IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, at the beginning of the second session of the 103d Congress, I began what became a weekly routine of reporting to the Senate on the number of homicides committed by gunshot in New York City. Not surprisingly, the numbers were shocking. In 1994, a total of 910 victims were shot to death. That is an average of over 17 each week. Many more sustained serious injuries from bullet wounds.

As of Sunday, January 8, 1995, 21 people had been shot to death in New York City. That despite the frigid weather, which often serves as a deterrent to violent crime. Obviously, the problem is not going away.

It is unfortunate that I need to remind my colleagues of these grim statistics. But until we begin to take meaningful steps to remedy this ap-

palling situation, I plan to continue my practice of reporting each week on the terrible death toll by gunshot in New York City.

Thankfully, there is some good news to report. The number of those who lost their lives to gunshot in New York City last year is substantially lower than the number in 1993, which was 1,450. The bad news is that national totals are still on the rise. In 1993, the most recent year for which statistics are available, 16,189 people were killed by firearms, nearly 1,000 more than in the previous year.

We made some important gains in our fight against gun violence in the 103d Congress. First we passed the Brady law in November 1993. Since then we have prevented thousands of fugitives and felons from illegally purchasing guns. Second, as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, which was signed by President Clinton on September 13, 1994, the Senate agreed to a ban on 19 types of semiautomatic assault weapons. That same bill also included a provision sponsored by the Senator from New York banning a new class of cop-killer bullets capable of piercing the soft body armor worn by law enforcement officials.

We need to continue to enact tough laws that will begin to curb the plague of gun violence. But with some 200 million firearms in circulation today, and with an estimated 5,479 new ones hitting the streets each day, it seems obvious that gun control can ultimately have only limited success. That is why I have long advocated ammunition control as the best solution to the epidemic of gun violence. While we have a supply of guns that will last us well into the next century, if not longer, we have perhaps only a 3- or 4-year supply of ammunition. The obvious solution, then, is to control the supply of bullets, particularly those used most often in the commission of crimes.

On the first day of the 104th Congress, I introduced six bills, some of which I had introduced in previous Congresses, relating to the subject of ammunition control. Some of these place bans on certain rounds of ammunition, including the deadly Black Talon bullet. Others heavily tax these pernicious bullets. A final bill requires records to be kept with respect to the disposition of ammunition and commissions a national study on the use of bullets. Currently, there are no reporting requirements for manufacturers or importers of ammunition. We need to know how much of what kinds of ammunition are being produced in order to help us craft more intelligent policy in this area.

Mr. President, 1994 saw too many tragic incidents involving guns. Many occurred right here in the city of Washington. Doubtless, many more will occur in 1995. We can, and must, do something about this without delay. I urge my colleagues to support the measures which I have introduced.

Mr. PACKWOOD addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PACKWOOD. 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.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to take a major step toward making Congress more accountable to the people by passing S. 2, the bill before us, the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

Let us face it. It is easier to make up a set of rules for someone else to play by than to devise guidelines for our own actions. It is easy to pontificate: Do as I say, not as I do.

And that is what we have been doing right here in the U.S. Congress. Congress has been exempting itself from the laws and regulations that everybody else in America has to live with.

Unlike their Government, the people measure such laws against a yardstick of common sense. If a law or regulation is a good idea for everybody else in America, surely the public good requires that it be imposed across the board right here.

As it is, individuals find these laws and regulations more and more onerous. The rules have grown so cumbersome that they now hamper business, small and large, and make everything we buy more expensive.

I do not know. Many of our rules make the goods we hope to export more expensive, threatening our ability to compete in the world markets.

Until now, Congress has totally avoided any firsthand experience with the results of its own rulemaking. But last week the U.S. House of Representatives fired the first shot in what will be a real revolution in Government. It passed its version of the Congressional Accountability Act. I hope the Senate will continue the mission and put this bill on the President's desk.

By making congressional accountability our very first order of business, the first legislation to pass this new session, with so much hope we will be sending a clear message to the American people. Signal received. Congress will comply with the same mandates it imposes on the rest of the country.

Mr. President, I have owned my own small business. I know the Senator in the chair has as well. I know what it is like to make a payroll. I know what it is like to comply with Federal regulations and State regulations and local regulations and still try to squeeze out