

one of those subcommittees. I think our committee is unique in that sense, because we do not bring a bill to the floor unless it has been a bill developed on a bipartisan basis within each of those subcommittees.

Mr. HARKIN, our colleague from Iowa, was formerly chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which now is chaired by Senator SPECTER, of Pennsylvania. So he brought into that partnership that kind of background and understanding, as we have on most every one of our subcommittees. The chair is now being occupied by the Senator from Washington State, who chairs the Interior Subcommittee. His ranking member is former chairman, Senator BYRD.

So, in effect, we have been jointly producing these bills; it is bipartisan, and giving the Senate a very strong position. Then, when we went to conference, we had 40 Democrats and 39 Republicans voting for the Senate product, including both the leaders, the Republican leader and the Democratic leader.

Sure, we knew we were going to be in tough negotiations, but, nevertheless, we had a great number of accomplishments. We had, as the Senator knows, 12 of our 13 subcommittees involved, most of them with language, but with 5 unresolved appropriation bills. We were able to reduce the five to two. In other words, we closed the chapters on three of them. We closed the chapter on a couple of the others that were in the language area. So that, in effect, when we come back on April 15 and we take up the unfinished business of the Labor-HHS, for which the Senator from Iowa is the ranking member, we will have the figures, the dollars, pretty well resolved, as the Senator has said. We are now talking about language, riders.

I wish we did not have them. I wish we would have those issues taken up by the authorizers where they belong. But there is a trend line upward, by the fact that the authorizing actions have become very, very slow. As an example, the Endangered Species Act; 4 years ago it expired. We, in the Appropriations Committee, have been keeping it funded and keeping it going.

I could say that when there was an effort made by a few of my colleagues to convince me, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that we should not fund expired authorization programs, I did not have any idea what the scope of that might be, so I went to CBO. I asked CBO to give us a quick analysis of the expired authorizations that we were continuing to fund. Mr. President, \$95 billion is what they came up with for their estimate on expired authorizations; a goodly percentage of them in the Justice Department, and particularly those relating to fighting crime—expired authorizations.

So we, in effect, have almost taken on double our responsibility, of not only funding but, assuming that in that funding we authorize for that

year, we extend the authorization that has expired. It is not a task that we have desired or we have asked for.

I like to always remind our colleagues, no other committee but the Appropriations Committee has to pass legislation. Every other committee can consider authorization, but there is no basic command to perform. Only the Appropriations Committee must keep the Government running. We have to pass a bill—in fact, 13 of them. So, lots of times, knowing that, we get piggybacked. Others who are finding an inability to either extend authorization or renew authorization or deal with authorizing items come and piggyback on the appropriations bill. We are taking on those duties, but I am saying to the Senator, there are a lot of reasons why this situation becomes increasingly difficult.

I thank the colleagues on the committee. I have never seen a more dedicated group working together on a bipartisan basis to do their duty as I have with the subcommittees of our Appropriations Committee and the staff. I just cannot pay too high a tribute to the staffs on both sides that assist the members. It is a collegial experience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business in order to introduce a bill.

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

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HATFIELD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1662 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield the floor?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR HATFIELD'S PATIENCE, DILIGENCE, AND SKILL

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would just take 1 minute from my other remarks to say, though this may have been the last major appropriations conference the distinguished Senator from Oregon manages, with his fairly delicate but forceful touch, as I watched him as a member of the committee deal with a number of issues, a number of temperaments, always with his excellent eye on the mission, I marvel at Senator HATFIELD's patience and diligence and skill.

This is no time for eulogies or good-byes, but he will be missed. That aisle does not separate our friendship in any way at all. As a matter of fact, few issues separate our friendship. But my respect for his ability, for his service to

country will be a permanent thing. I hope that it is also recognized in this body of ours that too few times do we have an opportunity to work with someone who has the kind of compassion and concern that is essential if one is to render the best service possible to this country of ours.

I thank the Senator for his sacrifices, for his willingness to bend to the task, and his skill for getting the job done for so many years.

TRIBUTE TO KATHLEEN STANFIELD WEINSTEIN

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of a constituent of mine whose name was Kathleen Stanfield Weinstein.

Unfortunately, she has been in the papers a lot in this last week. Her life was at once ordinary and extraordinary. She was a resident of a town called Tinton Falls in New Jersey. She was a wife to her husband, Paul, and the mother to their 6-year-old son, Daniel. Mrs. Weinstein taught special education classes at Thorne Middle School in Middletown Township in New Jersey.

She was a teacher, the kind of a teacher that we all wish our children had at some point in their education. She had begun a program in which children were given special recognition for committing "random acts of kindness," toward their fellow students and the community—random acts of kindness. Everyone knows that plays on other words. The other words will become clearer in focus as I discuss Mrs. Weinstein's end of life.

Today, Mr. President, the billboard in front of Thorne Middle School reads "Mrs. Weinstein, Thank You for Your Random Acts of Kindness. We Will Miss You."

She did not retire, Mr. President. Some days ago while on her way to take a test for a graduate school course, Kathleen Weinstein did what so many of us do ordinarily. She stopped at a local delicatessen in a shopping mall for a sandwich. When she returned to her car, a young man jumped in the car with her, threatened her, saying he had a gun, and abducted her with the car. Some time later, a day or so, her body was found in a wooded area where she had been smothered with her own coat.

Unfortunately, in these times, Mr. President, this kind of event does not seem extraordinary. Indeed, Kathleen Weinstein was an extraordinary woman. At some time during her ordeal she had the presence of mind to reach into her coat pocket and turn on a small tape recorder. She recorded the conversation that she had with her soon-to-be killer, capturing her final conversation.

Kathleen Weinstein pleaded for her life, but not until she had engaged her young—turned out to be 17-year-old—attacker, just turned 17, in what has been described as "a meaningful conversation about a great many things."

They talked about the consequences for his young life, and there was still time, she cautioned him, to turn things around. They talked about "what happens by the decisions * * * that you make."

The young man did not take her advice. You see, he was about to become 17 years old, and in New Jersey that is the age for a driving license. He wanted a car just like hers. So he took it. In the process, he took her life—a despicable, horrible, outrageous act.

Mr. President, Kathleen Stanfield Weinstein's exceptional character and tragic death have touched the heart of Americans from around the country. It is ironic that a woman dedicated to teaching random acts of kindness to our children should be taken by a single random act of violence. She was ordinary, yet extraordinary. The legacy of her life will continue to touch New Jerseyans for a long, long time to come.

I have an excerpt from a newspaper, the Cincinnati Post, that includes some of the conversation that she had with this young man. I will take the liberty of reading some parts of it.

In a secretly recorded tape she hid in her coat pocket, the teacher is heard doing everything she can to reason with a teen-age carjacker, authorities said. Eventually she breaks down and begs in vain for her life.

She says to him, "You haven't done anything yet. All you have to do is let me go and take my car."

The woman's miniature tape recorder clicked to a stop before she was smothered with her own coat and other pieces of clothing, officials said.

She "valiantly and persistently used every skill and power she had to convince her attacker to simply take her car and not her life," [the prosecutor] said.

This 24-minute recording provides the key piece of evidence against the 17-year-old suspect.

Through this article are accurate, precise statements that she made. The attack was described this way:

After her attacker grabbed her from behind and forced his way into her car at gunpoint, she managed to turn on the voice-activated miniature cassette player hidden in a bag.

She said to him, before he killed her,

Don't you understand, though, what kind of trouble you are going to get in? Don't you think they are going to find you? You haven't done anything yet. All you have to do is let me go and take my car. For my life, don't you think I should be concerned and let you take my car? For my life! Do you really want that on your head?

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the full article as it appeared in the Cincinnati Post be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cincinnati Post, Mar. 20, 1996]

TEACHER'S FINAL MINUTES TAPED SECRET RECORDING: SHE BEGS CARJACKER FOR LIFE

When investigators found the body of Kathleen Weinstein, she was still able to tell them about her last moments alive.

In a secretly recorded tape she hid in her coat pocket, the teacher is heard doing ev-

erything she can to reason with a teen-age carjacker, authorities said. Eventually she breaks down and begs in vain for her life.

"You haven't done anything yet. All you have to do is to let me go and take my car," Ms. Weinstein tells the boy.

The woman's miniature tape recorder clicked to a stop before she was smothered with her own coat and other pieces of clothing, officials said.

"I have no doubt Kathleen Weinstein spoke to us through that tape," prosecutor Daniel Carluccio said as he released transcripts of the tape Tuesday.

She "valiantly and persistently used every skill and power she had to convince her attacker to simply take her car and not her life," he said.

The 24-minute recording provides the key piece of evidence against the 17-year-old suspect—identified only as M.L.—who was caught Sunday driving the woman's car. His first name, age and details about his past were on the tape.

The prosecutor read some of Ms. Weinstein's comments but did not disclose any of the youth's taped comments.

He was jailed on murder and carjacking charges. Carluccio said he would seek to have him tried as an adult.

Ms. Weinstein, 45, of Tinton Falls, disappeared Thursday after staying home from her job as a special education teacher to study for a graduate school exam. She was en route to take the test when she stopped to buy a sandwich.

After her attacker grabbed her from behind and forced his way into her car at gunpoint, she managed to turn on the voice-activated miniature cassette player hidden in a bag, Carluccio said. She later removed the tape and slipped it in her coat.

her body was found Sunday in woods near a highway in Berkley Township. She leaves a husband and 6-year-old son.

Text of fax box follows:

A victim's final words

Here are excerpts from the 24-minute recording made by Kathleen Weinstein, the teacher who secretly recorded her pleas to a teen-ager who police said stole her car and then killed her. Authorities provided only selected quotes:

"Don't you understand, though, what kind of trouble you are going to get in? Don't you think they are going to find you?"

"You haven't done anything yet. All you have to do is to let me go and take my car."

"For my life, don't you think I should be concerned and let you take my car? For my life!"

"Do you really want to have that on your head?"

"Why don't you just tell me? Of course it's important, it's determining your whole life and the direction you're taking. It's important. We're here for a purpose. That's what happens by the decisions and things that you make."

"Whatever trouble you're in, you didn't add to it yet, right?"

"I'll make you a promise that I won't tell anybody. Because you won't be taking my car and you won't be hurting me. And maybe you can get away another way."

"You can't have a life of crime like this. You'll wind up spending your life in prison if you don't get killed."

On her plans to take in a foster child or adopt a child: "I want to give something to somebody, to give . . . to give something back."

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I make particular point of this horrible murder because it strikes a chord in all of us of our disappointment in the violence that threads our society, whether it is

a young kid like this out to take a car or another youngster out to take a jacket—a senseless killing. Or like the killing recently here in Washington, DC, a 15-year-old boy, apparently a nice young man, good student, in trying to defend an argument between his younger sibling and another child—stabbed to death.

Mr. President, I ask a question that must go on in every home in everyone's mind in America: When will we stop this violence? How do we stop it? We sure do not stop it by a vote in the House of Representatives that says, "Take away the ban on assault weapons. Let them have their assault weapons. That is part of freedom in America." That is nonsense.

If I was not on public record I would use other words, perhaps, to describe it—to make sure that people could get their hands on weapons that are designed to kill people. That is what the vote was over there—some 230 votes for, and against, 170.

I fought in World War II, Mr. President. I was no war hero, but I carried a weapon that could fire less shots than these assault weapons. I was supposed to kill the guys on the other side of the line. I was not called on to do it and they did not do it to me, either. The fact of the matter is the weapons issued to me as a soldier in the European theater were far less menacing than the kind of weapons we want to make sure everybody in America has, because the National Rifle Association says that is what we ought to do—make sure we free people up so they can bear their arms against their fellow citizens. That is hardly a way for a civilized society to conduct itself. When will we be so sick of violence that we will say no, no, no, you just cannot get a gun because you want one, and you are going to have to wait and pass a test just like you do when you want to drive a car?

In my State, and in every State in this country, in the State of the distinguished occupant of the chair, there is a confrontation that could very well result in death and disaster. Lots of weapons are involved. In my State, a man walked into the post office in Montclair, my hometown, and shot four people. He is an ex-employee of the post office. At the Long Island Railroad out of New York City, a man shot and killed a number of people, one of them a young woman from New Jersey, whose parents I know. He did not know them, did not ever see them before.

We hear about children picking up guns and killing other children. We hear about despondent daughters or sons taking their father's legitimately owned gun and blowing their heads off. We had four kids commit suicide in New Jersey a couple of years ago. They got hold of weapons and killed one another. There are disgruntled employees, disappointed partners, and family members who kill everybody in the family.

We hear this trite old expression that makes me ill: "Guns do not kill people, people kill people." Well, how do people get the ability to kill other people? I never heard of a drive-by knifing.

Mr. President, one of these days, we are going to have to come to our senses about gun ownership, the proliferation of guns. I have legislation that I introduced the other day to reduce, on a Federal level, purchases of guns more than once a month. One gun a month, 12 guns a year. That does not sound like much of a restriction. But we have a fight on our hands. Maryland just passed it in one of the bodies of legislature there, in their Senate. It is predicted that it will go through with dispatch. Virginia has a one-gun-a-month program. Because Virginia has a limit of 1 gun a month—can you imagine, 12 guns a year are able to be purchased? They have reduced the gun presence in the Northeast of guns coming from the State of Virginia by 60-some percent by restricting gun purchases to one gun a month. The madness of it all. In order to protect those who demand an arsenal, they can buy 12 guns a year. It does not seem like that is a necessary thing to me.

But I am willing to take whatever steps I can to reduce the proliferation of guns in our society. I have become friends with Sarah and Jim Brady. I would not have before Jim was shot because we were in different parties and of different political or philosophical persuasions, because I never belonged to a gun organization. But Jim Brady was a good friend of the National Rifle Association, until someone attempted to kill President Reagan and shot Jim Brady in the attack. Jim Brady, who has been physically disabled, wheelchair bound since that time, has turned the opposite way, and so did his wife, when they saw what a terrible thing a gun could do. There are others I have met who used to support the National Rifle Association agenda, and when they suddenly see violence in their homes, they are opposed to gun ownership as randomly as it exists in this country.

I have also introduced legislation that says that anyone convicted of even a misdemeanor on domestic violence charges should not be able to own a gun. Right now, someone who has indicated that their rage is so impossible to control that they can come home and beat up their wife or kids and get convicted and stand in front of a judge in Baltimore County, and he says, "I cannot assign criminal penalties to someone who is not a criminal," after the man killed his wife. He gave him community service and, I think, 5 months in jail after he killed his wife. He does not call it a criminal act.

Now, Mr. President, we cannot do the job by simply building more jails. There was an editorial piece, an op-ed piece, in the New York Times the other day—and that is not gospel, but it was reporting facts—written by Anthony Lewis. He said that the biggest pro-

gram for building in California was the building of jails. While the number of students per teacher increases, meaning less attention to the students' needs, jails are being built. I think criminals ought to be punished and punished hard. But I think we also ought to look at what it is that drives all these people to criminality with all of the penalties that we impose, each of them getting longer and larger and tougher. That has not curbed the violence problem. Maybe we ought to say, hey, perhaps there is a different way to do this and examine the alternative. I hope that we will, Mr. President.

If I sound agitated, I am. I think about this young woman, a devoted parent and teacher, a teacher of the type that we all respect and want in our schools. She was murdered by some young punk who decides he wants her car. He was encouraged by what he sees on television and what he sees in gun ownership. She is threatened by a gun and did not even know that it existed, but she knows when someone says they have a gun, very often that is the case.

I hope we will learn from this courageous woman's death, and many other murders around the country, that we ought to do something differently. I hope that police departments across the country will start to prepare some advisory so that women can protect themselves. I have heard—and I do not know whether this is true; I state it secondhand—that a woman is better off to resist in a public place than to permit herself to be taken out of the public limelight. I do not know whether it is true, but I hope police departments—I would like to see police departments across the country prescribe actions in response to an attack of that type, to do something to protect themselves, to thwart the intentions of somebody who wants to take their lives, or take their property first and, typically, then their lives, and often whether or not the property is gained.

Mr. President, I hope we do not have to keep on discussing these kinds of things in the U.S. Senate, or in the Congress, or in our Government, and that we can look forward to a more peaceful time within our society. We are all shocked and horrified by the prospect of military engagement in Bosnia and in other parts of the world, and we look with horror upon the period in Vietnam when so many of our young people fought bravely and gallantly against a bad policy decision. We lost 50,000 people in the period of years that the Vietnam war went on. Now we lose over 15,000 people a year in this country to gun murders. Unfortunately, it does not get a lot of attention.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe it was on March 21 that I spoke on this floor in reference to Senator SAM NUNN and the late Senator Richard B. Rus-

sell and their fine work on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. I made a comparison in the course of those remarks of Mr. NUNN to Marshal Michael Ney, who was one of the top officers in Napoleon's army. I referred to Marshal Ney's having been separated from the army of Napoleon, but having fought his way back to join the army. He fought through thousands of cossacks and had come to the river Dnieper, D-n-i-e-p-e-r. He had lost all of his guns, but he crossed the river and rejoined the main forces of Napoleon's army.

I stated that Napoleon was overjoyed when he heard that Marshal Ney had escaped and rejoined the army. And he made the comment to other officers at that point—he said, "I have more than 400 million francs in the cellars," c-e-l-l-a-r-s, "of the Tuileries," T-u-i-l-e-r-i-e-s. "I would gladly have given them all for the ransom of my old companion in arms."

Well, I suppose I was talking like I had my mouth full of turnips, and the official reporter did not get the name of the river correctly spelled—D-n-i-e-p-e-r—Dnieper; the reporter substituted the name of the river Niemen, N-i-e-m-e-n. It was a river in White Russia. When I saw that name I thought, "My, I never heard of the name of such a river." So I went to Webster's dictionary and I found there, indeed, the name of a river called the Niemen River. So it sounded very much like the Dnieper River.

I make these remarks today, Mr. President, just to call attention to the error which was inadvertent on the part of the reporter and was really my fault. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be shown to state that it was the Dnieper River, D-n-i-e-p-e-r, not the Niemen River, to which I referred in my remarks. I yield back the balance of my time.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 170

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, a little more than an hour ago, the Senate voted for the 12th time in this 6 months of the 1996 fiscal year for a short-term continuing resolution for many of our most important Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I voted for that continuing resolution as I have for its predecessors out of a sense of frustration and the absence of any other reasonable alternative. But, Mr. President, I am taking this occasion to announce that will be my last vote for such a continuing resolution because I believe that we are acting in a highly irresponsible and embarrassing—and adverse to the interests of the people of this Nation—manner by the way in which we are conducting the fiscal affairs of this great Nation.