

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Leg.]

#### YEAS—42

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Bayh	Feinstein	Levin
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Lieberman
Boxer	Graham	Lincoln
Breaux	Harkin	Mikulski
Bryan	Hollings	Murray
Byrd	Inouye	Reed
Cleland	Johnson	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Robb
Daschle	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Torricelli
Durbin	Landrieu	Wellstone
Edwards	Lautenberg	Wyden

#### NAYS—54

Abraham	Enzi	McCain
Allard	Frist	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Baucus	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner

#### NOT VOTING—4

Biden	Schumer
Moynihan	Smith (OR)

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 5]

Abraham	Dodd	Kerrey
Akaka	Domenici	Kerry
Allard	Dorgan	Kohl
Ashcroft	Durbin	Kyl
Baucus	Edwards	Landrieu
Bayh	Enzi	Lautenberg
Bennett	Feingold	Leahy
Bingaman	Feinstein	Levin
Bond	Fitzgerald	Lieberman
Boxer	Frist	Lincoln
Breaux	Graham	Lott
Brownback	Gramm	Lugar
Bryan	Grams	Mack
Bunning	Grassley	McCain
Burns	Gregg	McConnell
Byrd	Hagel	Mikulski
Campbell	Harkin	Murkowski
Chafee, L.	Hatch	Murray
Cleland	Helms	Nickles
Cochran	Hollings	Reed
Collins	Hutchinson	Reid
Conrad	Hutchison	Robb
Coverdell	Inhofe	Roberts
Craig	Inouye	Rockefeller
Crapo	Jeffords	Roth
Daschle	Johnson	Santorum
DeWine	Kennedy	Sarbanes

Sessions  
Shelby  
Smith (NH)  
Snowe  
Specter

Stevens  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thurmond  
Torricelli

Voinovich  
Warner  
Wellstone  
Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Democratic leader.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 504, E. Douglas Hamilton, of Kentucky, to be U.S. Marshal, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Leg.]

#### YEAS—41

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bayh	Graham	Lincoln
Bingaman	Harkin	Mikulski
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Breaux	Inouye	Reed
Bryan	Johnson	Reid
Cleland	Kennedy	Robb
Conrad	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Torricelli
Dorgan	Landrieu	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wyden
Edwards	Leahy	

#### NAYS—54

Abraham	Enzi	McCain
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Roth
Bunning	Gregg	Santorum
Burns	Hagel	Sessions
Byrd	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Chafee, L.	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner

#### NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Moynihan	Smith (OR)
Gorton	Schumer	

The motion was rejected.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I may send an amendment to the desk. I further ask consent that upon reporting of the

amendment there be 8 hours for debate, equally divided between the two leaders, or their designees, for the purpose of debating both amendments, with 4 hours consumed this evening. I also ask consent that at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday the Senate proceed to a vote on or in relation to the Lott amendment, to be followed by a vote on or in relation to the Daschle amendment. I finally ask consent that no amendments be in order to either amendment prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my pending point of order be vitiated.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3150

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 3150.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE SECOND AMENDMENT, THE ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS, AND THE JUVENILE CRIME CONFERENCE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the right of each law-abiding United States citizen to own a firearm for any legitimate purpose, including self-defense or recreation; and

(2) The Clinton Administration has failed to protect law-abiding citizens by inadequately enforcing Federal firearms laws. Between 1992 and 1998, Triggerlock gun prosecutions of defendants who use a firearm in the commission of a felony dropped nearly 50 percent, from 7,045 to approximately 3,800, despite the fact that the overall budget of the Department of Justice increased 54 percent during this period; and

(3) It is a Federal crime to possess a firearm on school grounds under section 922(q) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 8 cases under this provision of law during 1998, even though more than 6,000 students brought firearms to school that year. The Clinton Administration prosecuted only 5 such cases during 1997; and

(4) It is a Federal crime to transfer a firearm to a juvenile under section 922(x) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 6 cases under this provision of law during 1998 and only 5 during 1997; also

(5) It is a Federal crime to transfer or possess a semiautomatic assault weapon under section 922(v) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 4 cases under this provision of law during 1998 and only 4 during 1997; plus

(6) It is a Federal crime for any person "who has been adjudicated as a mental defective or who has been committed to a mental

institution" to possess or purchase a firearm under section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code. Despite this federal law, mental health adjudications are not placed on the national instant criminal background system; also

(7) It is a Federal crime for any person knowingly to make any false statement in the attempted purchase of a firearm; it is also a Federal crime for convicted felons to possess or purchase a firearm. More than 500,000 convicted felons and other prohibited purchasers have been prevented from buying firearms from licensed dealers since the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was enacted. When these felons attempted to purchase a firearm, they committed another crime by making a false statement under oath that they were not disqualified from purchasing a firearm; and, of the more than 500,000 violations, only approximately 200 of the felons have been referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution; and

(8) The juvenile crime conference committee is considering a comprehensive approach to juvenile crime including:

(a) tougher penalties on criminals using guns and illegal gun purchases;

(b) money for states to get tough on truly violent teen criminals;

(c) a provision allowing Hollywood to reach agreements to clean up smut and violence on television, in video games, and in music;

(d) changing federal education mandates to ensure that all students who bring guns to school can be disciplined; and

(e) a ban on juveniles who commit felonies from ever legally possessing a gun and from possessing assault weapons, and

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) Any juvenile crime conference report should reflect a comprehensive approach to juvenile crime and enhance the prosecution of firearms offenses, including:

(a) designating not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney in each district to prosecute Federal firearms violations and thereby expand Project Exile nationally;

(b) upgrading the national instant criminal background system by encouraging States to place mental health adjudications on that system and by improving the overall speed and efficiency of that system; and

(c) and providing incentive grants to States to encourage States to impose mandatory minimum sentences of firearm offenses;

(2) The right of each law-abiding United States citizen to own a firearm for any legitimate purpose, including self-defense or recreation, should not be infringed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of this agreement, there will be no further votes this evening. The next vote will occur at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday.

I thank Senator DASCHLE for his cooperation in getting this agreement.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I may ask the majority leader a question, the unanimous consent doesn't address this, but I assume the 4 hours tonight would be equally divided.

Mr. LOTT. Absolutely, Mr. President.

Mr. DASCHLE. Of course, it already notes it should be equally divided tomorrow. I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. President, let me thank the majority leader for his willingness to proceed in this manner. This is what we had hoped we could achieve. I am delighted now that we have done so. This is far better than to go through the parliamentary motions that were being made. I appreciate the patience and willingness on the part of everyone to

accommodate our desire to have this amendment and these votes. We will have them tomorrow, as we had hoped. I look forward to the debate tonight as well as tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield our 2 hours tonight on the Democratic side to Senator BOXER who will manage the time on my behalf.

(Mr. BROWBACK assumed the Chair.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, while the time will be equally divided tonight—2 hours on each side that are required to discuss the pending amendments—I want to emphasize again that there is another very important issue pending that everybody thought would be the subject of debate this afternoon, and that is the language in the appropriations bill regarding Kosovo and how we will deal with our allies' involvement there, and how we will deal in the future with the funding.

Some Senators may wish to take some time to speak on that issue. I also encourage colleagues that we work toward getting a time agreement tomorrow afternoon on the Kosovo issue, have a reasonable time, but have a focused, good debate and vote on that issue so we can complete the military construction appropriations bill. We are getting far afield from getting our work done on the appropriations bills. We would then go to the foreign operations appropriations bill. I encourage Senators to stay and make speeches tonight on these subjects.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

May I ask the majority leader if he could tell us who is going to be handling the time on his side of the aisle?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we don't have anybody designated yet. I will either be here to do it myself or we will designate somebody. There are a number of Senators who have indicated a desire to be heard on this issue—Senator SESSIONS, Senator CRAIG, and others. But exactly when tonight or tomorrow, we will have to make that determination since we just had this agreement entered into.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for getting us to a place where we can in fact consider the Daschle amendment, which simply says that on Mother's Day an estimated 750,000 mothers, fathers, and children united for the Million Mom March on The Mall in Washington, and they were joined by tens of thousands of others in 70 cities across America in a call for a meaningful, commonsense policy.

Essentially what this amendment says is that the organizers of the Million Mom March should be commended for rallying to demand sensible gun safety legislation and that Congress should immediately pass a conference report which will include the meaningful, sensible gun laws that were passed here in the Senate as part of the juvenile justice bill.

I had the privilege and honor of marching with so many American families of so many diverse backgrounds and so many Americans of different ages all united in a call for a safer America.

I am very pleased that my leader, Senator DASCHLE, has placed this amendment before the body. I hope all Members will vote for it.

I see that the Republican side has responded with a litany of attacks on President Clinton, which I think is most inappropriate. This should be a time when we reach across the aisle and say we want safety for our children. I hope maybe they will reconsider.

Believe me when I tell you that the million moms and their families are not Democrats, Republicans, or independents; they are Americans. Many were touched by violence in their families and violence in their communities.

At this time, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, if he would like to take up to 30 minutes to discuss these amendments. If so, I will now yield up to 30 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold?

May I have 1 minute?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for her leadership and her advocacy on this issue.

I was so proud to march with her on The Mall with the mothers and the fathers and the good men who supported the women. We were proud. Why were we proud? Because the people marching believed marching made a difference. They thought if they could go out and march with their feet instead of people marching with their money into these lobbying events that are held here, they could make a difference. I thank the Senator for responding to their marching feet.

I stand with her, along with the people who were there from Maryland. I congratulate her because we are making democracy work. If we don't march on this floor and pass this amendment, I really say to the voters of America, march into the voting booth and get a Congress that will respond to marching feet instead of marching to millions of dollars.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend from Maryland. It was an honor to march with her and to stand with her. She brings to the Senate a sense of reality for our families, our seniors, and our children. She fights for them every day. She is fighting for them tonight.

With that, I yield up to 30 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Two days ago, to honor Mother's Day, hundreds of thousands of mothers from across the United States marched on the nation's

Capitol, to insist that Congress do more to protect children from the epidemic of gun violence that continues to plague our country.

The Million Mom March has focused the attention of the entire country on this critical challenge—and the question now is whether Congress will at long last end the stonewalling and act responsibly on gun control.

The National Rifle Association is not the Majority Leader of the United States Senate. It shouldn't be dictating our agenda. It's irresponsible for the Republican Senate leadership to stonewall every opportunity to enact responsible gun control legislation.

For many months, Democrats have continued to ask the Republican leadership for immediate action on pending legislation to close the loopholes in the nation's gun laws, but every request so far has been denied.

Gun laws work. Experience is clear that tough gun laws in combination with other preventive measures have a direct impact on reducing crime.

In Massachusetts, we have some of the toughest gun laws in the country.

We have a ban on carrying concealed weapons. A permit is required to do so. Local law enforcement has discretion to issue permits, and an individual must show a need in order to obtain the permit.

We have a minimum age of 21 for the purchase of a handgun. We have increased penalties for felons in possession of firearms.

We require the sale of child safety locks with all firearms.

We have an adult responsibility law. Adults are liable if a child obtains an improperly stored gun and uses it to kill or injure himself or any other person.

We have a Gun-Free Schools Law.

We have a licensing law for purchases of guns.

We have strict standards for the licensing of gun dealers.

We have a waiting period for handgun purchases. It takes up to 30 days to obtain a permit.

We have a permit requirement for secondary and private sales of guns.

We have a ban on the sale of Saturday Night Specials.

We have a requirement for reporting of lost or stolen firearms.

As Boston Police Commissioner Paul Evans testified last year in the Senate Health Committee, "Any successful approach to youth violence must be balanced and comprehensive. It must include major investments in prevention and intervention as well as enforcement. Take away any leg and the stool falls."

Commissioner Evans also stated that to be effective, efforts must be targeted and cooperative. Police officers must be able to work closely with churches, schools, and health and mental health providers. After-school programs are essential to help keep juveniles off the streets, out of trouble, and away from guns and drugs. In developing an effective

approach like this, Boston has become a model for the rest of the country.

There are partnerships between the Boston Public Schools and local mental health agencies. School districts are employing mental health professionals. Teachers and staff focus on identifying problems in order to prevent violence by students. The Boston police work actively with parents, schools and other officials, discussing incidents in and out of school involving students. The Boston Public Health Commission promotes programs by the Boston Police Department.

The results have been impressive. The success of Boston's comprehensive strategy is borne out in these outstanding results:

From January 1999 through April 2000, no juvenile in Boston was killed with a firearm.

In 1990, 51 Boston young people, ages 24 and under, were murdered by a firearm. Last year, there were 10 such murders.

Reports from emergency rooms about firearm injuries are also down dramatically.

It's no coincidence that the firearm death rate in Massachusetts is significantly lower than the national average. We've taken strong and effective steps to protect our citizens, our children, and our communities.

When we compare states with tough gun laws to those that have weak gun laws, the differences are significant:

In 1996, across the nation, the number of firearm-related deaths for persons 19 years old or younger was 2 deaths per 100,000 persons.

In states that have the weakest gun laws, the number was significantly higher:

Utah had 5.1 firearm-related deaths per 100,000 people—two and a half times higher than the national average.

Indiana had 5.9 firearm-related deaths per 100,000—three times higher.

Idaho had 6.9 firearm-related deaths per 100,000—three and a half times higher.

Mississippi had 9.2 firearm-related deaths per 100,000—four and a half times higher.

No other major nation on earth tolerates such shameful gun violence. According to a study by the Centers for Disease Control in 1997, the rate of firearm deaths among children 0-14 years old is nearly 12 times higher in the United States than in 25 other industrial countries combined.

Every day we fail to act, the tragic toll of gun violence climbs steadily higher. In the year since the killings at Columbine High School in Colorado, 4,560 more children have lost their lives to gunfire, and countless more have been injured.

We intend to do all we can to see that the Senate votes on these common sense measures as soon as possible.

Today is a new dawn for gun control. On Sunday, finally, the immovable object we call Congress met the irre-

sistible force of the Million Mom March—and the immovable object moved.

I believe that at long last, Congress will say no to The National Rifle Association, and yes to the hundreds of thousands of mothers from across the United States who marched on the nation's Capitol to demand an end to the epidemic of gun violence that continues to plague our children, our homes, our schools, and our country.

The Million Mom March focused the attention of the entire country on this critical challenge. It is time—long past time—for Congress to end the stonewalling and act responsibly on gun control.

We already know what needs to be done to reduce the irresponsible proliferation of guns and gun violence in communities across the country. This is not rocket science. We should close the gun show loophole. We should require child safety locks for guns. We should insist on licensing for all handgun owners. We should take guns out of schools and let children learn in safe classrooms.

Enough is enough is enough is enough.

I am sure those Americans who have been watching the Senate now for the last 2 hours wonder whether we are going to be able to take very much action on matters which they consider important to their families.

In this particular instance, the issue is whether we are going to pass a sense-of-the-Senate resolution—not even an amendment that would be the basis for legislative action, but just an expression of the Members of this body, as the Senator from California has pointed out, effectively commending the participants of the Million Mom March. They should be commended for rallying to demand sensible gun safety legislation.

Congress should pass a conference report on violent juvenile offender accountability before the Memorial Day recess and include the Lautenberg gun show provision which passed in the Senate, and other Senate-passed provisions to limit access to firearms by juveniles, convicted felons, and other persons prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms.

That took just over 2 hours of the Senate's time primarily because of the Republican leadership saying they were not going to permit the Democratic leadership to go on record in the Senate this evening just for the sense of the Senate commending the Million Mom March, and also asking that the Senate do what it already should do—that is, pass the violent juvenile offender legislation out of conference where it has been for 7 months.

As a member of the conference committee, we met on two different occasions: on the opening occasion, and on the organization. And that was it.

It has taken the Republican leadership 2½ hours to say that we can vote on this tomorrow with their permission. They ought to get used to the fact

that we are going to continue to press this issue—2 hours to get a sense of the Senate to say the mothers, the 750,000 moms who marched with their daughters on Sunday—that they are to be commended. That is troublesome, evidently, to the other side.

These moms came from all different parts of the country. Many of them had never participated in any political process at all. They came here because they wanted the Congress of the United States to debate and take action. They had different views about what specifically should be out there. But they had a common sense and a common purpose that we should take some action. We are commending them for doing so. That evidently was unacceptable to the Republican leadership.

That is what we are facing here, for those who are watching this program tonight and who saw the march. In the last 2 hours we have been unable to get action. It is as clear as can be.

There has been objection, parliamentary maneuvering, and gymnastics using the rules of the Senate to deny an expression that we ought to commend the Million Mom March and that we ought to complete what is our responsibility to complete; that is, the conference, and pass sensible and commonsense gun control. You would have thought we were repealing the first amendment of the United States. That is what we are facing here. It is so interesting for us to find that out at this time in this session—the difficulty and the complexity we are going to have. But we are going to continue to pursue it.

I see my friend and our leader from California, Senator BOXER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I simply want to say to my friend that everything he said was true, except one small point. He said it has been 2 hours. It has been since 2 o'clock, I say to my friend from Massachusetts. They delayed for 5 hours the simple vote to say to moms who gave up their Mother's Day and came here: Thank you for what you are doing.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

We have a short period of time remaining. As a member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, we have responsibilities to try to pass education legislation. We had seven votes over a period of 5 days. That legislation was pulled. We are saying we don't have enough time, we don't have enough time to consider this, although we had all day Friday where there were no votes and all day Monday where there were no votes.

What we see now is that during the whole course of the afternoon, we were denied the opportunity to have just an expression of the Senate.

As I mentioned, this resolution is a simple, straightforward measure. Fact: Over 400 young people have been killed by gun violence since 1997. Fact: In the year since the Columbine tragedy, the

Senate and House juvenile justice conference has not taken action to ensure the passage of meaningful gun legislation. Fact: Our continued inaction poses a threat to public safety.

The sense of the Senate does only two things. It commends the participants of the Million Mom March and calls upon the conference to pass the language of the Lautenberg measure on the gun show loophole that has passed the Senate, and to take action that is sensible and responsible.

I will take a few moments of the Senate's time to respond to an argument and to discuss some of the facts which are so compelling, particularly about the children, because we as a country and as a society refuse to take action. The latest data released in 1999 shows in a single year—and this can't tell the story because for every statistic, for every individual there is a name and a face behind this—what has been happening: 4,205 children and teens were killed by gunfire—1 every 2 hours, nearly 12 a day; 2,562 were murdered by gunfire; 1,262 committed suicide using a firearm—more than 3 every day; 306 died from accidental shooting; 2,357 were white and 1,687 were black; 629 were under 15; 191 were under 10; 84 were under 5 years of age; nearly 3 times as many children under 10 died from gunfire as the number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. We know that the American children under 15 are 12 times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrial countries combined; homicide is the third leading cause of death among children 5 to 14; 61% of the 80,000 children killed by gunfire since 1979 were white; 36% were black; children are twice as likely as adults to be victims of violent crime, and more likely to be killed by adults than other children; white youths are six times more likely to commit suicide than black youths although the suicide rate for black youths is up more than 100 percent since 1980.

We do not believe this legislation is necessarily going to be the only answer. We understand that. We do understand this is a step that can be taken now to make a difference about the proliferation of weapons and the easy access to weapons.

Various studies and polls show the number of children who say how easy it is for them to acquire weapons in our country today. We want to reduce that availability and that accessibility. We understand there are legitimate issues with which we have to deal. I want to dispose of a few of them. One has been the argument that has been raised that there hasn't been a sufficient effort in the area of law enforcement.

Reading through our Republican sense of the Senate, they talk about law enforcement. It is an interesting fact that Republicans have cut back on the total number of agents who have been most involved in law enforcement—the ATF agents—over the last 15 years.

Back to the prosecutions and the important point which our Republican friends ought to understand because their sense-of-the-Senate resolution is basically flawed in what they say about the prosecutions: Although the number of Federal prosecutions for lower level offenders—persons serving sentences of 3 years or less—has dropped, the number of high-level offenders—those sentenced to 5 years or more—is up by nearly 30 percent. Do we understand that? If we are talking about the more serious aspect of gun prosecutions, they are up by 30 percent.

I hope our Republican friends acknowledge their findings which are flawed in their presentation on this issue. At the same time, the total number of Federal and State prosecutions is up sharply. About 25 percent more criminals are sent to prisons for State and Federal weapons offenses than in 1992. The number of high-level offenders is up nearly 30 percent. The total number of Federal and State prosecutions is up 25 percent or more. The total number of prosecutions—local, Federal, and State—are up significantly.

We hear from the National Rifle Association that all that is needed is further prosecution under the law, but that is happening at the present time. What we need is action over the proliferation of weapons. We have tried in recent times on our side, with strong support, to make progress regarding the proliferation of weapons.

Moving along to some of the other challenges that children are facing, in November of last year in the Senate, the mental health bill was passed unanimously, by Republican and Democrats alike. We are still waiting over in the House of Representatives for the Republican leadership to call that up.

What does that bill do? That bill directly addresses the problems of violence in children's lives. The first section of the bill provides grants to public entities for programs in local communities to help children deal with violence. Community partnerships are created among law enforcement, education systems, mental health, and substance abuse systems. These partnerships provide a comprehensive response to violence, and include security, education reform, prevention, and early intervention services for mental health and substance abuse problems, as well as early childhood and development and social services.

Recognizing what is happening in many of our urban areas, I know in my city of Boston, a third of the children who come to school each day come from schools where there is abuse—physical abuse and substance abuse. Those children need help. They have problems. Those who are the strongest supporters of eliminating the proliferation of weapons available to children have been fighting for these kinds of efforts.

Nonetheless, our Republican leadership is opposed to all of our efforts and

refuses to take action in those areas. It wasn't that long ago, in 1995, when we tried to get the Center for Disease Control to have a survey of gun violence and our House Republican budget proposed a phaseout of the Center for Injury Control because it was just collecting information about violence and guns in schools.

Not only are they opposed to trying to take direct action on the proliferation of guns, not only are they opposed, evidently—because they are refusing to take up legislation to deal with some of the other aspects of guns—but on the other hand, they are absolutely opposed to even permitting the Center for Disease Control, the premier organization in the world in terms of public health services, from having any collection of material on gun violence.

In 1996, the appropriation was cut by \$2.6 million, the appropriation of the Center for Disease Control, for injury control. That is the exact amount CDC was spending to survey gun violence. Since then, the CDC found other ways to continue the survey of gun violence, but Republicans have fought us every step along the way. That is what we are pointing out.

We are pointing out a number of things. First of all, if you can do something for effective law enforcement as well as prevention programs, you can have a dramatic impact on violence in communities. I want to show what has happened in my own State of Massachusetts where we have passed some of the toughest gun laws. We have a ban on carrying concealed weapons. A permit is required to do so. Local law enforcement has discretion to issue permits, and an individual must show a need in order to obtain the permit.

We have a minimum age of 21 for the purchase of a handgun.

We have increased penalties for felons in possession of firearms.

We require the sale of child safety locks with all fire arms.

We have an adult responsibility law. Adults are liable if a child obtains an improperly stored gun and uses it to kill or injure himself or any other person.

We have gun-free school laws.

We have a licensing law for the purchase of guns. We have strict standards for the licensing of gun dealers. We have a waiting period for handgun purchases. It takes up to 30 days to obtain a permit. We have a permit requirement for secondary and private sales of guns.

We have a ban on Saturday night specials, and we have a requirement for reporting lost or stolen firearms.

What have been the results? In the city of Boston, we see what the difference has been. In 1990, homicides of those 16 and under: 10 a year. See how this has gradually been phased out as these measures have been passed, down to the year 2000 where, in the first 3 months of the year, for youth homicides, we have not had one yet.

Does that mean something to anybody? Obviously we have had a very

powerful impact. That is not just because of this legislation which has been enormously important, but we have also had a very effective program in prevention and intervention as well as enforcement. As Commissioner Paul Evans said, you have to have all the legs of the stool to be effective. Commissioner Evans also states:

To be effective, efforts must be targeted and cooperative. Police officers must be able to work closely with churches, schools, health and mental health providers. Afterschool programs are essential to help keep juveniles off the streets and out of trouble, away from guns and drugs.

In developing an effective approach like this, Boston has become a model for the rest of the country. On this chart, here is the city of Boston: Firearm homicides, 50 a year in 1990, and now we are down, in the year 2000, to 3 this particular year. That is because of tough laws with effective efforts that include many of the different provisions we have talked about here in our SAMSHA program: Working with troubled youth; trying to work with children to deal with violence in their communities; community partnership among law enforcement, education, and mental health and substance abuse systems. Those have been local efforts—some supported by the States—that are effective. Prevention and tough laws; we are finding out the scores, the hundreds of children who are alive today that I dare say probably would not be if we did not have an effective effort against the proliferation of weapons as well as prevention.

There are partnerships between the Boston public schools and local mental health agencies. School districts are employing mental health professionals. Teachers and staff focus on identifying problems in order to prevent violence by students. Boston police work actively with parents, schools, and other officials discussing incidents in and out of schools involving students. The Boston Public Health Commission promotes programs by the Boston Police Department and the results have been impressive.

From January 1999 through April of 2000, no juvenile in Boston was killed with a firearm. We ought to be able to at least debate this issue in the Senate. If there are those who take issue with what we have represented tonight about the effectiveness of a strong prevention program in terms of proliferation weapons, and also a prevention program working with a range of different social services, come out here on the floor and let's debate it and call the roll.

But, oh, no, the Republican leadership says. Oh, no, we are not even going to let you, over 5 hours, pass a resolution commending the Million Mom March, or that we ought to get the bill out of the conference, where we have been for 8 months. Why is it they are so nervous about it? Why is it, when we have results that we are prepared to

defend that can demonstrate we can save lives in this country, but that we are denied the opportunity to do so? That is what is unacceptable. People are milling around saying: when are we going to end this evening? We have places to go. We have places to go—here on the floor of the Senate. We have things to do, and that is here in the Senate. That is what we are elected for.

The leader, Senator DASCHLE, has outlined what we want to be able to do.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has another 9 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me point out, when we compare States with tough gun laws to those that have weak gun laws—let's take a look at that. We are constantly told tough gun laws do not make any difference, they really do not make any difference.

Listen to this. In 1996, across the Nation the number of firearm-related deaths for persons 19 years old or younger were 2 deaths per 100,000. That is across the country, 2 deaths per 100,000. In the States that have the weakest gun laws, the number was significantly higher. Utah had 5.1 firearm-related deaths per 100,000, 2.5 times higher than the national average. These are, effectively, for children under 19 years of age. Indiana had 5.9 firearm-related deaths per 100,000, 3 times higher; Idaho, 6.9 firearm-related deaths per 100,000, 3.5 times higher; Mississippi, 9.2 firearms-related deaths per 100,000, 4.5 times higher. No other nation on Earth tolerates such shameful gun violence.

Where we have had effective laws and preventive programs we have reduction in the violence against children. Where we have weaker laws, we see the expanded number of deaths of children in our country. There may be other reasons for it, but come out here and defend it. We are prepared to debate these issues. But we are unable to do so because of these magic words: "I suggest the absence of a quorum."

If you took away the words, "I suggest the absence of a quorum," perhaps we could get some action around here. But we cannot and therefore we are stymied, at least to date, although we will have some opportunities to get some expressions tomorrow, and we are going to try to get action on these measures before the end of the session.

We are prepared to insist that action be taken on these measures. I will just conclude by reading some of the comments of children. These are the words of Columbine students who witnessed a horrible tragedy last year. This is a quote from Valeen Schnurr:

The nights are always the worst. Inevitably, I find my thoughts drifting into nightmares, terrifying images of the library at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. The sound of students screaming as explosive and gunshots echo through the school; the burning pain of the bullets penetrating my body; the sound of my voice professing my faith in God; seeing my hands fill with my own

blood; and my friend Lauren Townsend lying lifeless beside me as I try to wake her.

In the mornings when I look in the mirror, the scars I see on my arms and upper body always remind me that it's not just a nightmare, but the memory of a real event that will stay with me for the rest of my life. The scars are a part of me now, but they help me to remember that I've been blessed with a second chance at life.

From Garrett Looney:

I've never been ashamed to be an athlete. I started playing football when I was eight, and baseball and basketball too. This spring, I'll run track. Sports have always been part of me. \* \* \*

I'd been in the library that day, about 11 a.m., making some copies. Then I left with friends for lunch. We were heading back to school and thought there was a bad wreck because a fireman stopped us. We went to Clement Park, next to Columbine, and saw a sea of kids running from the building. We couldn't believe it. It's beyond me how two kids could go that crazy. \* \* \*

A friend of mine, Corey Depooter was killed. I had one [woodworking] class with him, and we did projects together. It was hard going back to that class. The seniors on the football team took memorial pictures of a columbine flower to the victims' houses, including Mrs. Depooter's. She wanted to know how we were doing and told us stories about Corey. That was tough for me.

The list goes on, Mr. President. Here is Nicole Nowlen:

I was only at Columbine for seven weeks before (the shooting). My parents are divorced, and I had been living in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., with my mother and younger brother, Adam. When my mom moved to California, I chose to live with my dad in Colorado. \* \* \*

On April 20, I was sitting alone at a table in the library doing my math homework when this girl ran in and yelled, "There are guys with guns downstairs!" I thought it was a senior prank. \* \* \*

The time seemed to go in slow motion. And then they came in.

I don't remember much until they got over into our area. I could see John watching where they were walking. I was trying to pick up expressions from his face, and I could hear them walking over to this table full of girls next to us. I remember this gun going off, and one of the gunmen saying, "Do you believe in God?" And I remember thinking, "These people are sick."

The stories go on.

We have had Paducah, KY. We have had Jonesboro, AR. We have had Columbine. Those who forget history are fated to repeat it. We have failed to take action. America has witnessed these shootings over the years. Every single day in cities, in communities, in rural areas, 12 children die. These are dramatic incidents which catch the heart, as they should, and the soul of every American, and it is happening every single day.

We can make a difference. We can reduce these incidents. Perhaps we cannot eliminate them all, but we can reduce significantly the total number of children who are lost every day. We fail to reduce the number if we refuse to take action in this area.

I hope the Senate will go on record in support of the Daschle sense-of-the-Senate amendment. I hope this will just be the beginning. I know it will be for many of our colleagues, including

my two dear friends, the Senators from California and Illinois, who have been providing leadership for our Nation in this area. We are going to respond to the Million Mom March. They asked for action. We committed ourselves to taking action.

I look forward to working with them and others in making every effort we possibly can to reduce the proliferation of weapons that should not be available to children in this country. We can make a difference. I look forward to working with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 30 minutes have expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his remarks. I know he watched with great pride while KERRY, KENNEDY, Cuomo, and Kathleen Kennedy Townsend spoke at the Million Mom March with hearts full. I know the people who came to that march, particularly those who witnessed and experienced pain, loss, and suffering have inspired people across the country.

I say to my friend, before I yield time to my friend from Illinois, that he is powerful on this issue. He is a powerful spokesperson for the children of this Nation. I was so happy he chose to come over here tonight. It is late in the evening. I know we will work together, as so many of us will on this side of the aisle, and hopefully a couple from the other, in making sure those moms who gave up their Mother's Day for a cause that is so important will be commended by this Senate. For goodness' sake, will be commended. As Hillary Clinton said, they did not care about the flowers; they did not care about the fancy dinners or breakfast in bed. They gave up their Mother's Day to march for something that was very important to them, more important than anything else: the safety of their children and the safety of the communities' children.

I say to my friend, thank you for making this point over and over. The other side seems to be fearful of these moms. Why don't they vote down our resolution if they do not like it? No, they stalled 5 hours because they wanted the clock to tick, and they are not even here to debate us on this amendment.

We voted out sensible gun measures. What are they afraid of, I ask my friend from Massachusetts? Sensible gun measures passed the Senate—child safety locks, background checks at gun shows, the banning of the superlarge capacity clips, a study to investigate how the gun manufacturers are marketing to our children, and changing the age at which one can buy an assault weapon from 18 to 21. A few of them crossed over, and this Senate voted for those measures.

Before my friend leaves, I want to ask him this question, and then I will yield as much time as he would like to the Senator from Illinois. I wonder if my friend can explain to me, because he has been around here a long time, of

what are they afraid? Why don't they just vote it down? Why don't they just say: No, we don't want to commend the moms; no, we don't want to bring these commonsense gun laws to the Senate? Why are they using every parliamentary trick not to have to vote on that?

Mr. KENNEDY. I say to the Senator from California, it defies every logical explanation. The alleged explanation is that we do not need these additional laws; what we need is the enforcement of existing laws; why waste our time on the floor of the Senate in considering these measures because if we dealt with these other measures, our problems would be resolved.

That is, of course, a flawed factual representation, as I mentioned, in terms of total prosecutions, and it is wrong in terms of fact, not only, as I mentioned, in total prosecutions, but it is wrong in terms of what can be done in States across this country.

I thank the Senator from California for raising these questions this evening for Americans. The question is, At least, why can't we vote? Why can't we vote? Why can't we have accountability? Why aren't they proud of their position? Why aren't they proud of their position and willing to take a stand on it? That is what this office is about: making choices and decisions; exercising some judgment. Why constantly try to frustrate the ability of Members to make some difference on this? I think that is the inexcusable position which hopefully the American public will find unacceptable in the remaining weeks of this session and, if not, then during the election.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend and yield as much time as he will consume to my friend from Illinois. If he is still going in 30 minutes, perhaps he would then wrap up in the next 15, and I would conclude this side's debate.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from California.

I salute my colleague from the State of Massachusetts. Senator KENNEDY has been the leader on so many issues throughout his political career. You can almost count on it: It is late at night—7:30 p.m. on the Senate floor. Very few Senators are still around to debate this important issue. But Senator KENNEDY, who has become legendary in his commitment to issues in the Senate, stayed for this important debate. I am honored to share the floor with him. I am honored to share the same position on this issue with my colleagues, Senator KENNEDY and Senator BOXER.

As Senator BOXER noted earlier, at the Million Mom March in Washington, there were several members of Senator KENNEDY's family who came and spoke about what gun violence has meant to them. America knows that story. America knows it so well. America knows of the assassination of President John Kennedy, of the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy, and all the tragedies that have befallen that family. We know it because they are so

prominent in the American culture and the American political scene. We know, as well, that people with less prominent names, not that well known, have endured gun violence on a daily basis.

At the end of the Million Mom March, in Chicago, a spokesman for one of the group's sponsoring it, the Bell Campaign Fund, brought a bell near the stage and invited the families to come up and ring it if they had lost someone to gun violence in their family.

At first they were hesitant to come forward; and then more started to move forward. Finally, it became a long, long procession of young and old, of those who were not well dressed and those who were very well dressed, of rich and poor, of black and white and brown, of children and of the elderly. They came forward—hesitated—and rang the bell. They had lost someone in their family to gun violence.

As you watched this procession go by, anyone observing it could not help but think there but for the grace of God go I; it can happen to any family in America.

A nation of 270 million people, and a nation of over 200 million guns, a nation where every day we pick up a newspaper, turn on the radio, or turn on the television, to hear of another gun death. The sad reality is that we have become inured to it. We have become used to it. We think this is what life is like in the world. It is not. It is what life is like in America—in America, where we have failed to pass legislation for gun safety, to make the neighborhoods and the schools, the towns, and the cities across America safer places to live.

What calls our attention to this steady stream of information about gun violence is the most outrageous situations. For the last several years, the most outrageous gun violence has occurred in America's schools:

In February, 1997, in Bethel, AK, a 16-year-old boy took a shotgun and a bag of shells to school, killing the principal and a student and injuring two others.

On October 1, 1997, in Pearl, MS, a 16-year-old boy is sentenced to life in prison for killing his mother and then going to his high school and shooting nine students, two of them fatally.

On December 1, 1997, in West Paducah, KY, three students are killed, five others wounded at the high school; a 14-year-old student pleaded guilty—mentally ill—to murder.

On March 24, 1998, Jonesboro, AR—you will remember this one—four girls and a teacher killed and 10 people wounded at a middle school, when two boys, aged 11 and 13, fired from a nearby woods. They literally brought an arsenal of weapons and ammunition. They triggered the fire alarm bell. The kids ran out of the classroom and they opened fire.

America, 1998:

On April 24 of that year, in Edinboro, PA, a science teacher is killed in front of his students at an eighth grade dance. A 15-year-old pleaded guilty.

On May 19, 1998, in Fayetteville, TN, 3 days before graduation, an 18-year-old honors student opened fire at his high school, killing a classmate who was dating his ex-girlfriend.

On May 21, 1998, in Springfield, OR, two teenagers are killed and more than 20 hurt when a teenage boy opened fire at his high school, after killing his parents.

On April 20, 1999—the news story of the year in America; you may not have heard of the town before, but you know the name now—in Littleton, CO, two students at Columbine High School killed 12 of their classmates and a teacher and wounded 23 others before killing themselves.

That was supposed to be the gun tragedy that turned this issue around. Congress was supposed to wake up at that point and finally do something to protect America from gun violence.

Of course, we considered legislation on the floor of the Senate, and it was a long, painful debate. The bill finally came up before us, and on a vote of 49–49—a tie vote—Vice President GORE came to this Chamber, cast the tie-breaking vote, and we passed a gun safety bill which, under the Constitution, then went to the House of Representatives across the Rotunda.

Was this a radical bill? Was this something so outlandish that we could not expect the House of Representatives to consider it? I do not think so. Forty-eight of my colleagues and myself believed it was a sensible gun control measure.

What did it say?

If you buy a gun at a gun show, we want to make sure you can legally own it.

If you have a criminal record, we do not want you to buy it.

If you are a child, we do not want you to buy it.

If you have a restraining order because of domestic violence or something else, we do not want you to buy it.

If you have a history of violent mental illness, we do not want you to buy a gun.

We want to check your background and make sure you do not have a problem where you should not own a gun.

Is this a radical idea, keeping guns out of the hands of people who are criminals? The Brady law, which we passed in America, has kept guns out of the hands of hundreds of thousands of people such as those I described. And you think to yourself: Come on now, somebody convicted of a murder surely is not going to walk into a Federal gun dealer and try to buy a gun. Yes, they do it—time and time again.

Nobody said they were rocket scientists. They are people who were criminals and want to be criminals again. They may not be very bright, but they are smart enough to know they need another gun to pull off another crime.

We stop them with the Brady law. But the Brady law does not apply to

gun shows. Gun shows across America are a loophole; they are exempt. You buy what you want at a gun show and nobody checks. Think about that. Even the least intelligent criminal will figure that out: Go to a gun show and get your gun. Do not go to a dealer. The dealer is going to check it out, find out if you have a criminal record.

So we said, in this gun safety law, let's do a background check at gun shows. Let's apply this same law we apply to gun dealers. That is not a radical idea. It is common sense.

Senator KOHL of Wisconsin had an amendment—part of this bill—that every handgun in America would be sold with a trigger lock, a child safety device.

It is interesting. We have many sportsmen and hunters in my family. They are strong in the belief that this is their right to own a gun; and I do not dispute it. But they are also strong in the belief that they never want their gun to harm anyone else, any innocent victim. They certainly do not want their gun to harm a child. Now they are turning around and buying trigger locks. I am glad they are.

Senator KOHL says, from now on, every handgun sold in America will have a trigger lock so that the parent who puts their gun up on the top shelf of the closet, thinking their little son or daughter will never find it—they may be wrong, but the child may be safe because with the trigger lock the child will not be able to fire the gun.

That is not a radical idea. That is part of gun safety. In fact, if there had been trigger locks in Jonesboro, AR, maybe these kids could not have taken the guns out in the woods, with an 11-year-old kid firing away at teachers and classmates.

No. I think, quite honestly, we all believe that if you are going to exercise any right to own a gun, you should exercise the responsibility to store it safely, securely, and away from children.

That is part of the bill sent to the House, a bill which still languishes. Senator FEINSTEIN of California has a provision that says you don't need a huge ammo clip with literally hundreds of rounds of ammunition for any sport or any hunting. So as you cannot manufacture them in America, you should not be able to import them from overseas. That doesn't sound radical to me. I don't know many people who need a hundred rounds to go out and kill a deer. As I have said many times, if you need an assault weapon to kill a deer, maybe you ought to stick to fishing. But the fact is, Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment was adopted as part of the bill.

We had an amendment by a Republican, Senator JOHN ASHCROFT of Missouri, that would limit who could buy semiautomatic assault weapons—certainly making sure that those under age of 18 cannot—and establishing an age of 21. We had an amendment by Senator BOXER to have the FTC and



the Attorney General investigate whether gun companies were trying to attract young buyers, underage buyers, with their advertising.

That is it. I have just described the entire gun safety bill. Did you hear anything that is patently unconstitutional, so radical and outlandish that we should not consider it in America? I don't think so. In that amendment, we have basic, commonsense efforts to make America safer. I am not so naive as to believe that we are going to end gun violence by passing this bill, but we think it will help. We certainly have an obligation to help. We passed that bill in the Senate, sent it over to the House, and the National Rifle Association tore it to pieces, passed a weak substitute, sent it to a conference committee where it has sat for 8 months, since Columbine High School. We have had all sorts of meetings on the floor of the Senate and in the House, all sorts of debates and committee meetings, all sorts of press conferences, and we have done absolutely nothing to make America safer when it comes to gun violence.

What do we have to show for it? Since Columbine High School, on May 20, 1999, in Conyers, GA, a 15-old-boy opened fire in a high school with a .357 caliber handgun and a rifle wounding six students.

On November 19, 1999, in Deming, NM, a 13-year-old girl was shot in the head at school and died the next day. A 12-year-old boy was arrested.

On December 6, 1999, at Fort Gibson, OK, a 13-year-old student fired at least 15 rounds in a middle school wounding four classmates. Asked why he did it, he said, "I don't know."

February 29, 2000, is one you won't forget. At Mount Morris Township, MI, a 6-year-old boy pulled a .32 caliber Davis Industry semiautomatic pistol out of his pocket, pointed it at a classmate, turned the gun on Kayla Roland, a little 6-year-old girl, and fatally shot her in the neck.

That is America since Columbine. America, unfortunately, is very busy with gun violence but, sadly, the Congress is not busy with legislation to reduce and end gun violence. So today, Senator DASCHLE came to the floor with a suggestion, one which obviously did not set well with the Republican majority. Senator DASCHLE suggested that we pass a resolution—and I want to read the language—that it is the sense of the Senate that the organizers, sponsors, and participants of the Million Mom March should be commended for rallying to demand sensible gun safety legislation, and Congress should immediately pass the conference report to accompany H.R. 1501—the bill I described, the gun safety bill—that includes all the provisions that I described, and do so as soon as possible.

With those two suggestions, the Republican majority stopped the Senate for 5 straight hours. They would not have this Senate vote to commend the organizers and mothers who partici-

pated in the Million Mom March, and they did not want this Congress to go on the record to pass gun safety legislation for 5 hours. They tried every parliamentary trick they could to stop this, and then when they found we were determined to bring this to a vote, they finally relented at about 3 o'clock. They said: All right, you can debate it a couple hours tonight and a couple hours tomorrow. That is why we are here.

I salute Senator BOXER of California. As you can tell, many Members of the Senate had other things they wanted to do. But she and I and Senator KENNEDY and so many others believe that after we have seen what those mothers went through to put together that march to come out and ask us to pass sensible legislation, we owed it to them to be here this evening and speak to it.

Let me talk about two or three issues that will come up in this debate. The National Rifle Association spent a substantial sum of money last week on television in preparation for the Million Mom March. They ran a lot of ads showing a member of their board of directors—a woman—who articulated their point of view, as well as their personal hero, Mr. Charlton Heston. They said during the course of these ads that what we need in America to reduce the killing of 12 or 13 children a day is more education. They use something called Eddie Eagle, which is like Joe Camel, for the NRA. It is a little symbol they use to try to attract children's attention with it. They say if we have more Eddie Eagle training in schools, we will have fewer gun deaths.

Well, this may surprise some, but I don't disagree with the NRA, to some extent. If they are suggesting we should teach children that guns are dangerous and they ought to stay away from them, I salute that and agree with that. In a nation of 200 million guns, we should do that. Members of my staff in Chicago and in Washington sit down with 4- and 5-year-old children and explain to them that guns are dangerous. You have to do it in America. Even if there is not a gun in your home, you don't know where your child may be playing or whether their classmate is going to find a gun. You should tell them that. It is a reality.

But if the National Rifle Association thinks education of children to reduce gun violence means teaching kids to shoot straight, that is where I part company with them. I don't think kids should be handling firearms. I think firearms should be in the hands of adults who understand the danger of a weapon. I go along with the National Rifle Association if they want to join us in educating children in school about the danger of firearms. That makes sense. Maybe we can find some common ground on that.

The second thing the NRA tells us is we have all the laws we need. All the States have laws, some of the cities have laws, and the Federal Government has all the laws it needs and, for good-

ness' sake, just enforce the law. This may surprise the NRA, but I don't disagree with that either. We should enforce the laws. In fact, we find that when it comes to the number of high-level firearm offenders, those sentenced to 5 or more years, Federal prosecution of those offenders has gone up 41 percent under this administration. The average sentence for firearm offenders in Federal court has increased by more than 2 years in that same period of time. Enforcement is taking place. Should there be more? Yes, and I will support that, too.

But let me tell you, there was an interesting vote on the floor. One of the Senators who opposed my motion on the floor is here this evening. When it came to enforcement, I asked those who are friends of the National Rifle Association to put their votes where their rhetoric happened to be. I asked them if they would join me in supporting President Clinton, who asked for 500 more agents at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to investigate firearms dealers who were violating the law and to make sure that we kept an eye on the people who were selling the weapons, and a thousand more prosecutors and judges and others across America to prosecute the same gun laws. I offered the amendment on the floor, and one of the Senators, who is here and is a member of the board of directors—or was—of the NRA, amended it and said take out the part on the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the 500 additional agents, and then we will vote for it.

So that really calls into question their sincerity when they say they want more enforcement. It turns out a very small percentage of firearms dealers in America actually sell guns used in crimes. Most of them abide by the law. We want to stop the ones who violate the law. When I tried to put more agents at work to do that, I was stopped by a Republican Senator who says he believes in the second amendment but wants enforcement but he would not vote for 500 ATF agents for more enforcement.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I think the Senator makes a very important point here. When we call for sensible gun laws, the other side gets up and says we can handle it all with enforcement. Do you know what we say? Excellent idea—enforcement and sensible gun laws. Let's join hands and do it all; that is what we need to protect our people. Yet as my friend says, when he attempted to do just that, the other side found fault with it.

I want to ask my friend if he is aware of what the Republican Appropriations Committee did on the House side with a number of Capitol Police officers? I know my friend is just as distressed. I discussed this with him.

We lost two beautiful Capitol Police officers. What were they doing? They



were protecting the people in this building. They were protecting the Members of the House and the Senate, and they were shot down in the prime of their lives. They have magnificent families. We went to a funeral. We all cried. Republicans and Democrats cried tears. Now what happens? The people who want the enforcement, what have they done on the House side?

Mr. DURBIN. The House Appropriations Committee, barely 2 years after two Capitol policemen were killed protecting the Members of Congress and visitors in the Capitol Building, has proposed that we cut by 400 the number of Capitol Police working at the Capitol. It is an incredible suggestion. We have doors leading into the office buildings and into the Capitol that literally hundreds, if not thousands, of people pass through but where there is one security guard. Many believe there should be two at these doors that are the busiest.

Instead of enhancing the Capitol Police so they can do their job and be safe in doing it, the House Republican leadership called for cutting 400 Capitol policemen. That does not sound like good law enforcement and vigorous law enforcement. Just the opposite is true. They are suggesting, for more enforcement of the law, cutting back on the police after we had the terrible tragedy right here in the Capitol not that long ago.

Mrs. BOXER. The old expression is hackneyed now but "actions speak louder than words." I think when you stand up on the floor and you say, "More enforcement, more enforcement," then you cut 400 police officers out of this Capitol Police Force, and you go to Senator DURBIN's resolution on hiring more agents so we can crack down on the gun criminals, it doesn't add up. Something is not adding up here.

I have to say it is time we just spoke very directly about it. It is hard. It is hard to pick a fight, and it is hard to get into an argument and debate on the other side of the aisle because we don't control this Senate. But we have our rights. Senator DURBIN represents a very large State. I represent a very large State. People sent us here not to just sit back and do nothing but in fact to speak out.

I thank my friend, and he can continue for as long as he wishes tonight.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from California.

I also want to tell you that I think this issue is an important national issue in this Presidential campaign because I think what you hear from two candidates is a clear difference when it comes to dealing with sensible gun laws and gun safety.

Vice President GORE came to the Senate floor casting the deciding vote on the gun safety bill, which I mentioned earlier. He has supported it publicly. He has spoken in favor of it. I believe it is fair to say he has supported the Brady law, he has supported the as-

sault weapon ban, and he has supported efforts to have a waiting period so people do not in a high state of emotion go out and buy a gun and harm themselves or others. That is a matter of record. That is his position.

On the other side, the Governor of Texas, George W. Bush, has a much different record. In his State, he signed into law a concealed weapon law which allows people to carry guns into churches and synagogues.

There are people who believe we will be a safer nation if everybody carries a gun. I am not one of them. I happen to believe we are not a safer nation when the couple is arguing across the restaurant and you have to wonder whether or not someone is going to reach into their pocket or purse and pull out a gun.

I don't happen to believe we are a safer nation whenever a policeman who pulls a car over is doubly worried and concerned that that speeder may have a gun in the glove compartment instead of the registration they are apparently going after.

I don't believe we are a safer nation when people are carrying guns to public events, such as high school football games, or are taking them into churches. I don't believe that makes America safer.

Governor Bush signed a law in Texas so people would have a right in the State of Texas to carry guns around. That is his image of a safer America; it is not mine. I am glad my State of Illinois has not passed such a law, and I hope we never do.

In addition, it appears that one of the problems the Republican Party has with our gun safety bill is that we require background checks at gun shows. Which State has more gun shows than any other State in the Nation? The State of Texas. The provision in the law—the loophole in the Brady law—which said you don't do a background check at a gun show was put in by a Democratic Texas Congressman. It is an important industry, I take it, in the State of Texas to preserve these gun laws. It may be the reason Governor Bush will not come out and support the gun safety law which passed in the Senate with Vice President GORE's tie-breaking vote.

Finally, the day before the Million Mom March weekend, Governor Bush came on television and said: I tell you what we are going to do in Texas. We are going to make a lot of trigger locks available. We are going to buy a lot of them and give them away.

I am glad he is doing it. I think it is a nice thing to do. It is certainly not a comprehensive attitude toward dealing with gun violence. I would like to see more communities and States do that. But certainly I would like to see Senator KOHL's amendment which requires a trigger lock with every gun as part of a law of the land, so that when you buy a handgun, it has a trigger lock and it has a child safety device. A once-in-a-lifetime or once-in-a-decade effort by a

Governor in any State won't make any difference unless it is in a comprehensive approach, as Senator KOHL has suggested.

It is interesting to note that when the Republican leadership is asked why they have failed in over 8 months to bring this gun safety legislation to the floor, they in the majority and in control of the House and Senate say it is the Democrats' fault. That is a little hard to understand. In fact, it is impossible to believe.

I have been appointed to conference committees in the Senate in name only where my name will be read by the President and only the conference committee of Republicans goes off and meets, adopts a conference committee report, signs it, and sends it back to the floor without even inviting me to attend a session. The Republican leadership majority could do that at any moment in time. To suggest that somehow the Democrats are stopping them from bringing a gun safety bill out of committee and to the floor just defies common sense. They are in control. They have to accept responsibility for their actions.

Senator ORRIN HATCH, a Republican of Utah, is the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He is the head conferee on the Senate side for the Republicans on this conference on gun safety. My colleague from the State of Illinois, Congressman HENRY HYDE, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, shares that responsibility with him. And the two of them have a majority of votes in this conference committee. If they wanted to bring a gun safety bill forward, there is nothing the Democrats could do to stop them from doing such. Yet they haven't done it. Eight months have passed, and more people have been shot and killed.

Stories come out suggesting to us there is much more to it. Unless and until Governor Bush decides this is an important issue in his Presidential campaign, unless and until Governor Bush decides he is for gun safety, that bill is going to stay in that conference committee. That is a simple political fact of life.

The Republicans on Capitol Hill don't want to embarrass their candidate for President by bringing out a bill he opposes. So the bill sits in this conference committee. And 750,000 mothers across America rallied in 65 different cities saying to Members of Congress, Members of the House and the Senate: For goodness' sake, can you put party aside for a moment and think about the safety of our children in schools? Can you put party aside for a moment and think about the safety of our neighborhoods so that we believe kids can stand at the bus stop without worrying about a gang banger coming by and spraying bullets? Can you put partisanship aside and decide that we can all agree we want to have background checks at gun shows, and trigger locks on handguns, and these huge ammo clips kept out of the country? Isn't it time Congress came together and agreed on

those basic simple things? The fact of the matter is, we have not, and apparently under this leadership we cannot.

The National Rifle Association is boasting that their membership is higher than ever. They love this, they say, because the more attention to this issue, the more people sign up for the National Rifle Association. More power to them. But I will tell you that if I had to put my political future with a group, it would be with the mothers who are marching and not with Wayne LaPierre and Charlton Heston. They represent the real feelings of families across America who understand that gun safety is important and that it includes not just the passage of laws to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and kids, but it also includes enforcement and it also includes education. All of it comes together.

The folks who listen to the NRA and believe them think that you stop once you talk about education and enforcement—that there is no reason to go beyond it. Yet we know better. We know those kids at Columbine High School got their guns from a gun show by a straw purchaser. We know it could have been more difficult if we had passed a law in the Senate and if it had been signed by President Clinton. We know that some of those lives might have been saved. Sadly, that didn't occur.

Now we are faced with the reality of a legislative session that is moving to the spending bills. It appears that the Republican leadership is not going to have its own agenda it wants passed but instead will move to appropriations bills, and in so doing, give us a chance, at least with sense-of-the-Senate resolutions, to continue to remind the Members of the Senate and people across America that we have not done anything to make this a safer nation when it comes to guns.

I understand, I think, the feelings of some gun owners. They feel put upon, that all this debate somehow involves them. Some of them have what I think is a naive, if not a wrong, point of view that they should not be inconvenienced in the ownership of their guns.

Let me suggest that we inconvenience a lot of people for a lot of good reasons in America. I was inconvenienced this morning when I went through the airport. I had to go through a metal detector. It is an inconvenience. I expect, because I want to sit on the plane with peace of mind, to know that every effort has been made to keep those who would create some terrorist environment off the plane. I am inconvenienced when I drive my car by the rules of the road of Illinois—thank goodness for the inconveniences—which require brakes on my car and require me to stay on the right-hand side of the road and abide by the speed limit. It is an inconvenience I accept because I want to bring my family home safely.

I think most gun owners are prepared to accept some inconvenience in life if

they know it means they can continue to use their guns legally and safely. In my home State of Illinois, it is a firearms identification card; you have to apply to the Illinois State Police. They do a background check on you. They give you a little card. You can't buy a gun or ammunition in Illinois without that card with your picture on it.

I don't own a gun, but I applied for one of these cards. I wanted to know how tough it was. It wasn't too tough: Fill out a questionnaire, give them a little photo, they do a background check, send me my card, and I send them a few bucks every year to renew it. That is a device that could be used on a national basis. It has been an inconvenience for the gun owners of Illinois for 40 years now but not such a serious inconvenience that they cannot go out and enjoy sports that involve guns.

We are talking about minor inconveniences with major dividends for America. Background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and fugitives and stalkers and kids so we don't have the sad situations that I recounted earlier in the schools and other places across America, these are things of common sense. These are things which, frankly, both parties should agree.

It is interesting to note that the Republican substitute to our amendment commending the Million Mom March spends a full page or so blasting the Clinton administration for the inadequate prosecution for gun crimes. As I read earlier, the statistics don't back up some of the claims they have made. Instead of commending the million moms who stood up saying, "Make America safer," the Republicans have replied by blasting the first family. That is their idea—go after President Clinton; don't stand up for the families across America who came together last Sunday.

Then they say they want a juvenile crime conference committee report that has a lot more than guns in it. Quite frankly, there are some things they want with which I can agree. It is interesting they don't call for the gun safety amendments which were adopted by the Senate. Of course, they close by repeating their belief that it is a right of each law-abiding citizen to own a firearm for any legitimate purpose, including self-defense or recreation, and that should not be infringed. I don't think it is an infringement to put a basic requirement to try to keep guns in the hands of those who will use them safely, rather than those who would misuse them.

I thank my colleague from the State of California for her leadership on this particular debate. I was happy to join her this evening. I look forward to joining her tomorrow when at least we will have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution and an opportunity for a vote as to whether or not we should finally tell this conference committee to get down to business.

Mrs. BOXER. Before my friend leaves the floor, I want to ask him a question. Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

Mrs. BOXER. I believe Senator DURBIN has the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). Senator DURBIN has the time and did not yield to the Senator, so I recognize the Senator from Illinois. I thought he concluded his debate.

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. This is brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yields to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. This is very brief. I have been touched reading some of the comments that have come via the Internet on the Million Mom March web site. I simply read two which I think indicate why the Democratic proposal commending the Million Mom March is so on target. It speaks for so many people across America. I want to get a quick response from my colleague to these two very brief statements.

A woman from Mount Royal, NJ, writes:

I wholeheartedly support the Million Mom March. I lost my 25-year-old son in November of 1999 to a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the head. I firmly believe that he would still be here today if there would not have been a gun available to him. My prayers go out to all those who are marching on Washington.

And Elizabeth from North Carolina writes:

Five years ago my sister was murdered by her ex-husband in a courthouse that had no metal detectors. She had warned the court of his threats and they took his guns away. But because of the easy access to guns, he just went out and got another. And he used it to kill her in front of their 6-year-old child.

She says to the million moms:

God bless all of you for walking in this march and raising awareness of the horrible problem we have with gun violence on behalf of my sister and her child. I thank you all for caring.

I say to my friend before he leaves the floor tonight—he has been so generous to share his tremendous wisdom—isn't the reason the Democratic proposal, which praises the million moms for doing what they did, makes sense because people such as these have felt so alone? Is that my friend's perspective?

Mr. DURBIN. I say to my friend from California, I understand the sentiments expressed. Even in my own family, I have a sister-in-law who is interested in politics. We talk about it from time to time. She is the mother of 10 children and I think 20-plus grandchildren—I lost count. She decided when she heard about this Million Mom March that she was going to be here in Washington on The Mall last Sunday. She called every woman in the family and said: We are all going down on Metro together. They did.

The same thing happened with other people in my Chicago office. There was a feeling of mothers across America that this was a special moment and

that they were going to take time away from their families, away from what was their day, Mother's Day, and come down and be with so many others.

I was in Chicago. I know the Senator from California was here in Washington and was touched by what occurred on The Mall gathering.

That is a sentiment growing in America. My Republican colleagues should think twice about criticizing this resolution where we commend these mothers who had the courage to come forward because they believe so passionately on this issue.

When it comes to the question raised by the other person who e-mailed or contacted your office about the accessibility of guns, they are easily acceptable. The District of Columbia has strong, strong, anti-gun laws in terms of ownership possession. Yet you go right across the bridge into Virginia or over the line into Maryland and you can purchase guns that end up coming right in to crime scenes here in Washington, DC.

It is naive to believe that State laws are going to control this traffic in guns. In fact, when they did a survey in Illinois of guns confiscated in crimes and their origin, where they were from—they traced them with the gun numbers and such—they found the No. 1 State for sending crime guns to the State of Illinois was the home State of the majority leader of the Senate, the State of Mississippi. Of all places, Mississippi. Why? It is easier to buy guns there. They buy them, they throw them in the backs of trucks and trunks of cars and take off for Chicago or Boston or wherever it happens to be.

This steady trafficking, in many cases illegal trafficking of these guns, needs to be better policed, and we need to ensure we understand that these guns move across borders at will. I would say to the Senator from California, the experience of the second lady who contacted you, when a person who was not supposed to have a gun had easy access, really speaks to the issue of the proliferation of guns in America, and their easy access not only to the violent and the criminal but also kids.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 39 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I retain my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I want to use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am compelled to speak at this point. I am really disturbed about the direction the conversation—I will not call it a debate—is going. I think the American public needs to know what is going on here.

At the moment, the bill that is on the floor is the military construction

appropriations bill—not gun control. You might be confused, if you have been listening to the debate. We are on the military construction appropriations bill. This is the bill that provides for the national security and promotes the national defense. This is the bill that builds things for the military, to make sure we have a strong military. This is the bill that builds the dormitories and the housing for our military people so they have the morale to stay in the military and do the job of protecting us.

We are debating the military construction bill. It is the bill that takes care of some of the problems on military bases where there has been pollution. A lot of it we did not know was pollution at the time it happened, but we recognize the need to take care of the environment, and this bill takes care of the environment—if we can ever get around to it and get it passed. But it sounds as if we are having a gun debate.

This bill, the military construction appropriations bill that we are considering, is the bill that handles our basic military construction needs. It is not about schools. It is not about gun control. It is about taking care of our military in a responsible and timely way. That is what is going to be happening with appropriations bill after appropriations bill. We do 13 of them. It takes us about a week to do an appropriations bill. It is tough to get them done by October 1, when the next appropriation starts. It is very important that we be expeditious in the work of the appropriations bills.

We have trouble passing appropriations every year. There is always a mini filibuster done on appropriations. My friends across the aisle would prefer the President set the appropriations for this country. That is not what the Constitution says. The Congress of the United States sets the appropriations. We can do it, and we can do it in a timely fashion, as long as there is not a filibuster.

Filibusters come in different forms. One of the filibusters you see is this gun control legislation that has been thrust into the military construction bill. Another form of it is putting 100 different amendments down on an appropriations bill and expecting to be able to debate each and every one. Those are all attempts to delay the appropriations process and put the process in the hands of the President. I want the American public to know that the responsible way, the constitutional way, is for this Congress to pass a budget.

As to the debate we are having tonight, why didn't we just agree to have a vote on the sense of the Senate and get on with the business of appropriations? This is a very important point. We cannot set new precedent for people to be able to delay the appropriations process, and that is what we are talking about.

Last year we passed rule XVI. We made rule XVI valid again. The purpose of that process that we went through, a very difficult process, was to say you cannot legislate on appropriations bills. You cannot do that because we are not going to have every piece of legislation that everybody would like to have passed that they cannot get through the regular process brought up as a simple amendment to an appropriations bill and debated for hours and hours and hours. If we are going to get the appropriations process done, it has to be according to the rules. We had a rule, rule XVI, that said you could not legislate on an appropriations bill. It had been kind of set aside. Last year, we put it back into effect so we could expedite the appropriations process.

OK, there is a way around that. There is not anything that really addresses if you offer a sense-of-the-Senate amendment on an appropriations bill. Perhaps that is a way to back-door some of these other debates. We are not going to do it. We said you cannot legislate on it, we are not going to let you back-door legislate on it at the moment. That is what we are talking about here, a sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

If I had my way, we would not do sense-of-the-Senate amendments. Sense-of-the-Senate amendments are our opinion as reflected in time crunches, which means they do not mean anything. They are used a lot because if somebody passes a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, you will hear them up here frequently saying: I passed that sense-of-the-Senate amendment 100 to nothing, and that means the Senate wants it. What they did was pass it 100 to nothing to get it out of the way so we could get to another issue, perhaps a real issue. The sense of the Senate does not get negotiated with the House folks. It is just something we pass so we can feel good.

That is what this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is; it is something that will make us feel good. There is violence in this country, and it is important to end violence. But we are not talking about whether or not we are doing that. We are talking about whether we are going to have an appropriations process that can be done responsibly, without all kinds of other issues being thrown into the process, willy-nilly, to hold up the process so the President can decide, with Congress, how the appropriations are going to go. So earlier tonight you saw a lot of procedural motions. Those were motions to make sure that the sense of the Senate could be voted on, that a new precedent could be set for how we are going to do appropriations bills around here. That is why we have been so adamant at making sure there are votes. In order to get a vote on germaneness, we had to concede 8 hours of debate time. Instead of talking about military construction and getting the bill passed, completing the amendments to it—instead of that, we agreed

we would do 4 hours of debate on each of two amendments, so we could get to some votes.

You saw what happened earlier—endless quorum calls. Every time there was one of those quorum calls, we did not have to go quite as formal. The other side likes these filibusters to be a bit more subtle, so instead we just have to do a quorum count. We had to actually show on the lists up there that the people were here. It was not an actual vote. It only took about 7 minutes each time one of those procedural quorum calls was called. But it did not just delay 7 minutes; it kept a vote from happening. And that is the strategy: Filibuster the appropriations, put it in the hands of the President, set a new precedent so we have additional opportunities to set it back.

It is about time Congress went to a biennial budget, a budget that we do every other year so we do not get in this time crunch every year; so we do not get under the gun and put things into appropriations that ought not be there; so we can have the best possible debate every other year and get the best possible biennial budget and appropriation that we can and, in the in-between year, have a chance to see how the people are spending that money and making sure it is according to the way Congress appropriated it.

We have concentrated on guns in the debate tonight. As I have pointed out, the bill we are debating is military construction. Everyone that I know is sensitive to the violence issue in this country. We need to do something about that violence. Since it has been brought up as the single solution being gun control, and the Democrats are willing to concede that perhaps a little enforcement might help out and are using statistics about a 40-percent increase in the amount of Federal enforcement that has been done—it is pretty easy if you only have 9 one year to get 40 percent the next year, especially with the crew we have to do the enforcement.

They ought to be embarrassed about the enforcement. Neither of these things are the solution. We have to quit trying to treat the symptoms. We have to get to the heart of violence, and the heart of violence is that we lack a sense of community. We have lost a sense of community.

I am from Wyoming, and I get back to Wyoming almost every weekend. I travel 300 to 500 miles around the State going to all kinds of towns—small towns, big cities. In Wyoming, the big cities are 50,000 people. One can drive out of that city and see the whole city at one time. It is not another town running into another town into another town.

Some of the communities I visit are listed on the Wyoming highway map as having zero population. That really irritates the two people who live there, but they are counted in the county population rather than the city population. When my wife and I go to those

towns, we call ahead and talk to those two people and say: Can you invite a few of your friends over so we can hear what is on your minds? When we get there, there will be 20 to 30 people at that place ready to give their opinion because they have seen a lot of stuff on television with which they do not agree. They have seen polls in which we believe, and they want me to know the right way.

I challenge any other Senator to beat that percentage of attendance: zero population, 30 people. Give it a try. The average town in my State is 250 people. They turn out well, too. When I go to a town of 250, I usually get to talk with 80 percent of the people who are there. I do not even know what size building I would have to have in Los Angeles to talk to 80 percent of the people, but we can do that in Wyoming, and we do.

They do not think handling the symptom of guns or enforcement is the answer. They are a little distressed at the lack of sense of community. They have a strong sense of community. They know their neighbors. They talk to their neighbors regularly. They respect their neighbors, and they have this community they can see. Wyoming is an example for the Nation when it comes to community.

We are worried about it there, too. Television has made a tremendous difference in this country. We are not trying to outlaw television. That would cause the biggest uproar this country has ever heard. I can tell from some of the satellite TV and cable TV problems we have that it is the most important thing in the minds of many people in America.

What does television do? It turns everybody inward. Part of the time I was growing up, we did not have television. Then we got a black and white television set. I watched this tremendous progression of television. It was a fascinating technology with fascinating new capabilities.

Television has turned us inward. When I was growing up, there were not many channels from which to select, but there were different programs that different members of the family wanted to see. We had a discussion, a debate, a family decision on what we were going to watch. There was interaction in the family. That is part of community.

Today we have the Internet. Not only can the child go to his or her own room and watch his or her own television set; they can go to their room, and if they do not like what is on television, they can go on the Internet. Again, it is turned inward, perhaps a little more outward than television because one can get into chatrooms.

I suggest to parents—and I know a lot are watching what their kids do with television and on the Internet—talking to somebody in a chatroom is not the same as talking to them in person. It is talking to a computer game. It is talking to yourself with some interaction, and that is turning us inward.

My daughter is a teacher. She is an outstanding teacher of seventh and ninth grade English in Gillette, WY. She has been a little distressed over the last year at some of the things she has seen happening even in Wyoming. I know it is nothing compared to what is happening in the rest of the Nation. There was a knife incident in her school, and she went through the entire enforcement process. It was a very disturbing experience and maybe a reason at some point in the near future for her to quit teaching. It is a very difficult process.

I have talked with her about guns, violence, and what we can do about it. I have received a lot of good suggestions from her and the students. Again, we find this inward turning, this lack of community, this lack of respect as being one of the big problems.

I am very proud of my wife. I have to mention her, too. This last weekend when I was in Wyoming, I went to the University of Wyoming and watched her receive her master's degree. She has been working on that for several years, while we have been in Washington, on the Internet taking it from the University of Wyoming. It is very difficult, but it is a way one can pick up a degree no matter where in the world one is. Even when we were traveling, she could go online and make the class times she had to make. It was difficult but doable.

I congratulate her for her efforts. Her master's degree is in adult education. She has done some teaching in high school before. One of her views is that one of the things we ought to have in schools is a course called "Life's Not Fair and What To Do About It." We are so busy in this country giving people rights. We have the Bill of Rights, but we are giving out a lot of other rights. Unfortunately, I think we have given the kids of this country the impression that they have the right to everything for themselves, and if they do not get that right, they can take it out on others.

There are a number of different ways they can do that. They can sue. If they fall down and hurt themselves, it is not their fault anymore. It is somebody else's fault and they have to concentrate on how much money they can get from them for themselves. Life is not fair. We have kids across this country who are saying life is not fair and I am going to hurt somebody because they have hurt me internally. In fact, they even kill people over that. Somehow we have to get the message out to each and every kid. We have lost a whole generation of kids. There is a whole generation of them who have not had the message they are not supposed to hurt other people, and they are definitely not supposed to kill them. That is a message we are missing.

I know the first thing a lot of people are going to do is jump up and say: But we have all these working mothers now. If they did not have to work, they could take better care of their kids. I

am not going to let them off with that excuse.

We just had Mother's Day, and that ought to be the most special day in the world. We ought to listen to what every mother has in the way of instruction—the mothers who marched and the mothers with whom we celebrated.

One of the most important lessons is listen to your mother. My mom is in Washington right now. She has had a tremendous influence on my life, and she was a working mother. She and my dad had a shoe store, a small business. If there are people who think owning a business is the easy way of life, they need to do a business plan and take a look at small business. The only people who do not get off when they need to or want to are the people who own the business. They are the ones locked into a schedule. The people who work for them have more flexibility because, as a businessowner, you do not want them to quit and not have any help. If you have your own business, you work interminable hours because it is everything you have. Until one has gone through the agony of figuring out how to pay the bills in a small business, one really cannot appreciate what a small businessman goes through.

My mom worked at the shoe store. She did the books for the store and had to spend a lot of time at it. So did my dad. But my sister and I, I do not think, turned out too bad.

My sister is really the smart one in the family. She is a CPA. She is the business manager for a school district in Sheridan, WY, and does just outstanding work. She understands numbers far better than I do. She is the more capable one in our family.

But I am proud of my mother and the way she brought us up. And my wife, all of the time our kids were growing up, was a working mother. We also had shoe stores. We also had to go through that pain and agony of making sure we could meet payrolls all the time and that we could get all the work done.

I am really proud of my kids. Her working did not destroy my kids. In fact, it may have aided my kids, as my mother working aided me.

It is very difficult to work and do all of those things and have special time with your kids. I really think that is the key—special time. That does not have to be a whole day. In fact, I would challenge anybody to spend a whole day of special time, unless they are doing it in an entertainment mode, in which case they are looking at something else other than their kids.

I would suggest that you have some family traditions. One of our family traditions, both when I was growing up and with my family, was to have one meal a day that you had together—not optional; not with TV—one meal a day together; one opportunity during that day to ask, what did you do, or what are you going to do, to compare notes, to find out and, most importantly, to show a little bit of concern for that child or that spouse—a time that is un-

interrupted, 5 minutes, 10 minutes—I do not know how long it takes you to eat but enough time to compare notes just a little bit.

If you compare notes, I think it will drag out into a much longer time than 5 minutes or 10 minutes.

Another part of this is a respect for neighbors and teachers. This is part of community, too. With community, you have to have some respect for yourself, some self-responsibility. You also have to have respect for your family. You have to have that willingness to work together because everything isn't going to work out in a family just the way you would dream of it. Life is not fair in families, either. But families show their strength by working together when things are difficult.

When I was growing up, we respected our neighbors. Our neighbors were able to say: Hey, I saw your boy. I didn't like what he was doing. No punishment was necessary because I changed immediately because I respected that neighbor, too.

The same thing for teachers in the classroom. One of the things my daughter does that I really like is, when she is teaching and she has a big assignment that is supposed to be turned in, she calls the parents of those students who did not turn in the paper. It is a lot of extra effort.

The first time she did that, she called us, in tears. And she is near tears every time she does it. The reason she is near tears is because of the number of parents who say: So, what are you going to do about it? They put it back on her, as the teacher, when they have the complete control—or as much control as anybody has—of making sure their child does the work timely. It is part of community.

I got in trouble a little bit in Wyoming with some education things. At one time I checked and found out Wyoming was spending—this has been a few years ago—about \$5,600 a student per year. I suggested that one of the ways we could improve education was if we charged tuition, and then gave every kid a \$5,600 scholarship to cover the tuition that we charged.

And how did you earn the scholarship? All you had to do to earn the scholarship was show up, do your homework, and be good. Those are pretty weak criteria for getting \$5,600 a year. But those are some things that we need in school. We need the kids to show up; we need the kids to do their homework; and we need them to behave so they are not disrupting other people—pretty easy criteria. But that is part of that sense of community, again, that sense of knowing that the people you are going to school with have an equal right to learn.

When I have talked to a lot of the school classes—and we usually do that on Fridays when we get to Wyoming—I have found that you want to phrase your questions on what needs to be done very carefully. If you do not, what you get back from kids is: You are not

doing enough for us: We need; we need; we need. That is not the solution either.

In St. Louis, one of the things they did there—this was not done professionally at all, as I understand; I read about it in a book on communitarianism, which is what I am talking about—in the book, they said in St. Louis they sent out a questionnaire to the kids in the school and asked: What does our community need? What do you need? What does our community need? Which happens to be the right way to phrase that question.

They also had a little spot on the survey of what needed to be done where they could list if they were willing to work on it, and how they would work on it, and put their name and their address and their phone number. They expected a small return of these questionnaires. Instead, what they got was over 50 percent back, and over 50 percent of those had signatures on them saying they were willing to participate. And the city was smart enough to put them to work. They let them use the city hall for committee meetings and to go to work on the projects they suggested the community needed. There was a huge decrease in vandalism. There was a huge increase in caring for their fellow people.

The same book talks about Cincinnati. There they hired a professional to check and see why there was so much violence and so much destruction. The conclusion of the report was: A broken window left undone leads to a door that is left undone that leads to a kid who feels that nobody cares.

They are not interested in us having a bunch of debates back here in a fancy sort of way that sets a whole bunch more laws in place.

I would like to be able to tell you I have the solution to violence and that I have the perfect law that will take care of the violence problem in this country. But it isn't going to be done by law. You cannot make people behave. You have to have people who want to behave, to know that they are supposed to behave.

Something I also find when I talk to kids is that they believe the only publicity out there is the publicity about the bad kids and the bad incidents.

We just had a Congressional Awards Ceremony in Cheyenne, WY. The Congressional Awards Program is something that we all ought to understand because everybody has the right to that program. The U.S. Congress gives out two kinds of awards. They give out the Congressional Medal of Honor; that is usually to adults who have done something fantastic to help our country and our way of life and democracy. We also have the Congressional Awards. Those go to kids, kids who have done something for other people, kids who have helped out in their community, kids who have set goals and followed them, and the goals have to include volunteer work.

We have quite a few kids sign up for that in Wyoming. In fact, in most

years Wyoming has more kids who get the gold medal than any other State. I did not say on a per capita basis. I want to make sure that everybody understands, in Wyoming we have 480,000 people. So sometimes on a per capita basis it is pretty easy for us. We show up in all the bad statistics because one incident drives us to the top of the charts.

I want to mention that again. For congressional awards, in Wyoming we have more kids who get a gold medal than any other State—flat out numbers. About 3 years ago, there were 21 gold medals awarded in the United States. Fifteen of the kids receiving that gold medal were from Wyoming. We are very proud of the program. But the thing we like the most is kids say: We get good publicity for doing that. Good kids get good publicity. The more publicity there is that way, the more people get in the program. So we always have the largest program.

I spoke at a Boy Scout Week dinner in Cheyenne. Lots of letters, again, said: Thanks for saying good things about what we are doing.

I have gone on a lot longer than I anticipated going, and I particularly apologize for it because we are debating military construction. That is the bill we are considering—military construction appropriations.

I have to tell you a little bit about the new dollar, the golden dollar, the Wyoming dollar. Yes, to have a new dollar in the United States, it has to go through the Banking Committee. When they noticed we were running out of the Susan B. Anthony coins, they passed a resolution to do a new dollar. And then the battle started.

The resolution said it would have the image of a real woman, and every State has a number of women who are worthy to be on a coin. Trying to break the logjam, I nominated Sacajawea. She is a person of tremendous interest to the Presiding Officer because Sacajawea was born in Idaho. Sacajawea, of course, was kidnapped at a very young age in Idaho and taken to North Dakota. It was in North Dakota that she met up with Lewis and Clark and went across the United States and helped them out by using the skills, talents, and language she had learned as a child.

Without Sacajawea, the Lewis and Clark expedition would have fallen far short of its goal. It might not have even made it back to Idaho. But she helped with that. I love to go on and add that not only did she get to travel the entire West through that process, but even after the territory expedition, it is with great pleasure that I can say she chose to spend her last years in Wyoming.

People who have seen the West usually like to stay in Wyoming, if they possibly can. But kids in Kelly, WY, helped me promote Sacajawea and helped to get her on the coin. One of the schoolteachers wrote a song about her. His dad wrote a book about her

that we used as the evidence for her importance in the United States. Of course, we are coming up on the bicentennial of the Lewis and Clark expedition. So we are pleased that through the whole process, Sacajawea made it onto the coin, along with her baby. It is a lookback, but a look to the future, and it is the first time we put a baby on a coin.

When we had the golden dollar celebration in Kelly, WY, the local bank—well, there is no local bank in Kelly. The nearest town is Jackson, and the bank there arranged for an armored car to come to Kelly, WY, with some of the dollars. I know it was the first time an armored car had been there. But the bank was also so kind as to invite some of the kids from the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, which is where Sacajawea is buried, and also from the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho. We just had a great day celebrating it.

One of the things I noted was that part of Indian tradition is a thing called “dream catchers.” They are circular to represent endless time, and they have webs that go through them that would catch dreams and visions. It occurred to me that is a bit of what the dollar is; it is a dream catcher. It isn't any good just by itself. We call it the golden dollar, and it has been pointed out that it doesn't have gold in it. It is colored gold, distinctly from the quarter. It has smooth edges so you can tell it from the quarter. But it is a dream catcher. You have to use it in order to make a difference.

Kids understand that. They know that helping other people with their dreams makes one's own dreams come true. Sometimes that is done through dollars. I mention this because, again, we are in the appropriations process. That is where we deal with dollars—trillions of dollars. It is very important that we spend those dollars as well as possible. And we are not going to get the process done if we are diverted onto a whole bunch of sense-of-the-Senate amendments, which are used a few times by people who say, “I got that through 100-0,” or whatever the number is. Most of them pass 100-0 because the words on them don't mean anything, except a vocal display.

So I hope we can keep the discussion relevant and make sure we can do the business of the United States—the dream catching of the United States—and get our appropriations process done.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I ask if there are other speakers on the other side this evening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I believe there is one other speaker on the Republican side who wishes to speak. We may want to propound the necessary language to close the Senate down, which would allow the Senator to complete her expressions for the evening.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to do that, but I don't have the particular language in front of me at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). It is not available yet. The Senator may continue with her remarks.

Mrs. BOXER. I appreciate that. How much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 39 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I don't intend to use the entire time. At the appropriate moment, I will be happy to make that unanimous consent request.

I want to say to the Senator from Wyoming I really enjoyed listening to him, and much of what he said I agree with. But I have to say that, as my friend explained the needs of our communities to be closer and the needs of our children to be paid attention to and to be taught respect and accountability and love, he is very right.

But I might say to my friend that every day in this country 12 children are cut down by gunfire. Most of them come from families who love them, come from families who respect them, come from families who have taught them the values of love and community and country.

So I say to my friend from Wyoming, who told some very tender stories about how good most of the youth are in this country—and I agree with him—a lot of those wonderful young people are being shot in schools and in churches. There seems to be no limit today on what can happen. So he can speak about the need to be close with our families. He is exactly right. Most of us are. But for those who are alienated, who don't have that love, why should the rest of the children pay the price and fear for their lives?

In some of our communities, if you ask those children, I say to my friend, the sad reality, for whatever reason, is that they are afraid. Many of them know someone who has been cut down by gunfire.

So I say, yes, the world he paints is a world I want for every child in America—a loving family, the ability to feel secure, the ability to feel responsibility, the ability to feel confidence. But also, I might add, if we don't pass sensible gun laws—and my friend doesn't want any more sensible gun laws—no matter what type of families our children come from, they are not protected.

I also want to address the point of my friend from Wyoming on why we are doing this on the military construction bill. Over on the House side, I served on the Armed Services Committee, and I know how important that bill is. I want to make it clear to my friends that the Democratic leader, TOM DASCHLE, didn't want to go this route. He asked unanimous consent to bring up the gun amendments that passed the Senate and are trapped in the conference committee, take them up immediately, and resolve them, and pass them in honor of the moms who

gave up their Mother's Day to come here and express themselves.

The Republican side said no. They objected. So what choice did he have but to offer up an amendment?

I say to my friend that the Republican leadership waited 5 full hours before they allowed us to be heard on the subject of sensible gun laws; 5 full hours before we could offer our amendment and be heard on our amendment which commends the moms for coming out on a day when they could have had breakfast in bed, have gotten flowers, and been treated to dinner, to say thank you for being selfless as moms are. That is what you learn when you are a mom—how to be selfless.

As my friend pointed out, military construction is funded for 4 more months. We are not up against any clock—4 more months. Would it hurt us to take a few hours to pay tribute to those moms who worked so hard to organize that march of 750,000 strong, and thousands across the country adding up to more than a million moms? By the way, plenty of dads, too; plenty of grandmas; plenty of grandpas; plenty of daughters and sons. Would it hurt us? My God, in the 5 hours the Republicans stalled before we could get to this measure, we could have had the debate and could have voted on it. Who is wasting time?

The Democratic leader said let's just take this matter up and vote it out. He would have agreed to a very short time limit. But, no, 5 hours of delay. So here it is 5 minutes to 9.

You know what. I am grateful we are taking this up. I am grateful even if it is late at night. Even if I have some other things to do, it doesn't matter at all. We will take it up tomorrow as well. By the way, we will take it up again, and we will take it up again, and we will take it up again because too many people are dying in our country. How many? Let's take a look.

We have a war at home. It is a war in our streets. It is a war in our schools. In Vietnam, we lost 58,168 of our people. This country came to its knees. We wanted to end the war. The vast majority of people thought it was a mistake. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents marched. And President Nixon ended the war in Vietnam. That is 11 years.

Let's look at what happened in the last 11 years in our Nation—395,441 people have been shot down by gunfire. That is from the National Census for Health Statistics.

We have a war here at home. It is shocking to look at that, isn't it? I find it so.

That is why we are going to come back again and again. It is not easy to be here late at night. But I think we are going to have to do that because we have to face it.

Let's look at murder by handguns compared to other countries. A lot of people say, well, this is just the way it is in a society that is free. I would argue that Japan, Great Britain, and

Canada are free countries. They are our allies. They are democracies. By the way, in Canada, murder by handguns per 1 million population is .12 per 1 million; .51, 3.64 in Canada. And in the United States, it is 35.05.

What is wrong? My friend from Wyoming talked about lack of community. He is certainly right on that point. But why is it always in this debate either/or? Why don't we want to work on that issue of community, work on those issues of respect for families, and work on those issues that we have to work on—yes, in the media—and also face one fact, that the only product in this country that has not one safety regulation is guns? Does that make sense to you?

In 1968, after the tragic assassination of Robert Kennedy—killed, shot down in the prime of life, who might have been our next President, shot down in the prime of life with an imported handgun—this Congress acted to ban Saturday night specials from being imported. As I remember, some of my colleagues who are still here on the other side of the aisle voted for that. But guess what they didn't vote for. They didn't vote to ban Saturday night specials from being made in America. So if you try to import a Saturday night special, you can't do it. You can't import a handgun. But guess what. They are made all over this country, particularly in my own home State. I am proud to tell you that recently with a new California Legislature and a new Governor, we have banned those Saturday night specials in California.

We are making progress. We are making progress. I am very proud of that.

After Columbine High School, this Senate gathered, and all said we are going to work together. We passed five sensible gun laws. They are so modest. They are so sensible. They passed this Senate and closed the gun show loophole that allows criminals to go to a gun show and not have to have a background check. It would have made a difference in Columbine. The woman who got the guns for those kids said so. It would ban the importation of high-capacity clips which are used in semiautomatic assault weapons. That is the Feinstein amendment. The first one is the Lautenberg amendment. Requiring child safety devices be sold with every handgun is the Kohl amendment. It requires that the FTC and the Attorney General study the extent to which the gun industry markets to juveniles. That was my amendment. I will talk more about it. It makes it illegal to sell or give a semiautomatic assault weapon to anyone under the age of 18. That was written by a Republican Member of this Senate, Senator ASHCROFT. Those amendments passed. And they are languishing in a conference committee that doesn't even meet.

On April 20, 1999, the Columbine High School shooting stunned America. On May 11, a month later, the Senate begins debate on those gun measures. On

May 20, just a month after Columbine, this Senate passed a juvenile justice bill by a vote of 73-25 that included those five sensible gun control amendments that I talked about.

The Senate and House go to conference 3 months after Columbine, and guess what. That was July. There is one meeting of the conferees. Here we are more than a year after Columbine and we have done zero, nothing, nada.

I am embarrassed to face my constituents. I was embarrassed to face these marching moms and look them in the eye. It is not their job to pass legislation. Hello. It is our job. It is not their job. It is our job. What are we doing? Nothing, zero, zip. I am embarrassed about that. I am angry about that.

I tell you that there are a number of us who are not going to go away on this point. We will be back here. That is why I say to the Presiding Officer sitting in the Chair today that we chose to move forward on this bill. We tried to get a separate resolution. We offered it. The Republicans said no. I don't know, I just do not know why the fear is in this Chamber about voting this thing up or down. All we said is commend the Million Mom March for what they did. It is the American way—standing up and being counted.

Moms attended who are Republicans, Democrats, Independents, some who don't have any affiliation whatever with politics, many of whom are never political. They want Congress to act. We do nothing.

I hope these moms continue to work on this matter, to connect this political process with the facts and the realities of the deaths that go on day after day after day after day.

We had a hearing the day after the Million Mom March and an art teacher from Columbine spoke. With a trembling voice she told us what it was like to be in that library, to tell the kids: Go under your desk. Call 9-1-1.

She said: I used to be in favor of no gun laws and now I am here asking you to act because I don't want anyone else to suffer in this way.

I talked about the five commonsense measures. I think the one that I wrote is very important. We learned when we looked at the cigarette industry how they marketed to kids. We have to realize how the gun industry is marketing to kids. Here is an ad in "Gun World": "Start 'em Young! There is no time like the present." Here is a child, definitely under 18. It is a toy gun that looks like a real handgun. Now, under the laws today you can't buy a handgun in a licensed dealer shop until you are 21 years of age and you can't buy it from anybody, including a gun show, until you are 18. Here is a young man: "Start 'em Young!"

Let's take a look at what some of the gun people say about marketing: "... greatest threat we face is the lack of a future customer base. . ."; "... we continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . ."; "Building



the next generation of customers takes work and commitment. But it must be done."

Sound familiar.

Let's hear what the tobacco companies said in the documents we found through the lawsuits. We will hear how the tobacco company and the gun companies sound alike.

Tobacco company documents: "If our company is to survive and prosper, over the long-term we must get our share of the youth market." "Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential regular customer."

This sounds very familiar.

Here are the gun companies: ". . . greatest threat we face is the lack of a future customer base. . ."; ". . . we continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . ."

Are they trying to reach young people? I argue they are.

We no longer see Joe Camel. Because of the lawsuits, tobacco companies agreed to stop using a cartoon character to lure kids to their product. Well, here is Eddie Eagle. If all Eddie Eagle did was to promote safety, it would be one thing, but it is absolutely a way to get kids interested in guns at a young age. "Start 'em Young!" begins to take on new meaning.

Here is a photograph from a gun magazine. This child is 4 years old and he is watching an adult load a handgun— "Start 'em Young!"

This is a very pressing issue. That is why we offered this amendment. We thank the moms for coming here. We call on our colleagues to free that juvenile justice bill and pass these laws.

My friend from Wyoming, in his opening remarks, said the people in his State don't want any laws. Quoting him the best I can, the Senator from Wyoming said: You can't make people behave. We don't need a bunch of laws.

Let's take that to its logical conclusion. You can't make people behave; you don't need a bunch of laws. OK. Should we have no laws against murder because you can't make people behave? Should we have no laws against rape because you can't make people behave? Should we have no laws on the books that say if you drive a car you have to have a license?

And the NRA takes out an ad and says, by the way, licensing a car doesn't save kids from getting hurt. They have to look both ways when they cross the street.

There is another either/or strawman. Of course, you have to look both ways when you cross the street. But if the driver didn't have to get a license and couldn't see and went up on the sidewalk, you would get killed. So what is this either/or? You don't need laws to make people behave? You want to repeal the laws for getting a license to drive? You want to repeal the laws on registering a car? Yes, you can look both ways, but if the guy's brakes don't work, you are hit. So we keep setting up these either/ors. It is not about either/or. Look both ways, yes. But also

make sure that your driver is licensed, the car is registered, it is safe, he or she can see, can hear, and can drive.

With this refrain that laws can't make people behave, if you take it to its logical conclusion, we wouldn't have any laws at all. We wouldn't have a country that was a country of laws. That is, by the way, what makes America the greatest country in the world because we are a country of laws, not men; I add, we are a country of laws, not men or women.

We have laws for safe toys; we have laws for safe products. We have the safest products in the world. Not because people are wonderful. Yes, some are; they would never make an unsafe product; they wouldn't do it. But some people aren't wonderful and we have to protect our people from those people who would make a shoddy product. Guess what. We have the safest products in the world.

The only product that is not regulated that I know of is a domestically produced handgun. If you try to import it, there are safety standards. But not if you make it here.

I would say to my friend, I do not agree with him. If he does not think laws make people behave, I don't know exactly what we are doing here. We do pass laws every day to protect our people. Laws are the bedrock of a civilized society.

The NRA took out a full-page ad—the same one where they said when you license a driver or register a car you do not make our kids any safer—so I already think I addressed that. But they also basically said: What kind of mother would march? This is a political agenda.

I wish those NRA members who wrote that ad could have been at the Million Mom March. I have been in politics all my life. I have to say, these people were authentic American moms, dads, grandmas, grandpas, aunts, uncles, sisters, brothers, daughters. Do you know why they were there? They said it: Enough is enough. Enough is enough. Many of them had lost children, relatives; they feel the pain; they feel the hurt. They are scarred forever. Many of them knew people who were injured, who were paralyzed for life. Enough is enough. That is why they came. That is why they marched. They could have stayed home, had their breakfast in bed once a year for Mother's Day, but they chose not to do it. I am proud of them.

For the National Rifle Association to take out an ad condemning those mothers is an insult to the women of this country. By the way, they were women from every political party imaginable, every age, every ethnic group. It was the most amazing picture. People out there saying: Enough is enough.

They want us to act. So, yes, I think it is worth a couple of days of debate in the memory of the almost 400,000 Americans shot dead by gunfire in the last 11 years. I think it is worth a cou-

ple of days of debate to say, in the name of these 395,441 people, that we will take a few hours; that we will commend the Million Mom March; that we will encourage them to keep on fighting for what they believe in—a safe America.

Many years ago, when I first got into politics, I was involved in trying to ensure that my children, who are now old enough to take care of me, had a safe future. We were embroiled in that Vietnam war for years and years. There was a bumper strip that came out and a lot of people put it on their cars. It said: Imagine peace. Because the war had gone on so long it was hard to imagine what it would be like, not to have this divisive war, where Americans were arguing with one another, where generations were having debates until most of the country came around and believed it was wrong.

I think we need to have a new bumper strip that says: Imagine an America with no gun violence. Maybe every day we could think about what it would be like to put on the television set at night and not hear story after story: A child goes to the zoo and shoots a gun and hurts a child; a 6-year-old brings a gun to school and shoots a 5-year-old; two high school kids go into their high school and kill people randomly. Every day 12 children die. Imagine what it would be like to turn on the television at night and not have to hear these stories. God, what a wonderful thing it would be for our Nation.

I will say this. If we take the attitude that laws do not mean anything, then we are giving up. We could stand up here, as many nights as we could, and say how much we need to feel a sense of community and how much mothers and fathers have to work with their children and how important it is that we respect each other and admire each other and love each other and come together as a community—and, my God, we should say that.

But we cannot stop there. Because the mothers who grieve for their children every day in America love their children and they gave their children values and their children went off to school and they never came home. So you can stand here, day after day and say that it is about a sense of community, and I will agree with every word that you say. But that does not mean we do not have the responsibility to protect the good children and the good families. We can do it. Five sensible gun laws that we have already passed here, seeing how we market to children, making sure we do not import those high-capacity clips, making sure that guns are sold with safety locks, making sure you cannot buy an assault weapon until you are 18.

The bottom line is we can do it. The last one, of course, is closing the gun show loophole. If you ask the woman who got those guns for those kids at Columbine, she says it clearly: If I had to undergo a background check at the gun show, this whole thing would not have happened.

So no one can get up here and say laws do not make a difference because I do not believe that. These people are telling us to pass these laws. We are not all that smart here. None of us is. But if we turn our back on the people who have experienced this violence, the Sarah Bradys, the Jim Bradys who beg us to pass waiting periods and background checks—if we turn our back on those Americans, I do not think we deserve to be here, really. Maybe that is what this election in November is going to be all about. We are going to see how much people really care.

I know it is late. The Senator from Alabama is here. I know he wants to talk. I know he is not going to agree with one thing I said—and that is good because that is what this is all about. That is what it is all about. That is why I love the Million Mom March, because it is what the country is all about: standing up and being counted, standing up and giving up Mother's Day to come out there and do what they think is right. We have a simple, simple opportunity for people to praise those moms.

I am going to close by reading from Senator DASCHLE's amendment and hope my friends on the other side will join us and will vote for it:

Since on Mother's Day, May 14, 2000, an estimated 750,000 mothers, fathers, and children united for the Million Mom March on the National Mall in Washington, D.C. and were joined by tens of thousands of others, in 70 cities across America, in a call for meaningful, common-sense gun policy;

Since 4,223 young people ages 19 and under were killed by gunfire—one every two hours, nearly 12 young people every day—in the United States in 1977;

Since American children under the age of 15 are 12 times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined;

Since gun safety education programs are inadequate to protect children from gun violence;

Since a majority of the Senate resolved that the House-Senate Juvenile Justice Conference should meet, consider and pass by April 20, 2000, a conference report to accompany H.R. 1501, the Juvenile Justice Act, and that the conference report should retain the Senate-passed gun safety provisions to limit access to firearms by juveniles, felons, and other prohibited persons;

Since the one year Anniversary of the Columbine High School tragedy passed on April 20, 2000, without any action by the Juvenile Justice Conference Committee on the reasonable gun safety measures that were passed by the Senate almost one year ago;

Since continued inaction on this critical threat to public safety undermines confidence in the ability of the Senate to protect our children and raises concerns about the influence of special interests opposed to even the most basic gun safety provisions;

Since this lack of action on the part of the Juvenile Justice Conference Committee and this Congress to stem the flood of gun violence is irresponsible and further delay is unacceptable; and

Since protecting our children from gun violence is a top priority for our families, communities, and nation: Now, therefore, be it

Determined, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the organizers, sponsors, and participants of the Million Mom March should be

commended for rallying to demand sensible gun safety legislation; and

(2) Congress should immediately pass a conference report to accompany H.R. 1501, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act, before the Memorial Day Recess, and include the Lautenberg-Kerrey gun show loophole amendment and the other Senate-passed provisions designed to limit access to firearms by juveniles, convicted felons, and other persons prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms.

It is very simple. It is a lot of nice and important words, but the bottom line is we commend those mothers for marching.

We agree with them that we should pass some modest gun laws that will stop our children from having access to firearms, that will keep us safe from criminals having access to firearms, that will keep us safe because we will not allow mentally unbalanced people to have access to firearms. That is all we are saying. We are not talking about stopping people who are law abiding from having a gun if they want it as long as they act responsibly. We are not talking about taking away anybody's guns. We are not talking about that at all. We are not talking about not being able to hunt. No.

No matter what the gun lobby says to you, I say this: We are saying if you are responsible, fine, but if you are a criminal, you cannot have a gun. If you are a child, you cannot have a gun. If you are mentally unbalanced, you cannot have a gun.

If we cannot pass laws that carry out those requests, then there is something wrong with us, there is something in this Chamber that is stopping us from doing what is right.

This is going to be a big issue in this Presidential election. It is going to be a big issue in the Senate and House races. As a matter of fact, we have a National Rifle Association first vice president saying:

With George Bush in the White House, we'll have a President where we work out of their office.

Imagine a satellite office of the National Rifle Association in the White House. Please, we need to protect the people of this country, and we need to do it by passing sensible gun laws and standing up in the face of powerful lobby groups, whether it is this one or any other one, because we should be the ones in the Senate who are free from that kind of special interest domination.

I pray that tomorrow when we meet—we have a few more hours of debate—we will adopt the Daschle amendment.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and I yield back all my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California. She is a most eloquent spokeswoman for her point of view, and I do share many of her concerns. I do

believe this: Too many people are dying and we can do something about it.

I want to share tonight some of my ideas about what we can do about it. If we do the things I am talking about tonight, we can literally save thousands of lives.

It is fair and accurate to say that as a direct result of the failure—it is shocking, stunning to me—of the Clinton administration to enforce existing firearm laws, thousands of people have died who otherwise would not have died. I say that as a person who spent 15 years as a Federal prosecutor working as an assistant U.S. attorney for 2½ years and almost 12 years as the U.S. attorney appointed to prosecute Federal criminal cases. In this body, we only deal with laws that apply to Federal criminal cases, not State cases.

We can save lives, but ask anybody who is a long-time, good student on the subject of crime in America, "Do you think a law that would stop the sale of guns at gun shows is going to stop people from getting killed?" and they will laugh at you. This is not something that is going to have a serious impact on crime in America, but it does have the capacity to seriously undermine a popular institution of gun shows because it delays for so long sales of guns and the gun show activities have closed and people are gone. It just does not work well. People have objected to that. That is where we are today.

I am frustrated, as I know the Chair is, because we are now back on this issue. The bill before this body is a military construction bill. We need to address certain matters of construction for our military bases and men and women in the service. We need to focus on that and get serious about it.

The majority leader, TRENT LOTT, knows what we have to do. We have 13 appropriations bills to pass. Are we going to every day have some other controversial, nongermane, irrelevant amendment brought forward disrupting the flow of the Senate and keeping us from doing the job we want to do? Is that what is going to happen? That is why he has stood firm. No, we are going to stay on military construction; we do not need to be on the issue of gun laws today.

It is a tactic. I know the Senator is most eloquent, but she also said basically the truth. She said it was a political issue; the Democrats want to use this in the fall. I suggest they are just playing politics and not talking about matters that will make our streets safer and our schools safer. I will talk about those in a minute. Politics is not what we need to be doing now.

The gun laws we debated in this body some time ago are, in fact, in conference. They passed this Senate. We passed a gun show law. Virtually everybody here voted for major restrictions on the gun show operations. The Lautenberg amendment was contested. Many believed the Lautenberg amendment went too far and disrupted a favored institution in America—the gun

show. We had a vote on it after a great debate, the thing the Democrats want to continue, apparently. We had a 50-50 tie. The Vice President sat in the Presiding Officer's chair and, with great pomp and circumstance, broke the tie in favor of the amendment, walked out here, and immediately had a press conference and accused those of us who did not agree with his view on the details of this gun show law of not caring about children, not caring about crime, being indifferent to murder.

I was offended by that. I remain offended by that because I have committed a better part of my professional life to prosecuting criminals and caring about crime and victims. I know them personally. I personally tried approximately 100 gun cases myself, and under my supervision hundreds of gun cases have been prosecuted. I think I know something about this. I want to share some thoughts about that today.

I start off by discussing some basic issues. I am delighted the mothers were in town. Most of all, they remind us that children, young people, adults, family members, ourselves, are in danger in America because of violence and that this Nation needs to use the expertise, knowledge, skill, and scientific data to do what we can as a Congress to make this country safer. We can do that.

How can we reduce crime? How can we save children's lives? How can we save adult lives? How can we make our communities safer? I have studied this for 17 years as a prosecutor. I have read reports and studies of the Department of Justice. I have observed personally and tried to see what was going on around me, and I want to share some things with you about crime in America.

During the sixties and seventies, as the Chair mentioned so eloquently in his remarks, crime in this country more than doubled. It tripled, maybe even quadrupled.

We had double-digit increases—15-, 17-, 18-percent crime increases—a year in the 1960s and 1970s. It was a direct result, in my opinion, of a breakdown of discipline, a breakdown of family, an increase in drug use, and a disconnect and a lack of respect for authority in America.

Our leaders in our colleges and universities, they all said it was "cool," it was "doing your own thing," it was "seeking fulfillment," and you should not teach children to just always be automatons and just follow orders; that they ought to be allowed to express themselves. They said people were not responsible for their own acts. They said crime was a product of finances; how much money you had would affect whether you were a criminal or not—all kinds of things like that.

People who are listening to me today, who lived during those times, know I am not exaggerating. As a result, even though crime was going up dramatically, we had no increase really

in the number of people in jail. We had a belief afoot in the land, by many of our brightest people, that jail did not work. They would say that putting people in jail just made them meaner, that it was no good, we needed to treat the root cause of crime, whatever that was, and we needed to increase welfare spending and just give people more money; that we could just sort of buy them off. Then they would not riot, rob, steal, rape, and kill. I am telling you, that is basically what the deal was in the 1960s and 1970s.

The critical point came when Ronald Reagan ran for President, and he promised he was going to promote law and order in this country. He made a serious commitment; he was going to create a war on drugs. He did that. He set about to appoint prosecutors, such as JEFF SESSIONS, in Mobile, AL, and 94 others in the districts around this country. He told us to get out there and utilize the skills and abilities and laws we had to fight crime.

This Senate and this Congress passed some extraordinarily effective and tough laws that had already passed a number of years earlier under President Nixon—a Speedy Trial Act that said cases had to be tried in 70 days. That is so much shorter than what goes on in most State courts today. The Federal Speedy Trial Act of 70 days is a very firm rule, and cases are normally tried within 70 days.

In addition to that, in the 1980s, under President Reagan, they passed a law that eliminated parole. It said that whatever sentence you got, you served it, virtually day for day. It eliminated parole, so a criminal who was sentenced would serve the time the judge gave him. We called that "honesty in sentencing." We said it was time to quit joking about giving someone 30 years and having them serve 6 and be right back out on the streets again, robbing and raping and doing other kinds of criminal activities. So we had the honesty in sentencing.

Then we had mandatory sentencing. Sentencing guidelines were set up. Minimum mandatory sentences were set forth under President Reagan and into President Bush's term. Those sentences were very effective.

We had an expert group of judges, and others, who analyzed the kinds of crimes and helped establish the statutory range of guidelines for judges to sentence within. The mandatory minimums said, for example, regardless of what else may happen, if you carry a gun during any crime, including a drug crime, you have to be sentenced for 5 years, without parole, consecutive to the drug crime or the burglary or any other crime you may have been sentenced for in Federal court.

So those are the kinds of things that happened. And the Federal courts improved themselves dramatically.

During those 12 years I served as U.S. attorney, a major factor dawned on me. We were making some progress. Crime in America began to drop in a number

of the years—maybe a majority of the years under President Reagan's leadership. But it was not always down. In some years it started up, or the crime did not drop enough. I wondered, what could we do?

Many questioned whether these sentencing guidelines were working or not. Then it dawned on me why we were not having the impact. It was so simple as to be obvious to anybody who gave any thought to it. Federal court only tries 2, 3, 1 percent of all the crimes in America; 95, 97, 98 percent of all crimes tried in America are tried in State courts, not Federal. Even though the Federal court had set the example for the State courts, it could not itself, in effect, change the climate in America.

Over the past number of years, State court systems have gotten fed up. They realized that the revolving-door mentality of just arresting people, releasing them on bail, trying them 2 years later, letting them plead guilty to 6 months, and having them in a halfway house and then back on the streets, selling drugs, conducting crime, was not effective; and they passed all kinds of repeat dangerous offender laws.

You heard the "three strikes and you're out" laws passed in many States. The third time you are convicted of a felony, you serve life without parole. All kinds of laws such as that were passed in virtually every State in this country. They got tough and serious about crime in America and said: We are not going to take it anymore. We are not going to allow people who threaten the lives of our children to be released on the streets. And from 1990 to today, the prison population in America has doubled—more than doubled.

Many people complain about it. They say to me: JEFF, we have too many people in jail. That is just too many. Oh, this is awful.

One person told me one time: If we keep this up, everybody is going to be in prison. Of course, that is a joke. Everybody does not commit crimes. Everybody does not rob, rape, shoot, and kill. No, sir. We have gotten serious about it. We focused on the repeat dangerous offender and did something about it.

The Rand Corporation, a number of years ago, did a very important study. In this study, they interviewed, in depth, people in prison all over, but I believe it was mainly in California. They interviewed lots of people in prison, in depth, for hours, about what their life was like when they were out involving themselves in crime.

They found some amazing facts. They found that a significant number, although less than a majority of those in prison, were very much criminally inclined, that they were committing as many as 300 crimes a year. Three hundred crimes a year they were committing. It gave further impetus to and further basis for these "three strikes and you're out" laws and multiple-offender laws.

You might say: They would not commit 300 crimes a year, Jeff. They must not be telling the truth. But listen to me. There are 365 days in a year. Some of these criminals go out and knock ladies down, take their purses two or three times a night, break into cars, steal cars, break into houses, break into stores and office places multiple times in one night. Many of them are committing 200, 300 crimes a year; some of them more than that.

So we began to focus on that, and, since about 1990, we have had a decline in the crime rate in America every year. This past year, we just had the announcement that the murder rate dropped 7 percent in America. I was proud to see that.

They can have all the theories they want, but I tell you, there are not that many people in my hometown of Mobile, AL, who are willing to come out and shoot you. There are just not that many of them. And if you identify them when they go out and start committing crimes, and put them in jail, they are not going to be out there to shoot you, your family, your children, your loved ones. They are not going to be there.

I wish there were some way we could do something different. I wish we could have a class for prisoners where they could take this class and in 6 months we could release them where they would not commit crimes.

You will hear of people who cite studies and say: Oh, this cures people, and they do not ever commit crime again. Look at them closely. If that were so, we would already be doing it. Trust me. Nobody would oppose that. Nobody would oppose that. But for the most part they do not work. They may help some—and I am not against these kinds of programs—but, fundamentally, many people who are definitely criminally inclined will continue to be so.

So we made some big progress.

The city of Miami—many of you will remember the commitment President Bush made when he went down there to head the task force in Miami when he was Vice President. They were using automatic weapons, machine guns, MAC-11s, slaughtering people. Colombian gangs were operating almost at will. They said they were going to do something about it. Over a period of years, Miami has been relieved of those kinds of violent shootings. You almost never hear of a shooting with an automatic weapon in Miami anymore. It was brought to a halt.

By the way, it has been a crime since the days of Al Capone to have a machine gun. In the midseventies, when I was an assistant U.S. attorney, we prosecuted every one of those cases where people had machine guns, fully automatic weapons. So this idea that somehow we need to pass laws to keep people from carrying AK-47s—and you hear that all the time—it is already against the law to carry those weapons. It has been in the law for some number of years.

Boston, MA, a few years ago, was very concerned about the number of murders in their town. They wanted to do something about it. My staff members went up and studied their program because we heard such good comments about what they had done. They took young people seriously. When a young person got in trouble in the juvenile court in Boston, they weren't only given probation and sent home. They had a police officer and a probation officer—and they changed their hours; they worked from 3 o'clock in the afternoon to 10 o'clock at night, and the police officer would go out with the probation officer, and if the curfew was at 7 o'clock for young Billy, they knocked on Billy's door at 7 o'clock or 7:30 to see if he was home at night. If he wasn't home, something was done. Almost all of a sudden, they began to realize that these people meant business. They really cared about them. If you care about these young people, you will make sure they are obeying the rules you give them.

They targeted gang members who were leading gangs and getting involved in criminal activities and told them: If you keep this up, you are going to serve big time in jail. They sent criminals away for long periods. They broke up the gangs and they went a year without a single juvenile homicide in Boston.

I thought it was a good program. That is why, as chairman of the juvenile crime subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, we put that kind of effort into our juvenile crime bill that is now being held up in conference. That would have been supported financially by the Federal Government, encouraging other cities to do those kinds of things that would reduce crime. But let me ask you, do you think we are going to save lives in Boston, MA, by passing a law to eliminate gun shows in America? It is not going to have anything to do with that crime. So we need to do those kinds of things.

Another city that had an extraordinary success rate was Richmond, and I will talk about it in a minute.

So what do we do? We have a juvenile crime bill that is being held up in committee. Let me tell you precisely why it is being held up, the way I see it. The Senator from California indicates she sees it a different way. Let me tell you the way I see it.

We had this strong—too strong, in my opinion—gun show amendment. It did not have a majority of support in the Senate. The Senate tied 50/50. The Vice President came in here and broke the tie. Only 50 Members of this 100-Member body voted for that amendment. They voted for other amendments that would be less strong and less damaging to the gun show activities but at the same time tightening up the gun show situation. It went to the House of Representatives, a coequal body. For a bill to become law, it has to pass the Senate and the House. The

House, on a bipartisan basis—JOHN DINGELL, Democrat from Michigan, and a number of other Democrats—voted against it, killed the Lautenberg amendment by a substantial vote.

Now, Members of this body are saying the conference committee is supposed to work out a bill and has to put in an amendment that was rejected in the House and had a tie vote in the Senate. You don't normally do that. Why would we think the votes in those two Houses would justify that? Surely not. That is not logical. So they are saying, if you don't agree to put in this amendment that was rejected already in the House, we are going to block the bill and keep trying to offer amendments here every day to see if we can't embarrass you Republicans so we can have an election issue in November.

That is what it is all about. But it is frustrating our ability to do our work because we have a military construction bill on the floor. That is what we need to deal with, taking care of that, not repeating the same old arguments we have had with gun laws.

Let me tell you what I think ought to be done. In the juvenile crime bill, we have, I believe, \$80 million for a project CUFF, Criminal Use of Firearms by Felons—just a title we came up with—that would provide special prosecutors in every U.S. attorney's office in America. It would, in effect, step up dramatically the Federal enforcement of criminal laws.

By the way, when I became a Member of this Senate 3 years ago, I started looking at the U.S. attorneys' statistics. I knew how to use them. I reviewed them every year when I was a U.S. attorney. I pulled out the book. I was hearing from friends and people in the Department of Justice that this Department had allowed criminal prosecution to decline markedly. I looked at the numbers to see if it were true. I was shocked to find that, under the Clinton-Gore administration, prosecutions of criminal gun cases dropped from 7,000 to around 3,500—nearly a 40-percent decline in the prosecutions of gun cases.

I was shocked because every day the President of the United States and Vice President Gore were out there saying: All you Senators and Congressmen who won't pass more and more restrictions on innocent law-abiding citizens who want to possess guns are for crime, death, slaughter, and shootings. You guys are no good. You are not worthy of respect. You are just trash. You care about crime. You defend crime and you don't believe in children.

Those are the kinds of things they were saying. At the same time, they had the power and authority to prosecute criminals who were actually using guns in criminal activities, and the prosecutions had dropped 40 percent. A stunning thing. I didn't ignore it.

Nearly 3 years ago—within a year of my being in this office—I challenged the Attorney General herself, Janet

Reno, about these numbers. She brushed off the debate. A deputy attorney general came before the committee and had private meetings when he was coming around to meet Senators. In his testimony, I asked him and demanded that they do better with the prosecutions of gun cases. The chief of the criminal division came by, as did two criminal division chiefs. I raised it with them. I had charts. I wrote an op-ed in 1998, or so, on this very subject, expressing my shock at this amazing decline in prosecutions. The reason was that was a big deal for us. Under President George Bush, we were told to do something about these gun cases. We were Federal prosecutors appointed by the President of the United States. All 94 U.S. attorneys were appointed by the President of the United States as part of the executive branch.

We had a project called Project Triggerlock. We had task forces with the sheriffs and the chiefs of police in our area. We met and discussed how to use these tough Federal laws for speedy trial actions with mandatory minimum sentences and no parole to crack down on violent criminals.

I put together a newsletter. I called it Project Triggerlock News. I sent it to all of the chiefs of police and to all of the sheriffs in my district. I sent it to the detectives and law enforcement officers who I knew were working on these kinds of cases. We showed example after example of criminals who were carrying firearms, and whom we tried in Federal court with joint investigations and prosecutions, and they served a long period of time in jail and were removed from the community.

I couldn't believe an administration that came into office talking about guns had abandoned this program. In fact, they had not totally abandoned it. Several years ago, the United States attorney in Richmond, VA, and the chief assistant who had been involved in these cases over the years got together with the chief of police in Richmond and determined to prosecute aggressively all Federal gun violations of existing law in Richmond, VA. They called their project Project Exile. They called it Project Exile because when they convicted them they got 5 or 10 years without parole. They didn't go to the halfway house in Richmond. They were sent off to a Federal prison maybe hundreds of miles away. They were gone, out of Richmond, away for long periods of time without parole. They did this consistently and aggressively.

President Clinton's own U.S. attorney, his own appointee, testified that they had achieved a 40-percent reduction in murder rate—a 40-percent reduction. They did one thing that we didn't do. They put ads out about it. They put up posters: Carry a gun, mandatory Federal jail time. They were out to convince people that they better obey the law, and they had better not be misusing guns. They were successful at it. They reduced murder rates 40 percent.

I asked Attorney General Reno if she was going to do something about that. Well, we are just going to let each district do what they want to, she said.

Curiously, I had a hearing set. It was really remarkable to me. We had a hearing on this matter. It was set for Monday morning. The administration did not want us to have this hearing. They kept wanting to put it off. I had the U.S. attorney from Richmond, the chief of police, and some experienced prosecutors testify about this kind of thing. I was amazed to turn on my radio on Saturday. What do you think the President's radio address to the Nation was on? It was on Project Triggerlock, and Project Exile. He had the U.S. attorney from Richmond and the chief of police from Richmond in the White House with him while he was doing the address. And he bragged on it, and said how good it was.

About 6 weeks later, the Attorney General came up. I had heard that they had not taken any action on it. They appointed some commission to talk about it, and no directives had gone out. I asked her about it. I remember asking her how the President sent her directives. Did he send them to her by writing or did she have to turn on the radio and listen to him? Because his exact words were, "I am directing the Attorney General and the Secretary of Treasury to crack down on these kinds of criminals."

To my knowledge, they still have not made the kind of progress that they should.

Do you see the hypocrisy here?

We have a plan in Richmond, VA, that I know as an experienced Federal prosecutor will save hundreds of lives and thousands of lives.

In the time this administration has been in office, I believe I can say with confidence that thousands of people are dead today because Project Triggerlock was abandoned and this administration allowed crime prosecutions to plummet. That is a tragedy, and it is wrong.

But, at the same time, when they come up to me, and they want to register handguns, or they want to close down gun shows, and if I don't vote for that, then I don't care about children, I don't care about people getting shot and killed in America. It burns me up. I do not like that. And why the media has not understood this fully is beyond my comprehension.

They just continue to suggest that the only thing that counts in this country is whether or not you vote for further and further restrictions that implicate and sometimes really go beyond implicating but, in fact, violate the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States which guarantees the right to keep and bear arms. Somebody will say, well, they don't like that. Well, that is our Constitution. Put it up in an amendment, big boy, if you want to change it. Let's see them bring forward an amendment to eliminate the second amendment.

There is no consensus for that in this country. It is part of the heritage of this country that people maintain firearms.

We didn't have these kinds of murder rates in the 1930s, the 1940s, and the 1950s when a higher percentage of Americans had guns than they have today. I don't know of anybody where I grew up who didn't have a firearm.

I say to you first and foremost, how do you reduce crime and murder and make our streets safer? Implement President Clinton's own Project Exile. Mr. President, direct that it be done. See that the Attorney General carries it out. Pass our juvenile crime bill which provides you even more money than you really need to carry out that project. I say you don't need any more money because we didn't need it when I was U.S. attorney. Why can't you prosecute these gun cases? They are not hard to prosecute. Really most of them are quite simple, and 80 or 90 percent plead guilty. It is a good way to crack down on violence in America.

There is one more thing that I want to mention. We implemented the National Crime Information Center—the NCIC—background check. That is a computer-operated system. So if you go down to a gun store and attempt to buy a firearm, they can plug in your Social Security number, date of birth, whatever, and they can run an NCIC check on your criminal history to see if you are a convicted felon. Most of you may not know it, but if you are a convicted felon, you can't possess a firearm, period. You can't possess a shotgun, a rifle, or a pistol. Any convicted felon in America, even if it is a fraud case with no violence in it, cannot possess a firearm. We used to prosecute a lot of those cases of a "felon in possession." That is what we called them.

We found that in 13 months of this new NCIC system, 89,000 individuals were rejected. They could not buy a firearm because they had some problem. Many of them were felons.

I submit to you they have already filled out a form. I used to remember the number. I think it was 4477. On that form they filled out they had to swear under oath they were not a convicted felon. That is a crime. That is a false statement. Also, many of these people turned out to be fugitives from other criminal activities.

The BATF, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms—I have great friends in BATF, and they do a good job—is not following up on these cases. They have prosecuted less than 1 percent of these 89,000 cases. Probably about two-tenths of 1 percent were actually prosecuted.

There are some serious criminals in that group. When those cases come in and are kicked out and people are rejected because of violence, they ought to be investigated, and they ought to be prosecuted.

I think that would be a great way to identify criminals who are out to get

guns and are up to no good and are out on the street. There are straw men who use false identities to buy guns. There are illegal sellers of guns. There are gun thieves who sell guns and pass them around the neighborhoods. Those kinds of people can be prosecuted, too.

If you do that, I have no doubt that crime will be reduced. There will be less murders in this country and we could save lives by the thousands. That is what we need to do. That is where our focus needs to be.

I hope those who came to the moms' march will cause us to focus on the real causes of crime and how to really stop it. If we do, we can make this country safer, we can save lives, and we can do what we are paid to do.

We need to quit playing politics. We need to get that juvenile crime bill up, voted on, and we need some compromise and support from the Members of the other side.

Once we do that, we will begin to save lives in America.

#### TRIBUTE TO LAMPTON O'NEAL "TREY" WILLIAMS III

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary young man who has persevered to overcome significant obstacles in his life and who, in spite of these obstacles, has excelled. Lampton O'Neal "Trey" Williams III, of Hattiesburg, Mississippi, exemplifies the qualities of courage, dedication, commitment, and self-discipline that harken back to the days of this great nation's founding fathers who likewise employed these values to overcome seemingly insurmountable adversity. With this graduation from the Presbyterian Christian School in Hattiesburg on Friday, May 19, 2000, I express my most heartfelt and warmest congratulations to Trey on this extraordinary accomplishment.

As a deaf student, Trey has been saddened in life with a hardship that many of us will never be forced to carry. Yet, from an early age, Trey refused to allow his disability to overcome him and, instead, set out to conquer his disability. As a young boy, Trey was enrolled in The University of Southern Mississippi DuBard School for Language Disorders where his eagerness, ability to learn, and refusal to yield to his disability quickly warmed him to the hearts of all around him. During his tenure at the DuBard School, Trey excelled in speech, lip reading, learning language and academic skills. However, Trey's passion for learning and his commitment to his education did not end there.

In 1992, having secured from the DuBard School the skills and abilities he would need to live a full and free life with his disability, Trey took the noble and daunting step of enrolling in regular education classes at the Presbyterian Christian School in Hattiesburg, Mississippi. Throughout his years at the Presbyterian Christian School Trey has continuously challenged him-

self and has demanded only the best from himself. His motivation, self-discipline and character have earned Trey the highest praise from his teachers and the respect of all who know him. And while Trey's forthcoming graduation from the Presbyterian Christian School is a truly extraordinary achievement in and of itself, it is only part of the story. As the result of his academic excellence and exceptional accomplishments over the past several years, Trey has earned a college scholarship. I have no doubt that Trey's strength of character and commitment to his education will result in a college career marked with awards and honors only few can ever expect to achieve.

Mr. President, Trey's dedication, commitment and perseverance is unique and truly commendable. With his graduation on May 19, 2000, Trey will receive a concrete representation of his years of perseverance—his diploma. And while his accomplishments thus far deserve the highest praise and commendation, I have no doubt this young man's future will be marked by even greater accomplishments. Trey's refusal to yield to his disability and his determination to overcome it should serve as an inspiration and motivation to all of us. It is an example of what we can achieve when we demand the most from ourselves. I want to extend my highest congratulations to Trey on his graduation and wish only the best for him in the future.

#### MARINE COLONEL WAYNE SHAW'S RETIREMENT ADDRESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the debt we owe to the men and women who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces is one that we will never be able to repay adequately. They sacrifice so much of themselves to defend our nation and its ideals, and ask for so little in return.

Today, I would like to focus the Senate's attention on one such veteran, who entered the United States Marine Corps more than a quarter-century ago. Colonel Wayne Shaw, who was a Marine for over 28 years, retired recently and delivered a farewell address to his fellow officers at Quantico, Virginia.

Colonel Shaw's address at Quantico was not your typical "feel-good" retirement speech. In it, he makes a number of observations about how the Marine Corps has changed in recent years—and how, in his view, many of those changes have weakened the Corps that, for the sake of our country and the world, needs to remain strong. Not a man to mince words, Colonel Shaw lists in his speech a number of concerns he has about the future of the Marine Corps.

Colonel Shaw does not question the future of the Corps because of any disillusionment he may have about the institution. Rather, he questions the future of the Corps because of his love for and devotion to it. Colonel Shaw is cer-

tainly entitled—if anyone is—to critique the Marine Corps because of his unique commitment to this country for nearly three decades. I believe we owe it to Colonel Shaw and other veterans like him to pay heed to his words of warning and carefully consider his suggestions to sustain the integrity of the U.S. Marine Corps. I hope each and every member of this chamber will do so.

I ask unanimous consent that Colonel Shaw's retirement address be printed into the RECORD.

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

#### A FAREWELL TO THE CORPS

(Remarks by Colonel Wayne Shaw, USMC, Quantico, Virginia)

In recent years I've heard many Marines on the occasion of retirements, farewells, promotions and changes of command refer to the "fun" they've had in the Marine Corps. "I loved every day of it and had a lot of fun" has been voiced far too often. Their definition of "fun" must be radically different from mine. Since first signing my name on the dotted line 28½ years ago I have had very little fun.

Devoting my entire physical and mental energies training to kill the young men of some other country was not fun. Worrying about how many of my own men might die or return home maimed was not fun. Knowing that we did not have the money or time to train as best we should have, was not fun either. It was no fun to be separated from my wife for months on end, nor was it fun to freeze at night in snow and rain and mud.

It was not much fun to miss my father's funeral because my Battalion Commander was convinced our peacetime training deployment just couldn't succeed without me. Missing countless school and athletic events my sons very much wanted me to see was not much fun either. Not being at my son's high school graduation wasn't fun. Somehow it didn't seem like fun when the movers showed up with day laborers from the street corner and the destroyed personal effects were predictable from folks who couldn't hold a job. The lost and damaged items, often irreplaceable family heirlooms weren't much fun to try to "replace" for pennies on the dollar. There wasn't much fun for a Colonel with a family of four to live in a 1200 sq. ft. apartment with one bathroom that no welfare family would have moved into. It was not much fun to watch the downsizing of the services after Desert Storm as we handed out pink slips to men who risked their lives just weeks before.

It has not been much fun to watch mid-grade officers and senior Staff NCO's, after living frugal lives and investing money where they could, realize that they cannot afford to send their sons and daughters to college. Nor do I consider it much fun to reflect on the fact that our medical system is simply broken. It is not much fun to watch my Marines board helicopters that are just too old and train with gear that just isn't what it should be anymore. It is not much fun to receive the advanced copies of promotion results and call those who have been passed over for promotion. It just wasn't much fun to watch the infrastructure at our bases and stations sink deeper into the abyss because funding wasn't provided for the latest "crisis." It just wasn't much fun to discharge good Marines for being a few pounds overweight and have to reenlist Marines who were HIV positive and not world-wide deployable. It sure wasn't much fun to look