

Delano Police Chief Gerald M. Gruver.
 Dixon Police Chief Rick C. Fuller.
 Downey Police Chief Gerald C. Caldwell.
 El Monte Police Chief Wayne C. Clayton.
 Exeter Police Chief John H. Kunkel.
 Escondido Police Chief Michael P. Stein.
 Fremont Police Chief Craig T. Steckler.
 Gardena Police Chief Richard K. Propster.
 Glendale Police Chief James E. Anthony.
 Half Moon Bay Police Chief Dennis K. Wick.
 Hawthorne Police Chief Stephen R. Port.
 Huntington Beach Police Chief Ronald E. Lownberg.
 Imperial County Sheriff Oren R. Fox.
 Irvine Police Chief Charles S. Brobeck.
 Irwindale Police Chief Julian S. Miranda.
 Laguna Beach Police Chief Neil J. Purcell.
 La Habra Police Chief Steve Staveley.
 Lodi Police Chief Larry D. Hansen.
 Lindsay Police Chief Bert H. Garzelli.
 Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block.
 Manhattan Beach Police Chief Ted J. Mertens.
 Menlo Park Police Chief Bruce C. Cumming.
 Montebello Police Chief Steve Simonian.
 Monterey Police Chief F.D. Sanderson.
 Morgan Hill Police Chief Steven L. Schwab.
 Newport Beach Police Chief Bob McDonnell.
 Novato Police Chief Brian Brady.
 Oakland Police Chief Joseph Samuels, Jr.
 Oxnard Police Chief Harold L. Hurtt.
 Palm Springs Police Chief Gene H. Kulander.
 Patterson Police Chief William D. Middleton.
 Petaluma Police Chief Dennis DeWitt.
 Piedmont Police Chief Jim Moilan.
 Pittsburg Police Chief Willis A. Casey.
 Placer County Sheriff Edward N. Bonner.
 Redding Chief Robert P. Blankenship.
 Rialto Police Chief Dennis J. Hegwood.
 Richmond Police Chief William M. Lansdowne.
 Sacramento Police Chief Arturo Venegas, Jr.
 San Buenaventura Police Chief Richard F. Thomas.
 San Carlos Police Chief Clifford Gerst.
 San Diego County Sheriff William B. Kolender.
 San Luis Obispo Police Chief James M. Gardiner.
 San Mateo County Sheriff Don Horsley.
 San Francisco Police Chief Anthony Ribera.
 City and County Police Captain Richard J. Cairns.
 Santa Ana Police Chief Daniel G. McCoy.
 Santa Barbara Police Chief Richard A. Breza.
 Santa Clara Police Chief Charles R. Arolla.
 Santa Cruz County Sheriff Mark S. Tracy.
 Santa Cruz Police Chief Steven R. Belcher.
 Santa Paula Police Chief Walter Adair.
 Seal Beach Police Chief William D. Stearns.
 Sonoma Police Chief John P. Gurney.
 Sonora Police Chief Michael R. Efford.
 South Pasadena Police Chief Thomas E. Mahoney.
 Suisun City Police Chief Ronald V. Forsythe.
 Tiburon Police Chief Peter G. Herley.
 Tracy Police Chief Jared L. Zwickey.
 Twin Cities Police Chief Phil D. Green.
 Ventura Police Chief Richard F. Thomas.
 Walnut Creek Police Chief Karel A. Swanson.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Congress should not and must not repeal the assault weapons ban. I thank the forbearance of the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for just a few moments I would like to speak about the budget and the happenings of this weekend on all the talk shows and the Presidential and Vice Presidential messages that were delivered to the American people.

I guess I can tell you, Mr. President, while I remain not surprised by the message of our President and Vice President, I can tell you that I am highly disappointed, for it is they who over the weekend threatened a Government shutdown if they could not get their way with the Federal budget. They would like to argue that it would be the fault of the Congress, but it was Congress that sent to the President this last week a budget, and it was the President who vetoed that budget, and then sent to the Hill a budget that was not even within the agreement that he had struck less than 2 weeks ago. As a result of that, he now proposes for the Congress to reconvene a budget conference with nearly a half a trillion dollars of difference between the White House and the Congress of the United States.

The Washington Post, which is not known for its conservatism, I thought made an important observation in an editorial on the 12th when they said the President's latest budget proposal, his third this year—in other words, twice he has not been able to get it right—is a disappointment. Even the Washington Post says it “* * * is a disappointment. It retains the basic weaknesses of the one that he put forward in June that it pretends to supplant. Mr. Clinton continues to back away from the serious part of driving down the deficit. He tries to balance the budget wearing a Santa [Claus] suit, and the simple fact is that you can't.”

Mr. President, I will tell you that the revelation over the weekend that there might be another \$100 billion worth of spending, while the American people watch what you say and listen to what Congress says, they happen to fear that kind of Santa Clausism right on the eve of Christmas, because they are very fearful that the party that now clings to its past underpinnings of being spendaholics can simply not get away from it.

The budget you have sent to us, Mr. President, clearly is reflective of the fact that the Democrat Party of America today cannot get away from the old habits that it had in the past, and that was, the solution to every problem was a new Government program and a huge chunk more spending of the Federal budget or, more importantly, the money of the taxpayers of this country.

So, Mr. President, the American people on the eve of Christmas are watching and saying, “What will the Con-

gress do? What will the President do? Can they strike a budget agreement this week? Will they develop a continuing resolution that goes on after Christmas? Will they be able to break with the past and truly begin to reduce the debt and the deficit bringing the Government's budget into balance? Will they really remember that the taxpayers of this country are being taxed more than ever in the history of our country?”

And yet, when we work the numbers a little bit, and we find an extra \$100 billion between now and the year 2002, there appears to be no consideration to apply it to deficit, only to apply it to a Government program, largely because we have heard nothing but whining and crying out of the White House over the last month that we are destroying all these marvelous Federal programs, when in fact none of them is being cut; only the rate of increase is being reduced to try to bring the budget into balance.

Mr. President, I challenge you to go dry, to take an Alcoholic's Anonymous approach to this—in other words, cold turkey it. That is what the American people are asking for, that you do not keep asking for more and more money, more and more spending, more and more of their hard-earned money, but leave it where it is. Come to the table, balance the budget, and start thinking on the positive side of a balanced budget instead of the negative side that somehow some Government program might be cut.

What is the positive side? Well, as you know, Mr. President, there are many, many positives. A lot of us have talked about it in the last few days here about the ability of families to have more money to spend or to save, about the ability of the economy to grow and have a greater level of jobs, to see our unemployment rate continue to go down. Mr. President, I really believe that is what the American people would like to hear as a message from Santa Claus on Christmas, is that the budget is going to be balanced, that we are going to stay within our spending limits and that what new moneys might be found could be applied to the deficit.

So, ho, ho, ho, Mr. President. It is not time to fool the American people with your Santa Claus tactics that somehow you can just keep on spending and keep on giving and the world will get a lot better. It will not work unless you make the tough choices, and the tough choices are to balance the budget and give the American taxpayers some consideration by a reduction in their overall tax rate.

I yield back the balance of my time.
 Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

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

KEEPING RECORDS ON CRIMINALS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am interested in the discussion that the Senator from California just had on the subject of crime. It reminds me again of the urge to ask all Members of the Senate to consider cosponsoring a piece of legislation I introduced last week on this issue. The issue of crime is one that concerns every American, and I introduced some legislation dealing with the issue of trying to establish a computer record of all people in this country who commit felonies.

It is incredible that we have a circumstance in our country where we keep track of a couple hundred million credit cards, and if you take one of those credit cards and go to a department store and try to buy a shirt, they will run it through a magnetic imager, and in 20 seconds they discover whether the card is good or whether it has reached its limit. If they are able to do that in the private sector on credit with a couple hundred million credit cards, we ought to be able to, for a whole series of reasons, keep an updated, accurate computer list of everybody who has committed felonies in this country. That way, when judges sentence somebody, they know who they are sentencing. Did this person commit a crime in Idaho 5 years ago, Montana 2 years ago, North Dakota last year, and Kansas this year? That is the kind of criminal record history we ought to have in this country. Regrettably, we do not. We have the NCIC and the III, but 80 percent of the records needed to be in up-to-date criminal records files of everybody who committed felonies are not there. It does not take Dick Tracy to figure out who is going to commit the next violent crime in our country. In almost every instance, it will be somebody who has previously committed crimes, somebody who has been in the system, and somebody who has been in prison—maybe not to prison, but maybe in prison and is now out of prison and back on the streets.

That is why we need, it seems to me, for law enforcement purposes, for judges, for a whole series of reasons, an updated computer listing of everybody in this country who has committed felonies. That ought to be updated every day across the country in order that we might effectively combat crime in America.

THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor today to talk just for a moment about the budget negotiations, not so much to talk about what might or might not happen in the negotiations, but to suggest that this is going to be a very important week with respect to the question of whether we are able to make progress in trying to reach two goals—first, balancing the Federal budget. That is an important goal and it is one we ought to reach in

the interest of our country. Second, balancing the Federal budget while we meet some of the priorities in doing so. Balancing the Federal budget without injuring the Medicaid or Medicare Program, so that someone who is elderly in this country and who is sick will not understand that they have to pay more for Medicare and get less as a result of our balancing the budget. We can balance the budget and do it the right way, retaining the priorities in Medicare and Medicaid and education and agriculture and the environment. It does not mean you cannot cut spending in all of those areas. It just means you cannot cut spending sufficiently so that you injure these programs at the same time that you have decided in the budget bill to provide a very significant tax cut. That represents the question of priorities.

I want to back up just for a moment and refer to something I read yesterday in a newspaper that I thought was an interesting piece. It was written by Jim Hoagland in the Washington Post. I commend Members of the Senate to read it; it is called "Surrender to the Money Men."

He starts out discussing something I have discussed previously on the floor of the Senate—that the stock market in America is at a record high, corporate profits are at near records in this country, productivity of the American work force is up. We are told the American economy is the most competitive in the world, but while all of these things are happening, wages in America continue to go down, and job security in our country continues to be diminished.

We hear about downsizing and layoffs, surplus workers, being more competitive; we hear about all of those things and then understand that it causes an enormous amount of anxiety among American workers because they feel somehow they are now surplus and they are the lost part of this economic equation called "globalization" in which in our economic enterprises' interest in being more competitive, they decide to produce elsewhere and ship back here. A corporation, international corporation, can become more competitive, they think, by deciding to produce shoes and shirts and belts, or trousers and cars and television sets, in foreign countries where labor is very inexpensive and then ship those back to our country for sale.

I understand why big corporations think it is in their interest to do so. It is something called profits. If you can get someone to work for 50 cents an hour and not be bothered by the issue of polluting water and polluting air and by the difficulties of the prohibition against hiring child labor, if you can get rid of those kinds of meddlesome difficulties by moving and producing offshore, you can make more profits if you can produce offshore and sell here.

Well, the result of that kind of strategy has created another kind of deficit

in this country that no one is talking about. We are talking about the budget deficit every single day. Already today, I have been to two meetings dealing with the budget deficit. I will spend much of this week, I assume, in negotiating sessions with other negotiators talking about the budget deficit.

There is not even a whisper in this Chamber or in this Congress about the other deficit, the trade deficit. We will, this year, have a merchandise trade deficit that is larger than our budget deficit. What does the merchandise trade deficit mean? It means that jobs have left our country. It means that our country has an economy that has weakened because we measure economic progress in this country by what we consume rather than what we produce.

It seems to me that we ought to start worrying about the twin deficits in our country—the budget deficit and the trade deficit. The budget deficit, one can make the economic argument, is the deficit we owe to ourselves but for the fact that it is unequally distributed; it causes problems in that regard. One can make the argument that it does not require a reduced standard of living to pay the budget deficit in this country. You cannot make the similar argument about the trade deficit. Inevitably, repaying the trade deficit will mean a lower standard of living in our country, and that is why this year, we will have the largest merchandise trade deficit in our history, and it is a very serious problem for our country.

I hope that at some point soon we start talking here in the Senate about the twin deficits, the budget deficit and the trade deficit. The trade deficit, as I indicated, relates to the budget deficit because there are things in the reconciliation bill here in the Congress that would make it even easier for those who want to move jobs offshore and to produce elsewhere and, therefore, it meets our trade deficit or makes it easier to do so.

I have shared with my colleagues on another occasion a provision in the so-called Balanced Budget Act in the reconciliation bill. I want to do that again today. It is a small provision that deals with tax law and the product called "deferral," deferring income tax obligations on foreign subsidiaries owned by domestic corporations that earn money overseas in their foreign subsidiary and do not have to pay taxes on it until it is repatriated to our country. Well, in 1993, we passed a law that tightened up on that and said that does not make sense. This is an incentive that says let us move the factories overseas and take American jobs and move them abroad.

What we have now is a provision by the majority party that says, "By the way, we will take this little provision that is an insidious incentive to move jobs overseas by multinational corporations and tell the multinational corporations we like this tax incentive so much, we want to increase it for