

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON pertaining to the introduction of S. 179 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON pertaining to the introduction of S. 180 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 181 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be able to speak for 5 minutes, not on the time of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes would have to come out of the time from the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if nobody else on his list is seeking recognition, I wonder if I might continue.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Can we extend my time for 5 minutes to 11:05?

I will yield to the Senator from Vermont 5 minutes out of my time.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his normal courtesy. Obviously, if someone from his group comes to the floor seeking recognition, I will yield the floor.

#### BIPARTISANSHIP IN THE 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. LEAHY. I just have heard so much, Mr. President, about a desire to return to less partisanship and more comity at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. I hope that might happen for the sake of this country.

I go back to an experience my father used to tell me about when I was a child. It was in 1936. I was not yet alive. But my father was born, raised in Vermont. At that time it was probably the most Republican State in the Union, one of only two States, for example, that voted for Alf Landon in the Franklin Roosevelt landslide.

President Franklin Roosevelt came to Vermont in 1936, actually August 1, 1936. He went in an open car down

State Street in Montpelier. The National Life Insurance Building had its headquarters at that time there. My family had their home almost across the street where they had the Leahy Press. My father, who was probably the only Democrat in Montpelier at the time, was standing in front of the National Life Building.

You must understand, National Life was sort of an adjunct to the Republican Party. They would determine, along with a couple other companies, who would be Governor this year to the next year and the next year at a time when we were solely a one-party State. I must say, as a Democrat I will have to admit they came up with some pretty good Governors too, but very, very much a Republican hierarchy place.

As the car went by, the President of the National Life took off his hat, stood at attention holding it over his heart. My father, standing next to him, said, "I never thought I'd see the day that you would take off your hat to Franklin Roosevelt."

He turned to my father and said, "Howard, I didn't take off my hat to Franklin Roosevelt. I took off my hat for the President of the United States of America." My father told me that story so many times growing up, and I had met the man who did that and I knew the facts of it. I recounted the story to a number of people, people writing books or speaking on this, as an example of a different era. Now, this man would never have voted for Franklin Roosevelt. He would have supported whoever ran against him, but he respected the office of the Presidency, as he respected the office of the Congress.

I hope, Mr. President, that all of us who serve in the Congress, in both parties, would stop trying to figure out how best to tear down these institutions. We are the most powerful democracy history has ever known. We are the only superpower in the world today. That brings with it certain responsibilities—to stay both a democracy and so powerful a country. We did it because of the genius of our three-part Government—the executive branch, legislative branch, and the judicial branch.

In recent years, with both Democrat and Republican Presidents, it has become a sport in this Nation to find every conceivable way to tear them down no matter what they do. I would ask myself and the public, is it conceivable that any person, man or woman, Democrat or Republican, could ever, anywhere in this Nation of 260 million people, reach the level of virtue and be the paragon that we seem to insist our President should be? If so, then that person is not a representative of 260 million Americans. But we try every which way to diminish the power of the Presidency, the leader of the most powerful nation on Earth. In the Senate and in the House we do it to ourselves, so that, again, the respect of the Nation is diminished. Now we see more and more attempts to do it to the judiciary.

Mr. President, let us stop and think. If we destroy, either by our actions or others', the respect that these institutions of Government must have, how long do we remain a democracy and how long before the checks and balances that have been so carefully built up, and built up based on the trust of the American people, how long before that trust is destroyed, the checks and balances fail, and suddenly you have an opening for a person on horseback to come in and take over the reins of power of the last great nuclear superpower, with the largest economy in the world, the most powerful nation on Earth, a nation that can justify its power and its position in this world only if it remains a democracy, only if it represents its own people, only if the reins of power maintain the respect of the people.

So I go back to that August day in Montpelier, VT, when that man was holding his hat over his heart as President Roosevelt went by, and as my father, a loyal long-time Democrat, may God rest his soul, took his hat off and held it over his heart when President Eisenhower honored the State of Vermont and drove through, and as I did, as a young prosecutor, for President Johnson and President Nixon and President Bush and President Clinton, stand at attention, thinking how honored our State was that they came and brought with them the symbols of the office of the Presidency.

Let us try. It is difficult in the time of the 30-second sound bites and special interest groups on the right and left. It is difficult when partisan feelings run high. But let us step back and say: Respect this country; respect the institutions; respect the integrity and the independence of our judiciary; respect the good will and patriotism of the men and women who have the opportunity to serve in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives; respect the fact that we, as a Nation, elect our President, a President who constitutionally can serve only 4 years at a time and no more than 8; respect the fact that we have those checks and balances. Maybe we ought to work at making Government work and earn the respect of our people and not try in so many ways to tear Government apart.

Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Iowa for his courtesy, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if he

would have any objection if I continue on another matter, with the understanding that, of course, I will yield the floor when one of his speakers comes on the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. No objection, assuming that if some of my cosponsors come to the floor, he will yield to me.

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there are few jobs on Earth more demanding, or where the stakes are greater, than the Secretary of State of the United States. The daily business of most heads of state around the world pales in comparison.

The President has made an outstanding nomination. Madeleine Albright brings to this job a lifetime of experience. She has proven her toughness and her fairness many times over. She has been an unwavering champion of the fundamental ideals our Nation stands for.

She has been a strong voice for international human rights and the dignity of all people. She is going to be looked at by millions of people all over the world—in democracies and countries that are not democratic—as our voice in foreign affairs.

My wife Marcelle and I have been privileged to know Madeleine Albright for over 20 years. We have traveled with her and we have worked with her. I also had the privilege to be appointed as a congressional delegate to the United Nations, when I joined with her in introducing resolutions on landmines. I have always found her to be a person of the highest integrity, the greatest ability, wide-ranging knowledge, and one real tough ambassador when she has to be, to protect the interests of the United States.

On an issue dear to my heart, the abolition of antipersonnel landmines, we could not ask for a more forceful or passionate advocate for an international ban. Her trip to Angola last year and her poignant descriptions of what she saw there gave a great boost to the effort to ban landmines not only in this country, but worldwide.

The recent United Nations vote, with 156 nations in favor and none opposed, for a U.S. resolution calling for urgent negotiations on a treaty to ban antipersonnel mines, was made possible in no small part because of Madeleine Albright's active role.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter she wrote to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor about her Angola trip.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 11, 1996]

#### ALBRIGHT VIEW OF LAND MINES

The author of "A Sower of Land Mines Pleads to End Them," Oct. 2, eloquently de-

scribes the horrific impact of land mines around the world. Ending the devastation of what I have called "weapons of mass destruction in slow motion" is a high priority. As President Clinton told the United Nations General Assembly just a few days ago, "our children deserve to walk this earth in safety."

This is why the United States is at the forefront of efforts to end the use of land mines and their stockpiling, production, and transfer. In the last few months, dozens of countries have joined a moratorium on these activities and in a few weeks, at the direction of President Clinton, I will introduce a resolution in the UN that will commit the world community to negotiating and concluding an international agreement designed to end the scourge of these dreadful weapons forever.

At the same time, as the author discusses, tens of millions of land mines are already in the ground and they go on killing and maiming long after the conflict has ended. Along with other countries, we have contributed more than \$90 million to demining efforts, and we are working hard to develop new technology to lower the costs of clearance and to reduce the danger to those heroes involved in this perilous work.

Finally, we are helping prevent greater suffering by alerting and educating on the hazards those millions of civilians, particularly children, whose lives are not only under threat everyday but whose ability to rebuild their communities is circumscribed by the hidden danger under roads, beneath playgrounds, or in unsown fields.

Whether in Cambodia, Angola, Bosnia, or in many other places, I have seen first hand the heartbreaking devastation of land mines and the continuing tragedy that they inflict. At the UN and around the world, as well as at the just-concluded Ottawa Conference, we will continue doing all we can to end this horror and make our earth safe once again.

Mr. LEAHY. As Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright and I will have many conversations on a wide range of foreign policy issues. I know Secretaries have traditionally steered clear of budgetary issues. As the budget for foreign assistance has fallen sharply in recent years, I hope she will become more directly involved in reversing this dangerous trend. Secretary Christopher called the decline in funding for foreign assistance "the biggest crisis we are facing in foreign policy today." Not Bosnia. Not the Middle East. Not the fate of democracy in Russia. Not North Korea. Not renewed violence in Northern Ireland. Not the simmering conflict between India and Pakistan—both nuclear powers. Not the danger of plutonium ending up in the hands of terrorists. Not war and hunger in Africa.

No, all of those things. Because we cannot deal with these problems unless we are willing to pay the price. Leadership costs money. Ambassador Albright knows that.

I believe she will make the foreign policy budget a high priority and keep it at the top of the agenda. There have already been a number of Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, who have said strongly and forcefully—respected voices in this Chamber—that they will work to ensure that the administration has the funding necessary to effectively carry out its foreign pol-

icy. We need her active and sustained support in this.

She is going to have her plate full. I urge her to give special attention to the needs of our own hemisphere, and I know that she will. We have seen real progress toward democracy and free markets in Latin America, but the future is far from certain.

We have a compelling interest in stopping the flow of drugs and refugees, in strengthening civilian governments and seeing human rights respected in places where they are not, and in broadening our trade relations. I know of nobody who would give a better voice to that.

So I think Madeleine Albright was a superb choice. She will make us all proud, as she already has as our representative to the United Nations. And I think the fact that we are hearing such strong voices on both sides of the aisle commending this choice bodes well for her as Secretary of State, and for all Americans. She will be confirmed overwhelmingly.

It truly is the American dream when the daughter of a Czechoslovakian escaping communism becomes America's Ambassador to the United Nations, and the Secretary of State of this great Nation.

Mr. President, again, I thank my dear friend from Iowa for his customary courtesy, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized in morning business for approximately 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California controls the time until 11:30.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

#### FEDERAL GANG VIOLENCE ACT OF 1997

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Federal Gang Violence Act of 1997 which was introduced yesterday by Senator HATCH on behalf of himself and this Senator from California. I also believe my sentiments and cosponsorship are joined by Senators HARKIN, REID, and D'AMATO.

Mr. President, this legislation makes the Federal Government a much more active partner in the war on criminal activity that, I am regretful to say, has become violent and deadly and is perpetrated by organized street gangs. This bill was introduced with some differences in the last Congress, but the need for the legislation has only increased, and today I hope to lay out the case for the need for the legislation.