

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.

Gang violence has become a problem in the United States of America of epic proportions, and I think few people really understand the degree to which street gangs are crossing State lines and perpetrating violence.

Today, the Department of Justice reports that in the United States there are some 25,000 different street gangs. There are more than 652,000 members of these gangs. And they are not loosely organized. They are not the street kids glamorized in *West Side Story*.

Today's gangs are very different. They are organized. They are sophisticated. They are traveling crime syndicates much like the Mafia. They regularly cross State lines to recruit new members. They traffic in drugs and weapons, they smuggle illegal aliens, they steal, and they murder. In just one city, Los Angeles, consider this: Nearly 7,300 of its citizens were murdered in the last 16 years from gang warfare—7,300 citizens. This is more people than have been killed in all of the fighting in Northern Ireland.

Gangs were responsible for 43 percent of all homicides in Los Angeles in 1994. They were responsible for 41 percent of homicides in Omaha, NE, in 1995; more than half of all violent crimes in Buffalo, NY, in 1994. In Phoenix, gang-related homicides jumped 800 percent between 1990 and 1994. In Wichita, KS, drive-by shootings jumped from 8 in 1991 to 267 in 1993. That is a 3,000 percent increase in just 2 years. And this is a smaller city—300,000 people. A Justice Department survey found that gang problems are worsening in 48 percent of the responding communities.

These are just a few examples of the alarming rise in gang terror. The problem is we have become numb to it. Let me give you an example. In Los Angeles, on a Monday last February, with Mayor Dick Riordan, I announced this legislation at a news conference. The Los Angeles city councilwoman who is in charge of the public safety committee, Laura Chick, reported that just that weekend six people had been murdered by gangs on the streets of Los Angeles, and you know what? Not one was reported in the press. We have become so numb because this kind of violence has become so commonplace all across the United States.

Last September, a member of the Crips from Los Angeles was arrested in Dayton, OH, with two other men for conspiracy to distribute cocaine. Police seized approximately \$1 million in cash in the raid.

A 1995 study of gang members by the National Gang Crime Research Center found that three-quarters of all gangs exist in more than one geographic area. One-half of gang members belong to gangs that did not arise locally but arose with contact from a gang outside the area. One-half of gang members had contact with the same gang in another city. And this is the clincher: 61 percent of gang members indicated their gang was an official branch of a larger national gang.

Sergeant Jerry Flowers of the gang crime unit in Oklahoma City captured the migration instinct of these gangs when he said, "The gang leaders realized that the same ounce of crack cocaine they sold for \$300 in Los Angeles was worth nearly \$2,000 in Oklahoma City."

Let me now tell you about the size and scope of some of America's most prominent street gangs. The Los Angeles Times recently conducted one of the most intensive investigative reports of major gang activity ever conducted by a newspaper in the United States.

Let me begin with the 18th Street Gang and the picture the L.A. Times painted. The 18th Street Gang has as many as 20,000 members in southern California alone—20 times the size of the notorious Bloods and Crips.

The 18th Street Gang is so influential in narcotics trafficking that the gang now deals directly with Mexican and Colombian drug cartels. The 18th Street Gang actually rents street corners to nongang dope peddlers, forcing them to pay so-called taxes of up to \$1,000 a day.

The gang is growing and spreading. They have become the largest and fastest growing gang in Oregon, where they gunned down a 15-year-old member who wanted out of the gang. Utah officials say the 18th Street Gang has arrived there with a vengeance.

Even internationally, the 18th Street Gang is fighting for turf. In El Salvador, 18th Street is warring with rival gangs. Honduran authorities have sought advice from Los Angeles law enforcement on the gang. 18th Street has a cell in Tijuana, where they often flee to escape arrest and prosecution. On the average, someone in Los Angeles County is assaulted or robbed by the 18th Street Gang every single day of every month of every year.

While currently the deadliest and most prolific on the streets in southern California today, the 18th Street Gang is not the only gang. Let us talk for a moment about Bloods and Crips.

The Bloods and Crips that originated in Los Angeles in the late 1960's are the Nation's two largest street gangs. They are also continuing to expand, and you see this expansion as they move across the United States. Local police and the FBI have traced factions of these gangs to more than 119 cities in the West and Midwest. Some of those cities are on this map. They have more than 60,000 members nationally. According to the FBI, narcotics trafficking is their principal source of income.

Let me give another one, the Chicago-born Gangster Disciples. The Gangster Disciples, according to the authorities, is a Chicago-based, 30,000-member, multimillion-dollar gang operation spanning 35 States. They traffic in narcotics and weapons and are said to operate much like a Fortune 500 company, with two boards of directors, one in prison and one outside, a layer of governors and regents, a tax col-

lector, and some 6,000 salespersons. Their income is estimated by Chicago authorities to be \$300,000 daily.

Let me talk for a minute about Russian gangs. Russian organized crime activity in the United States has been expanding for the past 20 years, but its most significant growth has occurred during the past 5 years. Mr. President, 29 States now report activities by Russian crime groups. FBI Director Louis Freeh stated that more than 200 of Russia's 6,000 crime gangs operate with American counterparts in the United States, so they flow from Russia to the United States and back.

Russian gangs tend to be more loosely organized than other gangs, but they have formed networks that operate and shift alliances to meet particular needs. The California attorney general indicates that the most common activities by Russian organized crime gangs are fraud schemes involving fuel taxes, insurance, and credit card fraud. But they also engage in more common organized crime activities: extortion, loan sharking, drug trafficking, auto theft and prostitution.

Asian gangs: The Department of Justice indicates that among ethnic gangs, Jamaican and Asian gangs are considered by law enforcement officials to pose the largest threat. Asian gangs have been identified as major threats in more than 17 cities. In Los Angeles alone, there are more than 100 Asian gangs with 10,000 members. Illegal activities include alien smuggling, murder, kidnapping, extortion, home-invasion robberies, high-technology heists, and firearms trafficking.

Vietnamese gangs, in particular, have become a serious threat in many of our cities. They tend to be very violent. They are more sophisticated organizationally, and they specialize in stealing multimillion-dollar quantities of computer chips. At least 400 Silicon Valley companies in my State that deal in computer chips have been hit in the last year and a half. That is almost one a day. And they are losing tens of millions of dollars. Computer firms lose as much as \$1 million a week in thefts, according to the Justice Department.

The legislation Senator HATCH and I have introduced does this: It doubles the sentence for any member of an organized criminal gang who commits a Federal crime. It expands the scope of gang-related criminal acts to include activities such as carjacking and drive-by shootings, and significantly increases penalties for those crimes. It checks the growth of gangs by making the recruitment of minors into criminal gangs a Federal offense with stiff penalties.

Specifically, this legislation doubles the actual sentence for any member of an organized criminal street gang who commits a Federal crime. Current Federal law increases the penalties for organizers, leaders, managers and supervisors of criminal activity, including gang leaders. However, members of

known criminal street gangs currently are not subjected to higher penalties when a Federal crime is committed. Many prosecutors and law enforcement officials indicate that gang members, in addition to the leaders and supervisors of gangs, should see their penalties increased to provide a stronger deterrent for children to stay away from street gangs.

This legislation amends the sentencing guidelines so that individual gang members convicted of felonies would have their sentencing level approximately doubled. For example, currently, if a first-time offender who is a member of a gang is convicted of trafficking in 30 stolen guns, he or she would receive a minimum sentence of 4¾ to 6 years in jail. Under this legislation, that sentence would be increased to 9 to 11¾ years.

This legislation makes it a Federal offense to engage in a pattern of criminal gang activity, subject to severe and certain penalties. Under this legislation, if a person commits two or more predicate gang crimes, which include carjacking, drive-by shooting, drug dealing and obstruction of justice, in furtherance of a criminal street gang's activities within a 5-year period, that gangster is engaging in a pattern of criminal gang activity and he can be prosecuted federally. This is the Federal-local partnership we envision, to get at gang activity that crosses State lines. And this individual, if convicted, will be sentenced to at least 10 years in prison, up to life imprisonment for a first conviction of this offense; will be sentenced to at least 20 years imprisonment up to life imprisonment for a second or later conviction of this offense; and would be subject to asset seizures and forfeitures.

This legislation expands the definition of criminal street gangs in Federal law to better reflect modern-day gang activity. So it broadens the definition of criminal street gangs in title 18 of the criminal code to include State crimes such as drive-by shootings, rape, torture, carjacking, kidnapping, and assault with a deadly weapon.

It doubles the penalties for interstate gang-related crimes, and it expands the Travel Act to respond more effectively to the growing problem of highly sophisticated, mobile and organized street gangs. As most of us know, the Travel Act was written in 1961 and it had Mafia-style activity in mind. While the Travel Act as it is now written allows prosecutors to target some gang activities such as drug trafficking, the list is not complete. Law enforcement leaders and prosecutors, including U.S. attorneys, have recommended to us that the act be modernized to better reflect current crimes by gang members.

(Mr. BROWNBACK assumed the chair.)

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, under this legislation, the list of unlawful activities in the Travel Act will be expanded to include the following

crimes: drive-by shooting; robbery; burglary; assault with a deadly weapon; intimidation of witnesses, victims, jurors or informants; assault resulting in bodily injury; possession and/or trafficking of stolen property; alien smuggling; and firearms trafficking.

In addition, the maximum penalties would be doubled, from 5 to 10 years, for those who commit nonviolent violations of these provisions. A conspiracy provision is also added to the statute.

We double the base offense levels under the sentencing guidelines for traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in aid of a street gang. This is to get at those gangs that come from other countries and States and operate back and forth. So traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in aid of a street gang would increase from 6 to 12 in sentencing levels, which increases the base sentencing range from a low of 0 to 6 months and a high of 12 to 18 months, to a new low of 10 to 16 months and a new high of 30 to 37 months. Committing violent crimes in aid of a street gang or racketeering activity would increase from 12 to 24, which increases the base sentencing range from a low of 10 to 16 months and a high of 30 to 37 months, to a new low of 51 to 63 months and a new high of 100 to 125 months.

One of the most insidious tactics of today's gangs is the way they target children to do their dirty work, and they indoctrinate them into a life of crime. Let me give you an example.

According to the Los Angeles Times, the 18th Street Gang, which I described earlier, "resembles a kind of children's army," with recruiters who scout middle schools for 11- to 13-year-old children to join the gang. The gang's real leaders are middle-age veterans, long-time gang members who direct this criminal activity from the background.

Chicago's Gangster Disciples recruit not just at high schools, but even at elementary schools. One of the gang's members told a Federal court about his preference for children 17 and under as armed guards, "because they can go to jail and get out quicker."

This pattern is not unusual. A report by the National Gang Crime Research Center found, "The term 'youth gang' is itself somewhat of a misnomer when it comes to the major gangs in America today \* \* \* the real leaders at the top of these major gangs are in fact older adults, many in their forties and even older \* \* \* 84.8 percent"—85 percent—"of the gang members in our sample indicated that their gang does in fact have such older adult leaders."

Current Federal law contains no penalty for recruiting minors to participate in gang activity, and this is a critical part of our legislation. This legislation makes the recruitment or solicitation of persons to participate in gang activity subject to a 1-year minimum and a 10-year maximum penalty, or a fine of up to \$250,000. If a minor is recruited or solicited, the minimum penalty is increased to 4 years.

In addition, the person convicted of this crime would have to pay the costs of housing, maintaining and treating the juvenile until the juvenile reaches the age of 18.

This act also makes violation of this section a predicate offense under the racketeering statutes, known as RICO statutes.

It is now a crime to knowingly transfer a firearm to be used to commit a violent crime or a drug trafficking crime. This legislation adds a mandatory minimum penalty of 3 years if the gun to be used in crime is transferred to a minor.

This legislation increases penalties for transferring handguns to minors. The Youth Handgun Safety Act, passed by Congress as part of the 1994 crime bill, does not contain sufficient penalties against juveniles who possess handguns for criminal purposes. In fact, one provision of this act requires only probation for first-time juvenile offenders who possess a handgun.

Such a weak penalty has meant that prosecutors don't bother to target and prosecute gang members. I have been told this by U.S. attorneys and by district attorneys, and we aim to correct that problem with this language. In addition, current law sets different penalties for juveniles and adults who transfer a weapon to a minor. The Federal Gang Violence Act toughens the penalties against juveniles and adults who transfer a firearm to a minor—and subjects juveniles and adults to the same penalties for violating this law.

This legislation changes the Youth Handgun Safety Act by:

First, setting a one-year minimum sentence for anyone—adult or juvenile—who provides a minor with a handgun.

Second, holding juveniles accountable when they unlawfully give another minor a firearm by applying the same 5-year maximum sentence now given to adults.

Third, setting a 1-year minimum sentence and applying the same 10-year maximum sentence to adults and juveniles who give a firearm to a minor and should have known the gun would be used in a crime of violence. Currently, the 10-year maximum sentence only applies to adults.

Juveniles under 13 years old, however, would not be subject to these mandatory minimum sentences.

The Armed Career Criminal Act provides that if a person has three or more prior convictions for certain crimes—is a "career criminal"—and he possesses, ships, transports or receives a gun or ammunition—is armed—he will be subject to a mandatory minimum 15 year penalty and fine of up to \$25,000.

Serious drug offenses are already in the list of crimes which count toward the three-conviction minimum; this bill would allow juvenile convictions for serious drug offenses to also count toward that three-conviction minimum.

This would not apply to nickel-and-dime possession offenses, but to drug

dealing which is punishable by 10 or more years in prison.

Many police officers around the country are confronting heavily-armed gang members who are wearing bullet-proof vests.

This legislation increases Federal sentences if a person wears body armor in the commission of a Federal offense, by directing the Sentencing Commission to provide for a sentencing enhancement under the Guidelines of at least two levels.

Presently, a 30-day time limit exists for bringing juveniles to trial. With crimes being committed by juveniles becoming increasingly violent and complex, prosecutors need additional time to adequately develop cases. This legislation increases the time limit to 45 days.

This bill adds firearms trafficking violations to the list of crimes that can be attacked by prosecutors under RICO. Currently, firearms violations are not RICO predicate acts. Prosecutors and law enforcement officials indicate an increasing use of firearms by criminal street gangs to commit home robberies, business invasions, and attacks on rival gangs.

Since most of the firearms have moved in interstate commerce—and because firearms are such an integral part of the gang's activity—law enforcement officials have suggested that firearms violations become predicate acts under RICO.

Finally, this legislation authorizes \$100 million over the next 5 years for hiring additional Federal prosecutors to prosecute violent youth gangs.

I don't mean to go into detail, but I really want this body to understand that in this Senator's opinion, and I think Senator HATCH's and our cosponsors', this Nation's No. 1 criminal threat comes from organized street gangs now moving vociferously across State lines and across international lines. If we don't move now, I think we surrender the independence of this Nation to a kind of underground world of street gangs connected in Russia, connected in Asia, connected in Japan, connected in Latin America, and Central America.

What we aim to do is up the penalties and create some new penalties which can really be effective in dealing with crime. The addition of the RICO statutes, the use of asset seizures and forfeitures, treating street gangs today the way mafia organized crime was treated 10 to 15 years ago can make a big dent and deter gangs. Most important to me is that it becomes a Federal offense for anyone to go out there and recruit a member of a gang that moves their stolen goods, illegal immigrants, drugs, guns, murder, extortion, witness intimidation across State lines.

Mr. President, I would like to make one last comment on another subject before I yield the floor.

#### END THE BOMBINGS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, this morning, on my way to work, on Connecticut Avenue, I ran into the fact that another bomb had been placed at a Planned Parenthood center. This is just January, and the number of these bombings and attempted bombings are already over six.

I rise today really to deplore these acts, and I rise today to say to the right-to-life movement: Please, make clear that terrorism is not part of your agenda. If you fail to do so and fail to do so now, I believe we are in for a terrible siege this year, if the month of January is any indication.

I am also hopeful that the Attorney General will join in the investigation and the subsequent prosecution as our legislation of the last session provides.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for not more than 5 minutes and that my remarks be included with the group of speakers, including the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. GRASSLEY], on alternative minimum tax relief.

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

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota, Senator Dornan, is controlling the time until 12 noon.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I think the President said, "Mr. Dornan." Mr. Dornan is no longer serving in the House. I am Senator DORGAN from North Dakota. I would observe—I know the Senator knows the difference—but there is a substantial difference between former Congressman Dornan and Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the President apologizes for that. Mr. DORGAN, I do apologize. You are recognized, and you control the time until noon.

Mr. DORGAN. The President need not apologize. I was just calling attention to it.

Let me yield a couple minutes—

Mr. REID. How about 3 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Three minutes to the Senator from Nevada, Senator REID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### ABORTION AND VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to coming to this body I was an attorney, practiced law, I have great respect for the law. I tried dozens and dozens of cases before juries. I did not always agree with the result of the verdicts that the jury came to, but I always re-

spected what they did, their obligation to do what they felt was right. The U.S. Supreme Court, and other courts—I do not always agree with their decisions, but I respect the United States being a body that follows the law. We respect the law. We follow the law.

Mr. President, on the 24th anniversary of the Roe versus Wade decision, I feel it is appropriate that I come and offer a few words today about what is taking place in our country. My record—as you know, is that I am personally opposed to abortion. But, Mr. President, I am also opposed to what is going on in this country today where certain people feel that they are above the law, that the law is something that they can interpret on their own.

There is no justification for what is taking place in America today where violence is almost a way of life in some areas. Today on the news it had appeared that a bomb went off near an abortion clinic here in Washington, DC. It is not clear whether the bomb was meant to destroy the clinic, but all over the country there are abortion clinics that are being bombed. I think that is abhorrent and wrong.

Mr. President, if someone respects life, you cannot choose which life you respect. You cannot only respect the lives of those who agree with you politically or those who agree with certain decisions surrendered by the Supreme Court.

I am adamantly opposed to the use of violence to show one's displeasure with the law. I was the first Member of this body to come to the floor and denounce the killing of Dr. David Gunn in Florida. I am compelled to come to the floor again today, given the most recent bombings of abortion clinics.

It is incumbent upon the leaders of this country to condemn these shameful acts. It is incumbent upon the religious leaders that they condemn these shameful tactics. Yet we need more than people saying, well, I disagree with violence. We need people speaking out against this violence. We need people denouncing these acts. Through their silence, I believe there is an acquiescence to this violence.

The people who perpetrate these bombings are wrong. They are a fringe element. They are extremists who advocate violence as an alternative to meaningful debate and discussion. They believe, I assume, Mr. President, that they are above the law.

Let us continue to have passionate and vigorous debate on this subject and all other subjects, but do not take the law into our own hands. I repeat, those who respect life cannot choose which lives they respect. You cannot only respect the lives of those who agree with us.

Religion teaches us tolerance. This does not mean tolerance for only those people who agree with us. It means tolerance for all. If your message is to protect life, then you do not put other lives in jeopardy by your acts.

We have been told in Holy Scripture, Mr. President, as you have heard it