

have served with 18 percent of all of the Senators since the beginning of this country. If I put my tiny handful of the best, Howard Baker is in there, hands down—a wonderful, wonderful man. He was a Senator's Senator. He believed in the Senate. He believed what a privilege it was to serve here.

He believed that the Senate could be the conscience of the Nation. I appreciate the tribute that was paid by my dear friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, who I knew as Governor and as Cabinet member. We have always had a good personal relationship. I listened to his tales of Howard Baker. His colleague from Tennessee painted quite a picture of him. I thank them for doing that. I thank them for adding to the history of the Senate by doing it.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois be recognized once I yield the floor.

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

LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Everyone knows the old adage that a picture is worth 1,000 words. I have been an avid photographer since I was a child. I have a strong sense of that. So I thought I would provide a few examples today, because sometimes words are not enough.

I have often spoken about the horrific toll on civilians from landmines. These tiny explosives, about the size of a hockey puck or a can of soup, can kill a child or blow the legs and arms off an adult. They are triggered by the victim. In other words, unlike a gun that a soldier aims and fires or a bomb that is dropped and explodes on a target, landmines sit there and wait for their victims.

It could be hours or days or weeks, even years. But however long it is after they are scattered and hidden beneath a layer of sand or dirt, they explode when an unsuspecting person, whether a combatant or an innocent civilian, steps on it or triggers it with a plow or a wheelbarrow or a bicycle. That person's life is changed forever.

In many countries where there are few doctors, landmine victims bleed to death. Those who survive with a leg or both legs gone are the lucky ones. This girl is an example of who I am talking about. We do not know her nationality, but the picture tells a lot. She is learning to walk on artificial legs. Her life has been made immeasurably harder because of a landmine that probably cost less than \$2. I have a granddaughter not much older than her.

Each of these photographs tell a similar story. None of these people were combatants. Each are facing lives of pain, and sometimes in their communities stigmatization because of weapons that are designed to be indiscriminate.

The Leahy War Victims Fund has helped some of them, as this photo-

graph taken in Vietnam shows. My wife Marcelle and I have seen the difference the Fund has made, but I wish there were no need for it because there would be no landmines.

Over the years, as people around the world became aware of the landmine problem, they took action. The Senate was the first legislative body in the world to ban exports of antipersonnel landmines. I am proud of writing that amendment. Other countries soon followed our example.

And there were others, especially Canada's former Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. Thanks to them an international treaty outlawing the weapons has been joined by 161 countries. I regret that the United States, of all the NATO countries, is the only one that has not joined, even though the U.S. military has not used antipersonnel mines for 22 years, despite two long wars.

On June 27, though, the Obama administration finally took a step—it is an incremental step, but it is a significant one—to put the United States on a path to join the treaty. Although the United States has not produced or purchased antipersonnel mines since the 1990s, the White House announced that as a matter of official policy that it will no longer produce or otherwise acquire antipersonnel mines, nor will the Pentagon replenish its stockpile of mines as they become obsolete.

Our closest allies and many others around the world welcomed this step, even though it falls far short of what supporters of the treaty have called for.

But one senior Member of the House of Representatives immediately accused President Obama of ignoring U.S. military commanders, some of whom have defended the use of landmines, just as the military defended poison gas a century ago when nations acted to ban it.

This Member of the House said: The President "owes our military an explanation for ignoring their advice", and he went on to say that this decision represents an "expensive solution in search of a nonexistent problem."

A Member of our body, the Senate, called the announcement a "brazen attempt by the President to circumvent the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to provide advice and consent to international treaties that bind the United States."

These are strong words. They make great sound bites for the press. But the truth lies elsewhere.

Over the years, the White House has consulted closely with the Pentagon, including about this decision. The policy just announced simply makes official what has been an informal fact for at least 17 years through three Presidential administrations.

It also ignores the fact that the United States has neither joined the treaty nor has the President sent it to the Senate for ratification, so the

President has obviously not circumvented the Senate's advice and consent role.

And it ignores that every one of our NATO allies and most of our coalition partners have renounced antipersonnel mines, as have dozens of countries that could never dream of having a powerful, modern army as we do—countries that look to the United States, the most powerful Nation on Earth, but they got rid of their landmines.

The naysayers' argument is simple. It goes like this: The United States is no longer causing the misery captured in these photographs, so why should we join the treaty? Does that mean they also oppose the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, such as the crippled people in this photograph? Do they oppose the Chemical Weapons Treaty, and every other treaty dealing with international relations that the United States has joined since the time of George Washington?

Does the fact that we are not causing a problem, that we do not use landmines or chemical weapons, absolve us from having a responsibility to be part of an international treaty to stop it? Of course not. The world looks to the United States for leadership.

In 1992, if the Senate had accepted the argument now being made this body would never have voted 100 to 0 to ban the export of antipersonnel landmines.

I suppose those in the House who criticize President Obama today would say the entire Senate was wrong 22 years ago. Those 100 Democrats and Republicans who voted back then to ban U.S. exports of antipersonnel mines understood that while the United States may not have been causing the problem, we needed to be part of the solution. The same holds true today.

In 1996 President Clinton called on the Pentagon to develop alternatives to antipersonnel mines, whether they were technological or doctrinal alternatives. He was Commander in Chief, but the Pentagon largely ignored him. But now 18 years later it needs to be done. Not at some unspecified time in the future but by a reasonable deadline—because it can be done.

Now, I am not so naive to think that a treaty will prevent every last person on Earth from using landmines. But if people use them, they pay a price for using them. Bashar Assad used poison gas, but look at the political price he paid. Are those who oppose the landmine treaty so dismissive of the benefits of outlawing and stigmatizing a weapon like IEDs, which pose a danger to our own troops?

Rather than opposing a treaty that will make it a war crime to use landmines against our troops, why not support the mine-breaching technology they need to protect themselves?

I always come back to the photographs. I have met many people like these. They may not be Americans, but what happened to them happens to

thousands of others like them each year. The United States can help stop it. It is a moral issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The assistant majority leader.

REMEMBERING ALAN DIXON

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday at 6 p.m. on Capitol Hill there was a gathering at a nearby restaurant known as The Monocle. It was a gathering of former staffers of U.S. Senator Alan Dixon of Illinois. They picked The Monocle because he would have picked it. It was his favorite place on Capitol Hill. And it was a sad day, because Senator Dixon passed away Sunday morning in Fairview Heights, IL.

His staff gathered at The Monocle the next day, which would have been his birthday, to toast him and to pay tribute to a great boss, a great friend, and a great Senator from the State of Illinois.

Senator Dixon passed away in his sleep in the early hours on Sunday morning. His son Jeff had dropped him off at home, and he was there with his wife Jody when he passed away. So instead of celebrating his birthday on Monday, we had a day of remembrance of an extraordinary public servant for the State of Illinois.

Alan Dixon used to be known in political circles as Al the Pal, and he loved it. It really described him. For him, friendship and loyalty were everything. It showed in his life and, I think, was a great part of his success.

He was a person who gloried in representing Illinois. He never harbored any national ambitions. Being a Senator from Illinois was his goal in life. He reached it and performed so well as Senator that he is fondly remembered by many who served with him in the House and in the Senate.

He represented an old-school style of politics. He believed in his heart that people of good will could find common ground if they worked at it. He knew how to make this government work, how to make this Senate work, and work for the State of Illinois.

In his memoir, which he published last year, he wrote:

Generally speaking, my political career was built on good will and accommodation.

He was known by Senators on both sides of the aisle as a friendly, helpful, articulate, and effective colleague.

He was a downstate guy in our State. He grew up in Belleville and St. Clair County, not too far away from my hometown of East St. Louis. He grew up just across the river from the great city of St. Louis. His dad owned and ran the Dixon Wine and Liquor Company in Belleville.

Alan served in World War II, in the U.S. Navy Air Corps. After the war, he went to the University of Illinois where they had a special arrangement for vets to earn a bachelor's degree. He went for a short time to the University of Illinois Law School and then, when

his dad's business was struggling, he transferred to Washington University Law School where he graduated second in his class.

In 1948, at the age of 21, a neighbor said: Alan, I have been watching you and I think you ought to consider running for police magistrate in Belleville, IL. Alan hadn't even graduated from law school, and his friend reminded him you didn't have to be a lawyer to be a police magistrate in those days. So he ran and he won.

Two years later, after getting out of law school and passing the bar, both in Missouri and Illinois, he was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives—the youngest member ever elected to the Illinois General Assembly. His starting salary: \$3,000.

He went on to become one of the most successful vote-getters in the history of the State of Illinois. He won 29 consecutive bids for public office, for State representative, State senator, secretary of state, and state treasurer. During one of those races, he carried all 102 counties in Illinois, all 30 townships in Cook County, and all 50 wards. That is a record I don't think anybody will ever break.

When he served in Springfield, IL, as a State representative and a State senator, he did a lot of things, but he pointed with pride to his passage of a constitutional change in Illinois to finally modernize our judiciary. He remembered his days as police magistrate and thought our system of justice had to be brought into the 20th century. Alan Dixon of Belleville, IL, led that effort—an enormous political lift. He got it done. He was effective. People trusted him and they respected him.

He led an unpopular fight against loyalty oaths during the McCarthy era, and he helped create the Illinois college system.

In 1980, the people of Illinois chose Alan Dixon to represent them here in the Senate. He teamed up with his old friend a couple years later who had joined him in the Illinois General Assembly, his seatmate in the Assembly, a man named Paul Simon. Senator Dixon and then-Congressman Paul Simon, soon to be Senator Paul Simon, were colleagues and buddies and business partners. What an unlikely duo. There was Paul Simon who might be persuaded once in a blue moon to drink a little glass of wine, and there was Alan Dixon who loved that cold beer that he grew up with in Belleville, IL. But the two of them were fast friends. I witnessed that friendship over the years. I didn't see the early days when they owned newspapers together—Paul was a newspaper man and Alan more an investor—but I did witness the political part of that friendship, and it was amazing to see.

There were moments in their lives when the two of them could have clashed over their political ambitions, but they always worked it out. They were always friends, and that made a big difference in both of their lives.

It was Alan Dixon as Senator who came up with an idea that had never been tried before in Illinois: He decided to try to get all of the members of the Illinois congressional delegation—Democrats and Republicans—together for lunch on a regular basis. Well, he had to persuade a few of the oldtimers who weren't really open to the idea, but it was his personality and his determination that got it done, a tradition which continues to this day.

In his 12 years in the Senate, Alan Dixon didn't forget where he came from. He remembered growing up in a family of modest means in Belleville. He remembered those tough summer jobs—and there were plenty of them. And he never forgot the working people he represented in St. Clair County and across the State of Illinois.

Alan was at the top of his game and in the strongest voice when it came to standing up for working people and the little guy. He fought for affordable housing and lending practices. He denounced wasteful spending and created a procurement czar to oversee spending at the Pentagon.

One of the things which he is remembered for as a Senator was deciding to personally test a new weapons system. They sent him down to test the Sergeant York gun. They put him in a helmet and sat him on the gun. He was going to test it and fire it, and he soon discovered the gun was a dud—it couldn't shoot straight. He came back and reported it to his colleagues in the Senate, including Senator Sam Nunn, and they went along with Senator Dixon and said: We are going to junk this project. It is a waste of taxpayers' money.

It was Alan Dixon who called for tougher oversight of the savings and loan industry and vigorous prosecution of scam artists who defrauded S&Ls and left taxpayers holding the bag.

In 1992, Alan lost his bid for reelection to the Senate in a hotly contested three-way primary. It was the political upset of the year. It isn't often around here that a Senator would lose in a primary race for reelection—and a lot of people were wondering, his first political loss, how would it affect Alan Dixon.

Election night, Alan stood up and gave the most heartfelt, touching speech I can ever remember of a person who lost a campaign. It was repeated over and over that he was a real gentleman, and his words that he had to say even in defeat added to his reputation as a fine, honest, great public servant. A tearful crowd listened as he said he had “loved every golden moment” of his time in politics.

His fellow Democratic Senators had twice unanimously elected him to serve as chief deputy whip. After his loss in that election and then retirement, he was praised on the floor of the Senate by not only Ted Kennedy and George Mitchell but Bob Dole and Strom Thurmond as well.

In 1995, his public life was resumed when President Clinton appointed Alan