to come to an agreement that every Senator will agree to, but I think we are close enough on that issue that we ought to be able to reach agreement and bring the foreign operations appropriations conference report to a conclusion. And if we can get that agreement and fast track, we will have completed the year on a very high note and one that the American people, I think, will be proud of and of which we could be proud.

The taxpayers of the United States have had a pretty good year. We would like to end up with agreements on these important issues. Certainly, it won't be perfect, as the Senator has said, but we have tried compromise after compromise after compromise. So far, none of them have taken hold. But I have faith that on Sunday, we will find a way to do that. Certainly, I do think that senior Members and leaders have to step up to these challenges and get the job done.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business until the hour of 1:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

THANKING THE SENATE STAFF

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will be very brief because I see other Senators waiting to take the floor. I will note a couple of things. The distinguished majority leader has mentioned that it is Sunday. The guest Chaplain today, Father Paul Lavin of St. Joseph's Church, is my pastor when I am away from my home in Vermont, which is not often on a Sunday.

But this Sunday is extraordinary, that is, being in Washington and not in Vermont.

Father Lavin also prayed for, in the mass this morning which my wife and I attended, the Congress and the Government, and so forth, as we all do.

Sometimes we have to be careful we don't get too much of what we pray for, but I think it would probably be safe to say, as I look around at the staff and everybody else here, that they were probably praying that it would come to a conclusion.

In that respect, I note, Mr. President, as I have in other years, that while I may joke about Senators being nothing but constitutional impediments to the staff, the fact is, the U.S. Senate, the greatest parliamentary body in the world, could not exist without the extraordinarily talented men and women who work on Capitol Hill for Members on both sides of the aisle, for committees, for the Senate itself, and those who take the notes of our proceedings, to those who keep the procedures of the Senate moving.

I say a special compliment to the young men and women who come here and serve as pages, come from all over the country and serve here as pages. I have been fortunate to have had a series of some of the most exemplary young men and women from Vermont who have served here as pages. They go through a rigorous screening process. Only the best get picked. And they go back to be the best among our citizens in our own State.

The people in this country ofttimes do not realize the extraordinary dedication of the men and women who work here who sometimes put in literally around-the-clock hours and days, who literally give of themselves more than any private industry could ever expect of anyone. And that is what makes the Senate work.

My friend from Mississippi and I were discussing earlier putting together this last-minute legislation. Well, we can make some policy decisions, but it is these people who have to then pull it together. For Foreign operations, Tim Rieser, from my staff, carries out my duties as ranking member on that. There are dozens of others on both sides that have to do this—Robin Cleveland for Senator MCCONNELL, who is the chairman of that subcommittee.

And it is the same with all the subcommittees, trying to pull these pieces together and actually have the paper. We stand up and say ''aye'' or ''nay,'' but they have to have the papers on the floor in perfect condition for us to vote on them.

Then, whether it is the people in the Cloakroom, the people back at our offices, or anybody else, they also give up their family time to be here for the good of the country.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hope we can complete these foreign aid bills. I would also say to my friend from Mississippi, he mentioned whether we should use taxpayers' money for abortion in the foreign aid bill. There is a specific prohibition against any U.S. dollars being used for abortions abroad in the foreign aid bill.

In fact, as Senator Mark Hatfield, former chairman of the Appropriation Committee, and I pointed out on the floor earlier—he was very much a right-to-life, antiabortion Senator, consistent in that—pointed out that the family planning moneys that have gone in the foreign aid bill have dramatically decreased the number of abortions in those areas where they were used.

An example was Russia where abortion was used as a form of birth control, where we gave them family planning money and the number of abortions dropped dramatically.

So I hope that we will continue to do that and realize, while family planning is something available to most people in the United States, in a lot of other countries it is not available because of costs, because of techniques, because of training, for whatever reason. Unfortunately, in those countries ofttimes abortions are a means of family planning. So I hope that those who are against abortion would realize family planning money can help us prevent that.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Then lastly, Mr. President—I will probably speak on this again this afternoon. If we go out, it means there will not be a chance to confirm a number of judges who are pending, who have been pending for a considerable period of time; one in particular, who has been voted out of our committee twice, once last year and again this year, Margaret Morrow, one of the most qualified people, man or woman, ever to be nominated to be a district court judge.

We also have what I think is the shocking situation of Bill Lann Lee, who has been subjected to some of the most scurrilous charges—charges, unfortunately, repeated even by Members of the Senate. The charges have been refuted, but need to be refuted in a hearing. We have asked for a further hearing on Bill Lann Lee just so those charges can be refuted. We have been told that we cannot have that hearing.

I renew the request. We should have it.

We talk about civil rights in this country. The civil rights of this country are determined by having strong laws and strong people to enforce those laws. I do not believe in the better natures of our souls as Americans that all of us would support the civil rights of all others simply in a vacuum. Many of us would; others do need the requirement of a law to do that.

I would like to think that I am a person who would never break into an unlocked, unguarded warehouse in the middle of the night to steal things. But we have laws and locks to prevent others who may not feel as strongly motivated to obey the commandment: ''Thou shalt not steal.''

By the same token, we set up laws that say: ''You shall not discriminate. You shall protect the civil rights of all Americans.'' Those laws need to be enforced. We do not have a chief enforcer now. The President has nominated Bill Lann Lee, a most qualified person for that position.

Unfortunately, the debate on this fine nominee took a decidedly partisan turn when the Speaker of the House chose to intervene in this matter and urge the Senate Republican leader to kill this nomination. He waited until after the confirmation hearing to raise and mischaracterize a case about which no member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Republican or Democrat, had asked a single question. Indeed, apparently unaware of the decision of his

party leaders to defeat this nominee, Chairman HATCH predicted on the weekend news programs following the hearing that the nomination would be reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee but might face tough going on the Senate floor.

In his unfortunate letter, Speaker GINGRICH unfairly criticized Mr. Lee and accused him of unethical conduct. Since that letter Speaker GINGRICH's charges have been repeated over and over again. Indeed, Senator HATCH devoted an entire section of his statement last Tuesday opposing Mr. Lee to the Tipton-Whittingham case. Because of the mischaracterizations of this case and the misstatements of Mr. Lee's record and because Republican opponents are now distorting and contorting Mr. Lee's views, testimony and work, I thought it appropriate to request an opportunity for Bill Lee to respond to the false charges and impression being espoused by his opposition. I thought it only fair.

On behalf of and along with the other minority members of the Judiciary Committee, I sent Senator HATCH a letter yesterday formally requesting such a hearing. The chairman refused our request for a hearing. That is unfortunate. He explained on a Sunday talk show morning that all the questions that would be raised at an additional hearing had already been covered and implied that questions about the Tipton-Whittingham case had been asked in the extensive written questions to Mr. Lee that followed the hearing.

In fact, no Senator asked a single question about the Tipton-Whittingham case at the October 22 hearing and, although, Mr. Lee was sent page after page of written questions following the hearing, only Senator HATCH asked about the case. Unfortunately, Senator HATCH's question and its answer have been ignored by those opposing Mr. Lee. Speaker GINGRICH and others are making false charges and the nominee has been given no fair opportunity to set the record straight.

Let me explain what the Tipton-Whittingham case is about. I regret having to discuss this matter at all since it remains a pending matter in the District Court for the Central District of California. The case includes serious allegations of sexual harassment and gender and racial discrimination involving the Los Angeles Police Department arising in part from an association of officers, called ''Men Against Women,'' which was apparently organized by former Los Angeles Police detective Mark Fuhrman.

The allegations of wrongdoing carelessly lodged against Mr. Lee are contradicted by the Republican mayor of Los Angeles, Richard Riordan, as well as the vice-president of the Los Angeles Police Commission, T. Warren Jackson, the assistant city attorney, Robert Cramer, and the city attorney, James K. Hahn. I ask unanimous consent that their letters be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I recall when times were different. I recall when charges were raised against Clarence Thomas and the Judiciary Committee held several days of additional hearings after that nomination had already been reported by the Judiciary Committee to the full Senate. There was a tie vote in committee on the Thomas nomination, which would not have even been reported to the Senate had we not also voted virtually unanimously, with six Democrats joining seven Republicans, to report the Thomas nomination to the floor without recommendation. Of course, ultimately the nomination of Judge Thomas to become Justice Thomas was confirmed by the Senate.

Over the last decade and one-half Republicans have pioneered and developed procedures whereby the Judiciary Committee has reported to the Senate for its consideration nominations on which the committee had come to a tie vote and even, in the case of Judge Bork's nomination to the Supreme Court, an overwhelmingly negative vote.

I recall for example the nomination of Daniel Manion which was reported to the Senate after a tie vote and was ultimately approved by the Senate. I recall, as well, the nomination of Clarence Thomas to the Supreme Court which was reported after a tie vote and ultimately approved by the Senate.

Time after time during the Reagan and Bush years the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee urged that the full Senate be permitted to decide these questions. Senator Thurmond argued in favor of reporting an executive branch nomination on which the committee had voted negatively, noting:

> As long as I am a member of this Committee, I will give an opportunity, whether it is majority or minority, to send the nominations to the Senate. I think the Senate is entitled to the recommendation [of the Committee], and you made the recommendation by the vote just taken. But I think the Senate is entitled to a vote on this matter, I think the President is entitled for the Senate to vote, and I think the country is entitled for the Senate to vote. I would hope it would be sent to the Senate and let the full Senate act.

I have been one, frankly, who has not always supported such action. It took a while to bring me around. But I joined in voting to report the Thomas nomination after a tie vote.

It remains my hope that we will find a way to show Bill Lee the same fairness that we showed Clarence THOMAS and allow his nomination to be debated and voted upon by the U.S. Senate. It would be ironic if, after the Senate proceeded to debate and vote on the Thomas nomination—one that included charges that he engaged in sexual harassment, the Republican leadership prevented the Senate from considering a nominee because he has worked to remedy sexual harassment and gender discrimination.

I feel confident that this nomination, the first Asian-American to head the Civil Rights Division, would be confirmed by the majority of the Senate. I believe that when the facts and record are reviewed fairly and dispassionately he will be confirmed. When the country has had an opportunity to focus on this important nomination and Senators have had a chance to consider how their constituents feel, I am confident that a positive outcome will be assured.

From all that I have seen over the past week, it appears to me that the Republican leadership is intent upon seeking to kill this nomination and determined to kill it in this committee and never give the Senate an opportunity to consider it. I do not think that it is fair or right or right for the country. We need Bill Lee's proven problem-solving abilities in these difficult times.

No one can argue that the President has sent to us a person not qualified by experience to lead the Civil Rights Division. Bill Lee's record of achievement is exemplary. He is a man of integrity and honor and when he said to this committee that quotas are illegal and wrong and that he would enforce the law, no one should have any doubt about his resolve to do what is right. The Senate should be given the opportunity to debate and vote on this outstanding nominee and then give Bill Lee the chance to serve the country and all Americans.

I think the Senate has committed a great wrong to him in blocking his nomination, that is absolutely wrong.

EXHIBIT 1

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Los Angeles, CA, March 20, 1997.

ERSKINE BOWLES,
Chief of Staff, Office of the President,
The White House, Washington, DC.

Re: Bill Lann Lee, Candidate for Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, United States Department of Justice.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: I am writing to support the appointment of Bill Lann Lee to the United States Department of Justice position of Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division. Throughout his distinguished career as a civil rights lawyer, Mr. Lee has worked to advance the civil rights progress of the nation and of our richly diverse city of Los Angeles.

In my opinion, Bill Lee is an astute lawyer who is superbly qualified to enforce our national civil rights laws. Mr. Lee's candidacy offers the President an excellent opportunity to reaffirm his strong support of women's rights and civil rights laws.

Mr. Lee first became known to me as opposing counsel in an important civil rights case concerning poor bus riders in Los Angeles. As Mayor, I took a leading role in settling that case. The work of my opponents rarely evoke my praise, but the negotiations could not have concluded successfully without Mr. Lee's practical leadership and expertise.

I know that his expertise is the result of working twenty-two years in the ''All Star'' leagues of civil rights litigators. His track record is nationally renowned and speaks for

itself. Beyond the many victories, what makes his work special is that he has represented clients from every background, including poor whites, women and children suffering from lead poisoning. His admirable ability to win the trust of so many communities is evident in the broad coalition of civil rights and women's rights experts who are backing his candidacy for this position.

Mr. Lee has practiced mainstream civil rights law. He does not believe in quotas. He has pursued flexible and reasonable remedies that in each case were approved by a court.

Mr. Lee is an outstanding citizen of Los Angeles. He has my enthusiastic support and strongest recommendation for the position of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. RIORDAN,
Mayor.

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION,
Los Angeles, CA, November 5, 1997.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: As Vice-President of the Los Angeles Police Commission, and a Governor Wilson appointee to the California Fair Employment & Housing Commission (the state's civil rights enforcement agency), please allow me to clarify the record and give my unqualified support for Bill Lann Lee to be Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. The clarification involves a case entitled Tipton-Whittingham, et al. v. City of Los Angeles, wherein allegations of sexual harassment and sex discrimination in the Los Angeles Police Department (''LAPD'') have been asserted. This case appears to have become an issue in the nomination of Mr. Lee.

The allegations in Tipton-Whittingham, while disputed in some respects, are serious matters that the LAPD are committed to addressing. Issues of gender bias and harassment have been raised not only by these plaintiffs but also by independent and respected voices such as the Christopher Commission. The parties engaged in arms length negotiations for more than a year before a proposed partial consent decree was submitted for approval to the Los Angeles City Council and then the Court.

The proposed decree was presented to the federal magistrate only after being vetted by the Police Commission, the Mayor's office, the City Council and the City Attorney's office. While members of the Police Commission, including this Commissioner, and the Mayor's office initially objected to specific provisions of the proposed consent decree, those objections were fully heard and addressed before the decree was presented.

As you know, that proposed consent decree has not been approved by the Federal Court. In the meantime, the parties are engaged in mediation before Charles G. Bakely, Jr. in the hopes of reaching a complete settlement of the lawsuit. Hopefully, any settlement will ensure that the LAPD of the future is free of racial and gender bias and sexual harassment, and any consent decree will neither on its face nor in operation require or induce unlawful preferences. I hasten to add, however, that the proposed partial consent decree previously submitted to the Federal Court had that same objective.

As a final matter, in my role as Assistant General Counsel for Hughes Electronics responsible for labor and employment law matters, I have opposed Mr. Lee in employment litigation. I was then and continue to be impressed by his balance, ethics, intelligence and commitment to reaching practical solutions. In my view, he would be an outstanding addition to the Department of Justice.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

T. WARREN JACKSON,
Vice-President.

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY,
Los Angeles, CA, October 29, 1997.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Senate Majority Leader, Washington, DC.
Re: Bill Lann Lee Confirmation.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: As an Assistant City Attorney for the City of Los Angeles—and opposing counsel to Bill Lann Lee in recent federal civil rights litigation—I read with concern the October 27 letter to you from the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I believe the Speaker has been misinformed about many of the facts set out in that letter, and therefore the conclusions he reaches about Mr. Lee's fitness for public office, and in particular for the position of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, are unwarranted.

The Speaker's letter begins by asserting that Mr. Lee ''attempted to force through a consent decree mandating racial and gender preferences in the Los Angeles Police Department.'' This assertion is erroneous. In the course of representing the City of Los Angeles, I have for the past seventeen years monitored the City's compliance with consent decrees affecting the hiring, promotion, advancement, and assignment of sworn police officers. I have negotiated on the City's behalf two of those decrees. Of those two, Mr. Lee was opposing counsel on the first, and was associated with opposing counsel on the second. None of these decrees mandates the use of racial or gender preferences. In fact, each of them contains provisions forbidding the use of such preferences.

For the same reasons, the Speaker's statement that the use of racial and gender preferences ''would have been a back-door thwarting of the will of the people of California with regard to Proposition 209 (the California Civil Rights Initiative)'' is inapposite. Because the decrees with which Mr. Lee was associated do not call for racial or gender preferences, and in fact forbid them, these decrees do not violate the requirements or the intent of Proposition 209.

Of particular concern to me is the Speaker's reference to ''the allegation that Mr. Lee apparently employed dubious means to try to circumscribe the will of the judge in the case.'' Thus allegation is wholly untrue. The case being referred to is presently in litigation in the district court. Mr. Lee was not at any time a named counsel in the case, but was associated with opposing counsel because of his involvement in the negotiation of a related consent decree. Neither Mr. Lee nor any opposing counsel attempted in any fashion to thwart the will of the judge supervising the litigation. The matter had been referred by the court to a magistrate judge appointed by the court to assist in the resolution of the case. Each counsel had advised the district judge at all points about the progress of the matter. Upon reconsideration, the district judge elected to assert direct control over the litigation. Nothing in Mr. Lee's conduct reflected any violation of the court's rules, either in fact or by appearance.

Bill Lann Lee and I have sat on opposite sides of the negotiating table over the course of several years. Although we have disagreed profoundly on many issues, I have throughout the time I have known him respected Bill's candor, his thorough preparation, his sense of ethical behavior, and his ability to bring persons holding diverse views into agreement. He would, in my view, be an outstanding public servant and a worthy addition to the Department of Justice.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT CRAMER,
Assistant City Attorney.

CITY ATTORNEY,
Los Angeles, CA, November 4, 1997.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: As City Attorney of the City of Los Angeles I feel compelled to correct the inaccurate and defamatory allegations in the October 27th letter from Speaker Newt Gingrich about Bill Lann Lee.

The Speaker's letter charges that Mr. Lee ''attempted to force through a consent decree mandatory racial and gender preferences in the Los Angeles Police Department.'' That assertion is wrong. Mr. Lee participated in two lawsuits against the Los Angeles Police Department several years ago that were resolved by consent decrees, but neither decree mandates the use of racial or gender preferences. In fact, each of them contains provisions forbidding the use of preferences.

What is most outrageous about Mr. Gingrich's letter is his reference to ''the allegation that Mr. Lee apparently employed dubious means to try to circumscribe the will of the judge in the case.'' There is simply no truth to this allegation. The facts are these. This case, known as *Tipton-Whittingham*, is presently in litigation in district court. There are serious allegations of discrimination and harassment being made by the plaintiffs in this case who are women police officers in LAPD. Mr. Lee was not at any time a named counsel in the case, but was associated with opposing counsel because of his involvement in the negotiation of a related consent decree. Neither Mr. Lee nor any opposing counsel attempted in any fashion to thwart the will of the judge supervising the litigation. The matter has been referred by the court to a magistrate judge appointed by the court to assist in the resolution of the case. Each counsel had advised the district judge at all points about the progress of the matter. Upon reconsideration, the district judge elected to assert direct control over the litigation. Nothing in Mr. Lee's conduct reflected any violation of the court's rules, either in fact or by appearance.

Bill Lann Lee and I have been on opposite sides of the negotiating table over the years and we have not always agreed. Yet I respect him for his keen intellect, his profound sense of ethics, and his ability to negotiate an outcome that achieves justice and fairness.

The United States Senate should not countenance the kind of character assassination based on erroneous information that has occurred in this confirmation process. I'm glad I can help clear the record in this regard.

Bill Lann Lee is an outstanding lawyer who embodies the highest ethical traditions of that profession and will be vigilant in his defense of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. He should be confirmed as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. HAHN,
City Attorney.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JOHN LUNDY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one of our finest and brightest and best-liked members of staff, from the State of Mississippi, is leaving the Senate and going back to Mississippi at the end of this month to join one of the leading law firms in our State. I am talking about John Lundy, who is chief of staff for my distinguished State colleague, Senator LOTT.

John Lundy came to Washington in 1987 to work as a legislative assistant on the House side of the Capitol. He distinguished himself right away with his hard work, his ability to get along with staff members and Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, as well as work effectively with Senate staffers from our State and Members of the Senate.

He had a lot to do with the writing of the 1990 farm bill as a member of the staff of LARRY COMBEST, Congressman from Texas, who is a Member of the Agriculture Committee in the House.

John is originally from Leland, MS. He graduated from Mississippi State University in 1983 with a degree in agricultural economics. After graduation, he went to work as a research assistant at the Mississippi State University Delta Branch Agricultural Experiment Station in Stoneville, MS, near his hometown of Leland. He then worked for a while as a loan officer with a farm credit institution in the Mississippi Delta.

When he joined Senator LOTT's office, he became someone with whom I had an opportunity to work closely over the years. When Senator LOTT was elected majority leader, he made John Lundy his chief of staff. John has been one of my favorites and a good friend to me and to all of the Members of our delegation. We are going to miss him and his lovely wife, Hayley, very much, and their daughter, Eliza. They are moving to Jackson, as I indicated, toward the end of this month.

But I wanted to take this opportunity to let other Senators know about his decision to go back to Mississippi and to congratulate him on his distinguished service here in the U.S. Senate as a member of our staff and the House of Representatives staff as well, and to wish him all of the best in his new undertaking. I am confident that he will be a tremendous success in his new association with the law firm in Jackson.

We wish him well. We will miss him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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.

LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in one of the newspapers I was reading this morning, there was an editorial speaking about the U.S. position in saying that they will work to lead an effort toward the demining of antipersonnel landmines around the world, an effort that is already well underway in a number of countries, which is supported partly by the United States in the millions of dollars in humanitarian demining efforts.

I agree with the President. I agree with the administration's efforts to seek more money for demining.

We have so many millions of landmines in the ground in 60 to 70 countries that nobody even knows how many landmines are out there. Very often the way we find out where they are is when a child or some other noncombatant steps on a landmine, touches a landmine, and is either crippled, maimed, or killed from the explosion.

We also know, whether these are $3, $4, or $5 antipersonnel landmines stuck in the ground, they can cost a considerable amount of money to take them back out depending on where they are—anywhere from an average of $100 on up to as much as $1,000 per landmine.

I agree that the United States, as the most powerful and wealthiest Nation on the Earth, should do everything possible to try to take landmines out of the ground. But I note the obvious, Mr. President. It is like trying to bail out the ocean, if you continue to put new landmines down.

Next month, in Ottawa, over 100 nations will come together to sign a treaty banning the placement and use of antipersonnel landmines. One of the most notable exceptions to the signers will be the United States of America. I think that is a bad mistake. I think if the United States wishes to have leadership and credibility on this issue they should do both—help in the demining, but do the right thing, and that is help stop further mining.

Until the use of antipersonnel landmines is treated the same way we treat the use of chemical weapons then we will continue to see them and we will continue to see the use of antipersonnel landmines against innocent civilians. They have become more and more—if not exclusively, at least primarily—a weapon against civilians. Worse than that, they are weapons that stay long after the war is over. Peace agreements are signed, tanks pull away, guns are unloaded, armies march away, and 5 years later a child on the way to school is destroyed and nobody even remembers who was fighting, nobody knows who put the weapon there.

I just mention, Mr. President, while I support our continued efforts to demine and while I take pride in writing much of the legislation to get the money for the United States to be involved in humanitarian demining up to this point, I note it falls short of the ultimate goal until we have a real ban on the use of antipersonnel landmines.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. I appreciate the courtesies of my colleague and good friend from Vermont.

COMMERCIAL SPACE ACT OF 1997

Mr. GRAHAM. I rise today to speak in support of legislation which Senator MACK and I filed last night, legislation that will bolster one of the most important components of our Nation's high-technology economic future, the space industry.

For more than 40 years, my home State of Florida has been pleased, proud, and gratified to have been the launching pad for our Nation's exciting adventure in space. Our friend and colleague, Senator JOHN GLENN's historic *Friendship 7* mission was launched from Cape Canaveral. So were Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin, and Michael Collins on their way to the first manned Moon landing.

For the last 16 years, the world has watched intently as dozens of space shuttle missions have started at the Kennedy Space Center.

But as we prepare for the increasingly high-technology, dynamic world of the 21st century, space will be more than just a place of exploration. In the 4 decades since the Soviet Union launched sputnik in October 1957, space has become a site for tremendous scientific innovation. Ball-point pens, velcro, and numerous other consumer products that make our lives easier are a direct result of the space program.

Medical research has also reaped tremendous benefits from our time in space. And satellite technology has led to revolutionary advances in the way we forecast weather, protect the environment, and communicate with each other.

Space may also revolutionize the way we transport goods and services and pursue other economic and business opportunities. In recognition of these advances, Senator CONNIE MACK and I are introducing the Commercial Space Act of 1997.

Cape Canaveral is also home to the Florida Spaceport Authority, which is set to launch its first commercial payload from Launch Complex 46 in January 1998. This will be a milestone event in our State's history, and the bill that I am introducing today aims to modernize the laws that govern the United States' emerging commercial space industry.

It is urgent that we develop a clear Federal policy for this important enterprise. For much of the last 40 years, our Nation's experiment in space has been in the exclusive domain of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA].

The legislation I am offering today recognizes that space is now a public