

is why we rise this afternoon and are ready, willing, and able to draw some lines that are understandable that will develop into a firm policy.

If the U.N. wants to get in there, fine, but if they are not going to support it, then we have a problem. I will never forget the story about Vaclav Havel saying he hoped Secretary Albright could come back to the Czech Republic, her native land, and succeed him as President. He said the one difficulty was that 75 percent of the people of the Czech Republic opposed "Madeleine's war."

Take a rollcall. Go up to the U.N. See how enthused they are about the non-policy.

Quit giving this patina of deliberation and positivity by doing nothing and keeping the troops out there and praying like we all do that no one gets assaulted or loses a life at Bonsteel. We have an impossible situation. It is not going to get better in the foreseeable future. We ought to bring it to a head and certainly let the next President, whomever that is, have a 6-month period to review the mistake we made and say: Wait a minute, it was not a mistake.

I do not mind if they are right and I am wrong. I can tell my colleagues right now though, unfortunately, I think I gave the right vote when I opposed the Biden amendment.

I appreciate the leadership and the conscientious approach the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has given this responsibility. We are not trying to embarrass the President. We are not trying to take a political position. On the contrary, I have my GIs out there. I saw what happened in Vietnam, and I saw what happened in Somalia. If it had not been for the Byrd amendment, we could possibly still be there.

This is a similar call to arms politically for us to set the policy and do so in a judicious way. We all know they want to try to subvert it; they do not want to talk about it. With this crowd in Washington, you have to be on message: Let's not talk about it because it might get on to the weekend shows, and if it gets on to the weekend shows, it might send the wrong message to Milosevic. Bah humbug to Milosevic. I am trying to send a message to those fellows at Bonsteel. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from South Carolina. I remember when I first came to the Senate 22 years ago, two-thirds of the Senate or more had the opportunity to serve in uniform. Today, there are fewer. I cast no aspersion against those who do not. It is just a generational thing.

Listening to my dear friend from South Carolina, I know he draws on his experiences in the army in World War II as a young officer in the battle to free Europe when he had the responsi-

bility of life. No one else but him, as an officer, had the responsibility for those young men under his command.

This type of amendment we discussed—certainly I have and others—with many veterans who have worn the uniform of this country and many who are on active duty today.

The distinguished Senator said he has seen war. I saw it in the continental limits in World War II, and then I had a brief tour in Korea as a ground officer with an air wing. I saw the others who had to fight it, but I never put myself in the category of a combat soldier. I have always said my orders did not take me there, but they took the Senator there and he saw it.

I know in the course of this debate, the issue will be raised: We may be putting the young men and women in the Armed Forces in jeopardy as a consequence of this amendment, even the act of filing it and debating it.

I want to get into that. I am sure the Senator will rejoin in this debate if and when that happens.

I see our distinguished colleague here, who is a naval veteran, who is about to speak. I do not know if it is on this matter or on another matter. It is not on this matter.

But I am willing to join in that debate. When 23 members of the Appropriations Committee voted "yea" to put this in—and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina can correct me—but of that group who voted "yea," the following have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country: Senator COCHRAN, Senator SPECTER, Senator GORTON, Senator BURNS, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Senator DANIEL INOUE, Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, Senator HERBERT KOHL, and Senator STEVENS, the chairman. They are veterans.

Let us debate it, but let us debate it with great care.

The letter which I put in the RECORD from Senator BYRD and myself states our point of view. This letter is just going out to Members, but already the following cosponsors, who likewise were veterans, have signed on: Senator ROBERTS, Senator STROM THURMOND, Senator INHOFE, Senator ROBERT SMITH, and Senator SESSIONS. So a goodly number of those who have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country have joined behind this.

We would not have done it, I say to the Senator, if we had had a moment's concern we were increasing the risk to our people. They are at risk today. They will be at risk tomorrow and the next day. And as we are drifting into this endless—endless—commitment, they are at risk every single day.

This amendment simply says: Congress, either join with the President or state your case and bring them home. That is the purpose of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator HARKIN for up to 20 minutes, Senator HELMS for up to 10 minutes, and Senators ROBERTS and CLELAND in control of 60 minutes total.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to make my presentation seated.

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

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 306 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

#### DAMS IN WASHINGTON AND OREGON

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is flying to Oregon this evening, or tomorrow morning, for a visit to that State. On the last five or six occasions on which he has visited the State of Washington, I have inquired of him, as politely as possible, as to his intentions with respect to the future of four dams on the Snake River. This inquiry is of significant importance to the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of the State of Oregon. The answer from the Vice President is peculiarly important because of the disarray of the present administration. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recommended that the dams come down, be removed, for salmon recovery. The Corps of Engineers, almost a year ago, was ready to recommend that the dams stay in place and that we deal with salmon recovery in another productive fashion. That recommendation was vetoed by the White House and removed physically from the Corps of Engineers' report.

More recently, the National Marine Fishery Service has said that we don't know enough to decide whether or not we should remove the dams and that the decision may be at least 5 or 10 years away. The Governor of Oregon has recommended that the dams come down. The Governor of Washington, also a Democrat, has opposed that recommendation. As you know, Mr. President, so have I, in the most vehement possible terms. Of all of the proposals for salmon recovery, dam removal is, first, the most ineffective and, second, of the most marginal utility with respect to the recovery of the salmon resource in the Pacific Northwest.

At a capital expenditure of \$1 billion to \$2 billion, and annual losses of at

least a third of a billion dollars in perpetuity, the promise of salmon recovery from dam removal is extremely marginal, with no impact on some of the endangered runs, and only a modest improvement in the order of 10 to 20 percent in the prospects for certain other runs. Weighed against that are the potential real successes from the Salmon Recovery Board of the State of Washington, which has for the current year an appropriation from the Congress of \$18 million for the work of citizen-based salmon recovery teams, which will be the beneficiary of an appropriation from this body of about \$4 million.

There is a very real concern with predation at the mouth of the Columbia River—a concern now frustrated by a lawsuit against any removal of Caspian terns from an artificial island at the mouth of the river by at least a temporary injunction. These and dozens of other projects in the Pacific Northwest have a far greater promise for the salmon recovery than does dam removal, with all of its devastating impacts on the loss of benign, renewable energy power, to be substituted by the use of fossil fuels, for all of the loss of agricultural land that requires irrigation to be anything other than a desert, for all the loss of a transportation system which is the most efficient and environmentally benign for the transportation of grain to ports on the lower Columbia River.

All of these factors argue against dam removal. But the Vice President of the United States, in his candidacy for President of the United States, refuses to make any commitment whatsoever on this matter. Now, it may be that he didn't want to respond to this Senator on these visits to the State of Washington. But he is now going to be asked to respond by the Governor of Oregon, who supports his candidacy. His response has been demanded by the Portland Oregonian, the largest newspaper in the State of Oregon, which, incidentally, holds my position and that of my colleague, Senator SMITH of Oregon, on the subject. One hopes that the Vice President will finally be able to come up with an opinion. Now, he has taken positions on other local issues. He is certainly quite willing to tell the people of South Carolina what flag they can fly. But he seems unwilling to tell the people of Washington and Oregon what his views are on an issue of vital importance to them and to their regional economy.

So I am here to express the hope that the Vice President will finally come clean with his views on this subject. But I must express the expectation that he will, once again, dodge the issue, pretend that he has not made up his mind when, in fact, he has, and claim that he can't make a substantive comment on this until after the election in November is over. I will regret that, Mr. President. His opponent, the Governor of Texas, has taken the forthright stand that it is improper and un-

economical and unwise to remove those dams. He will protect the physical infrastructure of the Pacific Northwest. I am here to invite the Vice President of the United States to do likewise, without, I regret to say, any expectation that he is willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Georgia.

#### DIALOG ON AMERICA'S GLOBAL ROLE III, MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS, to continue our dialog on the global role of the United States. This is the third such dialog in what we have intended to be a year-long series. In February, we began by taking a broad look at the priorities and approaches of U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold-war period. A few weeks ago we narrowed the focus somewhat by trying to define and defend our national interest, which must be the first step in arriving at a coherent national security strategy.

Today, as we start to go from general principles to concrete applications, Senator ROBERTS and I, along with several of our colleagues, will attempt to zero in on the U.S. role in multilateral organizations which strongly impact our national security, especially NATO and the U.N.

I have just returned from a trip to Brussels and Italy where we were briefed on the air campaign from Aviano Air Base. In Brussels, I met with the Deputy Secretary General of NATO. As I said, Italy and then on to Macedonia, where we saw the regions where the refugees were kept during the war in Kosovo. Then, into Kosovo itself.

I met with key military leaders and key political leaders from the United States, European nations, and NATO. These meetings only served to reinforce my strong belief that there is a pressing need to address the global role of the United States, both in our own national strategic planning and in NATO's planning. This conclusion is not a result of the recent actions taken in Serbia and Kosovo. Rather, these actions were merely symptomatic of, I think, the problem.

A large portion of the military operation in Kosovo was supplied by the United States. I believe it is now time for the United States to lead in finding a political solution. Similarly, I believe the time has come to "Europeanize" the peace in Bosnia and Kosovo. While the soldiers I spoke with at Camp Bond steel certainly displayed high morale, reflected in the excellent job they actually have done, if we stay in the Balkans indefinitely with no clear way out, I believe we run an increasing risk of further overextending our military, thus exacerbating our recruitment and retention problems and lessening our capability to respond to more serious challenges to our vital national interests.

From my perspective, the basic problem in the Balkans today is political, not military, and requires a political rather than military solution. Essentially, at this point in time, the various communities wish to live apart and exercise self-determination along ethnic lines. I would agree that such a development is unfortunate and not in keeping with our American view of the way the world should be. However, for any solution to the current situation to be acceptable to the parties directly involved—and, thus, durable—this inescapable fact must be taken into account.

On June 30 of last year, the Senate accepted by voice vote my amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which expressed "the sense of the Senate that the United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans" to develop a final political settlement of both the Kosovo and Bosnia conflicts.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1163 TO S. 1234, FISCAL YEAR 2000 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS SUPPORTING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO ACHIEVE A DURABLE POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IN THE BALKANS

(Adopted by Senate by unanimous consent on 6/30/99)

#### SEC. X. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BALKANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted large-scale military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) At the conclusion of 78 days of these hostilities, the United States and its NATO allies suspended military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia based upon credible assurances by the latter that it would fulfill the following conditions as laid down by the so called Group of Eight (G-8):

(A) An immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

(B) Staged withdrawal of all Yugoslav military, police and paramilitary forces from Kosovo.

(C) Deployment in Kosovo of effective international and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the agreed objectives.

(D) Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo, to be decided by the United Nations Security Council which will seek to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

(E) Provision for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons from Kosovo and an unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

(3) These objectives appear to have been fulfilled, or to be in the process of being fulfilled, which has led the United States and its NATO allies to terminate military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(4) The G-8 also called for a comprehensive approach to the economic development and