

subject. I understand Governor Bush plans to visit my State on Monday. I expect he will be impressed by what he sees, and he is always welcome in Washington. I am glad he is making the trip because, unlike President Clinton and Vice President GORE, I do not believe Governor Bush has spent much time there.

Governor Bush, the people of Washington want to know three things:

First, will you make a commitment to protect the Hanford Reach National Monument?

Will you commit to saving salmon?

And most importantly, what is your plan for saving salmon?

When you come to Washington State, Governor Bush, those are the questions people will be asking.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, when it comes to the Hanford Reach, I believe that the Governor needs to know that those in Washington State who are close to him opposed Federal protection of the Hanford Reach—a designation that will save the last free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River—and the best salmon spawning ground we have.

I believe the voters of Washington State deserve to know what Governor Bush's intentions are.

And on the issue of preserving salmon on the Snake River, I have heard Governor Bush articulate what he won't do, but I have yet to hear what he would do to protect our region's economy while restoring wild salmon runs.

His spokespeople attacked the Vice President on his latest visit to Washington State when the Vice President indicated his personal interest in helping the region solve the tricky issues related to salmon restoration. Bush's people offered no plan, they just attacked the Vice President for having one.

The people of Washington want to hear plans for saving salmon—not just attacks, but credible, responsible plans.

Let me be clear: When it comes to helping the people of Washington State meet environmental challenges, just saying "no" doesn't cut it. The people of my State deserve to know what the President would do to save salmon.

When the Vice President was in Washington State recently he met this challenge head-on. He very clearly committed to saving salmon. He said that extinction was not an option. And he indicated that in his administration, he would call a summit to bring together diverse views so we can work together to save salmon.

He faced the issue in a thoughtful, responsible way.

In fact, many of my constituents came up to me after the Vice President spoke to tell me how impressed they were with the Vice President's understanding of the issue and his commitment to protecting our natural resources, and to thank me for his leadership on this critical challenge.

Mr. President, the ball is clearly in Governor Bush's court, and it is time

for him to provide his own answers and vision.

When Governor Bush enters the State of Washington, residents will be listening for his commitment to the Hanford Reach National Monument, listening for his commitment to saving salmon, and listening for his plan to save salmon.

The people of my State care about this issue. They deserve to hear specific answers.

I suggest that if Governor Bush leaves Washington State without addressing the concerns of Washington State voters on the issue of salmon recovery, it would suggest that his trip was more about politics and photo-ops than addressing the concerns of Washington State voters.

I urge Governor Bush to respect the concerns of the people of my State, to address their concerns and to answer their questions.

I pledge to work with the next President to implement a plan that will save salmon while keeping our economy sound.

My hope is for a President who is willing to work with me and the other citizens of Washington State in a constructive fashion to address the complex issues related to recovering the once mighty runs of wild salmon on the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

I believe the people of Washington State deserve nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend our colleague from the State of Washington. This is kind of a "Washington hour." We not only have my colleague who just spoke, but the Presiding Officer from the State of Washington. I commend her for her thoughtful comments. While I represent the State of Connecticut that is 3,000 miles away, we, too, believe it is in our interest to see that the wonderful wilderness areas and wild salmon of the Pacific Northwest be preserved and saved. I commend her for her efforts. She is not only representing her State well, she is representing my State well when she speaks on this issue.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a number of weeks ago, the distinguished minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and others thought it might be worthwhile on a daily basis to remind our colleagues of the human tragedy that occurs every day in this country as a result of gun violence.

We all remember very vividly the astounding events that occurred in Littleton, CO, at Columbine High School when we watched some 13 people lose their lives in that tragedy. It is hard to believe that that could occur; 13 people gunned down in a high school. Yet as the Democratic leader and others have pointed out, regrettably,

every single day in this country we suffer the same results as we did at Columbine High School—not in one setting, thank God. Across the country, on average, 12 or 13 people die every day in the United States as a result of gun violence.

I am not going to stand here and suggest to you there is a simple piece of legislation that is going to resolve the issue. There are a lot of reasons we see this continued violence in our country. But certainly, responsible, thoughtful gun control legislation could make a significant contribution. We have already seen that in States and jurisdictions that require waiting periods, require some notification ahead of time as to who would be the purchaser of these weapons.

There was a decision made a number of weeks ago that it might be worthwhile to make the case—and we talk in abstractions so often here—and to start talking about those people who lost their lives a year ago on this very day, June 16, 1999. On that date, we didn't have the average of 12 or 13; we lost 3 people in the United States on June 16. There was one in Chicago, one in St. Paul, and one in Newark, NJ. That was a day on which the numbers were way down from what the average death toll is.

I also point out that the names we have only come from the 100 largest cities in the United States. Cities with populations of less than 12,000 are not included in these numbers. In those 100 cities, on June 16 last year, it was a far better day than most. Every one of the victims was a unique human being. Many other gun violence victims in other cities on that day didn't necessarily die, but some did in smaller towns.

In the name of all of those who have died across the Nation a year ago today, and those who, regrettably, will lose their lives today in too many places across our country, I want to read the following names listed by the Conference of Mayors who were killed by gunfire 1 year ago in our country: Manuel Marcano, 18, Chicago; Antoine Watson, 19, of St. Paul, MN; an unidentified female in Newark, NJ.

I know all Americans regret the loss of those lives. I hope that someday the national average will be something such as that, or even less, as a result of sensible, thoughtful proposals we might make to reduce the level of violence in our country.

#### U.S.-CUBA RELATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, next Tuesday morning I will offer an amendment that is not a radical idea, not something that ought to evoke much debate or dissension but the kind of proposal that might even carry by a voice vote under normal circumstances. Because of the nature of the subject matter, it has become controversial, and I regret that. It was my hope that the Senate would vote today on the Dodd amendment, which is currently pending to

the Defense authorization bill. Unfortunately, that vote was put off until next week.

Having said that, I want to take a few minutes to discuss this proposal and explain why I believe it makes sense to go forward to establish a bipartisan commission to review U.S.-Cuban policy.

The amendment I will be offering provides for the establishment of a bipartisan 12-member commission to review United States policy with regard to Cuba and to make recommendations for the changes that might be necessary to bring that policy into the 21st century.

On Wednesday of this week, the President of South Korea, Kim Dae-jung, and the North Korean leader, Kim Chong-il, signed a broad agreement to work for peace and unity on the Korean peninsula. Needless to say, the level of hostility that has existed between these two governments for more than half of a century has been extremely high. These two countries fought a bloody and costly war in which hundreds of thousands of Koreans lost their lives. More than 35,000 of our own fellow service men and women in this country lost their lives as well. Yet these two leaders have been able to bring themselves to meet and discuss the future of their peoples and the possibility of reunification at some point down the road.

The Clinton administration, to its credit, has announced that, as a result of these efforts, it will soon lift economic sanctions against North Korea, paving the way for American companies to trade and invest and for American citizens to travel. I support the administration's decision and applaud them for moving forward in such an expeditious manner to complement the efforts of the North and South Korean leaders.

Similarly, despite the fact that more than 50,000 American men and women in uniform lost their lives during the Vietnam conflict, the United States and Vietnam have full diplomatic and trade relations today. In large measure, this is due to our colleagues and veterans, Senators McCAIN, KERREY, and others in this Chamber.

Even though we have a number of serious disagreements with the People's Republic of China, we are not imposing unilateral economic sanctions against that country; quite the opposite. I predict that the Senate of the United States, very shortly, will follow the House of Representatives and vote to support permanent normal trade relations with China, which will pave the way for China to join the World Trade Organization.

My point is this: Across the globe, we are seeing efforts to normalize relations, to reconcile old grievances—the Middle East, the Korean peninsula, the Balkans, Northern Ireland. There isn't a place I can think of where people are not trying to resolve the differences that have existed for far too long.

The question I will pose by offering the amendment on Tuesday is: Isn't it about time we at least think about doing the same in our own hemisphere, when it comes to a nation that is 90 miles off our shore, less distance than from here to Hagerstown, MD, or Richmond, VA?

The reaction to my amendment would suggest that there is still strong resistance to doing in our own hemisphere what we are promoting elsewhere around the globe. The amendment I will offer would simply establish a 12-member commission to review U.S. policy, to make recommendations on how it might be changed or if it ought to be changed. I am not even suggesting that the commission would come back with changes. In fact, they may come back with quite the opposite result.

This proposal is not new or revolutionary. The Senate has authorized establishment of commissions to review many subjects—the Central America Commission, the Kissinger Commission, Social Security, Terrorist Threats, and many other subject matters. Our colleague from Virginia, Senator JOHN WARNER, first proposed this idea of a bipartisan commission on the subject of Cuba in a letter to President Clinton more than 1 and a half years ago. One quarter of the Senate joined him in urging the President to take the politics out of United States-Cuba policy and to look to the wisdom of some of our best and brightest foreign policy experts to make recommendations on what we should do with respect to this issue.

I personally urged Secretary Albright to recommend that the President move forward with this proposal. Regrettably, she believed that the timing was not right for doing so. I was saddened by that decision. I disagreed with the Secretary then, and I believe that a year and a half later the arguments are even more compelling for establishing such a commission today.

We are about to change administrations. What better time to use the interval between the current one and the next one to take a fresh look at Cuba-related issues and be ready to make recommendations in the spring of the coming year as to what makes sense with regard to Cuban-U.S. relations?

We recently entered a new millennium. Yet U.S.-Cuban policy is still locked in the old shibboleth of the last one. It is a policy that is 40 years old. We have seen changes in South Africa. The Soviet Union doesn't exist any longer. Eastern European countries have managed to find reform and democracy. We now welcome Yasir Arafat to the White House, and the prospects of peace in the Middle East have never loomed more large. We are watching reconciliation on the Korean peninsula. The Balkans are trying to resolve their difficulties. Northern Ireland is, hopefully, putting to bed years of hostility. Can we not at least find the opportunity to get this issue of

Cuba-United States relations out of politics and have a bipartisan commission make recommendations from which we might consider some different ways of approaching what has been a 40-year-old policy?

I should have said at the very outset of my remarks—and I apologize for not doing so because it needs to be said—that I carry, nor does anyone who supports this commission, any grief for Fidel Castro or the dictatorship in Cuba. The conditions these people have to live in are deplorable—the hardships, the denial of human rights, the economic deprivation. I hold great respect for the Cuban exile community in this country. They have come to be great Americans and have contributed significantly to the economic well-being of our country. They have made contributions as public servants and as patriots—men and women in uniform. But too often this issue has been dominated by how we deal with one individual.

There are 11 million people living 90 miles off our shores. We need to think about the post-Castro period as well. How can we create a softer landing? How can we try to at least frame issues that will allow for a transition there and avoid the potential conflict in civil strife that could occur on the island of Cuba?

I hope that the Cuban American Foundation will support the idea of a bipartisan commission—a commission that would incorporate and include people of different points of view to try to come up with some common ground on which they could recommend to a new administration and to this Congress or the next Congress.

This proposal is not some radical or fringe idea. It is strongly supported by the mainstream of our foreign policy establishment. People such as Dr. Henry Kissinger and Bill Rodgers support this effort. I appreciate their willingness to say so. I suspect they would be willing to serve as commissioners if they were asked to.

In light of the systemic changes that have transformed the globe over the last 40 years, I believe a fundamental rethinking of the U.S.-Cuban policy is in order. In fact, such a rethinking is long overdue and it is very much in our national interest to do it at this juncture.

The pending amendment that we offered on Tuesday deals with the problem by broaching anything relating to Cuba in an election year or any year for that matter.

The sad reality is that the only way we are going to get this dispassionate review of our current policy and sensible recommendations with respect to how that policy should change is by bringing together a commission of respected outside experts to advise the executive and the legislative branches on future policy options.

I said a moment ago that some 11 million people live less than 100 miles from our shores. We owe it to the

American people to seriously analyze the consequences to the United States of a major civil upheaval on the island of Cuba and to devise a policy that minimizes the possibility of such an event occurring.

Does anyone believe for one moment that a sea of humanity would not stream from the island toward U.S. shores if civil conflict erupts there?

Two years have passed since Pope John Paul II made a historic visit to Cuba that called upon that country to open up to the world and for the world to open up to Cuba.

Even after such an unprecedented event, the centerpiece of our policy remains the same—an embargo which seeks to restrict trade, travel, and a low flow of information to Cuba and thereby strangle Cuba economically.

This hard-line stance continues to hold sway in Washington today in large measure because successive administrations have been hamstrung by domestic political considerations and have been fearful of provoking the ire of those who are obsessed with the island of Cuba and its personification in the person of Fidel Castro.

We have just entered a new millennium. Surely it is time to break with the policy that is largely centered on the fate of one individual and replace it with one that is more future oriented—one that focuses on the other 11 million individuals who also reside on the island of Cuba, and on the millions of Cuban-Americans. Many of them believe we ought to think differently today. They do not speak out on the issue but would welcome the opportunity to see a commission created which would give us a chance to look at other policy options.

The time has come to have a reasoned conversation regarding Cuba and U.S. policy, and about the effectiveness of our policy. I think the establishment of a bipartisan commission would be the starting point for just such a conversation and just such a debate. Hopefully, the end point of that conversation would be the development of a national consensus around a new Cuba policy—one that is compatible with America's values and beliefs, one that truly serves our own national interests.

I hope my colleagues will agree with this analysis. If so, I urge them to support this amendment when it is voted on next Tuesday.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. We are under a time agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator has 15 minutes.

#### HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at an appropriate time, I intend to offer the Hate Crimes Prevention Act as an amendment to the Department of Defense Authorization Act. It is essential for the Senate to deal with this important issue.

Hate crimes are modern day lynchings, and this is the time and the United States Senate is the place to take a stand against them. We must firmly and unequivocally say "no" to those who injure or murder because of hate. Every day that Congress fails to act, people across the Nation continue to be victimized by acts of bigotry based on race, religion, sexual orientation, gender, or disability.

Hate crimes are a national disgrace and an attack on everything this country stands for. These crimes send a poisonous message that minorities are second class citizens with fewer rights. And, sadly, the number of hate crimes continues to rise.

70,000 hate crime offenses have been reported in the United States since 1991. In 1991 there were 4,500 hate crimes; 7,500 in 1993; 7,900 in 1995, and over 8,000 in 1997. There were 7,700 hate crimes reported in 1998, and although the numbers dropped slightly, the number and severity of offenses increased in the categories of religion, sexual orientation, and disability.

This is a serious and persistent problem—an epidemic that must be stopped.

All of us are aware of the most highly-publicized hate crimes, especially the brutal murders of James Byrd in Jasper, Texas, and Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming. But these two killings are just the tip of the iceberg. Many other gruesome acts of hatred have occurred this year:

On January 28 in Boston, a group of high school teenagers sexually assaulted and attacked a 16-year-old high school student on the subway because she was holding hands with another young girl, a common custom from her native African country. Thinking the victim was a lesbian, the group began groping the girl, ripping her clothes and pointing at their own genitals, while shouting "Do you like this? Do you like this? Is this what you like?" When the girl resisted, officials said, a teenage boy who was with the group pulled a knife on the girl, held it to her throat and threatened to slash her if she didn't obey her attackers. The girl was left unconscious from the beating. Three high school students were arrested in the attack and charged with civil rights violations, assault with a dangerous weapon, assault and battery, and indecent assault and battery.

On February 6 Tuscon, Arizona, a 20-year-old gay University of Arizona student was sitting at a cafe when a man came up behind him and punched and stabbed him with a large knife. Witnesses heard the perpetrator using vicious anti-gay epithets. The victim was

treated at a local hospital and survived. The attack spurred an anti-hate rally on the campus a few days later, drawing over 1,000 people.

March 1 in Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania, a black man was charged with a hate crime after going on a shooting rampage killing three white men and leaving two others critically wounded. Prior to the attack, he told a black woman that he wouldn't hurt her because he was "out to get all white people." The perpetrator was shouting racial epithets at white maintenance workers, and shot only white men on his rampage. Authorities found anti-white and anti-Jewish writings in his home.

On April 29 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Richard Scott Baumhammers, 34, a white man was charged with murder and hate crimes in a shooting rampage targeting minorities that left five people dead and one critically wounded. The first victim was a Jewish neighbor who was shot half a dozen times before her house was set on fire. The perpetrator then went from shopping mall to shopping mall, shooting and killing two Asian Americans at a Chinese restaurant, an African American at a karate school, and a man from India at an Indian grocery. He also fired shots at two synagogues, and the word "Jew" and two swastikas were painted in red on one of the buildings. According to press reports, attorney of the accused is raising an insanity defense.

On June 4 in Rapid City, South Dakota, press reports indicate that police are baffled by a series of eight inexplicable drowning deaths among mostly Native Americans along Rapid Creek that have occurred over the course of 14 months. Law enforcement officials initially thought that the severely intoxicated men had drowned by accident. But local Native Americans believe an "Indian-hater" is waiting for the victims to become drunk and then dragging, rolling or pushing them into the water. These incidents come on the heels of a March 2000 report from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission that shows that racial tensions in South Dakota are high, and that Native Americans in the state feel that the justice they received is unfair.

The most brutal and shocking hate crimes continue to make national headlines. Yet this list highlights just a few of the many hate crimes that afflict communities throughout the nation. This problem cannot and should not be ignored.

We know that hate groups have increased in number in recent years. A study by the Southern Poverty Law Center reported last year that 474 hate groups exist nationwide. Clearly, the Internet has given them a larger megaphone. In earlier years, hate groups would spread their messages of hate by using bulletin boards, newsletters, cable television, and occasional rallies. Now, the Internet gives them a vastly increased audience that can be reached