troops for the United Nations peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the same vein, the United States will not provide troops for the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor, the follow-on mission to the Australian-led intervention force, but will provide a few U.S. officers to serve as observers and will, as part of their normal exercises, periodically deploy U.S. personnel to perform activities such as the rebuilding of schools and the restoration of medical services.

Mr. President, I believe that it is in the United States national interest to support the United Nations as it seeks to fulfill its primary responsibility to maintain international peace and stability. We also need to work to strengthen our alliances and to encourage our allies to strengthen their military capabilities so that they can share the common burden. We also need to utilize the various other multilateral organizations that can contribute to international peace and stability. Finally, we need to explore every opportunity to bring about actions that will serve to end conflict at the earliest possible time, as wasn't done in 1991 at the time of the initial shelling of Dubrovnik, and to prevent the spread of conflict, as was done by the UN preventive deployment mission to Macedonia in 1992.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to end in the same way that I started; namely, by commending Senator CLELAND and Senator ROBERTS for instituting this dialogue. I look forward to the continuation of this dialogue in the coming weeks and I hope to be able to participate again in the future.

I again thank our good friends from Georgia and Kansas. I add my thanks also to the Senator from Indiana for his extraordinarily thoughtful remarks this afternoon. I was not able to hear all of it. I would like to have heard all of it. But I heard enough to know that, as usual, the Senator from Indiana adds an extremely thoughtful and thorough contribution to this debate.

I commend our good friends from Georgia and Kansas for carrying on what I consider to be a very significant dialog. It takes a lot of effort and a lot of energy to do what they are doing. It is critical to this nation's security. Both of them have already made huge contributions to our Nation's security. Now, on the floor of the Senate, they are making an additional major contribution, and this country is again in their debt.

I thank my friends.

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

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

The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are about to go out. Before we do, I wanted to call attention to the fact that I wish we could have taken up the ESEA bill again this afternoon. The fact is that we have amendments that could have been offered on either side. We have indicated a willingness to even offer time agreements on virtually all amendments. There are a number of amendments that are pending. We are told that we just do not have time on the schedule to revisit ESEA this week. I really question that. The fact is that we have been in morning business all afternoon. We are not going to be in session tomorrow. We will be in debate only scheduled on Monday for the military construction bill. We are not overworked here.

It seems to me that on an issue as important as ESEA needs to be addressed. The fact is, it should have been reauthorized last year. It wasn't. It needs to be reauthorized this year.

We have fewer than 40 legislative days left between now and the time that we are scheduled to adjourn. With appropriations bills, the China debate, and a number of other issues unfinished—bankruptcy we hope, and other issues—there is very little time.

So it seems to me that we ought to be using what time we have available to us to our best advantage. Being in morning business for most of the day is not my concept of utilization of time in an appropriate way.

Again, I express the regret that we haven't had more of a chance this week to deal with this very, very critical bill. The education bill ought to be finished. We worked on it in a very constructive way, I have felt. There has been progress—limited, but, nonetheless, progress. We could have had a lot more progress. There is no reason why we can't finish this bill. There is no reason why we couldn't have done another bloc of amendments today and some amendments tomorrow. In fact, I think maybe we could have finished the bill this week. That is now impossible. And there is no prospect of bringing the bill up at least for the foreseeable future, given what the majority leader has indicated is his intention with regard to appropriations bills. I am troubled and disappointed by that.

I make note of that as we end the day today. Hopefully, we will have more productive weeks and more opportunities to debate this issue. But time is going by quickly. We don't have that much more time. I hope we can better use the time we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I have had the privilege for the last hour of sitting in that chair and hearing our colleagues debate the issue of NATO and our place in Europe and the broader national security issues and the specific issue of whether or not we should remain in Kosovo. It is entirely appropriate that this body debate this issue. No one should criticize any Senator for bringing that up or for crafting a piece of legislation designed to focus this Government on an exit strategy. Everyone knows we need one.

I add my voice to that of Senator LUGAR, Senator LEVIN, and others, who have expressed concern that while it is appropriate to debate, it is not appropriate to leave at this moment. I wish I could say it is time to leave, but I believe America still has a place in Europe. I believe if we set in motion the wheels to leave Kosovo, we will set in motion the mechanism to decouple the United States and NATO with Europe. I think we need to be very thoughtful about that.

I wish Mr. Putin and the new Russian Federation well, and I hope they join the democratic nations of Europe. I hope we can include them in more ways than ever imaginable throughout all of my lifetime. But I think the jury is still out. I hear from their neighbors, still, they are afraid of what happened in Chechnya. The Nation of Georgia trembles. I know Moldovians do, I know Ukranians do, I know Romanians do. They have all been in my office this week, worried that the United States would pull out its stabilizing influence, an influence that, frankly, these emerging democracies look to, count on, and still need. I know we are tired of it. I know we are tired of funding it. I know our fighting men and women don't like being in a police operation.

But I also know the cost of leaving Europe is a cost that is much larger than the one we are paying now to stay in Europe. I hope President Clinton and Madeleine Albright and others in our executive branch can figure out how we can get out of there, but get out in a way that does not destroy this institution called NATO, which the world still needs. As Senator LUGAR said, that day may come, that we can go home and the Europeans say goodbye, but that day is not now.

I think we should have a vigorous debate, but I think we should be exceedingly careful before we say to our European allies and to everyone watching the United States and counting on the United States, that we are pulling out of Dodge. I don't think we can say that yet. I hope we can say it soon. But I know we can't say it now.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES IN OREGON

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I have come to talk to citizens of my State who have a rare privilege in the next few days: The two leading candidates for the highest office in our land will be in the State of Oregon. Vice President GORE will be there tomorrow, and Governor Bush will be

there on Tuesday. I will have occasion to be with Governor Bush, and my friend and colleague, RON WYDEN, will have occasion to be with Vice President GORE tomorrow.

Oregonians need to ask a lot of questions to find out where these men are on issues that affect their lives. I came to speak in terms similar to those of Senator GORTON, who wants Washingtonians to ask what I want Oregonians to ask; that is, Mr. Vice President, where are you on the issue of hydroelectric power on the four Snake River dams in the State of Washington? I am not sure I know of an issue of greater importance to our State's environment and our State's economy. As a background to this question, Mr. GORE, where are you on the question of breaching these dams?

I would like to talk a little bit about our energy policy in this country. So I say to any Oregonians that may be watching, I want to share a memo which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

ENERGY SECRETARY RICHARDSON ANNOUNCES SIX SHORT-TERM ACTIONS TO HELP PREVENT POWER OUTAGES

STRESSES NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE TO PROTECT RELIABILITY IN THE LONG TERM

Energy Secretary Bill Richardson today announced a series of short-term actions that the Department of Energy will take to help ensure the reliability of the nation's power supply in the coming months. Several regions across the country have experienced reliability problems in recent summers and there are concerns about the reliability of the nation's grid this summer.

These short-term actions by the Department of Energy, while not a cure-all, are designed to help keep the lights on this summer,'' said Secretary Richardson. ''To protect reliability in the long term, we need new policies and passage of federal electricity legislation to keep pace with rapidly changing market developments.

The Department of Energy will: work with other agencies to identify opportunities to reduce electric consumption at federal water projects during times of peak demand; urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and state utility commissions to solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak time periods. For instance, large industrial consumers could find it to their advantage to sell their power entitlement back to their utility if it would be profitable; explore opportunities for the use of existing backup generators during power supply emergencies to reduce the strain on electric systems and help avoid blackouts; conduct an emergency exercise with state and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies; work closely with the utility industry to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible; and prepare public service announcements to provide tips to help consumers reduce electricity use and lower their bills.

Secretary Richardson began a series of regional summits this week between federal, state and local government officials, regulators, utilities and consumers to discuss ways to enhance the reliability of our electric system. The first meetings are taking place on April 24 in Hartford, Newark and New Orleans. On April 28, he will co-host a summit in Sacramento.

After last summer's outages Secretary Richardson formed a Power Outage Study Team to review the events of last year and provide recommendations for making the nation's grid more reliable. The team's final report, issued last month, is available online at http://www.policy.energy.gov.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. This is a news release from Department of Energy Secretary Richardson announcing six short-term actions to help prevent power outages.

This will blow your mind.

We are expecting power outages all over the United States this summer. The long-term forecast for the Pacific Northwest is for energy shortages, as well. If you look at the six proposals for what this Government is going to do, there isn't one proposal about producing energy. The first one is: Look for opportunities to reduce electric consumption at Federal water projects.

Let me tell the farmers what that means, they are turning off the switch and they are turning off the water. That is what that means.

Second, solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak times. Do you know what that means, Mr. President? That means the rates are going up. It is like a tax increase. So the cost of your energy is going up. We are not going to produce any more, Heaven forbid, we are just going to make it more expensive.

The next actions prescribed: The Energy Department will conduct an emergency exercise with State and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies. So we essentially will do a fire drill to see what happens when a whole city shuts down because electricity isn't produced when hitting a switch. Somebody has to turn something before we can have lights.

The next one prescribed: the Government is going to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible.

Great. We don't already have that information?

Finally, we are going to prepare public service announcements to provide tips for how you can conserve electricity.

Nothing in the news release about producing.

When Mr. GORE and Mr. Bush are in the State of Oregon, I want Oregonians to ask about our power. I want them to ask how are our lights going to go on at night? How are we going to stay warm in the winter? How are our factories going to continue to operate? How will we have jobs?

This is not a hypothetical situation I am posing. These are real potential threats.

In spite of all of that, the Vice President is talking about shutting down any offshore drilling. Fine, but realize that has a cost to the environment.

Talk about not renewing nuclear licenses for energy plants—but that has an environmental cost as well. I see Senator BYRD on the floor all the time, decrying how the coal fields of West Virginia are being shut down because this Administration does not want to produce any more coal. I hear the people in the northeastern United States screaming about skyrocketing fuel prices in the winter, yet we are becoming more dependent upon foreign oil. Now I hear this Administration, in my neck of the woods, the Pacific Northwest, saying they are going to tear out our hydroelectric power.

It is not unreasonable, my fellow Americans, to ask how are the lights going to go on? Our own Energy Department is admitting we have a problem on the horizon. I think the whole country was just reminded that gasoline does not come from a filling station. It is $2 a gallon and climbing in some cases, falling in others, I hope.

We need an energy policy.

I support conservation initiatives. Raise CAFE standards? I am for that. I am looking for ways to conserve. But Americans are demanding energy and this Administration's policy is to shut down domestic energy production and leave America more dependent on foreign oil. This does not add up.

I hope Oregonians understand that it is very important to ask the Vice President of the United States what his policy on energy is. Mr. Bush has already answered it. He said if he is elected President, the dams will stay and you will keep your jobs and the lights will go on at night. I like that answer. It is clear.

He also made the point that we can have our energy and we can have our fish as well. Let me tell you a real dirty little secret. As we speak, all that can be heard here in Washington is the gloom and doom about the fish going away. Do you know that in the Columbia/Snake Rivers right now, those rivers are teeming with salmon coming back to spawn?

Let me give some numbers. As of today, at the furthest dam they want to take out, called the Lower Granite, 18,000 chinook have passed through this season. Some say, ''Oh, but they must be hatchery fish.'' To those I say no, they are not. A few of the fish are from hatchery stock, but many of them are wild. Do you know how many fish passed through this same dam last year? It was 240. This year it was 18,000. These numbers have many in the environmental community looking pretty ashen-faced.

The first dam on the Columbia River that the fish pass through is called the Bonneville Dam, a dam Franklin Roosevelt dedicated, I believe in 1936. As of today, 160,000 spring chinook have passed over that dam this season. These are big returns. There are lots of fish returning. In fact, there are so many coming back that the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is clubbing nearly every fish they can find

that is a hatchery fish. They are killing them so they will not spawn because they say that hatchery stock affects the ethnic purity of the wild stocks.

The real secret about hatchery fish is that their eggs come from wild fish. But, nevertheless, we have so many fish now, apparently, that we have the luxury of clubbing them to death before they can spawn. By the way, the hatchery fish in the Atlantic salmon recovery program are treated the same as wild fish. But in spite of all this, we're told in the Pacific Northwest that we have to take out our dams. We have to take them out in order to have a normative river.

What do we hear from the administration? We hear on the one hand that Fish and Wildlife has concluded the dams have to come out. The National Marine Fisheries Service says we need to study dam breaching for at least 10 years because we do not have a good answer yet. And, by the way, the studies they have been producing are all predicated on data from 1980 to the current date. However, if you look at data dating back to 1960, which is available, you do not come up with extinction modeling. But federal agencies just picked the years that had the worst ocean conditions to argue that the salmon are going to become extinct unless we tear out our dams. I want the fish but I don't want the people to be suckers. I think we are being set up to be that.

I would like to know, also from Mr. GORE, why it is that the Corps of Engineers was about to issue their recommendation, which was don't take the dams out, and they were ordered by the White House not to make that recommendation? Why were they ordered to make no recommendation? What that adds up to, I believe, is that this is not about science—this is about political science. Political science is not the basis upon which this decision should be made, particularly when our rivers are full of fish as we speak.

What are the consequences if they pull the dams out? I have named a few already, but I do know it adds 13 cents a bushel to every farmer's wheat. I know it means $11 million a year lost in revenue to the barging industry. When you take this wheat from the barges and put it on a truck, do you know how many trucks it takes to replace those barges per day? It takes 2,000 semi trucks a day. You say you care about the environment? Are you going to burn that kind of fuel, burn up those kinds of miles, cause that kind of congestion in the city of Portland and the city of Seattle? Not on my watch you will not.

What else does tearing out the dams mean? It means a loss of about $130 million in property values to farmers. What does that mean to property taxes? School support? Roads? All those things are in jeopardy if you take those dams down. Dam breaching takes 37,000 acres of wheat out of production. What happens to those families? Their land goes back to sagebrush.

It takes at least 5,370 direct jobs in Portland. I actually think it is higher than that when you look at the ripple effect. When you take out these dams, you lose longshoremen in Portland and the many other service-related jobs that depend on them. Not only that, but to take these dams out, it would cost $809 million. Some have said that it could cost that much for each dam—I don't know whether we can get through this body an appropriation to destroy Federal assets that will be in the billions of dollars. What are you going to replace the energy with? What are you going to burn? This is crazy.

What else do you lose? You lose 3,033 megawatts of clean hydroelectric power. That is the amount it takes to run the city of Seattle every day. We are going to take that out in the face of projected energy shortages? Not on my watch.

So I say with the Senator from Washington: No, not on our watch.

I say to my fellow citizens in Oregon, this is the most important question you can ask Al Gore. Governor Bush has answered it. Please, Mr. Vice President, tell us what is your position on tearing out hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest? One of your agencies says do it. Another says we don't know enough yet. A third says don't do it. And GORE is refusing to answer the question.

We can have our fish and we can have our power. There are many things we can do, short of destroying our energy infrastructure and our clean, hydroelectric power. There are many things we can do to save fish short of the destruction of this kind of energy. To replace our clean energy with any other type, you are going to burn something and Oregonians will live in a dirtier place. I do not want them to.

I ask the Vice President, respectfully, to answer the question. What is your policy on dam breaching?

EUROPEAN UNION HUSHKIT REGULATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, is a specialized agency of the U.N. that has been tasked for more than 50 years with the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation. Based in Montreal, this 185 countries strong organization develops international standards on such critical issues as noise, emissions, and air worthiness.

I am saddened to report that, last week, the European Union dealt a severe blow to the integrity and future viability of this critical organization. I, of course, am speaking of the EU's implementation of the so-called hushkit regulation. This regulation bans hushkitted aircraft from being registered in Europe, prohibits such aircraft that are not European registered from flying in Europe within two years, and bars certain reengined aircraft with low by-pass ratios from European airspace. The regulation was implemented despite the fact that the aircraft in question meet the highest international noise standards.

Thankfully, in March, the U.S. filed an Article 84 case within ICAO against the fifteen EU Member States arguing that the regulation violated the Chicago Convention. ICAO will review the matter this fall, and hopefully resolve it in a way that reaffirms its position as the sole, international standard setting body.

Ironically, the EU wants to have its cake and eat it too. EU Members States are now anxious for ICAO to establish new, more stringent, Stage 4 noise standards. Indeed, the U.S. is working with ICAO on this endeavor as we speak. The key question becomes, why should we develop new standards if the EU has demonstrated that the old ones can be disregarded at whim? If the EU wants Stage 4, it must begin by demonstrating its respect for Stage 3 by withdrawing the hushkit regulation.

Mr. President, I will be following the resolution of this dispute very carefully. It is critical to future trading opportunities that the integrity of the ICAO process be upheld.

SECURITY AND COMMERCIAL SATELLITE IMAGERY

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I am concerned about an emerging issue that has important implications for our national security: the commercial satellite imaging industry. Soon the public will have access to high resolution pictures able to show objects as small as three feet in size.

The rapid evolution of satellite technology has suddenly made the ''eye in the sky'' accessible to everyone, from foreign governments to the average individual. Secret sites are suddenly no longer secret. Photos of Area 51, a top-secret military installation located in Nevada, were recently made available by a private company selling commercial satellite images. The wide availability of these pictures to any person or country that can afford to buy them has the potential to both help or hinder our security.

Initially satellites were used during the Cold War for defense purposes. These classified images were only available to the government. However, civilians began to benefit from satellite pictures about thirty years ago when the government satellite, Landsat, began to sell photos to the public for agricultural planning purposes. The first commercial satellite launch did not occur until 1986, when France, Sweden and Belgium jointly launched SPOT I.

The technology of satellites today has evolved considerably since