

I am concerned, however, about the general direction of President Clinton's foreign policy.

It has been a policy with very little direction. I fear that the U.S. armed forces have become an international cleanup force sent to all parts of the world that have no strategic relationship to the United States. Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti, and other U.N. peace-keeping missions have been costly with little tangible benefits for the United States.

In the case of Bosnia, clearly, the administration misled the Congress about the length of time troops would be present there. Only after the election did the President have the courage to tell the American people that the troops would not be coming home in December of 1996 and that the deployment would extend another 18 months.

Further, with respect to Bosnia, it has now become apparent that this conflict dragged on longer than it should have because the administration and Democratic leaders in Congress blocked arm shipments for the Bosnians. Yet, in a secret policy, they allowed Iran to arm the Bosnian Muslims. This administration told the Congress one thing and Iran another.

This is an unacceptable way to conduct American foreign policy.

The Clinton administration has pursued what I call the un-Reagan doctrine. Rather than preside over the decline and fall of the last remaining communist regimes, this administration has reached out and befriended them. It gave diplomatic recognition to Vietnam. We provided foreign aid to North Korea, and we sought warmer relations with Fidel Castro until he shot down innocent civilians out of the sky. In contrast, this administration ignored, almost to its peril, the new democracies in Eastern Europe and Russia, to the point that the Communists tried to stage an electoral comeback in Russia.

This is not foreign policy America can be proud of.

Another problem with this administration is its handling of our future security from nuclear attack.

In my view, nothing is more important to the national defense of this country than deployment of a national ballistic missile defense for the United States. More than 25 countries now possess or are seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.

We have to address this issue—we cannot ignore it.

I would hope that the two people we are confirming today, both of whom are honorable, decent, hard-working people will work on these issues and improve our defense and foreign policy in the next 4 years.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish Senator Cohen well in his new position. I was pleased to serve with him for the last 4 years, and we will certainly miss him in the Senate, but the United States will be better off by having him as Secretary of Defense.

THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to join with my distinguished colleagues, Mr. MURKOWSKI, chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and Mr. CRAIG of Idaho, in introducing the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997. As a cosponsor of the legislation passed by the Senate during the 104th Congress, I believe this legislation represents the best means of ensuring that the Department of Energy meet its legal obligations to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel by 1998.

Last year, nearly identical legislation was adopted by a strong bipartisan vote in the Senate. And with nuclear waste scattered over some 35 States, including my home State of Minnesota, it was no surprise that the national interest in resolving this issue is strong. However, a variety of factors, including a lack of action by the House of Representatives, led to the demise of the 104th Congress' bill.

But support for enacting a real solution has never been stronger. Last July, the U.S. Court of Appeals reaffirmed that the DOE continues to have responsibility for permanently storing our Nation's commercial waste. It is no wonder, considering our nation's ratepayers have already contributed some \$12 billion; over \$250 million from Minnesotans alone.

Having recently returned from Yucca Mountain, the proposed permanent storage site located in Nevada, I believe much progress has been made over the last year. But after 15 years and with nearly half the nuclear trust fund depleted, there still remains no measurable value and the American public is fed up with empty promises from their Federal Government. They deserve action now.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997 delivers such action. It provides all the tools necessary to break our interim storage impasse. Furthermore, it provides mechanisms to complete the characterization of Yucca Mountain and gets the program moving out of the current stalemate.

With 1998 just around the corner, timely action on this legislation is critical. For States like Minnesota, which stand to lose nearly 30 percent of its overall energy resources, action should have occurred last year. And now, with the confirmation of a new Energy Secretary required, and the program in transition, Congress is faced with some tough challenges but our resolve must remain strong. And the introduction of this legislation today is our first step.

In the coming weeks and months, we will be asking our colleagues to join us in supporting this long overdue legislation. Rarely does the Congress have the opportunity which meets the twin goals of protecting our environment and strengthening our economy. Mr. President, I hope that the support we had last Congress will be even stronger this year. I would encourage my col-

leagues to add their name today as cosponsors to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE CANNELL

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Mike Cannell, a dairy farmer and sustainable agriculture advocate from Cazenovia, WI who perished in a farming accident on December 2, 1996 while helping a neighbor unload corn. Mike died the same way he lived—helping others.

While those of us fortunate enough to have known Mike will miss him terribly, he has left us a great gift: his tireless work toward restoring and sustaining an agricultural community of healthy and economically viable family farms. His support of sustainable agriculture reflected his approach to life: balance. Sustainable agriculture is an integrated system of production that provides an adequate supply of food and fiber in a manner that enhances environmental quality, makes efficient use of limited natural resources, sustains small and medium sized farms and improves the quality of life for farmers and the community. It is an agricultural system that balances the many needs of our people and our planet.

Mike not only recognized the economic importance and the environmental benefits of a large number of small scale family farms, he recognized the ability of successfully owning and operating one's own farm to instill a sense of pride, accomplishment and satisfaction in the farmer-owner. In Mike's view, these things were at least as important as the many economic and environmental reasons to sustain small farms. In all things, especially farming, he sought balance.

I first met Mike Cannell when I was a State senator. He, along with other dairy farmers, met with me to express concern about the development of a new dairy technology that he felt was ill-timed, unnecessary and irresponsible. That technology was Bovine Growth Hormone, a product which when injected in cows results in greater milk production. The arguments made against BGH were many: increased milk production necessarily lowers milk prices; the technology will favor large farms over smaller ones; small farms will be driven out of business; there may be indirect but harmful environmental impacts, and many more.

But Mike's objections to BGH ran deeper. He did not believe in technology for technology's sake. He felt scientists and society's leaders were obligated to consider and recognize cultural traditions and predominant value systems of the community for which they were developing new technology. To him, the economic benefits of technology had to be weighed against the real or perceived ramifications on society. Mike didn't believe that the universities and private sector