A Builder builded a temple,
He wrought it with grace and skill;
Pillars and groins and arches
All fashioned to work his will.
Men said, as they saw its beauty,
''It shall never know decay;
Great is thy skill, O Builder,
Thy fame will endure for aye.''

A Teacher builded a temple
With loving and infinite care,
Planning each arch with patience,
Laying each stone with prayer.
None praised her unceasing efforts,
None knew of her wondrous plan,
For the temple the Teacher builded
Was unseen by the eyes of man.

Gone is the Builder's temple,
Crumbled into the dust;
Low lies each stately pillar,
Food for consuming rust.
But the temple the Teacher builded
Will last while the ages roll,
For that beautiful unseen temple
Was a child's immortal soul.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. 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.

## THE ELWHA RIVER ECOSYSTEM AND FISHERIES RESTORATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, earlier this month, I came to the floor to announce that I was introducing legislation that would authorize the removal of one of two dams on the Elwha River on the Olympic Peninsula in my state. I have always been skeptical about claims that dam removal will have significant enough impact on my state's depleted salmon runs to justify their social and economic costs. I am willing to go along with this limited experiment, however, provided that the removal or significant alteration of any dam on the Columbia-Snake River System will not take place without Congressional approval.

As I mentioned in my statement, removing the lower Elwha Dam, a relatively small, poorly maintained project, is a small price to pay for the protection of the larger, more productive Columbia-Snake dams that are the lifeblood of our Northwest economy and that in recent years have come under attack by the Clinton-Gore Administration. I hoped that allowing the experiment of dam removal to move forward on the Elwha River would be enough to satisfy the wishes of environmental extremists within this Administration. I should have known that when it comes to environmental issues nothing is ever enough for this Administration.

I was astounded by the criticism my bill has received. Big City newspapers in Seattle and Portland have attacked the bill. The Sierra Club and other radical groups have attacked the bill. The Administration has attacked the bill, as has my Democratic colleague from Washington state. Needless to say, this criticism is unfounded and shortsighted.

Let me remind my colleagues and anyone else who has an interest in this subject what my bill does and does not do. It authorizes many millions of dollars to remove the lower Elwha River Dam. It also protects the local water supply in Port Angeles, and protects jobs at a local paper mill. As I have said repeatedly, I am skeptical that dam removal will result in a significant increase in Elwha River salmon runs because: (1) many rivers on the Olympic Peninsula that have never been dammed are not teeming with salmon; (2) the salmon crisis challenge our coastal rivers as well and yet none of those rivers have dams on them; and (3) Puget Sound is now home to endangered salmon runs, and, of course, there are no major dams on Puget Sound. Yet, despite these reservations, I am still willing to go forward with this experiment—it's worth the money to see the results on the ground.

But rural communities of Eastern Washington are so concerned about how this legislation impacts their livelihood—many in Eastern Washington believe removal of the Elwha River dams is a precursor to destroying dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers . So my bill contains protections for these communities by requiring congressional approval for any destruction, or significant modification, of dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

I should point out that for several years federal agencies have taken unprecedented and unauthorized actions to alter significantly and limit the effectiveness of these projects without any input from Congress. For the most part, my bill allows these agencies to continue implementing the present series of unauthorized actions. It simply prevents the executive branch from taking additional unilateral actions to modify these projects without Congressional approval. Why it should be so controversial when Elwha dam removal will have been the subject of two bills in Congress, I fail to understand. Columbia and Snake River dam removal almost certainly requires Congressional approval now, under present law—my bill just provides reassurances for eastern Washington.

I think this is also an appropriate time to remind all of those who are interested in this legislation—the Port Angeles community, Eastern Washington, environmentalists, the Administration, and Northwest congressional officeholders—what I am for, and what I am not for in regards to management of our region's environment, and the Columbia/Snake Rivers system. Here are the things that I am for:

Salmon: On this one, everyone has the same goal—more salmon. We just have different approaches for accomplishing this goal. I want more salmon in our rivers, and I want solutions to our Northwest salmon crisis that result in more salmon and less conflict among the region's various interests.

Clear, Scientific Conclusions: We need clear, scientific conclusions that guide the region toward responsible salmon recovery measures.

Hydropower Production: Hydro is the cleanest and most cost-effective way to produce large amounts of electricity. Our hydropower asset is the backbone of our Northwest economy. I don't want to lose that ''leg up'' that we have on other regions, nor do I want to resort to less environmentally friendly sources of power production to replace power lost because of dam removal.

Irrigation: Eastern Washington is America's pantry and refrigerator. Our farmlands produce dozens of different crops that feed the nation and the world. Before the dams, Central Washington had few farms, and was mostly a dustbowl. Irrigated farmland has turned this part of the nation into some of the world's most productive farmland.

River Traffic: We get a large share of those crops to market by barging them down the river. Studies show that it would take 700,000 more trucks each year to get farm products to market if dam removal eliminated barge traffic.

Recreation: I want people to have access to the river for boating, fishing and other recreation activities.

Protecting our Communities from Severe Floods: Without question, the dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers were the single biggest reason why Portland and other Columbia River communities did not incur untold millions of dollars in additional damages from the record winter rains our area has seen over the past three years.

A Clean Washington State: This is my most important goal—I want our State to have clean water, clean air, and a healthy environment for all of our citizens. My desire for a clean Washington state is why I have backed the following environmental initiatives: Washington Wilderness Bill; Double-hulled oil tankers in Puget Sound; Higher emission standards for automobiles; and Spending taxpayer dollars on recreation such as the Mountains to Sound Greenway, the Cape Horn Trail, Alpine Lakes, and other nature projects.

Given all the confusion and mischaracterizations of my bill, I think it is also important to talk about what I cannot support. Here is what I am not for:

Removing Dams on the Columbia-Snake: Why would anyone want to remove the jewels of our Northwest economy? I will never support such efforts to cripple the world's most productive hydro system.

The Status Quo: During the past six years, we have spent $3 billion on salmon recovery for the Pacific Northwest, most of it directed by the Clinton Administration, and the crisis is even greater than it was when the Administration's efforts started.

Wasteful Spending of Taxpayer Dollars: Even now, our government spends $500 million on Columbia/Snake River salmon recovery, and most of that money is spent in ways that have not

proven to be successful. Until I passed legislation that ended an outrageous conflict of interest by which those who approved the spending of salmon recovery funds awarded most of the money to themselves, the money was misspent. Now, at least the money goes to those whom objective scientists feel will use it most effectively.

Solutions Dictated to the region from Washington, D.C.: Recently, the Administration's top environmental staffer in Washington, D.C., Katie McGinty, was in Oregon to discuss the government's salmon recovery plans for the Northwest. That is exactly the wrong way to approach this problem. Why would our region put decisions about our economy, our communities, our future in the hands of someone 3,000 miles away? I believe we need to make these decisions, not Administration officials in Washington, D.C.

Rather than continuing the mindless attacks on my efforts to bring some balance to this debate, I make the following offer to those who criticize the Eastern Washington part of my Elwha package. If you are not for dam removal and want to keep the dams intact, offer up better legislative language that helps accomplish the goal of protecting our region's economic future. My legislation may need improvement. I am anxious to listen to how others would reach my goal. If there is a better idea of how we can ease the concerns of Eastern Washington with regard to dam removal, I challenge the Administration, Senator MURRAY, and the Sierra Club, and other opponents of this legislation, to offer a better alternative. I am interested in all proposals from those who want to make a statement in favor of protecting the dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

If you favor removing dams, however, and that is what is really driving your opposition to my legislation, I think it is time for you to be honest with the Northwest and state your position clearly. The Clinton Administration, and major environmental groups have sent mixed signals on this issue. Many of them advocate extreme, unrealistic and unscientific salmon recovery measures; some do not. I think it is time for these people to make their positions clear—do they want the dams removed or effectively destroyed, or what? And if they continue to temporize on this issue, I ask them to address the goals that I discussed earlier—salmon, irrigation, river traffic, hydropower production, recreation, and flood control—and tell me how they are committed to those traditional objectives, or if the possibility of attaining some salmon recovery goals is worth destroying most or all of these other uses.

I want my Elwha Dam removal legislation fully discussed in committee and have requested hearings. In the past few weeks, the opponents of my anti-dam removal legislation have called me divisive, extremist, and a salmon-hater. I am none of those things. I hope that my opponents, and particularly the Administration and my Democratic colleagues from the Northwest, will work together with me to craft legislation that removes the lower Elwha River dam and protects Eastern Washington from those who want to remove dams, stop irrigation, eliminate barge traffic, reduce hydropower, raise electric rates for families, restrict recreation and push for dubious salmon solutions.

I welcome the opportunity for a full and reasoned debate on this subject. It's time to put the rhetoric aside, the tired adjectives aside, and the political smokescreens aside. It's time for everyone to come clean, and make clear where they stand on this important issue. This bill provides such an opportunity, and I look forward to receiving proposals from people throughout the region on how to improve my bill.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The distinguished Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. SNOWE. Thank you, Mr. President.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back on the pending conference report.

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my statement, the order of speakers be Senator COLLINS from Maine and Senator CHAFEE from Rhode Island.

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

Ms. SNOWE. I further ask unanimous consent that Senator DEWINE be recognized for up to 60 minutes following our statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EFFORTS OF SENATOR GEORGE MITCHELL IN ACHIEVING THE NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE AGREEMENT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join with my colleagues, Senator COLLINS from Maine and Senator CHAFEE from Rhode Island, in the wake of yesterday's 97 to 0 vote by the Senate to pass Senate Concurrent Resolution 90 acknowledging the historic Northern Ireland peace agreement reached just 2 weeks ago.

The agreement was produced through the hard work and patience and goodwill of representatives of Northern Ireland's political parties, the Prime Ministers of both Britain and Ireland, President Clinton, and a man well known in this Chamber, the former Senator from Maine and former majority leader, George Mitchell.

Senator Mitchell's skill, patience, and determination were largely responsible for bringing opposing parties to the point where they were able to broker a historic agreement that offers the people of Northern Ireland the opportunity to put an end to the long-standing fear and suffering they have endured and to achieve a future that will be as bright as the spirit and potential of her extraordinary people.

In describing Senator Mitchell's pivotal role, one of the participants in the talks said, ''Here the United States sent one of its most able, skilled, talented, humble politicians, a supreme diplomat, and frankly we didn't deserve him.''

Well of course, the people of Northern Ireland deserved his leadership that has provided, as we now know, the very best opportunity for these talks to succeed.

After his retirement from the Senate, President Clinton invited Senator Mitchell to serve as a special economic adviser to Northern Ireland. However, before he finished his efforts to attract business investment to Northern Ireland, Senator Mitchell was selected by both the British and Irish governments to join a panel that recommended the decommissioning of arms by the paramilitary factions in Northern Ireland. He assumed responsibility for taking over the peace talks in June of 1996.

Senator Mitchell faced tremendous obstacles in attempting to win the trust of the parties involved in seeking an agreement. After all, previous efforts resulted in failure. However, his patience, diligence and sincerity won them over. I know that Senator Mitchell's long experience in the Senate helped prepare him for this unique challenge. As one who served with him for more than 14 years in the Maine Congressional Delegation, I know he has an excellent ability to understand the concerns of whomever he is talking with—whether it is a constituent from Bangor, or Augusta or Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland.

Being an effective majority leader in the Senate, as we know, requires one to be a good listener, to know when to compromise, to know when to coax and cajole, to know when to be patient and to know when to be firm. All these qualities served George Mitchell well in this body and served him well in his most recent role which consumed 22 long, hard months of negotiations.