

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.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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