

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 might 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