This is a serious matter. It also threatens commerce and transportation, not just on the Missouri River but on the Mississippi River, because in dry years, 65 percent of the flow of the Mississippi at St. Louis comes from the Missouri River. If they have a spring rise, there isn't water to maintain river transportation during the summer and the fall.

I had understood, from the minority leader's staff, that he wanted a time agreement so he could move to strike it. I think this matter needs to be aired. We are willing to enter into a time agreement, so on Monday or Tuesday—whenever he wants—we can talk about the reason that this was included in the bill last year, the year before, the year before, and the year before that, because it is of vital importance to our State and to other States on both the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers.

We have a way of doing business around here and that is, the committee acts and they report out a bill; the bill comes to the floor. If somebody does not like a provision in the bill, they have a right to move to strike it. That right is totally protected. We are trying to get appropriations bills passed.

Frankly, I do not want to be held hostage by an idea that the minority leader has, that all of a sudden we can't put a provision in this year's bill that was in last year's bill and the bill the year before that.

I call on the minority leader to follow through with the commitment to have a time agreement. If he wants to move to strike it, fine. We have a lot of good reasons, and we want to let our colleagues know why that provision needs to be kept.

I do not want to be held hostage by the minority leader saying, we are going to stop the appropriations process unless you take it out of the bill—a measure that is vitally important to the State of Missouri, to the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Arkansas, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Louisiana. I am ready to talk about and argue against the minority leader's motion to strike. But to say that we can't even bring up the bill with that provision in it is, I think, inappropriate, unwise, and unprecedented.

So I am here. I will be back here on Monday or Tuesday to do business. I just ask that the minority leader let us bring up the bill. This is an unbelievable effort to hold a bill hostage because of a particular interest he may have in that bill. He can deal with it by an amendment to strike, a motion to strike—whatever he wants. But let us bring the bill up because there is too much that is important in it to have it be held hostage by an effort to say what can be in the bill, approved by the committee, where somebody does not like something in the bill.

There is a remedy: A motion to strike or a motion to amend. We will be here to do business Monday, Tuesday—whenever the minority leader wants.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Kansas, if I could just have 2 minutes to respond to my friend, because I have a dual role as not only whip but also I am ranking member on the subcommittee, I say to my friend, I think the proposal the minority leader has made is eminently fair: This provision should be taken out, that there will not be an amendment offered on the floor, and whatever took place in conference he would be willing to live with.

I am not going to go through the merits of the case. I think there is significant merit on the side of the minority leader. Basically, sure, this provision has been in the appropriations bill before, but it has had no impact on the upper basin States. Now it does, because the Corps of Engineers is at a point where they want to change the manual to determine how the river is going to operate.

What this bill says is there can be no funds spent to change the manual. That is how the flow of the river is going to be impacted. We should leave this to bureaucrats. It should not be done, preventing money from going to change how the river is operated.

This is something that, as indicated by my friend from Missouri, we can debate at a subsequent time. But the bill will not be brought up until this provision is out of the bill.

We can, during the process of the bill, and before it gets to conference, decide what to do with it. This provision is unfair to the upper basin States. There should not be a provision preventing administrative agencies of this Government from spending money as to how that river system should be operated.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask my friend from Nevada, if we pass a bill out of committee, what is the precedent for saying, oh, we have to change it before you even bring the bill to the floor, the measure that is reported out of the committee?

We have a process around here. There are many things that come out of committees that we disagree with. We have the option to change it on the floor. We need to move forward. Energy and water is vitally important.

I appreciate the excellent work my colleague from Nevada does on this and other measures. But why, for Heaven's sake, are we supposed to hold an entire bill hostage because a single Senator wants to strike something out of a measure that has been adopted at the subcommittee and full committee level? I just do not understand why we can't do this in the normal course of business.

Mr. REID. I made my remarks very short because my friend from Kansas yielded to me. So I will make this response very short.

We are following what takes place in the Senate every week. A person has the right to stop a bill from going forward. The rules of this Senate have been in effect for many years. I will insert in the RECORD today why the provision in the bill is so unfair to the upper basin States.

I won't take the time of my friend from Kansas. There are many reasons this provision is unfair that will be inserted in the RECORD today.

I say to my friend from Missouri that the procedure that is being exercised by the minority in this instance—the minority leader and others who are affected; the minority leader is not the only one who is exercising his rights—are rights that are exercised every day in the Senate. The procedures of the Senate may seem burdensome and cumbersome, but they have always been here to make sure the minority's interests are protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the order of business.

CHECHNYA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to once again draw attention to the continuing war in Chechnya. This war has raged for too long. The war in Chechnya from 1994–1996 left over 80,000 civilians dead, and the Foreign Relations Committee has received credible evidence that the current war has again resulted in the death of thousands of innocent civilians and the displacement of well over 250,000 others. The committee also received credible evidence of widespread looting, summary executions, detentions, denial of safe passage to fleeing civilians, torture and rape, committed by Russian soldiers. Colleagues, regardless of the politics of this war, this kind of behavior is unacceptable. War has rules, and the evidence and testimony the Foreign Relations Committee received raises serious doubts as to whether or not the Russian Federation is playing by those rules. Much of the evidence we received showed clear violations of international humanitarian law, including the well-established Geneva Convention.

The President must use this opportunity to relay our serious concerns with the actions of the Russian Government in Chechnya. Let's remember, what was the Group of Seven and became the G–8 with the inclusion of the Russian Federation, is an association of democratic societies with advanced economies. Although Russia is not yet a liberal democracy or an advanced economy, it was invited to take part in this group to encourage its democratic evolution. Today as I watch Russia refuse to initiate a political dialogue

with the Chechen people, and continue to deny international humanitarian aid organizations and international human rights monitors access to Chechnya, I must question that evolution.

I am disappointed that the Group of Eight will not include the situation in Chechnya on its formal agenda, but I am hopeful that the President will voice our serious concerns about Russia's conduct in Chechnya and take concrete action to demonstrate our concern, during bilateral talks with President Putin.

The United States should demand that the Russian Federation push for a negotiated, just settlement to this conflict. The conflict will not be resolved by military means and the Russian Federation should initiate immediately a political dialogue with a cross-section of representatives of the Chechen people, including representatives of the democratically elected Chechen authorities. The United States should remind the Russian Federation of the requests the Council of Europe for an immediate cease-fire and initiation of political dialogue, and of Russia's obligation to that institution and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The President must also remind the Russian Federation government of its accountability to the international community and take steps to demonstrate that its conduct will effect its standing in the world community. This body and the U.N. Human Rights Commission has spoken out demanding the Russian government allow into Chechnya humanitarian agencies and international human rights monitors, including U.N. Special Rapporteur, yet the Russian government has not done so. This body and the international community has also demanded that the Russian Federation undertake systematic, credible, transparent and exhaustive investigations into allegations of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Chechnya, and to initiate, where appropriate, prosecutions against those accused. But again, the Russian Federation has not done so.

During his meeting with President Putin, the President is expected to discuss economic reform in Russia and regional stability issues. President Clinton must relay to the Russian President that Russia's conduct in Chechnya is not only a violation of international humanitarian law, but that it threatens Russia's ability for economic reform and creates instability in the region. And President Clinton must make clear to President Putin that while the United States fully supports the territorial integrity of the Russian Federation, and is fully aware of the evidence of grave human rights violations committed by soldiers on both sides of the conflict, we strongly condemn Russia's conduct of the war in Chechnya and will continue to publicly voice our opposition to it. President Clinton should tell President Putin that the United States will take into consideration Russian conduct in Chechnya in any request for further rescheduling of Russia's international debt and U.S. assistance, until it allows full and unimpeded access into Chechnya humanitarian agencies and international human rights monitors, in accordance with international law.

The war in Chechnya has caused enormous suffering for both the Chechen and Russian people, and the reports of the grave human rights violations committed there, on both sides of the conflict, continue daily. We must raise our concerns about the war in Chechnya at every chance and in every forum possible, including the G–8 Summit.

That is why I speak on the floor of the Senate today.

I fear we have already given human rights a back seat to economic issues by not placing Russia's conduct in Chechnya on the formal agenda of the G–8 summit, which is meeting right now. I hope that will not be the outcome of our bilateral talks with Russia in Japan.

I hope the President will be firm. I hope the President will be strong. I hope the U.S. Government is on the side of human rights. As a Senator from Minnesota, I want to communicate in the strongest possible language that I hope Russia will do well. My father fled persecution in Russia. My hope is that Russia will be able to build a democratic economy. That is my hope for the Russian people. But I also want to make it clear to the Russian Federation that the conduct in Chechnya is unacceptable, in violation of basic international law, and that we should be talking about and moving toward some kind of peaceful settlement; and, for certain, international humanitarian agencies and human rights agencies should have unimpeded access to Chechnya now. Otherwise, the murder, the rape, the torture, and the killing of innocent people will continue. We in the Senate should speak out on this matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

JOHN O. PASTORE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Wednesday, the day before yesterday, I went with a delegation to the State of Rhode Island for the funeral of our former colleague, John O. Pastore. I was accompanied by Senators JACK REED and LINCOLN CHAFEE of Rhode Island, TED KENNEDY and JOHN KERRY of Massachusetts, PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont, and JOSEPH BIDEN of Delaware. Former Senators Claiborne Pell and Harris Wofford were also present.

The Catholic Mass at the Church of the Immaculate Conception was uplifting. John Pastore, Jr., and grandson, Gregory, spoke warmly of our former colleague. Senator TED KENNEDY was especially eloquent in his remembrance of Senator Pastore. It was obvious that this man was much beloved by his family and community.

Mr. President, I can recollect John Pastore's departing speech from the Senate. There he remarked that he had wanted to be a physician, but that his father had died when he was nine, and he had to help raise his four brothers and sisters and support his mother, who worked as a seamstress. How proud he must have been of his son, John, Jr., a Notre Dame graduate, a physician and cardiologist. So the son became what the father—John O. Pastore, the Senator—had wanted to be.

Instead of being a physician, Senator Pastore studied law at night at Boston's Northeastern University, eventually graduating with a Bachelor of Laws degree. This is an effort I can especially appreciate. At age 36, he became Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and was reelected twice before winning a Senate seat in 1950, where he served for 26 years.

Senator Pastore was a strong supporter of the National Defense establishment, with a great appreciation for the U.S. Navy—and especially the nuclear Navy. As the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, he was equally mindful of the power, and the terror, of all matters nuclear, and worked hard for passage of the first nuclear test ban treaty, which barred nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

John Pastore and I served for some 18 years together in the Senate. John was an effective and fiery orator. My recollection is that not many members were willing to take him on in a debate, because of his quick mind and fierce demeanor. Sometimes he would finish his debating points, leaving his opponent's arguments in shreds, and stride off the floor. But, even then he maintained his self-deprecating sense of humor—sometimes remarking under his breath, ''If I had been a foot taller, I would have been president.''

Mr. President, I wonder why he would have wanted to be President. He was an extraordinary Senator. But he may well have become President had he wanted to do so.

He was the keynote speaker at the 1964 Democratic Convention. According to news reports, his 36-minute speech was interrupted by applause 36 times, and he enjoyed a brief consideration for the Vice-Presidential nomination that eventually went to Senator Hubert Humphrey.

John Pastore's priorities were love of, and dedicated service to, God, Country, and family—especially family. I am told that John had the desk in his office equipped with a special buzzer that rang out to alert him whenever Elena, his wife since 1941, would call. I am told that no matter how important a visitor he might have in his office even if it had been Admiral Rickover, if the buzzer went off John Pastore would interrupt his meeting to take the call from ''Mama''—as he affectionately referred to his wife—for a list of