same goal. If we do not take action now to balance the budget, the tax burden will only get worse and worse for American families in the future.

The report of the bipartisan entitlement commission could not be more clear: If we do not change our present course by the year 2012, every single penny in the Federal budget will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the national debt. If in the year 2012 we want Government to do anything at all, such as run the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, run a program for women, infants, and children, the WIC Program, or any other things we consider important, it would have to mean a tax increase, a huge, staggering tax increase. You would have to have a tax increase, because there is no money left to do these things.

Let me try to put our present course in historical perspective and talk about an American family.

When my parents graduated from high school in early 1940's, the debt on each child who graduated that year was approximately $360. By the time my wife, Fran, and I graduated in 1965, it was up to $1,600 for each child.

When our older children, Patrick, Jill, and Becky, graduated in the mid-1980's, that figure had risen per child. The debt for each child graduating those years was $9,000. If we continue to go the way we have been going, by the year 2012, just 1 year after our grandson, Albert, graduates from high school and just 1 year after our daughter, Anna, enters college, by that year 2012, that figure will be $25,000. That will be $25,000 in debt for each person—each man, woman, child—in this country.

What a staggering debt, what a horrible legacy we would be leaving to our children and our grandchildren. Clearly, the longer we wait to change course, the worse it will be for the American people.

The reconciliation package that we will be considering balances the budget by slowing the rate of growth of Federal spending. Let me repeat that. It balances the budget by slowing the rate of growth.

Columnist James Glassman of the Washington Post has proposed a useful way of looking at this bill, this package. Add up all the spending by the Federal Government over the last 7 years and compare it with the total this budget proposes to spend over the next 7 years. The result: Spending over the next 7 years will increase over the last 7 years by $2.6 trillion.

Let me repeat that. Spending will increase. The truth is that by limiting spending growth to just a little more than the expected rate of inflation, by doing this, what would seem to be, simple act, we can balance the budget.

If we as a nation cannot summon the will and the courage to make that relatively small sacrifice, how on Earth can we expect the next generation to face a budget with no money in the discretionary account, no money for defense, no money for social programs, and $25,000 of debt owed by every single American?

Mr. President, over a working lifetime, the interest alone on the national debt will cost an American child born today a total of $187,000.

It is clear to me as well as to the American people this could very well be our last chance to solve this problem before it is really too late. This is a grave responsibility, and I do not believe that we can back away from it.

Is there an alternative? Is there anything else we can do? The President has proposed a different approach. His budget, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the budget office that he told us we should be following, contains deficits, according to their calculation. His budget, the President's budget, contains deficits of $200 billion as far as the eye can see, for the foreseeable future. His budget never gets to balance. Let me repeat that. According to CBO, the President's budget never gets to balance. In other words, no balanced budget, staggering deficits as far as the eye can see.

Mr. President, I do not believe that is how America wants to begin a new millennium. For over 200 years, we have given hope to all the nations of the world—hope that free men and women are, in fact, capable of self-government, capable of making responsible choices to ensure a prosperous future for our families, our children, and for our country.

Mr. President, a vote for the Republican reconciliation package is a vote to balance the budget so that we can start reducing the national debt and so we can put America on course toward a future we can be proud to leave our children.

The administration's budget proposal would take today's staggering deficits, add 24 percent, and then ask our children and grandchildren to pay our bills. Often in the past, Americans have faced up to a choice, a choice between two futures. The choice we make in this historic Congress will rank with some of the most important in our Nation's history. As Congress decides and as America decides, I believe we should stay true to our national calling. We should prove, Mr. President, that America is in fact capable of responsibility. We must balance the budget so that our children and grandchildren do not have to pay our bills. We must, we should, put the future first and support the reconciliation bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2916, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I appreciate the passion with which the author of this term limitation amendment believes in his cause. I can also appreciate the fact that he is adamant in having the Senate debate the issue of term limits. But I strongly suggest that the remaining days of the first session of the 104th Congress are not the time to undertake this debate. There will be plenty of opportunity when we return next year, as the able and distinguished majority leader has indicated, for the Senate to consider a constitutional amendment limiting the terms of service. I urge my colleagues to not vote for cloture today and to reject the amendment.

Notwithstanding the logistics, I believe that the Founding Fathers were exactly correct when they declined to establish in the Constitution arbitrary limits beyond those that are set forth in the Constitution regarding congressional service. It is not that the idea had not occurred to them. On the contrary, the Framers of our great charter deliberately rejected this structural prescription—one might call it a proscription; it is both a prescription and a proscription. Instead, they opted for having the number of terms a Member could serve limited not by the calendar, but rather by the Member's performance, measured through regular and periodic elections. After more than 200 years under that principle, we would all be correct to question why it deserves radical change.

Proponents may argue that it is, in fact, necessary to amend our Constitution in order to preserve the Framers' original vision of a citizen-legislator who would set aside his plow to serve the Republic, only to return to his fields as swiftly as possible. But when I think about those men who painstakingly crafted our Constitution—men like Madison, Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Wilson, Mason, and others—I have serious doubts about the strength of such vision. These were men who devoted nearly all of their adult lives to public service. And that such men could truly embrace that bucolic notion is dubious, at best. The fact is that the citizen-legislator has long been a political myth. Now, with the ever-increasing complexities of public affairs, it is also an unrealistic myth.

For the same reason we have professional doctors, professional accountants, professional teachers and professional engineers, we need an experienced Congress. In each of the cases I have mentioned, experience counts, and it should count. No one would go to an untrained and inexperienced heart surgeon. If they want to do that, they could come to me. That surgeon only

becomes so professional through a long period of schooling and an equally long residency at a hospital.

In the same light, the only way to become a better, more efficient, more professional legislator is through years of practical experience here in the Congress. Richard Russell, Everett Dirksen, Sam Rayburn, and Hubert Humphrey did not become the legislators that they became through limited terms. Just the opposite is true. They became proficient and experienced lawmakers through long years of dedicated service, learning their craft and honing their skills.

And finally, Mr. President, although I will have more to say to this issue at the appropriate time, I hope Senators will reject this notion of term limits for the most obvious of reasons: the surest and most effective term limit is that which can already be imposed by the voters. When the term of any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate expires, the American voter can turn any Member of this body or of the House of Representatives out of office for any reason. They, the voters, alone pick and choose whom they wish to have represent them. They alone, and not some arbitrary calendar, determine who will serve in this body. And no constitutional amendment, no matter how well intentioned, can improve upon that situation.

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.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. What is the pending business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 927.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I gather there is no time agreement other than the set rollcall, as I understand it, at 5 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit at this time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, as I understand it, the matter of strengthening sanctions on the Cuban Government is the underlying legislation, with the pending amendment being one offered by the distinguished colleague from Missouri with regarding term limits. I wish to talk on a subject relating to term limits, specifically the need to retain a sense of history around this place. I oppose term limits by way of any further provision other than that in the Constitution, that we in the Senate have to run every 6 years. I have faced the voters in six elections since I first came to the U.S. Senate.

In attempting to change the existing restraints, we are in danger of losing the sense of history that is necessary in a democratic government. Specifically, I want to address the budget and the reconciliation measure that will soon be considered, the so-called train wreck, to see if we can all talk in one vocabulary relative to this budget, and to specifically demonstrate that there is no plan at the present time that balances the budget.

If you were to go out on the sidewalk and ask any of the relatively informed passers-by, they would tell you, ''Well, there is a Republican plan to balance the budget by the year 2002, but the Democrats want to spend more money.'' The fact is, neither the President nor the Democrats nor the Republicans have a plan to balance the budget by the year 2002—or 2005, for the simple reason we refuse to face the truth; to face the reality.

Let me ask the staff to put copies of our budget tables around on all the desks and some upstairs for the media.

When Senator Howard Baker was the majority leader back in 1981, we saw that we were on a collision course. Specifically, we knew you could not cut taxes and raise revenues. Finally, the press seems to be catching on. I read with pleasure the first ''truth in budgeting'' article that I have seen this year, entitled ''GOP Tax Cuts Will Add $93 Billion to the United States Debt, Budget Analysts Say,'' by Jackie Calmes.

I have called to congratulate the young lady since yesterday. I am going to continue to try to find her, because she really has made history.

I ask unanimous consent the article be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 16, 1995]

GOP TAX CUTS WILL ADD $93 BILLION TO U.S. DEBT, BUDGET ANALYSTS SAY

(By Jackie Calmes)

WASHINGTON.—Despite Republicans' claims to the contrary, their tax cuts will add billions to the nation's nearly $5 trillion debt even as the GOP seeks to balance the budget by 2002.

An estimated $93 billion in extra debt will pile up as a result of the Republicans' proposed $245 billion in seven-year tax cuts, according to calculations from GOP congressional budget analysts. And that's assuming the economy gets the huge $170 billion fiscal stimulus that Republicans are counting on as a consequence of balancing the budget over seven years, thanks mostly to lower interest rates.

GOP leaders agreed last summer, as part of a House-Senate budget compromise, to apply that hypothetical $170 billion ''fiscal dividend'' toward their proposed $245 billion in tax cuts. That left $75 billion in revenue losses unaccounted for. Interest on that amount would add about $18 billion, for the total $93 billion in debt.

Meanwhile, the Republican architects of the plan boast that the tax cuts are all paid for with spending cuts. Senate Finance Committee Chairman William Roth, announcing his panel's draft $245 billion tax-cut package last Friday, said it would be completely financed with lower interest rates and smaller government. ''Other factors like that will add up to $245 billion,'' the Delaware-Republican said.

And Oklahoma Sen. Don Nickles, another Finance Committee panelist and a member of the Senate GOP leadership, added, ''We will not pass this tax cut until we have a letter'' from the Congressional Budget Office reporting that Republicans' proposed spending cuts through 2002 will give us a balanced budget *and* a surplus of at least $245 billion.'' He added, ''It's all paid for.''

The confusion has to do with the frequently misunderstood distinction between the nation's accumulated debt, now approaching $4.9 trillion, and its annual budget deficits, which have built up at roughly $200 billion a year.

Republicans' spending cuts, it's projected, generally will put the annual deficit on a downward path until the fiscal 2002 budget shows a minimal surplus. But the annual deficits until then, while declining, together add nearly $1 trillion more to the cumulative debt. Meanwhile, the GOP tax cuts add to those annual deficits in the early years—in fact, the fiscal 1997 deficit would show an increase from the previous year. Thus the debt, and the interest on the debt, would be that much higher.

Interviews in recent weeks indicate that many House and Senate GOP members are unaware of the calculus. And some are unfazed even when they hear of it. ''It would bother me if I thought we were adding to the debt,'' said Texas Sen. Phil Gramm, now seeking the presidency on his record as a fiscal conservative, ''but I don't think we are.''

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I worked with Senator Baker when he was in the majority, and the majority leader, in pushing for a freeze; namely, to take this year's budget for next year. We reasoned that if we could just hold the line, we would save billions and billions of dollars.

I was asked to go ahead and offer the budget freeze. Senator Baker gave some laudatory remarks. He could not endorse it. Unfortunately, we were tackled from behind, by Don Regan, the Secretary of Treasury, and Dave Stockman. Since I have started putting articles in, let me get right to the subject of tax cuts.

Mr. President, let me quote what the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Stockman had to a couple of years ago, when I quote from an article in which he wrote:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction of Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake of fiscal governance and their own culpability in it ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of antitax venom while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit. It ought to be obvious by now that we can't grow our way out of it.

We have had none other than the better words of Mr. Stockman, who was one of the leaders of the tax-cut Reaganomics, Kemp-Roth approach.

I have heard the distinguished Chair and others talk about a balanced budget, and I want to shed some light on the reality that you are not saving money or making money with tax cuts. If we are going to get rid of the deficit and the debt, we are going to have to have spending cuts, spending freezes, tax loophole closings, and we are going

to have to deny ourselves programs. I support the idea of voluntarism and helped to start the Peace Corps. But when went to start AmeriCorps, I withheld my support because there was a new multi-billion-dollar program that we just could not afford. So, it takes sacrifices, but it also takes a balanced approach with spending freezes, spending cuts, loophole closings, withholding of new programs, and a revenue increases.

The reason we are in this particular dilemma is that nobody in public office can use the expression ''tax increase'' and get by with it. They describe it as some kind of lunatic fringe. The media, which is charged with the responsibility of exposing the truth and bringing us in public office to task, has joined the conspiracy. They are one of the major culprits—by constantly quoting inaccurate deficit numbers and to budget that are balanced when they should know otherwise.

Take this particular budget we will soon be discussing. I ask you to refer to Mr. KASICH, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. Mr. KASICH in the conference report on page 3, and I read under the entitlement subsection 4, ''deficits,'' fiscal year 2002, a deficit of $108.4 billion. So, please, spare me from all this balanced budget talk. The media, the politicians, the White House, both parties and everybody else—let us start talking reality. The Republican plan that claims to balance budgets has no idea of being balanced. Indeed, Chairman KASICH himself in his conference report projects a deficit of $108.4 billion.

Let me focus for a moment on this tax-cut nonsense that we have to listen to in our debate. We talk about whether the cut is for the middle class, or the rich, or whether you are going to get credit, or we get credit or how much, or whatever it is, but no one really wants to come and say that the tax cut is going to lose revenues. That is why I have inserted this article that appeared yesterday in the Wall Street Journal, entitled ''GOP Tax Cuts Will Add $93 billion to the United States Debt.''

Going just to the October 23 issue of the New Republic, let me quote:

> Neoconman in the late 1970's and early 1980's, Irving Crystal, editor of the Public Interest, helped lend intellectual credibility to the supply side theory that cutting taxes would not increase the deficit. Crystal opened the public interests to supplysiders and introduced Jack Kemp, author of the Kemp-Roth tax bill that initiated the era of disastrous deficits, to supply side guru Jude Waninsky. In the 30th anniversary of the Public Interest, Crystal now confesses that he and his allies never really understood economics. They were merely after a something-for-nothing gimmick that could help elect Republicans.

Now he quotes from that particular statement in Public Interest, and I quote it.

> Among the core social scientists around the Public Interest there were no economists. They came later as we matured. This explains my own rather cavalier attitude toward the budget deficit and other monetary or fiscal problems. The task, as I saw it, was to create a Republican majority so political effectiveness was the priority, not the accounting deficiencies of Government.

I quote just a couple other sentences from that particular article:

> Now he tells us. Thanks anyway, Irving, for the confession of complete political cynicism. The accounting deficiencies of Government, by the way, at last count add up to $4.9 trillion.

If you look at the historical budget tables that I have distributed, I started back when we balanced the budget. This Senator has voted for a balanced budget. Yes, I am an endangered species—one of a very few left around here. But in 1968–1969, under President Lyndon Baines Johnson, you can see that the unified budget was in surplus by $3.2 billion, or the real budget surplus was $2.9 billion.

These are CBO figures, by the way. And I have researched them all the way back to the 1940's. But I wanted to have these figures on one piece of paper showing the Government budget in outlays, the trust funds and the unified deficit—which together make up for the real deficit—the gross Federal debt, and the gross interest costs.

I know people get bored listening to figures, but they better listen to this because they are going to have to live with these figures. You cannot avoid them. You cannot avoid death. You cannot avoid taxes. And you cannot avoid the interest costs on the national debt.

Right here in 1996, the present fiscal year, you can see that the Congressional Budget Office has projected an interest cost on the national debt of $348 billion. That is $1 billion a day. There are only 365 days in a year. So we have got automatic spending—or, rather, spending on automatic pilot of $1 billion a day.

This cancer has got to be excised. It cannot be defrauded. It cannot be finessed.

The present budget for 1996 increases spending. You will find at the bottom of the page not only the Kasich conference report which shows a $108 billion deficit in the year 2002—where they say on the face of the document itself there is a deficit and not a balanced budget—but also the 1996 budget outlay of $1.5756 trillion. Then look just below that, of course, is 1995, last year's, $1.518 trillion. So as you go from 1995 to 1996, you have increased spending.

Here is the best of the best that have come to town, the 74 freshmen on the House side that are controlling the agenda and are said to be beyond the control of the distinguished Speaker. And instead of cutting spending, they have increased spending $57.6 billion. That envisions, of course, abolishing the Department of Commerce, the Office of Technology and Assessment, the Advanced Technology Program, cutting education, cutting housing, cutting all of these other things, and Government outlays still increase.

Mr. President, here we have also listed the CBO baseline assuming passage of legislation to enact the budget resolution. The outlays for the year 2002 are $1.876 trillion, and the revenues of $1.883 trillion. So that is close enough. We call that a balanced budget. But now look down below, how they get to that particular outlay figure. They do that by extending the freeze on discretionary spending through the year 2002.

This fact is assumed rather than stated in the document prepared by the Republican Budget Committee staff entitled, ''Conference Agreement Compared to Baseline.'' It is used by Senator DOMENICI, our distinguished chairman and shows $1.876 trillion in outlays. The way you get it down to those outlays is starting from a figure at the top of the sheet called ''Current Law Deficit.''

Well, if you have not been in the budget game, you might say, ''Wait a minute. What in the world is a current law deficit?'' Translated into reality, it says, ''Assume that the discretionary caps do not expire in 1998 and continue them for the year 1999, the year 2000, the year 2001, and the year 2002.'' They pick up $91 billion—by extending the discretionary freeze through 2002.

Then they say, ''the necessary spending cuts of total deficit reduction'' on the work sheet. This is using the chairman of the Republican Budget Committee's own document. I am not playing games with figures. I want to assume everything they say is true and show you they still do not have a cause of action.

If we assume everything they say is true, they still do not have a balanced budget. Why? Because they say you have got to cut in the year 2002 a reduction of $235 billion in addition to the freeze of $91 billion. And then comparing apples to apples, we must subtract from that $1.876 trillion, the $109 billion surplus in the Social Security trust fund. So the total reduction needed in the year 2002, is a $435 billion reduction.

Now, Mr. President, look at what we are doing here. In the year 1996 we are trying to get a $10 billion reduction in non-defense spending—$10 billion. And, at the present time, we cannot get it. That is why we have not passed all of the appropriations bill. Our colleagues on the Republican side, as well as the colleagues on the Democratic side, are struggling to find $10 billion in discretionary cuts, much less $435 billion.

In the debate on the State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations bill, I used the expression that if the present budget plan balanced by the year 2002, I would jump off the Capitol dome. The chairman of the Budget Committee, my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, said, ''Well, you better take hang gliding lessons.'' I said, ''I'm not going to take them from you because I know I will crash, just like this budget.''

I can tell you here and now, if we cannot cut $10 billion in this struggle

with the best of the best and the sincere intent of the newcomers claiming that all we have to do is cut spending, I know I have a safe bet when you look at the year 2002, and try to cut $435 billion.

Now, that is a swing, Mr. President, from this present year of a $57.6 billion increase. If you want to talk reality, rather than increasing $57.6 billion, you need to turn around and cut $435 billion. That is an almost $500 billion change in position. It is not going to happen.

Why do the distinguished newcomers have such difficulty in stomaching these cuts? The mistaken assumption is that Government began when they got elected—that we had not been cutting. President Ronald Reagan, the best of the cutters, was here for 8 years, and I worked with him. I was on the Grace Commission. That is when we tried the freeze, and then Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. When we could not get the freezes, we said we had to have automatic cuts across the board. If the budget did not come out as you had predicted, what you had to do was automatically cut across the board, otherwise known as a sequester. A majority of the Democrats and a majority of the Republicans voted for Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

Now, right to the point, Senator GRAMM went along with the repeal of that on October 19, 1990, at 12:41 a.m. Look at the RECORD. I raised the point of order. I said that if we did not follow through with automatic cuts across the board, we would instead start increasing spending. We do not have truth in budgeting.

We not only cut under President Reagan, we cut under President Bush. Incidentally, I had gone from the attempts of the freeze and cuts across the board with Gramm–Rudman-Hollings to supporting of closing of tax loopholes. We worked it out with the Finance Committee, and passed the Tax Reform Act of 1986. We had supposedly done away with corporate welfare, but now they are beginning to talk about it again.

Then in 1989 and 1990, I talked to the President, and particularly to Dick Darman, the Director of his Office of Management and Budget. I said, ''This thing is getting out of hand. The debt is so big and interest is so high that we are not getting on top of just paying the interest on the national debt.'' It was something like Alice in Wonderland's character whereby you have to run faster to stay where you are.

So I said to Darman, what we need is a value-added tax across the board in America. He said, ''How are you going to get votes for it?'' I said, ''We will get it in the Budget Committee. If you and the President will come out for it, we will run with them and get on top of it. If you don't, by 1992, you are going to be in real trouble.''

The truth is, in 1992, President Bush was in real trouble. The deficit was up to $400 billion and President Clinton did not so much as win that election as President Bush lost it. The people said: ''We hear all the rhetoric about what all they are going to do with balanced budgets, but like Tennessee Ernie, another day longer and deeper in debt;'' and there we are, Mr. President, you can understand exactly what I am talking about.

We had been to the Budget Committee and we got eight votes to increase taxes across the board. We had Senator Boschwitz. We had Senator Danforth. It was bipartisan. We got eight votes in the Budget Committee, but the Bush administration would not follow through. As a result, as I stated in 1992, we were up against $400 billion deficits.

President Reagan came to office in 1988 and pledged to balance the budget in 1 year. Of course, he soon backtracked and said, ''Oops, this is way worse than I ever thought. It is going to take me 3 years.'' Well, here was the pledge made; they are all talking about pledges and I want to get to this one. The pledge made was to balance the budget in a year, and then in 3 years, and they instead paved the way for truly astronomical deficits.

Mr. President, gross Federal debt in 1980 was $909 billion; in 1981, it was $994.8 billion.

Former OMB Director Stockman called this gross incompetence—let me use the exact expression he used. I had it here just a minute ago. To quote Mr. Stockman: ''Willfully denying this giant mistake of fiscal governance.''

Giant mistake of fiscal governance, whereby in almost 200 years of history and 38 Presidents, Republican and Democrat, we had not reached a trillion-dollar debt. Now, in 12 short years, add on 3 under Clinton, 15 years, we are up to $5 trillion. We have quintupled the debt of the United States of America.

Senator THURMOND and I are going to get by. We are up there now in age, so we do not have to worry. It is not going to be us paying. It will be our children and grandchildren. We have to constantly hear this caterwaul over on the other side of the aisle: ''We want people to get out of the wagon and start pulling''——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allocated to the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, I am about to complete my thought here, to extend for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, my only question will be, there are some of us who want to speak on the Cuban matter before the vote. The vote is at 5 o'clock. I do not know how many people are lined up to speak. I am enjoying the Senator's speech. I would like to listen to it. Can we extend the vote for 5 or 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would take unanimous consent to change the time of the vote, which is now set for 5 o'clock.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that it be extended to 5 past 5 and that I be allowed to speak.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time be equally divided between the two sides in the usual form.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the point should be made that for years now up here, at least for the past 15 years, we in the Congress have jumped up into the wagon. We have not paid a bill in 15 years, and we have crowded out the children; we have crowded out the hungry; we have crowded out the poor and the sick; and we have been up in that wagon. So do not give me this stuff about let us help pull the wagon when we do not pay our own way.

There is one fellow in this town, one individual that is not responsible for this deficit, and that is William Jefferson Clinton. President Clinton was down in Little Rock, AR, when this sham and fraud started. He came to town and cut the deficit 500 billion bucks. He increased taxes even on Social Security. He cut defense without a single vote on that side of the aisle.

Yet, they constantly appear talking about a balanced budget when they know it is not balanced, and continue to chastise the one person who did something about it.

Last year when the Medicare trustees reported that Medicare was going broke in the year 2001, they cried, ''What is the matter? We have the best health system. There's nothing wrong.'' They would not do anything.

So President Clinton has tried. Now we are trying again. I ask these fellows to get off that high horse of this fraudulent nonsense about their balanced budget plan when it is far from being balanced—they report it themselves as a $108 billion deficit—and start working with us and cut out the sham about who is in the wagon.

I thank my distinguished colleague and ask that the document that I have referred to throughout my speech entitled, ''Budget Tables'' be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET TABLES: SENATOR ERNEST F. HOLLINGS

Year	Government budget (outlays in billions)	Trust funds	Unified deficit	Real deficit	Gross Federal debt	Gross interest
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	−0.3	+3.2	+2.9	368.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.6	−212.3	−252.9	1,817.6	178.9
1986	990.3	81.8	−221.2	−303.0	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.2	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,868.0	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.2	−221.4	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.7	−269.2	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,408.2	94.2	−255.1	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.1	−203.2	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,518.0	121.9	−161.4	−283.3	4,927.0	336.0
1996 est.	1,575.6	121.8	−189.3	−311.1	5,238.0	348.0

Source: CBO's "1995 Economic and Budget Outlook: An Update," August 1995.

[In billion of dollars]	*Year 2002*
1996 Budget:	
Kasich Conf. Report, p.3 (Deficit)	−108
1996 Budget Outlays (CBO est.)	1,575.6
1995 Budget Outlays	1,518.0
Increased spending	+57.6
CBO baseline assuming budget resolution:	
Outlauys	1,876
Revenues	1.883
This assumes:	
(1) Extending discretionary freeze 1999–2002	−91
(2) Spending cuts	−235
(3) Using SS Trust Fund	−109
Total needed	−435

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes for the proponents and 10 minutes for the opponents.

Who yields time?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I assume the proponents as being those seeking cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FEINGOLD. What is the amount of time for the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask the Senator from Connecticut, through the Chair, if he would yield me time to speak in opposition to the motion.

Mr. DODD. It is my understanding that the time remaining is equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Helms bill on Cuba. As I have said on the floor several times before, it advances the wrong policy at the wrong time.

Fidel Castro is finally, reluctantly, finding that his government must accept the realities of the 1990's: that free trade and political liberalization are fundamental to the promotion of enlightened self-interest. As we have seen time and again, once a people have tasted the fruit of freedoms they invariably demand the only atmosphere in which free markets and human rights flourish. That, of course, is democracy and a government protective of a phalanx of rights: the free exchange of ideas and information; respect for human rights; the right to seek one's livelihood unhindered by government fiat. We are seeing the first tentative steps toward an emerging market economy in Cuba; the first steps, we can all agree and hope, which point towards and end of this dictatorship.

So I find it ironic that at the very moment when the United States is presented with the best opportunity in nearly four decades to encourage and influence the move toward positive change in Cuba, the Senator seeks to legislate that opportunity out of existence. Rather than encourage the Cuban Government to move into the 1990's, the Helms bill would have it slide back into the 1960's, dragging the administration as well into continuing and, indeed, strengthening a fossilized policy of isolation that did not work even when, it could be argued, a bipolar world justified such short-term thinking.

In fact, rather than seek to promote the kind of positive change administrations, Republican and Democratic, have sought for decades, and which at long last holds out the promise to lift the Cuban people out of the misery visited on them by Castro's totalitarian regime, the Helms bill, incredibly, would increase their pain by further isolating Cuba. It is wishful thinking—nearly 40 years of wishful thinking—that a tightened embargo will provide the final push leading to the downfall of the Castro regime. We can be certain, rather, that Castro will put this pain to good effect: if the history of recent Cuban-American relations has taught us anything, it is that to this day Castro can still rally a proud people against the bogeyman of Yanqui imperialism.

But Senator HELMS' bill does not stop at increasing the hardship of Cuba's people. It seeks to impose on other nations—close allies in many cases—extraterritorial provisions which conflict with international law and various treaties to which the United States is party. I note that the embargo is already considered by many of our allies to be a hopelessly out-dated affront to their sovereignty: the HELMS proposal will only lead to retaliation at a time when we seek their cooperation on issues of greater complexity and, frankly, of more immediate import to our national interests.

I would add, as well, that our Latin American friends see efforts such as the Helms bill as a vestige of the gunboat diplomacy which, to this day, leaves them wary of our intentions. But it is not enough that this bill would hurt the average Cuban, enrage our allies, and renew the suspicions of our Latin American friends. It would also strike at the American taxpayer. Senator HELMS would have the administration seek—in vain, in my opinion—to expand TV Marti, a failed program which figuratively and literally crashed in a Florida swamp. The Cuban people have not seen the truth from TV Marti, because they never see TV Marti.

Rather, the truth is more likely to come to them as Cuba gains more access to international television, engages in dialogs about the rest of the world, and integrates into the international community. Therefore, we should encourage policies and dialogs which will lead to the political changes and freedoms sought by the Cuban people.

The administration's October 5 announcement that it will seek to put in place measures designed to promote the flow of information into and out of

Cuba is a step in that direction. To further promote, rather than strangle, democratic transition in Cuba, United States NGO's would now be authorized to help independent Cuban NGO's provide training to Cuban human rights activists. Without employing the expensive baloondoggle of taxpayer-funded TV Marti, for example, United States news bureaus would set up shop directly in Cuba and Cuban news agencies here in the United States. The new regulations are also family friendly, easing procedures for Cuban-Americans who want to visit relatives in Cuba.

However, the proposed policy will not reward a totalitarian regime which continues to violate basic human rights with impunity. In fact, the administration proposes enhanced enforcement of the embargo and the U.S. Neutrality Act. This mixed bag approach—injecting into Castro's system the poison of free thought while continuing to restrict his access to the relief found in free trade—may not be the perfect solution. I think it is time for a new strategy in Cuba, rather than more of the same, which the Helms bill advocates and which has clearly failed. I believe an incremental approach, which minimizes the pain to the Cuban people and the cost to the American taxpayer, while making clear our determination to not do business as usual with the Castro regime, offers the best current hope of effecting change. The Helms amendment does everything but that, so I urge its defeat.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent that Juan Alsace be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of this bill.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act currently before the Senate presents us with a difficult decision. I am sure we all favor the early return of freedom in Cuba. I am sure the sponsor of this act believes that this legislation would contribute to that aim. There are those of us, though, who have grave doubts.

Mr. President, I am particularly concerned about the impact of this proposed legislation on our Nation's national security interests. For that reason, I requested the views of our responsible military commander Jack Sheehan, commander in chief of the United States Atlantic command, under whose command Cuba falls.

I would like to share the letter I received, dated October 15, from General Sheehan, who is in direct charge of the security aspects of Cuba under his command. It says:

DEAR SENATOR NUNN: I am writing to provide my assessment of the potential effect of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act * * * could have on the United States Atlantic command and operations in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. There are currently 8,000 Cuban migrants in camps at Guantanamo Bay, down from 20,000 5 months ago. The Department of Defense has processed more than 100,000 Cuban and Haitian migrants in Guantanamo Bay over the last few years. When the migrant population was at its peak, it cost the Department of Defense over $1 million a day in operation and maintenance—money which was not in the budget. Additionally, prior to the White House policy announcement in May, we had more than 6,000 U.S. personnel in a potentially explosive situation—guarding and caring for Cuban migrants who were frustrated because there was no hope of leaving the camps.

From a military perspective, the current version of the Helms–Burton bill could create conditions for more migrants. I believe the Cuban economy is at a low point. I have this on interviews of more than 40,000 Cubans who have been through Guantanamo. They say one of the primary reasons for leaving Cuba is to be able to provide a basic quality of food and shelter for their families. The bill in its current form could further punish the people, not Castro or the privileged elites. Furthermore, rather than promoting a peaceful transition in Cuba, the bill could give Castro an excuse to maintain his focus on ''U.S. aggression,'' rather than his own failed ideology. I also question the bill's implied assumption that strengthening the embargo would lead to a revolt from within and create the conditions for a transition to democracy. Cuba is not Haiti—the circumstances which allowed for a successful intervention in Haiti, with only one American casualty, do not exist in Cuba. Any operations involving U.S. forces in Cuba would likely have a much higher cost in terms of lives and national treasury.

Our policy objective should be the peaceful transition of power in Cuba, and I support any congressional language that brings about that change.

Mr. President, in short, General Sheehan believes that our policy objective should be the peaceful transition of power in Cuba to democracy. But he does not believe the legislation before us will make a net contribution to this objective. He believes that this legislation, in fact, will have the opposite effect and that it will basically cause an increase in the very migration that has now finally subsided.

Mr. President, I hope we can work out, before this legislation is concluded, a satisfactory bill that can be agreed to on both sides of the aisle and supported by the administration. I do not believe this legislation meets that test.

I thank the Senator for the time. I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

I ask unanimous consent that General Sheehan's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
U.S. ATLANTIC COMMAND,
October 15, 1995.

Hon. SAM NUNN,
Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Senate Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NUNN: I am writing to provide my assessment of the potential effect the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act (The Helms/Burton Bill) could have on the United States Atlantic Command and operations in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. There are currently 8,000 Cuban migrants in camps at Guantanamo Bay, down from 20,000 five months ago. DoD has processed more than 100,000 Cuban and Haitian migrants in Guantanamo Bay over the last few years. When the migrant population was at its peak, it cost the Department of Defense over $1 million a day in operations and maintenance—money which was not in the budget. Additionally, prior to the White House policy announcement in May, we had more than 6,000 U.S. personnel in a potentially explosive situation—guarding and caring for Cuban migrants who were frustrated because there was no hope of leaving the camps.

From a military perspective, the current version of the Helms-Burton Bill could create the conditions for more migrants. I believe the Cuban economy is at a low point. I have this on our interviews of more than 40,000 Cubans who have been through Guantanamo. They say one of the primary reasons for leaving Cuba is to be able to provide a basic quality of food and shelter for their families. The bill in its current form could further punish the people, not Castro or the privileged elites. Furthermore, rather than promoting a peaceful transition in Cuba, the bill would give Castro an excuse to maintain his focus on ''U.S. aggression,'' rather than his own failed ideology. I also question this bill's implied assumption that strengthening the embargo will lead to a revolt from within and create the conditions for a transition to democracy. Cuba is not Haiti—the circumstances which allowed for a successful intervention in Haiti, with only one American casualty, do not exist in Cuba. Any operations involving U.S. forces in Cuba would likely have a much higher cost in terms of lives and national treasure.

Our policy objective should be the peaceful transition of power in Cuba, and I support any congressional language that brings about that change.

Sincerely,

J.J. SHEEHAN,
General, U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I do not see any of the proponents on the floor at this point. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes, forty seconds.

Mr. DODD. Let me take the time. I presume the Senator from North Carolina may come to the floor shortly.

Mr. President, I want to spend some time this afternoon explaining the very complex issue of how the U.S. Government deals with property claims by U.S. citizens who have had their property expropriated by a foreign government and who failed to receive adequate and effective compensation for such action.

I believe that it is important to do so, because what we are prepared to do today, if we enact this pending legislation into law, is to totally reverse more than 46 years of practice on how we as a government have dealt with this question. Not only would it alter the scope of claimants who would be able to seek some remedy from the U.S. Government for acts against property held abroad, it would also change the manner in which the U.S. Government seeks to ensure that claimants are compensated.

So, how have property claims been handled in the past? for which countries? What have been the results?

Claims by U.S. citizens for losses arising from a foreign government's nationalization, expropriation, or other takeover of their property are administered under provisions of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949. That act originally authorized the international claims commission to adjudicate claims pursuant to an agreement negotiated between the United States Government and the Government of Yugoslavia.

During ensuring years the act has been amended a number of times to authorized the commission—now called the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—to determine claims against a number of other foreign governments, including Cuba that have expropriated property from our citizens.

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has already processed the claims of United States citizens who lost property in Cuba. That is why we can say with certainty today that thee are 5,911 certified U.S. claimants who have not been compensated for their losses.

It is not the responsibility of the Commission to actually make payment of the awards for these certified claims. That responsibility rests with the Secretary of the Treasury, as funds become available for payment of claims. Funds generally come available through negotiated agreements between the U.S. and the foreign government in question.

Since 1949, the Commission has undertaken claims programs in 36 countries—including most recently—Yugoslavia, Panama, Poland, Ethiopia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Italy, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, the People's Republic of China, East Germany, Iran, Vietnam, and most recently Albania. That means that the Commission has processed or is processing claims by American citizens that their property was taken by the government in question.

Claims settlement agreements have been reached with a number of these countries including Yugoslavia, Panama, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Italy, China, and Vietnam. That means that the United States and the government in question have reached agreement on a sum of money which such government has agreed to provide to the United States for distribution to the claimants.

In the case of Cuban claims, the Commission evaluated some 8,800 United States claims over a 5-year review period—1967–1972—and determined that some 5,911 were in fact valid claims. Once the United States and the Cuban Government have reached agreement on a sum of money to compensate these claimants then the funds will be paid out by the Secretary of the Treasury for these claims.

In none of these cases were property claims of non-U.S. citizens included in these claims settlement procedures. One of the key qualifications in each one of these claims programs is that the claimant must first and foremost have been a U.S. citizen at the time the property was taken. The reason for this is obvious. While we may not agree with the manner in which another government regulates or otherwise makes decisions about the property of its citizens, how that issue gets resolved is to be sorted out between that citizen and his or her government.

Now, not only are we going to jettison the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission as a method of adjudicating property claims, we are going to dramatically increase the scope of claimants. The bill would change the definition of who is eligible for U.S. assistance in resolving his or her claims.

The bill before us would have the Federal district courts be the venue for resolving these suits. Any Cuban-American whose property was taken and is currently being used in a commercial activity is eligible to sue for up to triple damages for such losses.

How many claims are we talking about? There is clearly some dispute here. In one of the earlier versions of the Helms legislation, it was asserted that this figure was in the hundreds of thousands. Analysis by outside experts have indicated that there is a range of possibilities reaching as high as $430,000. No one knows for sure. Yet some in this chamber are prepared to vote for this legislation anyway, in the name of being tough on Castro.

This is the height of irresponsibility in my view. The only one that we are being tough on is ourselves and our own judicial system. The only one we are being tough on is this administration and future administrations that will have to deal with the court logjam in the context of forging normal relations with any post-Castro government.

Mr. President, let me point out to my colleagues once again that the heart of this legislation is title III of the bill. Again, briefly, what this title III of the bill will do is expand the universe, the population of those who would be able to utilize the U.S. system in order to be compensated for lands that were expropriated from them. What it does is carve out a unique group of citizens in our country—in fact, people not even citizens of this country—to be able to take advantage of our claims compensation program.

Under more than four decades of law, Mr. President, we have provided assistance to United States citizens whose lands were expropriated by a foreign government. There are some 6,000—in fact, we know the exact number, which is 5,911 claimants, who have been certified as bona fide claimants. This legislation would say that you no longer have to be a United States citizen when it comes to Cuba, that even if you are not a citizen of the United States today, but you incorporate yourself for that purpose, you can take advantage of the law that is designed specifically to assist United States citizens.

Now, Mr. President, that would expand the universe from 5,911 certified claimants to one estimate of 430,000 people, at a cost of $4,500 to process each claim. My colleagues can do the math and see the explosive costs here. Beyond the costs, there are 37 other nations in the world with whom we have expropriation cases pending on behalf of U.S. citizens. We do not carve out or create a situation where those who have left those countries and have become citizens or are not citizens of this country, but would incorporate themselves for the purpose of having those claims processed by the United States, are included. So nations such as Poland, Vietnam, People's Republic of China, and others, would not be given the same benefits, with all due respect to Cuban-Americans, Cubans who left Cuba to seek redress under this law we are adopting.

I am sympathetic to the people who had lands expropriated without compensation, but the law was written specifically to assist U.S. citizens at the time of the expropriation. If we want to change the law, we ought to do so with all nations, not just one. Certainly, Polish-Americans, those who were left in East Germany, and others, would have just as much right, it seems to me, if we are going to carve out an exception as those so poorly treated in Cuba. For that reason, title III deserves special attention.

Let me echo the comments of my colleague from Georgia. I would love nothing more than to see democracy come this evening to Cuba. But we need to think smartly, intelligently, and prudently as to how we can expedite that conclusion.

Jude Winitisky wrote an excellent piece in the Houston Chronicle, which I inserted in the RECORD last week. I encourage my colleagues to review that article.

He makes a strong case that we have a wonderful opportunity, I think, to create that kind of a change. This legislation would set us back in that process.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against this cloture motion in hopes we might be able to come up with some sort of a bill here that makes far more sense, with all due respect, than the one that would come before the Senate if cloture is adopted. I urge the rejection of the cloture motion.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, some opponents of the pending Libertad bill, I am sad to say, appear to be willing to say almost anything to defeat this bill, a bill that Cubans inside of Fidel Castro's land are pleading with us daily to

pass so that they could have an opportunity for freedom.

These people in Cuba are writing to me every day. We have had—I do not know how many letters—50 or 60. Yet the forces who oppose this bill have repeatedly misrepresented what the bill does and have ignored the support that this bill has among the American certified claimant community as well as among Cubans inside Cuba.

Now, the record needs to be set straight about what these two groups are saying about the Libertad Act.

Last week, for example, this Senate was told that all certified claimants oppose this bill. Not so. For example, Colgate-Palmolive, a certified claimant whose stolen property is valued at over $14 million in 1960 dollars, wrote to me stating this communication is to state for the record the support of Colgate-Palmolive Co. for Senate bill S. 381. This is the bill pending right now.

Then Procter & Gamble, another company who had property seized by Fidel Castro's crowd and is therefore a certified claimant, wrote to me and said, We support this legislation as currently written, and agree with the aims and goals of the Cuban Liberty and Solidarity Act.

Then there is another claimant company, Consolidated Development Corp., whose president, Alberto Diaz-Masvidal, testified before the Foreign Relations Committee this past June in strong support of this bill.

The United States-Cuban Business Council, the largest private sector organization addressing Cuban issues of interest to businessmen—particularly American certified claimants—has actively encouraged its members to support this legislation. In September, a letter went to all of its members asserting that the Council considers the Libertad Act to be beneficial for the United States business community, protection of United States property rights, and the economic development of a free market, democratic Cuba.

Another American property owner supporting the Libertad bill is the Cintas Foundation, which is a New York charitable organization. This organization owns artwork on loan right now to the National Museum in Havana and it, too, has been victimized by Castro's thievery. In 1991, two pieces from the Cintas collection appeared for auction in London. See, what is happening? Castro is stealing this stuff and selling it overseas. The Cintas Foundation submitted testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee saying that the Libertad bill provides an important legal avenue for the Cintas Foundation to prevent any further attempts by the Castro regime to break up and sell off this valuable art collection.

These are just a few examples. Now, then, the truth deserves to be heard.

There have been specious suggestions that the Cuban people are opposed to the Libertad bill, the pending bill. Absolutely untrue. Yet it has been said on this Senate floor that that is the case.

Scores of letters and cassette tapes have been smuggled out of Castro's Cuba and delivered to me expressing support for the Dole-Helms bill or the Helms-Burton bill, or however you want to describe it.

These are Cubans who are very well aware that in speaking out against Castro they will be persecuted, to say the very least. They go ahead and speak at great personal risk because they are willing to put their lives on the line to help get this bill passed. Yet we have voices in this Senate and we have voices in the news media saying this is a terrible bill.

Mr. President, let me read from one or two of the letters. A vast number of Cuban citizens on October 8 signed a letter to me saying:

> We, as members of the internal opposition to the dictatorial regime that oppresses us, ask you, in the name of the men and women who languish in Castro's prisons or who saw the ends of their days before a firing squad, that you cooperate to remove the last tyrant in our continent.

Then they said:

> A vote in favor of Helms-Burton will bring joy and hope to all Cubans. It is not the embargo that keeps the Cuban people hungry and desperate, but the Castro dictatorship, and that, all of Cuba knows well.

Then there is an October 10 statement delivered by cassette tape representing the views of more than a dozen leaders of human rights and dissident groups in Cuba saying:

> The U.S. embargo works. The few changes that have taken place in Cuba are a result of economic, political, and diplomatic pressures. Those pressures should be intensified. We support the Helms-Burton initiative. We call upon the Executive not to veto it, if passed. It is a peaceful measure, aimed only at preventing that foreign investors continue buying from the Cuban Government properties confiscated from and not paid to United States and other citizens. By passing this bill, you will be taking a fair ethical decision in the name of freedom and democracy.

In September, the leader of another dissident group, Democratic Solidarity Party in Cuba, wrote,

> We want freedom from oppression, we want respect for our rights, but most democratic government seems to ignore this, * * * But we know that we are not alone in this problem, and you are proof of that Sir. * * * We are deeply thankful of you, and all the politicians who are not forgetting the ultimate interest of the Cuban people * * * to live in freedom and democracy.

There are many more, but I think Senators get the point, which is this: American citizens whose property was stolen by Castro want this bill passed. The Cuban people are begging that it be enacted. I simply cannot be a party to our turning our backs on them. The Cuban people deserve freedom. They are pleading for our help.

The question just will not go away. Can we in good conscience, Mr. President, turn away from them and walk away on the other side of the road?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters and statements previously referred to in my brief remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material has ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.-CUBA BUSINESS COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, September 20, 1995.

DEAR COUNCIL MEMBER: As you know, the US-Cuba Business Council has closely monitored congressional and Executive Branch action on the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995 [H.R. 1868], known as the LIBERTAD Act of the Helms-Burton bill. The LIBERTAD Act has undergone significant change since the bill was originally introduced. Council members have inquired as to how the Council views the potential impact of this bill on the US business community.

The measure, in its current form, addresses many of the concerns expressed by the Executive Branch, the business community and legal scholars. As modified, we believe that the LIBERTAD Act is fundamentally consistent with the goal of current US policy on Cuba designed to foster a democratic change with guarantees of freedom and human rights under the rule of law. Congressional action on the bill may take place as early as this week.

Chapter I of the bill includes measures to strengthen the embargo against Cuba. Questions have been raised about the ''extra-territoriality'' of these provisions. As currently drafted, LIBERTAD Act is consistent with US obligations under the North American Free Trade Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and does not involve secondary boycotts.

Chapter II establishes a framework for trade with, and economic assistance to, a transitional or democratic government in Cuba. Some US certified claimants have expressed concerns that Section 737 of the bill may diminish the pool of available assets for American property claimants by conditioning US assistance to Cuba on resolution of claims held by those who were not US citizens at the time of confiscation. Section 737 of the LIBERTAD Act has been significantly modified to address such concerns. As amended, this section protects the rights of certified US claimants by conditioning assistance to a transitional government in Cuba on U.S. Presidential certification that the Cuban government is taking appropriate steps to resolve property claims involving US claimants as described in Section 620(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

A key element of the LIBERTAD Act involves measures under Chapter III to defend US property rights and discourage foreign investors from trafficking in confiscated US properties. Under these provisions, foreign firms trafficking in stolen US property in Cuba would risk action by US claimants against their US-based assets [(Chapter III) Sections 741–744] and invite US action to revoke entry visas of foreign corporate executives trafficking in confiscated US properties.

We believe these measures will enhance the leverage of US claimants seeking to discourage prospective foreign investors from trafficking in their confiscated properties in Cuba, facilitate the rapid and effective resolution of claims disputes, and level the playing field for US firms preparing to participate in the economic development of a democratic Cuba.

Some US claimants have expressed concerns about allowing Cuban American claimants to file suits against traffickers or to obtain default judgements against the Cuban government. Sections 742 and 744 of the LIBERTAD Act have also been modified to

clarify that the bill does not authorize the President to espouse the claims of naturalized US citizens in any settlement with Cuba and will not dilute the pool of assets available to US claimants. As modified, the LIBERTAD Act significantly narrows and limits the filing of suits to effectively target foreign firms trafficking in confiscated US-owned property.

In the new version of LIBERTAD, it is not possible to obtain a default judgement against the current government of Cuba. Moreover, the right of action to sue a trafficker in stolen US assets applies almost exclusively to commercial property. Claimants must provide suspected traffickers with 180 days notice before filing legal action and the case must involve property worth more than $50,000. The Cuban government claims a total of 212 joint ventures on the island. Few of those enterprises are likely to have US-based subsidiaries or other assets. Thus, only a handful of cases against foreign firms in the US would qualify for consideration in US courts. Accordingly, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the cost of enforcement of the LIBERTAD Act would be less than $7 million. Furthermore, under current law the President could halt such suits through is authority under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act once a transition regime is in power in Cuba.

On balance, the Council considers the LIBERTAD Act, in its current form, to be consistent with the Council's mission statement and beneficial for the US business community, protection of US property rights, and the economic development of the free market, democratic Cuba.

Please contact me or USCBC Executive Director Tom Cox in our Washington office (202) 293–4995 if you need further information on issues relating to this measure. I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO J. REICH.

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO.,
New York, NY, June 20, 1995.

Subject: Cuba

Chairman HELMS,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, This communication is to state for the record the support of Colgate-Palmolive Company for Senate Bill S. 381 in the form of its June 12, 1995 draft.

Sincerely,

EMILIO ALVAREZ-RECIO.

ADOLFO FERNANDEZ SAINS,
PARTIDO SOLIDARIDAD DEMOCRATICA,
Havana, September 12, 1995.

Hon. SENATOR JESSE HELMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

HON. SENATOR JESSE HELMS: We admire your courage, and we thank you for your help.

We regret that you are so right. Because you are right sir, if you were wrong, than we the cuban people would be facing a lesser problem, but our problem is serious indeed. We want freedom from oppression, we want respect for our rights, but most democratic governments seem to ignore this, most important newspapers ignore this, but we know that we are not alone, in this problem, and you are aproof of that Sir.

Our problem is, that we are rule by intolerance. We are not going to ignore this, and we should not reward intolerance.

A glance at the conduct of the cuban government will tell you, the only language they understand is might, and never reason.

Some seek dialogue, we deeply regret that they are wrong. They are trying to dialogue with a non-repentant dictator with all the power in his hands.

We would certainly prefer dialogue, but we cannot ignore the truth.

Our prisons are full of political prisoners, and convicts, that are convicts only in Cuba, their crimes are crimes only in Cuba.

Our problem is not only economic, solving the economic problem, and ignoring the political one, would leave us in the hands of tyranny.

America has the right to defend their property, economic sanctions are right, they are applied daily everywhere.

We are deeply thankful of you, and all the politicians who are not forgetting the ultimate interest of the cuban people, the ultimate right of the cuban people, to live in freedom, and democracy.

Our struggle is not about the right we have to invest in our own country, that is obvious. We are not opposing Fidel Castro's government, because we want to be the owners of a laundry shop, or a bar, or even a sugar factory.

We want all that for our people, but we also want to publish an article in a newspaper, to establish an association independent from the government, to create a political party without having to go to prison for that.

Nobody should forget or ignore this. We think that the U.S. government has so far understood this, and has remain firm, and we appreciate it deeply.

You have been extremely generous with the cubans, so we are very thankful to you, Senator personally, for all you have done for us in this very difficult time, of our history, and we have a history of friendship, and understanding, and good neighborliness between our two people, and we want to go back to that situation again.

ADOLFO FERNANDEZ SAINS.

PARTY OF DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY,
City of Habana, October 8, 1995.

DISTINGUISHED U.S. SENATORS: Today you are not simply debating a law, you are debating the future of a nation. We, as members of the internal opposition to the dictatorial regime that oppresses us, ask you, in the name of the men and women who languish in Castro's prisons or who saw the end of their days before a firing squad, that you cooperate to remove the last tyrant in our continent. It is dishonorable to allow a dictator, who with terror maintains an entire nation in the dark ages, to continue to blatantly ignore the rights of the men and women in the land of José Martí.

A vote in favor of Helms-Burton in the Senate of the U.S. will bring joy and hope to all Cubans. It is not the embargo that keeps the Cuban people hungry and desperate, but the Castro dictatorship, and that, all of Cuba knows well.

May God illuminate you and allow you, and the rest of the world, to clearly declare enough is enough! to the bloody dictatorship that misgoverns our country.

MIGUEL ANGEL ALDANA RUIZ,
President of the Marti Civic League.
RAMON VARELA SANCHEZ,
(In detention), Vice-president.
ANNIA NAVARRO GONZALEZ.
OMAR ACOSTA RODRIGUEZ.

OCTOBER 10, 1995.

Message to: Senator Robert Dole, President of the Senate, Senator Jessie Helms, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the U.S. Senate.

Cuba is the country with the highest rate of suicide, prisoners, exiled nationals and abortions in the Americas, and probably in the whole world. That will be enough to oppose Castro's government, even if it were not a 36 year old dictatorship that has plunged the Cuban people into poverty, divided the Cuban family, and brought to the country an ideology, enemy of Democracy and Freedom, alien to our traditions and our environment, and on behalf of which the human rights of the Cuban people are violated.

The Cuban government has not shown the necessary political will to bring about changes in the country. We believe that the Cuban government does not understand any language, other than pressure, and coercion measures. Even if the Cuban government decided to effect a true economic reform, leading to a market economy, something it has not done, and in our opinion, will not do, we would still be in the hands of a dictatorship.

President Clinton recently announced a package of measures, adopted unilaterally by the U.S. Government in relation to Cuba. We consider it counter-productive to send the Havana regime a mixed signal, giving them a certain hope that with our holding free, fair and internationally supervised elections, an amnesty for all political prisoners and legalizing the internal opposition, they could get rid of the U.S. Embargo.

The U.S. Embargo works. The few changes that have taken place in Cuba are a result of economic, political and diplomatic pressures. Those pressures should be intensified. We support the Helms-Burton initiative. We call upon the Executive not to veto it, if passed. It is a peaceful measure, aimed only at preventing that foreign investors continue buying from the Cuban government properties confiscated from and not paid to, U.S. and other citizens. Those investments only completed to extend the suffering of the Cuban people.

Distinguished Senators, you are facing an ethical alternative, where you choose whether you support or not this Bill, know that you are choosing between the weak and the powerful. The weak are the Cuban people, torn by so much pain and suffering. The powerful are Fidel Castro's totalitarian and anti-democratic government, that continues to make decisions affecting our lives and compromising the future of the whole people, without ever submitting to the will of those people in the ballot box. By passing this Bill, you will be taking a fair ethical decision in the name of Freedom and Democracy, which you enjoy fully as their main advocates in today's civilized world.

Finally, a word of thanks to the American people and their Government, and for the support, the solidarity and generosity that historically they have extended to the Cuban people.

And now, from Cuba, signing this document on behalf of their respective organizations:

Partido Solidaridad Democratica, Hector Palacio Ruiz, President and Fernando Sanchez Lopez, Vice President, and National Executive; on behalf of Partido Democrata 30 de Noviembre Frank Pais, Osmel Lugo Gutierrez, Vice President; on behalf of ALFIN, Asociacion de Lucha Frente a la Injusticia Nacional, Beatriz Garcia Alvarez, President, Fernando Alfaro Garcia, Vice President; on behalf of Liga Civica Juvenil Martiana, Miguel Aldana Ruiz, President, Ania Navarro Gonzalez, Vice President; on behalf of Partido Pro Derechos Humanos en Cuba, Lazaro Gonzalez Valdes, President; on behalf of APAL Independiente, Juan Jose Perez Izquierdo, Vice President, and Vicente Escobar Rivero; on behalf of Corriente Liberal Cubana, Juan Jose Lopez Diaz, President; on behalf of Asociacion Ecologista y Pacifista de Cuba, Leonel Morejon Almairo, President; on behalf of Movimiento

Democrata Cientifico, Juan Rafael Fernandez Peregrin, President; on behalf of Comite Cubano de Opositores Pacificos Independientes, Victoria Ruiz, President, and Lazaro Garcia Cernuda; on behalf of Movimiento Maceista por la Dignidad, Isidro Herrera Carrillo, President; on behalf of Frente Femenino Humanitario, Gladys Linares, President; on behalf of Consejo Medco Cubano Independiente, Jesus Marante Pozo, President, and Dianeli Garcia Gonzalez; on behalf of Frente Maximo Gomez from Pinar del Rio, Jose Angel Chente Herrera, President, Juan Jose Perez Manso, and Julio Cesar Perez Manso.

Also signing this document are a number of independent activists: Norman Brito Hernandez Human Rights Activitist, Rafael Solano, a Journalist and president of Havana Press News Agency, Hector Paraza, Journalist, also from Havana Press, Raul Rivero, a Poet and Journalist, President of Cuba Press News Agency, Miguel Fernandez, a Journalist, Vice President of Cuba Press News Agency, and Ana Luisa Lopez Baeza, a Journalist, also from Cuba Press News Agency.

This document was produced in Havana City, on 10 of October, 1995, and your speaker is Adolfo Fernandez Sainz, from Democratic Solidarity Party.

Thank you very much.

[Source: Radio Marti, Havana, Sept. 21, 1995]

COMMENTS BY MIGUEL ANGEL ALDANA, EXECUTIVE OF THE COALITION FOR A DEMOCRATIC CUBA AND MEMBER OF THE MARTI CIVIC LEAGUE

At this time, we ask the U.S. Government and we ask President Bill Clinton to support the Helms-Burton bill, because it's the only way to free the Cuban people. It's the only way that our human rights groups and the political opposition are going to feel strong. If that bill is not passed, the Fidel Castro dictatorship, which is crushing the Cuban people, and which is committing injustices daily, is going to get stronger. It's deceiving the U.S. Government, the way it did with the boat people. It obligated the U.S. Government to sit down at the negotiations table. They're laughing at the American government, they're laughing at the entire world, and they're doing away with the Cuban people.

We ask the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to support those Senators, and we ask the American people to support the Helms-Burton bill so that once and for all the Cuban people will be freed from a dictatorship of more than 36 years that is leading and subjecting the people of Cuba to injustice and abuses, and killing children, women and the elderly from hunger.

When here the diplotiendas [stores for the elite with cash] and the markets are full of food, the Cuban government is alleging that there's an embargo, or blockade. The only blockade here is the Fidel Castro dictatorship.

This bill has to be passed because the freedom that the people of the U.S. enjoy has to be shared. This law is necessary!

A MESSAGE TO SENATE MAJORITY LEADER BOB DOLE, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN JESSE HELMS, AND THE ENTIRE UNITED STATES SENATE FROM THE DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY PARTY

Cuba is the country with the highest rate of suicides, political prisoners, exiled nationals, in the Americas, and perhaps, in the whole world. That would be enough to oppose Castro's government even if it were not a 36 year old dictatorship that has plunged the Cuban people into poverty, devided the Cuban family, and brought to the country an ideological enemy of democracy and freedom alien to our traditions and environment and on behalf of which the human rights of the Cuba people are violated.

The Cuban government has not shown the necessary political will to bring about changes within the country. We believe that the Cuban government does understand any language other than pressure and coercive measures. Even if the Cuban government decided to effect a true economic reform leading to a market economy, something it has not done and will not do, we would still be in the hands of a dictatorship.

President Clinton recently announced a package of measures adopted unilaterally by the U.S. government in relation to Cuba. We consider it counterproductive to send the Havana regime a mixed signal, giving them a certain hope that without holding free, fair, and internationally supervised elections, an amnesty for all political prisoner, and legalizing the internal opposition, they could get rid of the U.S. embargo.

The U.S. embargo works. The few changes that have taken place in Cuba are a result of economic, political and diplomatic pressures. Those pressures should be intensified. We support the Helms-Burton initiative. We call upon the Executive not to veto it if passed. It is a peaceful measure aimed only at preventing that foreign investors continuing buying properties confiscated from and not paid to U.S. and other citizens. Those investments only contribute to extending the suffering of the Cuban people.

Distinguished Senators, you are a facing an ethical alternative. When you choose whether to support or not this bill know you are choosing between the weak and the powerful. The weak are the Cuban people, torn by so much pain and suffering. The powerful are Fidel Castro's totalitarian and antidemocratic government that continue to make decisions effecting our lives and compromising the future of the whole people without ever submitting to the will of those people in the ballot box.

By passing this bill you will be making a fair ethical decision in the name of freedom and democracy, which you enjoy fully as the main advocates in today's main civilized world.

Finally, a word of thanks for the American people and their government, for their support, solidarity, and the generousity that they have historically extended to the Cuban people.

And finally, in this message from the Cuba Democratic Solidarity Party president Hector Palacio Ruiz, vice-president Osmel Lugo Guttirez, and the national Executive; by the 30th November Democratic Party ''Frank Pais''; and on behalf of Rafael Ibarra Roque who is in prison; the Association for the National Struggle for Justice, Beatrice Garcia Alvarez, president, Reinaldo Fargo Garcia, vice-president; Marti Youth Civil League, Miguel Angel Aldana Ruiz, president, Amnia Navarro Gonzalez, vice-president; the Pro-Human Rights Party of Cuba, Lazaro Gonzalez Valdes, president; Ampare Independiente, Juan Jose Perez Izquierdo, vice-president, Vincente Escobar Trabiero; the Liberal Cuban Current, Juan Jose Lopez Diaz, president; on behalf of Association of Cuban Pacificists, Leonel Morejon Almagro, president; on behalf of the Scientific Democratic Movement, Juan Rafael Fernandez Pelegrin, president; on behalf of the Cuban Committee Independent Pacifists in Opposition, Vicotrio Ruiz, president, Lazaro Garcia; Maceo Movement for Dignity, Isidro Carrera Carillo, president; on behalf of the Women's Humanitarian Front, Gladys Linares, president; on behalf of the Independent Cuban Medical Council, Jesus Marante Pozo, president, Ana Beoneles Gonzalez, on behalf of the Maximo Gomez Front from Pinar del Rio Province, Jose Vincente Herrera, president, and Juan Jose Perez Manzo and Julio Cesar Perez Manzo; and also a number of independent activists who are also signing this document, Norma brito Hernandez, an activist of human rights, Rafael Solano, a journalist who is president of Havana Press News Agency, Hectro Peraza, journalist, also from Havana Press, Raul Ribero, poet, journalist and president of Cuba Press News Agency, Miguel Fernandez, journalist, vice-president of Cuba Press, Ana Luisa Lopez Baeza, journalist from Cuba Press.

This document is signed in Havana, October 10, 1995.

Thank you very much.

TRANSLATION OF INTERVIEWS WITH CUBAN DISSIDENTS, SEPTEMBER 24, 1995

New Jersey, United States, Sunday, September 24, 1995. The Revolutionary Movement of the 30th of November this week held interviews with several organizations in Cuba so as to know their opinions with regard to the bill proposed by Senator Jesse Helms and Congressman Dan Burton, a law that was approved by the Congress this past Friday, 21 of September.

The first interview is with Osmel Lugo, Vice-president of the Democratic Party, November 30 in Cuba. For those who don't know, the President of this party, Mr. Rafael Ibarra is in jail completing a 20 year sentence for his ideas contrary to those of the Castro regime:

November 30 Democratic Party, special communique that reflects the opinions of our organization.

In more than 36 years of the Castro regime never have human rights been respected and the desire for development, prosperity and liberty has been ignored for the Cuban people now for more than three decades. In Cuba, when the U.S. embargo wasn't even mentioned, and it was a time of need, already more than 70% of imports were covered by the European Communist markets. Unfortunately the Soviet Union sustained and maintained the Cuban economy in exchange for a military base called Cuba and not even then were we allowed to enjoy our civil, political and human rights and we have never been able to rid ourselves of the ration card that limits us to what and when we can eat. The Cuban government has not shown any interest in solving the serious problems affecting the country even though government and non-government organizations as well as other countries and governments have made recommendations for this out of compassion for the tough conditions the Cuban people are being put through. The Cuban government has not only not shown signs of any interest of a political process for change to a democratic and representative government, but it remains in complete immobility since it does not wish to lose the throne of absolute power with which it has been able to govern the country with an iron fist. Fidel Castro, as the most faithful representative and highest ranking official of the Cuban government has expressed and continues to express so that there will be no misunderstandings his known phrase ''Socialism or death.'' ''Socialism or death'' means or his type of government or death with as much transparency as macabre is the phase. The only solution Castro offers the Cuban people is death or to live under his system of death itself. And if several reforms have been taking place in the economic field, reform measure which, may we add, could be easily reversed, it has been simply to gain some time and accommodate his needs of the moment more than to try and solve the despairing social conditions. So we harbor no false hopes that the lifting of the economic sanctions will change the will of those who try to stay

in power or that they will put the dictatorial regime which allows them to on the line. The end or lifting of the embargo would not guarantee the respect of the civic, political and human rights of the Cuban people or bring democracy to our country. Rather, it would strengthen the totalitarian and dictatorial regime that has destroyed Cuban society sinking it into misery, indigence and mental slavery, facilitating it the millions it needs to develop and perfect its repressive apparatus the base and principle of its power. The lifting of the embargo will not bring an amnesty for all the political and conscience prisoners. It will not return the life of hundreds of thousands that have died at the hands of the regime or of those who have lost their lives trying to escape through the Florida straits. Nor will it allow the recovery of the remains of more than 42 people killed during the homicide that took place in the sinking massacre of the ''13 de Marzo'' tugboat for which the regime hasn't even allowed flowers to be thrown in the sea. The embargo is not the cause of Cuba's problems, it is actually the solution to these. Intolerance is the only thing that should not, and cannot be tolerated. The November 30 Democratic Party Frank Pais ratifies its support for the bill for democracy in Cuba and even asks for the globalization and internationalization of sanctions against the Cuban government. We thank the U.S. legislators that voted in favor of Helms-Burton and we recognize their good will to contribute to the democratization and liberty of the Cuban nation. At this same time, we exhort the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, to not veto this law if he truly wishes that Cuba be among the democratic countries of the world where human rights are respected and recognized.

Signed by the Democratic Party November 30. Dated in the City of Havana on the 21st day of September, 1995.

Interview with Rafael Solano, president of Havana Press

SERGIO GATRIA from New Jersey. We want your opinion regarding the debate this week in the House where the name of Havana Press, your name, Jose Rivero's, who are journalists who are being persecuted in Cuba, we want to know what your opinion is with regard to these Congressmen who were defending you.

SOLANO. Well, let me tell you that when I first received the news I was very excited. Family members in Miami called me that on the U.S. TV channels my name was appearing. In other words, a series of personalities in this Congressional session spoke about persecution and where it affects me directly. As President of Havana Press I am very grateful to these people, among who are Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Robert Menendez, Robert Torricelli, Senator Jesse Helms and Congressman Solomon from New York. That is an incentive for all the independent press in Cuba, that people within the U.S. government defend the independent press and that encourage us to continue our task in this country that censors the freedom of expression, it inspires us to continue exercising independent journalism. I can sincerely tell you that I am very grateful to these individuals and I believe history will one day pick up these names that fight civically so that we, the independent journalists, can continue practicing our careers without the harassment from the repressive organs of this government.

GATRIA. Have you continued to be persecuted?

SOLANO. Yes. As everyone knows, last week I was arrested by three officials of our country's State Security. I personally, as director of Havana Press, am threatened with 10 years of jail for the crime of enemy propaganda. In other words, in our country, he who expresses himself freely is considered as a person who issues enemy propaganda. However, the Constitution states that every Cuban citizen has the right to express himself freely and change ideas, but in practice, it is not allowed. Our position is that if we have to go to jail for our cause, free press, the independent press of which Jose Marti dreamt about, we are willing to take that risk.

GATRIA. Are you the only journalist that has been arrested or have there been others?

SOLANO. Well Mr. Jose Rivero was also arrested in the past few days. I was arrested on Thursday and he was arrested on Friday; he also suffers from government harassment by the State's Security Forces. I think the free press is an instrument to make public the true Cuban reality and that is what the government is afraid of, but, when we feel the support of people like the ones I mentioned we are inspired and we love our fight for a free press in Cuba even more.

GATRIA. You also said that several journalists were being attacked didn't you?

SOLANO. Well actually, I have next to me the Vice-President of Havana Press who has actually been attacked because they have launched a wave of attacks against independent journalists, supposed delinquents have attacked independent journalists and I would like you to speak to Julio Martinez so that he can tell you what happened.

GATRIA. So you were attacked?

MARTINEZ. Yes, I was attacked by two unknown assailants the morning of the 15th of September when I was headed home. They immobilized me and took my jacket, shirt and tie and they left me with pants and shoes.

GATRIA. Do you think that was a normal mugging or have there been other attacks against journalists?

MARTINEZ. Solano was attacked by two unknowns after he interviewed the ex-lieutenant Colonel Labrada. Rail Rivero was also attacked a few days before and they stole his briefcase. I was the last to be attacked.

GATRIA. So it is a strange coincidence that there have been so many muggings of Cuban journalists.

MARTINEZ. They must simply be categorized as suspicious muggings.

GATRIA. Do you have anything else to add, Martinez?

MARTINEZ. I want to congratulate those U.S. government individuals who have come out in defense of the independent journalists in Cuba. I especially want to thank Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and the gentlemen Lincoln Diaz-Balart and Bob Menendez who are Cuban.

GATRIA. You know that Helms-Burton was approved in the House . . .

SOLANO. Did it have more than the two thirds?

GATRIA. Almost 300 votes . . . Has there been any reaction from the Cuban people?

SOLANO. So it had a great majority. Well, I don't think the Cuban people are very aware of what's happened, maybe the Cuban press will have something today. You know that the Cuban government had launched a huge campaign to stop Helms-Burton, holding meetings in the streets, at work. We had a favorable reaction to the approval of the bill and we gave our reasons in Cuba's free press.

Interview with Elizardo San Pedro Marin, president of Democratic Solidarity Party

GATRIA. I need you to state your name, the organization and your opinion regarding Helms-Burton.

SAN PEDRO MARIN. We consider the approval of Helms-Burton in the House is a very positive step that brings us closer to a peaceful transition to democracy. The Cuban government has felt the effects of the U.S. economic embargo after the fall of the socialist bloc and it began to issue changes in the economic sector, not in the political but in the economic to try and retain its power. All this foreign investment and looking for foreign investors shows that they have no means within the country they have no solution to the problems we face. And so the fight against Helms-Burton has become the Cuban government's foreign relations priority and they have been using all their time and manpower to fight against it. There is still a lot of territory for the Helms-Burton bill to cover but I believe the reasonable outcome will be reached, that the bill will be approved. The Cuban government doesn't understand any other kind of language except this style, it is a government that is known for its intolerance. So I think it is very positive that this bill was approved because it is a commitment by the U.S. Congress to democracy in Cuba. And even though we Cubans know that we are the ones responsible for the changes within the island, we also need the support from the U.S. government and this time we have it.

GATRIA. Do the other dissidents in Cuba have the same criteria?

SAN PEDRO MARIN. There are all different kinds of opinions among the dissidents. Of course there are dissidents who think there are other alternatives to the situation, such as the embargo being lifted, establishing a dialogue, that Helms-Burton not be approved etc., but the Cuban government has never stated that those changes will help to bring about any kind of political change. For example, the Cuban government has never stated that in exchange for something it will release political prisoners, it does not recognize the internal opposition, it doesn't speak about a free electoral process, and it doesn't even speak about asking the people if they want ''Socialism or Death'', or if they want pluralism and democracy. in other words, there can be no concessions to the Cuban government if the Cuban government has no intention of solving any of its internal political problems.

GATRIA. What is the opinion of the majority of the Cuban people with whom you have spoken?

SAN PEDRO MARIN. The people don't know this bill. The legislation has not been published by the Cuban press. The people only know sections, details, partial or manipulated information so the people really don't know. And even the free press that reaches them, like Radio Marti, only broadcasts sections of the bill so the people don't know. I'm sure that there are people who don't understand it and don't share this criteria but I think what the people need right now is that this bill be approved and made law.

Interview with Raul Rivero, Cuba Press

GATRIA. Helms-Burton was passed in the House, would you like to make a statement?

RIVERO. Well, I signed a letter from the Democratic Solidarity Part (Sampedro Marin) on a personal level, I'm not a member of any political party but I signed it as a journalist and as a Cuban. I support the bill, I believe in it. It may seem strange and there has been a lot of controversy that people could want more pressure on their country, the problem is however, that there is no foreign blockade, only an internal one that causes damage, that is stuck on us by the government, that is the true blockade that hurts the people. The true blockade as I said is an internal one, issued by a group of people who wish to stay in power and that is what has this country in ruins, not just in material ruin, but a spiritual ruin.

Interview with Jose Rivero, Cuba Press

GATRIA. Your names were mentioned and the persecution suffered.

RIVERO. Well, it's something that has been happening for the past couple of months against the members of the free press and they seem to have it in especially for Solano and myself. Especially after the 13 of July, the anniversary of the sinking of the ''13 de Marzo'' tugboat, since the 11th or 12th we've been visited by these people who harass us and try to manipulate us and now around the 15th of this month when we were arrested for a couple of hours. We know that this is how it is going to be and it is nothing out of the ordinary where dissidents are concerned. Against members of political or human rights groups there has always been repression, against journalists it is a more sensitive issue.

GATRIAL. What does the government want you to do?

RIVERO. They want us to leave. They don't care if we practice journalism is the U.S. or Europe they just don't want us here so that they can protect their public image which as you know is very important to them and that is why they have always tried to monopolize the press.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment, calendar No. 202, H.R. 927, an act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba:

Senators Robert Dole, Jesse Helms, Bob Smith, Bill Frist, John Ashcroft, James M. Inhofe, Paul Coverdell, Spencer Abraham, Larry E. Craig, Trent Lott, Rod Grams, Frank Murkowski, Fred Thompson, Mike DeWine, Hank Brown, and Charles E. Grassley.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the substitute amendment (No. 2898) to H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 489 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Abraham	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Bradley	Grams	Pressler
Brown	Grassley	Reid
Bryan	Gregg	Robb
Burns	Hatch	Roth
Campbell	Heflin	Santorum
Chafee	Helms	Shelby
Coats	Hollings	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Specter
Craig	Kyl	Stevens
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Thomas
DeWine	Lieberman	Thompson
Dole	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—36

Akaka	Feingold	Kohl
Baucus	Feinstein	Leahy
Biden	Ford	Levin
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Inouye	Nunn
Bumpers	Jeffords	Pell
Byrd	Johnston	Pryor
Conrad	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerrey	Simon
Dorgan	Kerry	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—4

Exon	Mikulski
Hatfield	Moseley-Braun

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 36, three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, what is the pending business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Ashcroft amendment in the second degree to amendment No. 2916.

Mr. BUMPERS. Is that the Ashcroft amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the second degree.

Mr. BUMPERS. An amendment would not be in order to that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. It is in the second degree.

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2916, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I come to the floor to make a motion in regard to the second-degree amendment which I have submitted to this body. It is an amendment related to term limits. I believe that it is a substantial question and item on the agenda of the American people. All the polls indicate overwhelmingly that the people favor term limits. Forty States term limit their Governors; 20-some States have attempted to term limit the U.S. Congress.

The amendment before the U.S. Senate is a simple one. It says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the United States Senate should pass a constitutional amendment limiting the number of terms Members of Congress can serve.

Members of this body have debated this issue on this occasion and on previous occasions. The pros and cons are well known. I do not believe we will settle this issue with a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, but I do believe it is possible for us to identify those of us who are for term limits and those of us who are against term limits.

In order to get this vote, I have conferred with the majority leader, and I have modified the amendment so as to make it consistent with his agreement with the rest of the freshman class on the Republican side and others that the amendment itself should be voted on next April.

Thus, this amendment merely says that it is the sense of the Senate that we should pass a constitutional amendment limiting the number of terms that Members of Congress can serve. I want to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his cooperation in this respect.

Last week, he assured me that he would do his best to assist me in getting a vote on this matter at the earliest possible time this week, and here we are on the first day of our deliberations this week, and we will have an opportunity to vote in this respect.

The procedure which I intend to invoke in order to have this vote is a motion to table the amendment. Those who vote against tabling would be voting in favor of term limits; those who vote in favor of tabling, would be voting against term limits. But this will provide an opportunity for us to vote on this most important issue.

So, Mr. President, I now move to table the Ashcroft second-degree amendment regarding the limitation of congressional terms, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I can take 1 minute or 2 minutes of leader time.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not have any objection to the vote. I am going to vote against tabling the resolution. But as I indicated when we were