

and the remaining 85 percent of the reimbursable costs would be paid from collections to the LCRBDF as costs for construction are incurred. To cover the reimbursable costs allocated to the UCRBF, CBO expects that the federal government would increase its power surcharge rate beginning in fiscal year 2002. We expect that no rate change would be made to cover costs allocated to the LCRBDF because this fund is currently running an annual surplus of about \$9 million.

6. Comparison with spending under current law: None.

7. Pay-as-you-go considerations: None.

8. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

9. Estimate comparison: None.

10. Previous CBO estimate: None.

11. Estimate prepared by: Ian McCormick and Susanne S. Mehlman.

12. Estimate approved by:

PAUL N. VAN DE WATER,

*Assistant Director*

*for Budget Analysis.*

### GET OFF CUBA'S BACK

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, William Raspberry's column in the Washington Post and other newspapers around the Nation frequently gives us insights into our society and our policies that are important.

Recently, he had a column under the title "Get Off Cuba's Back" that pointed out how ridiculous our current policy toward Cuba is.

As I have said on the floor before, if Fidel Castro and the Soviet Union had a series of meetings to create an American policy that would make sure Castro would remain in power, they could not have devised a better policy than the one the United States has followed.

We should forget our illusions about overthrowing Castro, and move in the direction of trying to influence him to ameliorate his policies.

The William Raspberry column hits the nail on the head.

I ask that the column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1995]

GET OFF CUBA'S BACK

(By William Raspberry)

Why doesn't the United States get off Cuba's back?

The question is meant literally, not rhetorically. In what way is it in the interest of the United States to cut Cuba off from the rest of the world, to wreck its economy and starve its people?

When there was a Cold War, the reasons were understandable enough—even to those who disagreed with them. Cuba was on outpost of international communism and right in our back yard. Communist leaders, whether in the Soviet Union or in China, were eager to use Fidel Castro as an annoyance to the United States and as the means of spreading communism throughout the hemisphere. There were even times when the communist-expansion-by-proxy scheme seemed to be working, and it didn't make sense for us to sit idly by and let it happen.

The alternate? Isolate Cuba from its neighbors, crush pro-communist revolutions wherever they occurred in the region, encourage the Cuban people to overthrow their despotic leader and serve notice to the communist world that it would be permitted no exploitable foothold 90 miles from our shores. That,

as far as I can figure it, is how our opposition to Castro's Cuba became such an obsession.

But that was then. This is now, and I cannot find any logical reason for continuing our Cold War attitude toward Cuba—or Castro. Certainly there is no threat that anyone else in Latin America will be tempted to follow Cuba's disastrous economic path. Cuba, no longer anyone's well-financed puppet, is hardly a military or political threat to destabilize its neighbors. And if anything is clear, it's that the Cubans (in Cuba) have no intention of overthrowing the aging Castro.

But even if they did, so what? Absent the Cold War, why do we care that Castro continues to try to manage a communist state? Doesn't China, with whom we are panting to do more business? We're buddy-buddy with the Russians now—lending them money, supporting their leaders and again, doing business with them.

Isn't there business to be done with Cuba? To this recently reformed cigar smoker, the answer is obvious. And not just Habanas, either. There's sugar and rum and tourism on their side and (prospectively) cars and machinery and other sales and service opportunities on ours.

Isn't it likely that international trade and the concomitant exposure of Cuban citizens to the advantages of capitalism would do more to move Cuba away from communism than has a 30-year U.S.-led embargo of the island?

Or can it be that we don't care whether Cuba abandons communism or not? Officially, of course, we do care. It is, ostensibly, what our policy is about. Members of Congress—notably Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and much of the Florida delegation—justify their call for yet tougher sanctions against Cuba on the ground that the new measures will finally topple the regime.

My fear is that the motivations are less philosophical—and significantly less noble—than that. Two things seem to be driving our anti-Castro policy: Cubans in Florida and sheer vengeance.

Few politicians with aspirations for national leadership seem willing to take on the Miami-based Cubans who (like the followers of Chiang Kai-shek) see themselves as a sort of government-in-exile and dream of a triumphant return to their homeland. There being no significant pro-Castro lobby here, the hopeful antis carry the political day.

Keeping these next-Christmas-in-Havana dreamers tractable is, I suspect, one reason for our policy. The other may be a sort of institutional rage that Castro has withstood an international missile confrontation, the Bay of Pigs, any number of unsuccessful CIA plots against him and the demise of international communism—and still sits there as a rebuke to our hegemony.

Our officials keep hinting that Castro is ailing, or aging or losing his iron-fisted control. No need to think of economic concessions or diplomatic rethinking now. . . just hold out a few months longer, and watch him fall like a ripe plum.

And, of course, use our political and economic power to shake the tree.

But to what purpose of ours? Isn't it time to stop making our official hatred of one increasingly harmless old man the basis of our foreign policy?

Why don't we get off Cuba's back? •

### LONDONDERRY HIGH SCHOOL BAND PERFORMS IN WASHINGTON, DC.

• Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Londonderry High School "Lancer" Marching Band and Colonguard from Londonderry, NH. The Lancers recently performed here in the Nation's Capital for the 1995 Washington, DC St. Patrick's Day parade and received awards for their performance.

The Lancer Marching Band and Colonguard, under the able direction of Mr. Andrew Soucy, have a proud tradition of representing the Granite State in parades across the country. In addition to the St. Patrick's Day parade, they have marched in the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Parade and, just this year, performed for the New England Patriots football team at Foxboro Stadium in Massachusetts.

These fine young men and women demonstrate the hard work and dedication that is characteristic of the Granite State students. They have proven that determination and teamwork are the hallmark of success both as musicians and students. The Lancer Band and Colonguard are outstanding ambassadors for New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I want to express my thanks to both the students and faculty at Londonderry High School for their commitment to excellence. It is an honor to represent them in the U.S. Senate. •

### INVEST NOW, OR PAY MORE LATER

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I respectfully submit into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from Mayor Richard J. Riordan of Los Angeles on the issue of the Davis-Bacon Act and Prevailing Wage laws.

Mr. President, I ask that Mayor Riordan's full statement be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

INVEST NOW, OR PAY MORE LATER

(By Mayor Richard J. Riordan)

"You can pay now or pay later" is more than grandmotherly advice. It is a healthy dose of financial wisdom which all levels of government ought to heed. In fact, the pay now approach is a goal-oriented investment strategy that considers current and future needs. The pay later scenario is highly reactive, unpredictable and void of strategy.

Unfortunately for Angelenos and our local businesses community, Los Angeles city government is too reliant on the pay later approach, which really translates to "pay more later." The cost to the city by failing to invest is hundreds of millions of dollars in deferred maintenance and the taking of precious investment dollars for short-term crises. For example, due to years of inadequate funding for street maintenance, 111 miles of Los Angeles City streets are beyond repair and must be totally reconstructed at an estimated cost of \$150 million. It costs five times as much to reconstruct a street as it does to maintain it.

Investment in affordable housing, streets, sidewalks, parks, library buildings, schools, water storage, railways, airports and port facilities is good business. Directly, this investment in infrastructure generates tens of thousands of construction jobs. Over the long-term, it creates a climate where businesses will stay and come out of their own self-interest because the quality of life is better—streets are safer, long term economic