

which the hero of the movie had spoken with the nobles in the country asking for their support. And at the crucial moment in the battle, I remember again the hero turning to someone for support from these nobles, and at this crucial moment, the nobles turned their backs on freedom. They turned their backs on freedom for one reason: for their self-interest, for their need to continue the existing system because they profited from it.

I know that the motivation, frankly, behind those who are in disagreement with what we are trying to accomplish is the desire to profit from the markets that will be available someday in Cuba. I understand that. I am disappointed that people react that way. We will never change that attitude. It has been in existence as long as man has been on the surface of this Earth.

But I think we ought to recognize it for what it is. People want to do business in China today for exactly the same reason. For a few brief moments the Nation focused on Harry Wu. But now he is back, and everyone has forgotten. The same kind of thing is happening in Cuba. Day in and day out innocent people who want the same things out of life that you and I enjoy, and those are the basic principles and the freedoms that we enjoy—the freedom of assembly, the freedom of religion, the freedom to pursue your own livelihood—and yet we are, in essence, not willing to stand up and fight for those individuals because of the commercial interest that exists throughout the world. I understand it. I reject it. I wish it was not there. But I think we ought to recognize it because that is what is driving a lot of this debate.

I would hope that just occasionally there would be an opportunity for the nobles of the world to say just once in this one case, "I am willing to give up the opportunity for profit, the opportunity for growth in my company, give up those opportunities so that other individuals that we do not know, never will meet, but who have struggled for the same kinds of freedom and liberty that we enjoy today." And I certainly would hope that this Congress will pass this legislation so that we can provide a message of hope to the people of Cuba.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995. I believe this legislation will encourage the holding of free and fair democratic elections in Cuba. It will provide a policy framework for United States support to the Cuban people in response to the formation of a transition government or a democratically elected government in Cuba. This bill will also protect the rights of U.S. persons who own claims to confiscated property abroad.

I believe this legislation will expedite the transition to a democratic government in Cuba. Whether you are for or against this bill, no one disagrees that

this should be the policy of our government. Denying United States visas to those who trade with Cuba and discouraging International Financial Institutions assistance to Cuba are necessary steps that will strengthen the embargo and bring about the downfall of the Castro regime.

One of the significant provisions of this bill is the section dealing with property. It is difficult to accept the argument that Fidel Castro's confiscation of property belonging to naturalized citizens should not be subject to a remedy under the domestic laws of the United States. Confiscations of property belonging to U.S. nationals at the time of the taking clearly violated international law. These takings were done to retaliate against U.S. nationals for acts of the U.S. Government, and the takings were without the payment of adequate and effective compensation.

While courts have generally not recognized actions of foreign governments against its own citizens, international human rights law does recognize that in certain circumstances a state violates international law when it confiscates the property of either its own citizens or aliens based on some invidious category such as race, nationality, or political opinion. Some legal scholars have noted that the international community may be moving toward recognition of claims when confiscations or expropriations are the result of such discrimination.

The stories of property confiscation in Cuba are repugnant. The confiscations of Cuban-owned property were based on such obscene grounds as an owner's having committed "offenses defined by law as counter-revolutionary."

I believe this legislation establishes the framework by which Cuba will become a democratic nation. I have heard from many in the Cuban-American community who spend the majority of their time working to realize this objective. This legislation honors the hard work of these fighters of freedom and I encourage my colleagues to support final passage. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). The Senator from California is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SAM NUNN

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise not to speak on this bill but to do two things. First, to say a few words and share my respect and admiration for the senior Senator from Georgia. And, second to share some of my reflections of the past year and where I think we seem to be heading with the reconciliation bill.

Mr. President, I do not serve on a committee with the senior Senator from Georgia, but I do try to listen to the floor when I am in the office. I have a very simple test, I either turn the sound up or down or off depending on

the merit I find in the discussion. I have always turned the sound up to listen to Senator Sam NUNN. And, what I have heard is an intelligent, a reasoned, and a very informed person who has brought a great deal to bear in the debates on the Senate floor. He has been a strong and tireless advocate for a national defense policy that is well thought out, for foreign policy that explores each issue as part of a whole policy situation and not a separate stand-alone issue.

His ability, I think, to see individual defense programs or foreign policy actions as part of the total debate has given him the ability to think independently of party and the daily public opinion poll and put forth a policy that is really important.

I will miss him greatly. I very much regret his decision to retire from the U.S. Senate. I think it is to the Senate's loss when we lose one of our great minds.

The distinguished Senator has been an advocate for a strong national defense, especially pushing for a well-trained and modern force. He has constantly lent his support to support programs which would better prepare our men and women in uniform for war, but moreover for operations-other-than-war including humanitarian missions.

His leadership in foreign policy is marked, as well. He has been the single strongest voice for lessening the threat of nuclear proliferation from the States of the former Soviet Union with the policies advanced under the Nunn-Lugar program. And, he has helped our relationship with the new Russia and the nations of Eastern Europe through his ideas on NATO expansion and the Partnership for Peace Program.

Senator NUNN will continue to remain a voice of moderation and independent thought throughout the remainder of his term. I will miss his contributions to some of the most important issues of our day and this body will miss his leadership.

THE RECONCILIATION BILL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, over the past 200 years, almost 2,000 men and women have stood in this Chamber charged with the task of governing the greatest democracy in the world. They were, like us, men and women of ideals and principle. This Chamber is also no stranger to revolutionary winds and radical ideas.

Some ideas dissipate quickly; others stand like pillars in our Nation's history. One thing has held true over time, most ideals will not withstand the rigors of the democratic process if they do not hold true to the democratic promise: The promise of opportunity for those willing to earn it, the promise of freedom for those willing to protect it, and the promise of security for those who play by the rules and give their fair share.

And these ideals, once implemented, must also withstand the test of time, which brings us to where we are today: Reexamining institutions and programs, cutting or streamlining where possible, eliminating where necessary. We have done some important work this year, and I commend the party in power for that. But I am deeply troubled by the direction of some of these changes and the extremes to which this Congress seems to be headed.

The American people voted for change in 1992 and in 1994. They clearly wanted a smaller, more efficient Government. They wanted a better use of their tax dollars. But they did not vote for the wholesale dismantling of Government. Laws that protect public safety, education, and access to basic health care are all critically needed and supported by the public we serve.

Some of the proposals being put forth in this Congress seem less like needed reform and more like revolution for revolution's sake. They go beyond reason and, I believe, beyond the wishes of the American people.

If moderation does not prevail, this level of extremism will ultimately take our country backward, not forward, and the damage will be felt not by us, but by generations to come.

Examples of the kind of extremism which seems to have gripped some in this Congress are littered throughout major bills we have dealt with this year, from regulatory reform to appropriations bills, to obscure language added to defense authorization bills, and to the upcoming reconciliation bill. But some of the most onerous and most blatant extremism is reserved for the upcoming Medicaid and Medicare plans. Let me give you examples of my concerns.

Medicaid is the safety net, a true safety net, for 36 million Americans. Does Medicaid need to be reformed? Yes, but you do not get there by simply cutting off the most vulnerable people from access to fundamental health care.

Six million Americans who are disabled rely on Medicaid for their health care. Because they have long-term, complex and expensive health conditions, they cannot buy private insurance. Medicaid is often the only health insurance available for this population. Yet, both the Senate and the House bills could jeopardize coverage for the disabled.

Nationally, 15 percent of Medicare beneficiaries rely on help from Medicaid to cover the required copayments. The Senate bill would allow States to remove such coverage, leaving millions of the poorest seniors quite possibly unable to pay their share of Medicare costs.

The House bill would also eliminate guaranteed coverage for children whose health insurance is Medicaid. Twenty percent of the Nation's children rely on Medicaid for basic health needs—immunizations, emergency care, regular checkups. This makes no sense to me, fiscal or moral.

What is revolutionary about regressing on quality and safety standards in nursing homes? Twenty years ago, Congress reacted to the appalling state of our country's seniors who resided in nursing homes: elderly patients strapped to their beds against their will, patients being fed dog food and drugs, lice-infested bed sheets. These pictures are not even old enough to fade from memory yet.

I well remember conditions in the early seventies that my sisters and I found when we went to look at some 40 San Francisco Bay Area nursing homes for my mother who had chronic brain syndrome—a deterioration of the brain that covers memory, reason, and judgment.

I remember the stench of urine, seniors strapped to wheelchairs, poor food, and on and on. We were lucky then to find 1 home out of 40 that we visited that had a level of care that was appropriate for my mother, and she lived there for 7 years.

The call for national standards then was loud, clear and bipartisan. In fact, the standards now in place were supported by both parties and signed into law by then-President Ronald Reagan.

Have we really so soon forgotten these lessons? In our extreme zeal to get Government off our backs, are we really willing to subject the next generation of seniors to the same degradations all over again?

Another aspect of the House Republican Medicaid plan that I believe goes beyond the bounds of reason is the repeal of protections against spousal impoverishment. A woman today who cannot afford the cost of nursing home care for her husband with Alzheimer's already must spend down her own resources to low levels in order to qualify for Medicaid.

Current law allows her to retain up to \$14,961 in income to remain living independently, and prohibits States from imposing liens on homes of nursing home residents. The House bill eliminates these protections, protections which allow her to keep her car, her home, and enough money to pay her heating bills while paying for her husband's nursing home care with Medicaid assistance.

Over 10.5 million Californians, nearly one-third of my State's residents, have incomes less than 200 percent of the poverty line. These families are one tragedy, one major illness, one job loss away from not making it. Removing the only thing that stands between these families and bankruptcy is not reform, it is extreme, and it is unconscionable.

The Republican proposal cuts Medicare by \$270 billion. That is not just extreme, I think it is disingenuous. The \$270 billion in cuts is not going to the deficit. It is not being used to save Medicare. It is going to give tax breaks to the wealthy, and it is going to raise taxes for the poor.

Only \$89 billion is needed to make the part A trust fund of Medicare sol-

vent. That is what becomes insolvent in the year 2002. But cuts are also made in part B, which has nothing to do with the trust fund, and the reason for this is, in part, it would seem, to give a capital gains tax cut.

A capital gains tax cut largely benefits people who earn incomes of over \$100,000 a year, and I can see reasons for a capital gains tax cut—but not by cutting Medicare. That is simply not moral.

The cuts to hospitals in part A will have a devastating impact, particularly on public hospitals and teaching hospitals. In my State, for example, the University of California maintains five big teaching hospitals. According to them last week, under this plan, they would face a net loss of \$116.4 million over 7 years. Other California hospitals, already facing strapped budgets, would lose an additional \$7 billion.

The Senate Medicare plan also includes arbitrary cuts in provider services if spending does not meet targeted levels—indiscriminate cuts in home health, hospital care, doctor visits and diagnostic tests.

Providers have already borne the brunt of congressional budget cuts over the last 10 years, and we all know what indiscriminate cuts mean; it means fewer doctors serving Medicare patients, and cutbacks in services for those who do.

This is not reform, it is a kind of politics, but these politics will hurt America's seniors and America's indigent. We can do better than that if moderate heads prevail.

I am not one that says only \$89 billion should be cut. I recognize that we have to look at other things to balance the budget. I recognize that Medicare and Medicaid are culprits in budget balancing. But let us do it in a way that sees the light of day, that has full discussion, that takes into consideration many views, not just the views of one political party and, in fact, one branch of that political party.

Some of the extremism that I have seen this past year is not just an isolated case. Much of the legislation we have worked on takes this country back. Let me just throw out some of the areas: environmental protection, safety regulations, abortion rights, education.

We are not talking about Federal micro-management that can be done better by States. We are talking about things like clean air, clean water, hazardous waste cleanup, and airline safety.

For example, provisions in appropriations bills for the EPA and proposed budget cuts would hinder the enforcement of safe drinking water standards for contaminants like cryptosporidium and arsenic in water. Do the American people want this? No. It would prevent EPA from testing for groundwater contamination at underground storage tanks. Do the American people want this? No. It would reduce hazardous waste compliance inspections at Federal facilities, such as Edwards and

Vandenberg Air Force Bases, the Department of Energy's Livermore Laboratories, San Diego Naval Station, and Sacramento Army Depot. Do Californians want this? No.

It would further delay the cleanup of 230 Superfund sites across this Nation, including a dozen or more in my State. One of them that would be delayed is called Iron Mountain Mine, located in Redding. It is interesting. It is a mountain that used to be an old copper mine. It has holes in it the height of a 30-story office building because the mountain was drilled. When it rains, the water mixes with the chemical and it produces sulfuric acid, which drains out into the Trinity River and metalizes the river bed. There are a couple of ways of controlling it, but they are very expensive. It is a big Superfund site. Is it important to do it? Of course. This river eventually becomes part of the drinking water for two-thirds of the people in the State of California.

But balancing the budget is not all that this agenda is about, because at the same time many are proposing cutbacks in funds to enforce environmental and safety standards, they want to give away billions of dollars in gold and mineral resources owned by American taxpayers to mining companies at a fraction of what they are worth. They want to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil development companies and permit logging on public lands, while waiving environmental laws that protect those lands.

This is not budget cutting; it is "set-back" political agenda. These proposals place cost above safety in regulatory reform. To me, this means many safety standards can be challenged because they do not meet the least-cost alternative test, including shoulder belts and rear seat belts in cars, airbags in cars, and black boxes on airplanes. It means critical delays in safety regulations for things like commuter airlines and meat inspections. This is not reform; this is an abdication of responsibility.

This agenda is not about reducing taxes—at least not for everyone. While some plan to cut Medicare to give a capital gains tax break, they also want to increase taxes for 7.4 million lower income Americans. Republican proposals would reduce the earned-income tax credit for low-income workers and their families, and eliminate it entirely for low-income workers without children.

While the Senate proposals would also make cuts in capital gains taxes, a House plan would eliminate \$3.5 billion in tax credits for developers investing in housing for low and moderate-income families.

Education, without an education and skilled work force this country will be nowhere. We cannot compete in a global marketplace. We all agree with that, regardless of party. Yet, there are efforts to cut the number of students receiving Pell Grants, to eliminate the direct student loan program, to tax

colleges for every student that receives a Federal loan, to eliminate the AmeriCorps Program, which provides money for college to more than 4 million youngsters who serve their communities over the next 7 years.

This is not about getting Government off of our backs. We see attacks on a woman's right to choose everywhere in these bills—from preventing women in the military from using their own funds to pay for an abortion at military hospitals overseas, to preventing the District of Columbia from using its own locally-raised tax dollars to provide abortions for poor women, to denying Federal employees access to abortion services in their health benefits—an option available to all non-government employees—to the most insidious of all: House measures, and an expected Senate measure, to make Medicaid funding of abortion optional for States even in cases of rape and incest.

This is not reform, it is a step backward in time to the days we all remember well, where desperate women were forced to seek medical treatment in back allies. I remember it. I remember college dormitory students passing the plate so an 18 year old woman could go to Mexico for an abortion. There is no other way of describing this, except extremism.

The irony of the reconciliation bill is that it will contain many of these things. And our process, theoretically, is designed on big issues to have full discussion and debate. That is what this Senate is supposed to be all about. Some of these issues will have little public hearing. They will be limited to 20 hours of debate. These extreme proposals can set back our Nation, and they most certainly will impact the future of tens of millions of Americans.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to state the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 2898 to H.R. 927.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. HELMS. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative 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, 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. sec. 1384(b)), a notice of proposed rulemaking was submitted by the Office of Compliance, U.S. Congress. The notice relates to the Congressional Accountability Act and the Extension of Rights and Protections under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as applied to interns and irregular work schedules in the House of Representatives.

Section 304(b) requires this notice to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, therefore I ask unanimous consent that the notice be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995: EXTENSION OF RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938 (INTERNS; IRREGULAR WORK SCHEDULES)

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Summary: The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance is publishing proposed rules to implement section 203(a)(2) and 203(c)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (P.L. 104-1). The proposed regulations, which are to be applied to the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives, set forth the recommendations of the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives, Office of Compliance, as approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

Dates: Comments are due within 30 days after publication of this notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Addresses: Submit written comments to the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive notification of receipt of comments are requested to include a self-addressed, stamped post card. Comments may also be transmitted by facsimile ("FAX") machine to (202) 252-3115. This is not a toll-free call. Copies of comments submitted by the public will be available for review at the Law Library Reading Room, Room LM-201, Law Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

For Further Information Contact: Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives, Office of Compliance at (202) 252-3100. This notice is also available in the following formats: large print, braille, audio tape, and electronic file on computer disk. Requests for this notice in an alternative format should be made to Mr. Russell Jackson, Director, Service Department, Office of