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

requested by nearly every group who is supporting term limits, in addition to the Christian Coalition, I thought nearly every Member, every Member of the freshman class and others, we did accommodate them by saying we would have the vote later. Some suggest next April, which would give them time to do whatever they do in that time to encourage more people to vote for term limits.

So I do not have any problems with the efforts of Senator ASHCROFT. I was prepared to bring it up 3 weeks ago, but I must say the same thing happened with the flag amendment. We asked about it, and then all the people who support the flag amendment said, ''Oh, we have to have more time.'' All right, we will give you more time.

I am not certain when that amendment will be brought up, or if they would like to do it later this year. I am not certain we will have time. We had time last week and the week before. We had time for term limits. I assume by next April we will have some additional time. I cannot set an exact date. All this resolution says is that we should vote sometime on term limits. I do not have any problem with that. So I hope the amendment will not be tabled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters from the supporters of term limits requesting that I reschedule the term limits vote for next year be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIAN COALITION,
Chesapeake, VA, October 13, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT DOLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: The Cristian Coalition thanks you for granting our request to reschedule a vote on a constitutional amendment to provide for term limits until next year.

Postponement of the vote should increase our prospects for success as the Senate will not be in the midst of deliberations on reconciliation and appropriations bills, and 1996 will be an election year.

Thank you for your leadership and for your support for term limits.

Sincerely,

BRIAN LOPINA,
Director, Governmental Affairs Office.

AMERICANS BACK IN CHARGE,
Washington, DC, October 12, 1995.

TERM LIMITS ACTIVISTS APPLAUD SENATOR DOLE FOR RESCHEDULING TERM LIMITS VOTE; PLEDGE TO MOBILIZE GRASSROOTS SUPPORT FOR ISSUE

WASHINGTON, DC.—Term limits activists today applauded Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R–KS) for agreeing to their request to reschedule the Senate vote on term limits.

''We applaud the willingness of Sen. Dole to reschedule the first ever Senate floor vote on a term limits constitutional amendment,'' said Cleta Mitchell, Director/General Counsel of Americans Back in Charge in Washington, D.C. ''We requested that Sen. Dole reschedule the vote on term limits until next year. We believe it is in the best interests of the issue to be able to focus public attention on term limits for the weeks leading up to the Senate vote and that is not possible at this time, with the congressional focus on the budget, taxes and Medicare. It would not be fair to term limits for the vote to occur now and we are pleased that Sen. Dole agreed to our request that floor action be rescheduled.''

''Term limits is an issue of fundamental importance and one that the American people care about. Over 25 million votes have been cast in favor of term limits in the past five years in elections held in 22 states. Ultimately, the members of the U.S. Senate will be called upon to make a decision as to whether they intend to honor or ignore the obvious will of the American people. We want to be certain that when that day comes, the people have had a full and fair opportunity to weigh in on the issue with their Senators, reminding the Senate of the public support for term limits. We look forward to working with our principal author, Sen. Thompson and the other members of the Senate supporting term limits to build the Senate between now and next spring when SJ Res 21 comes to the Senate floor.''

Americans Back in Charge is the first national term limits organization, which grew out of the 1st in the nation Colorado state term limits effort in 1989–90. Other groups participating in the Term Limits Coalition include American Conservative Union, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Council for Government Reform, Seniors Coalition, and the Christian Coalition.

[News Release from Fred Thompson, U.S. Senator, Tennessee, Washington, DC, Oct. 12, 1995]

THOMPSON THANKS DOLE FOR RESCHEDULING TERM LIMITS VOTE

WASHINGTON, DC.—Senator Fred Thompson (R–TN) today thanked Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole for his willingness to reschedule a Senate floor vote on Thompson's term limits Constitutional amendment from this week to early next year.

''The Majority Leader has provided supporters of term limits with an opportunity to maximize the public's involvement in this critical debate,'' Thompson said, ''while at the same time giving term limits backers in the Senate the time to urge their colleagues in the strongest terms to support the amendment. Make no mistake, it is in the best interest of the term limits movement that this Senate vote come next April.''

Thompson pointed out that a vote now, in the midst of the Senate debate over the budget and appropriations legislation, would not receive the public or Senate attention it deserves.

Eight other Senate freshmen joint Thompson on a letter delivered to Majority Leader Dole on October 4 requesting that the vote be rescheduled in April. In addition, the Term Limits Coalition—which includes Americans Back in Charge, American Conservative Union, Christian Coalition, Council for Government Reform, Seniors Coalition, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste and National Taxpayers Union—strongly urged in a separate letter that Dole delay the floor debate and vote.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, October 3, 1995.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: As the primary sponsors and supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 21, the constitutional amendment to limit congressional terms, we are joining forces to request that the Senate postpone any scheduled vote on SJ Res 21 until April, 1996.

We have been meeting with and discussing the upcoming term limits vote in the Senate with those individuals and organizations who are most dedicated to passage by Congress of the term limits constitutional amendment. Those who are prepared to lead the effort to round up votes for SJ Res 21 are in agreement that it makes little sense to bring the issue to the Senate floor for a vote this fall when the Senate is otherwise wholly absorbed with the crucial budget issues.

Supporters of term limits have indicated to us that the crush of other legislative business pending before the Senate over the next two months will make it difficult, if not impossible, for term limits to receive the kind of attention from the Senate and the American people that it deserves.

We do not propose an indefinite postponement of the first recorded vote on the term limits amendment. Rather, we would specifically ask that the resolution be scheduled for a vote in April, 1996. By making this change in the schedule, we believe that it will enable the Senate leadership to work with term limits supporters inside and outside the Senate to achieve the maximum possible support for SJ Res 21.

Please let us know at your earliest possible convenience your response to this letter so that those of us committed to term limits can have the certain knowledge of exactly how and when the Senate plans to proceed in considering this vitally important issue. The American people are anxious for the Senate to consider term limits when we can give it our full attention. We believe that April, 1996 is the appropriate time for a complete and fair Senate debate on term limits. We urge your favorable consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

James M. Inhofe, Spencer Abraham, Rick Santorum, Rod Grams, Jon Kyl, Fred Thompson, Bill Frist, Craig Thomas, and Mike DeWine.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1995.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: The undersigned organizations have been actively involved in the effort to pass the constitutional amendment to limit the terms of members of Congress. We are all deeply committed to term limits as a cornerstone of a permanent restraint on the role of the federal government. We believe that limiting the terms of members of Congress is an important structural change that the American people support overwhelmingly and we want to do all in our power to help bring term limits to reality as part of our Constitution.

To that end, we are aware that you have promised to bring the term limits constitutional amendment to the floor of the U.S. Senate for a vote in the 104th Congress and for that we are grateful. We believe it is significant that this Congress will allow, for the first time in America's history, a recorded vote on term limits in the House and the Senate. While we appreciate your commitment to bring term limits to the Senate floor this fall, we are asking that you postpone consideration of the term limits amendment to April of next year.

All of us are aware of the difficult and crowded legislative calendar facing the United States Senate during the weeks between now and the scheduled adjournment of the first session of the 104th Congress. Term limits is an issue that deserves a complete and open debate on the floor of the United States Senate. We believe that the American people are entitled to such a full and fair hearing on the issue of term limits—and we believe that this fall is not a time when such a debate can or will occur. Because of the budget, tax, Medicare and other major fiscal issues facing the Senate, not to mention the other issues remaining to be considered as part of the

House Contract with America, we do not believe that term limits will be able to be given its proper consideration by the Senate if the vote is held this fall. We do not think there is adequate time available to the members or the citizens to focus the necessary national attention on term limits if it is wedged among the issues now facing Congress.

It is further our belief that the most important contribution you can make at this point in time toward helping to maximize the Senate's support for term limits is by granting to the supporters of term limits a specified time on the Senate calendar for April, 1996 to schedule a vote on term limits. If April is not acceptable, we would request that you advise us now of another time certain in the spring of next year when term limits will be rescheduled for a Senate vote.

We believe that this is more appropriate timing that will benefit the issue of term limits and the ability of the American people to focus their attention—and that of their Senators—on the importance of this vote.

We urgently request that you adopt this strategy and notify us as soon as possible as to whether we can expect a Senate vote in April of 1996, or exactly when such a vote would be rescheduled. We look forward to the opportunity to work with your leadership team to encourage passage of the constitutional amendment for term limits next year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Organizations Supporting Term Limits: Americans Back in Charge, American Conservative Union, Christian Coalition, Council for Government Reform, Seniors Coalition, and Council for Citizens Against Government Waste.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will vote to table the Ashcroft amendment to H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act.

I have not yet decided how I will vote on an amendment to the Constitution proposing limits on the terms of office for Members of Congress when it comes before the Senate next year.

The Ashcroft amendment is not a constitutional amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution lacking the force of law. Its language is totally open-ended without restrictions and standards. Therefore, although I may support specific constitutional amendment language when it is offered, I cannot support and will vote to table the Ashcroft amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2916 offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mrs. BOXER (When her name was called). Present.

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 Florida [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 490 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Glenn	Lugar
Baucus	Graham	McConnell
Biden	Harkin	Moynihan
Bingaman	Heflin	Murray
Bradley	Hollings	Nunn
Breaux	Inouye	Pell
Bryan	Jeffords	Pryor
Bumpers	Johnston	Reid
Byrd	Kassebaum	Robb
Chafee	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kerrey	Roth
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Lautenberg	Simon
Dodd	Leahy	Snowe
Dorgan	Levin	Specter
Feingold	Lieberman	
Ford	Lott	

NAYS—45

Abraham	Faircloth	Mack
Ashcroft	Feinstein	McCain
Bennett	Frist	Murkowski
Bond	Gorton	Nickles
Brown	Gramm	Pressler
Burns	Grams	Santorum
Campbell	Grassley	Shelby
Coats	Gregg	Simpson
Cohen	Hatch	Smith
Coverdell	Helms	Stevens
Craig	Hutchison	Thomas
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thompson
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thurmond
Dole	Kohl	Warner
Domenici	Kyl	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—4

Exon	Mikulski
Hatfield	Moseley-Braun

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Boxer

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 2916) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there will be no more votes this evening.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 7 p.m. with Members entitled to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1329 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

CENSUS BUREAU BURDENS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bring your attention to a single example of what I believe to be an all too common practice of our Government bullying small businesses with burdensome requirements.

My office recently received a letter from a small business in Georgia describing the mounds of reports required by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. I believe this case serves as an excellent example of the kind of bully Government so many of us in the Senate have worked to control through regulation reform and paper work reduction. The most troubling message to me in this letter is that this small company does not perceive such Government burdens as atypical, just as a normal course of doing business in America.

How far are we going to stretch the limited resources of our small businesses? Let me list for you the reports this company, the Great American Cookie Co., must submit to the Bureau of the Census or face Federal penalties: Report of Organization, Survey of Industrial Research and Development, Survey of Business, Investment Plans Survey, Current Retail Sales and Inventory Report, Annual Trade Report, and Annual Capital Expenditures Survey.

In addition, it also provides much of the same information to each of the more than 40 States and in some cases municipalities in which it operates retail outlets. These State reports include summaries on payroll taxes, income taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, worker's compensation, property and liability insurance, annual reports and franchise returns.

As you and my other colleagues know, we succeeded in getting a provision included in the Paper Work Reduction Act to reduce the burden of firms who are forced to file quarterly reports by the Bureau of the Census used to compile the ''Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing, Mining, and Trade Corporations.'' While I am pleased this is now law, I firmly believe we can do more to reduce the formidable burdens imposed by the Bureau of the Census, especially for small businesses.

By allowing this veritable gauntlet of requirements for doing business in America to continue, I wonder at the kind of message we, the Members of the U.S. Senate, are sending to small businesses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the content of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

GREAT AMERICAN COOKIE CO., INC.,
Atlanta, GA, September 14, 1995.

Hon. PAUL COVERDELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COVERDELL: I am writing this letter to express concern over reporting requirements of the Census Bureau upon The Great American Cookie Company, Inc. (the Company). The Company is currently responsible for the following reports: Report of Organization, Survey of Industrial Research and Development, Survey of Businesses, Investment Plans Survey, Current Retail Sales and Inventory Report, Annual Trade Report and Annual Capital Expenditures Survey. We understand that, as a governmental agency, the information provided by these reports is a valuable tool for monitoring certain types of business activity. However, as a small business with limited resources, these reporting requirements place an undue burden on us.