

which we should make this decision, and I think it would be a huge mistake for this Nation.

Our natural resources are among the most important things we can leave to future generations. Those resources are in our care. Our children and our grandchildren—we keep talking about our children and our grandchildren—deserve more than what this bad energy policy, bad environmental policy, and shortsighted politicking would leave them.

I urge my colleagues to support an amendment to the reconciliation bill to strike the provision opening ANWR to drilling. It is time to get our priorities right, and if we are serious about doing well for our children and our grandchildren, we will make the protection of the environment and the protection of ANWR our very highest priority.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

additional \$75 million funding to prevent violence against women—an amendment that was unanimously adopted. It included support of counseling and assistance to victims and witnesses to support them throughout the prosecution process of offenders, funding for safe homes for victims of violence, and improving the database that collects nationwide information on stalkers.

In closing, let me applaud the tireless work of Majority Leader DOLE, Senators HATCH, BIDEN, and SNOWE and many others to bring an end to violence against women in this country. Even though there have been some tragic setbacks recently, we cannot give up hope. We need to continue to support these efforts in the Senate and to support women who are victims of violence.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS
SUPPORTING DAY OF CONFRONTING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
e will make the protection of the environment and the protection of ANWR our very highest priority.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise in support of observing a Day of Confronting Violence Against Women and this week as a Week Without Violence.

Widely publicized media reports, especially those most recent, have literally seized the attention of the American public and brought to the forefront alarming instances of violence against women. When I learn that three out of four women will be victims of violence at some time in their life, it makes me angry, as it should every Member of the U.S. Senate.

This issue should strike each of us at the heart of our homes and families. Why? Because we are not just talking about numbers and statistics here, we are talking about our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters. We may even be talking about some of our colleagues. When you consider that every 15 seconds a woman is battered in America, four women have been cruelly beaten since I began my statement only a minute ago. When every 5 minutes a woman is sexually attacked, sadly enough, one woman's life is forever destroyed by the time I conclude my remarks.

In our country, one in every four relationships involve physical abuse. In my home State, I am sad to say, 250,000 women are abused each year. This is why violence against women is an issue very important to me. One of my first acts as Senator was to sign onto Senator DOLE's Violence Against Women Act. Last year two antistalking amendments I offered were adopted by the Senate. They provided for training of criminal justice officials and victims' service providers as well as funding for further research.

Most recently, I am proud to have been a cosponsor of an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill to target an

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 927, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Dole amendment No. 2898, in the nature of a substitute.

Helms amendment No. 2936 (to amendment No. 2898), to strengthen international sanctions against the Castro government and to support for a free and independent Cuba.

Simon modified amendment No. 2934 (to Amendment No. 2936), to protect the constitutional right of Americans to travel to Cuba.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have a couple of amendments that I would like to offer to the pending legislation. I point out we have already spent, I guess, 4 or 5 days on this bill, and I think people might suggest probably more time than the legislation de-

serves, but nonetheless it is taking a great deal of time.

What I would like to do, if my colleague and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would agree, rather than having separate debates on amendments, I will try to confine my remarks to both amendments—they are related, I would say to my colleague from North Carolina—and then either have back-to-back votes on them or, if he prefers, I could ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be considered as one amendment for the purpose of a single rollcall vote. Either way is fine with me, and I will yield to my colleague for any particular comment he may have on procedurally how we handle it.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to have the two amendments voted en bloc. And I would further ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if he would be willing to enter into a time agreement?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to, if he wants. I know some of our colleagues have—there is one other amendment pending, the Simon amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I believe he needs 20 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. There is a time agreement.

Mr. DODD. Of 20 minutes. I would say 40 minutes, and it may not even be that amount of time necessarily.

Mr. HELMS. Forty minutes equally?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. HELMS. I ask unanimous consent that the time agreement be 40 minutes equally divided—on the two amendments?

Mr. DODD. That is fine.

Mr. HELMS. Very well.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. DODD. Fine. Mr. President, I will wait to ask for the yeas and nays.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2906 AND 2908 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2936

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendments are at the desk. They are numbered 2906 and 2908. I ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] proposes amendments numbered 2906 and 2908 to amendment No. 2936:

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2906

On page 23 of the pending amendment beginning with line 18, strike all through line 21 on page 24.

AMENDMENT NO. 2908

On page 28 of the pending amendment beginning with line 42, strike all through line 32 on page 32.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me explain, both of these amendments are related to title II of this bill.

Let me explain both of these amendments. I should begin by thanking my colleague from North Carolina that we have gotten to this point and that we are considering the bill, having dropped title III of the bill.

I should, before discussing these two amendments, make clear, having read the comments of the distinguished majority leader and others, that title III of the bill will come back in the bill, I guess, or at least there are threats of that when the House and the Senate go to their conference on this legislation. On the assumption that the bill is passed out of the Senate, I would just notify my colleagues that if that is the case and it comes back, we will be back in the same position we were in earlier this week where I strongly objected to title III of the bill and would take appropriate actions if that is the case.

I certainly understand and respect the right of the conferees to have and decide what they are going to decide, but I would have to also put my colleagues on notice that I would use whatever procedural vehicles are available to me as a Member of this body to stop consideration of the legislation if that were to occur.

Mr. President, these two amendments, as I mentioned a moment ago, strike portions of title II of the bill that I think unduly hamper the ability of our country to provide assistance—and let me emphasize this—to a post-Castro government. Title II does not talk about Fidel Castro's government in Cuba today. Title II exclusively talks about the government that comes after Fidel Castro.

So my colleagues who are worried here that they may in some way, if they were to adopt these amendments I am proposing, do something to support Fidel Castro, they have nothing to do with Fidel Castro. The language specifically refers to the post-Castro government. And I want to emphasize that point because I think it sets new ground, that is, the language in the bill, that I think is dangerous, in my view, and precedent setting.

The restrictions, of course, I mentioned are not restrictions on how we relate to the existing government. Rather, they are restrictions on a relationship with a future Cuban Government, a government in transition from dictatorship to democracy. And, Mr. President, this does not make any sense at all to me. Title II of this legislation relates in large measure to what the United States' policy should be toward a post-Castro government.

It states, among other things—I am quoting here:

It is the policy of the United States to support the self-determination of the Cuban people and to be impartial toward any individual or entity in the selection by the Cuban people of their future government.

That is a beautiful statement. I endorse it 1000 percent. It is exactly the position we ought to have. Let me repeat it again.

It is the policy of the United States to support the self-determination of the Cuban peo-

ple and to be impartial toward any individual or entity in the selection by the Cuban people of their future government.

That is exactly the position we ought to have. In fact, if it ended right there I would be standing up here urging all my colleagues to support this. But unfortunately, Mr. President, if you read further on in here, we seem to then contradict the very statement that I have just read to you. And I suspect that many of my colleagues—most would endorse the first statement. However, key provisions of title II belie that statement.

I would urge my colleagues to take a look, if they would, at sections 205, 206, and 207 of title II which set forth a laundry list of conditions and requirements that either must or should be met before the President, our President, the President of the United States, can provide even very limited assistance to help the Cuban people make the very difficult transition from dictatorship to democracy.

These conditions, Mr. President, go on for four pages here, laying out, in some cases, "shall," and what we "must" do.

Section 205:

(a) A determination . . . that a transition government in Cuba is in power shall not be made unless that government has taken the following actions—(1) legalized all political activity; (2) released all political prisoners . . .

Most of the list I do not have any problem with whatsoever except that it gets to micromanagement in a sense and lays out in great specificity exactly what we are going to require before we provide any assistance to the people of that new government.

Again, I go back, Mr. President, to read, if you will, the statement I read a moment ago when we started talking about it. "The policy of the United States to support the self-determination of the Cuban people and to be impartial toward any individual or entity." Again, we are talking about a post-Castro government here. Presumably, they are getting rid of the dictatorship and moving in the right direction.

Now, I am not suggesting we ought to say we are going to provide help to anybody that becomes a transition government or becomes the new government after Castro. I would oppose just as strongly any suggestion in legislation that we automatically ought to be providing assistance. But I also think it gets rather ridiculous if we lay out four pages, Mr. President, of conditionality here that a government must meet absolutely in many ways if we are going to provide any assistance at all. I am talking about humanitarian assistance to people in transition.

And, in fact, these standards that we have here, as much as I think they have value, and although I think some of the language is a little less than precise, I do not—"legalizing all political activity"—I do not know what "all political activity" means. I do not know

what we mean about that in this country. But I am not going to quibble about the individual wording in it, Mr. President. I think there is value in each one of these statements.

But my point is, if we applied these standards to the New Independent States that emerged after the collapse of the Soviet Union, we still would not be providing any assistance to them, and we would not be allowed to under this, if adopted. We need to provide Presidents and Congresses in the future with the flexibility to respond to a transition in Cuba. And to sit down and have a four-page minutia detail by detail by detail, steps that they have to go through before we can help them, I think just is wrong, wrong headed.

Again, this has nothing to do with Fidel Castro. This title II works on the presumption he is gone, he is out of there. Now, we are talking about a new government.

Mr. President, I just think it is a mistake to be passing legislation that micromanages and goes into such detail. It is not just this President. Maybe people are talking about this administration somehow. No one can say with certainty when the transition is going to occur in Cuba. We all hope it occurs peacefully and occurs soon. But it may very well not be for a year or 2 or 3 or 4 for 5. Who can say?

We have listened to nine Presidents since Dwight Eisenhower talk about the change coming in Cuba. It has not happened yet. Now, again, all of us here, I presume, would like to see it happen quickly. But if it does not happen during this administration but some future administration, including the administration of some of our colleagues who are in this Chamber today, they could face four pages we adopt into law setting out in detail what that government must look like before we can provide assistance to them, despite the fact that we said earlier in the bill that it is the policy of our Government to support the self-determination of the Cuban people and to be impartial, impartial toward any individual or entity in the election by the Cuban people of their future government.

Again, I would not suggest in any way whatsoever, Mr. President, that we ought to write a bill that would say no matter what happens, no matter who follows Fidel Castro, we ought to provide aid to them.

Imagine if I wrote a bill that said that, that whoever comes after Fidel Castro automatically qualifies for U.S. assistance. I would be laughed off the floor of the Senate if I suggested a bill that proposed that idea. And yet, what we are doing here today, in a sense, is just like that. We are saying in effect that "no matter who comes after Fidel Castro, unless you meet these detailed standards, we cannot provide any help to you at all."

I thought the idea was to encourage a transition, to move to democracy, and to then provide the kind of nurturing

support to see that that transition occurs. Now, it may not occur exactly as we like.

One of the provisions says you must have free elections within 2 years. I wish it was 6 months. I wish it were the next day. What happens if it is 2½ years and not 2 years, or 2 years, 2 months? It is that kind of detail that is in this bill, Mr. President. That is not smart. That is not wise. That is not prudent. I do not know of any other place where we provided this kind of language.

Imagine the Philippines if we tried that. Imagine if we tried it, as I said, in all of these New Independent Republics that have emerged. Our ability to weigh in and create that kind of transition would have been severely hampered had we been required to meet the standards we are going to be adopting in this legislation if my amendment is not approved.

Now, I do not know, again, how this will come out politically. But I hope my colleagues would look and just read the sections 205, 206, and 207. They go on for some pages. Some require "shall," others "should," in the transition.

Last, and it gets into this same area, the settlement of outstanding U.S. claims. And here the language, Mr. President, is pretty emphatic in the bill.

No assistance may be provided under the authority of this act to a transition government in Cuba.

And then it goes on for a page or two here talking about how we resolve these outstanding claims.

Mr. President, I hope that happens. I do not think any U.S. citizen who has property confiscated anywhere in the world ought not to be compensated. But we have now 38 countries in the world, including Cuba, where United States citizens' property has been expropriated, and we are in the process of trying to get those individuals compensated for that property.

Some of the countries where that occurs are very strong allies of ours. Germany is one, I point out. We now have diplomatic relations with Vietnam. The list is lengthy, 38 countries.

We never said before we cannot provide any assistance to those countries until those claims and matters are all settled, and yet that is what we do with this legislation. We are saying we cannot provide under this—the language very specifically in section 207, "Settlement of Outstanding U.S. Claims to Confiscated Property in Cuba," section (A), paragraph 1:

No assistance may be provided—

The assumption is that you are going to set up a mechanism to resolve these claims, again no matter how meritorious they may be, and have that control our foreign policy interests, which would be, I presume, to support the transition to get aid to people to try to establish a presence there and assist that process. To have it totally linked to claims issues, where we do not do

that even among our allies around the globe, seems to me to be going too far. It just goes too far.

Again, I realize with everything else going on around here that the attention on something like this may not seem like much to people. I just think it is bad policy, Mr. President, to have this kind of detailed step-by-step requirement that you have to meet and then absolutely hamstringing not just this administration, but future administrations, from being able to move intelligently and rapidly to try to shore up a government that will follow Fidel Castro.

Again, I emphasize to my colleagues, none of these provisions has anything to do with the present government in Cuba—not one thing to do with it. It is all about the government that comes afterward. It seems to me we ought to be trying to figure out a way how we can play the most creative role in that transition, to try to move that process toward a democratically elected government as quickly as we can—as quickly as we can. And yet, before we can do that, we now have to go through a series of hoops that will make it very, very difficult for us to respond creatively and imaginatively to a situation that has gone on far too long.

So, Mr. President, I will not dwell on this any longer. I made the point, I hope, and I urge my colleagues to look at these sections of the bill. Some, as I said, are more advisory. Others absolutely demand certain things occur. They can go through and read which is which. It seems to me we ought to stick with the paragraph I read earlier on in my statement, and that is that we provide the kind of flexibility in allowing the Cuban people to determine for themselves what it is that they would like to have as that new government.

We may not decide to support it. It may not meet our standards and we will act accordingly, but the best policy is the one that is included as a preamble to this section, and the preamble to this section is one that every single person in this country, let alone in this body, can support, and that is the policy of the United States to support the self-determination of the Cuban people and to be impartial to any selection of the Cuban people as to their government. It is their choice. If they want to make a bad choice, that is their right. We do not have to support it, but that is their right if they so desire.

The idea, then, that we are going to detail in painful minutiae every step that must be met, I think is a mistake. Again, I am not quarreling myself with any provisions here necessarily. There are things I support and I believe make sense. But to spell out as a roadmap what they have to follow in great detail before we can provide any kind of help down there is a mistake, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], is recognized for 20 minutes.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the distinguished President of Estonia waits without in the Vice President's Office. I desire to present him to the Senate, and I shall do so, and I shall go and invite him to come in. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged to neither side.

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 dispensed with.

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF ESTONIA, LENNART MERI

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am honored to present to the Senate the President of Estonia, the distinguished Lennart Meri.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, so that Senators and staff can greet our distinguished guest.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:06 a.m., recessed until 11:13 a.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CAMPBELL).

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. As I understand it, I have 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. On the two amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I will not use all that time. I will reserve some. When the Senator from Connecticut is willing, we will yield back what remains of our time.

Mr. President, Senator DODD's amendment proposes to delete from the pending bill any guidance and recommendations to the President from the Congress of the United States as to what constitutes a transition or democratic government in Cuba. I am a little surprised at the thrust of the amendment. But I respect the Senator, although I disagree with him.

The administration has maintained that the President should retain flexibility to deal with the situation in