

Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of which I was privileged to be an original cosponsor, and intend, if I am not, to be a cosponsor of the substitute.

Mr. President, for decades we in America faced down Fidel Castro's threats to our security, and his efforts to spread communism in our hemisphere. The worldwide struggle against communism is over, and democracy and market economies have won. It may be too easy in that global context to simply take Castro and his continued power in Cuba as a curiosity—a harmless relic of a bygone age. But it is much more than that.

His continued governance of Cuba represents the continuation of dictatorship and denial of human rights to the people of Cuba. The valiant struggle of the Cuban people to liberate themselves from the yoke of Castro's Communist regime goes on. We in our turn owe it to them, and to our principles, to remain steadfast in support of their struggle. The Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, of which I was a cosponsor, established a policy, now carried out by the Clinton administration, which is to maintain pressure on the Castro regime for peaceful democratic and market reform.

Mr. President, it is pleasing to note that we are seeing progress as a result of that policy. Without Soviet aid, the Cuban economy continues to deteriorate. With freedom and democracy growing throughout the Western Hemisphere, Castro cannot long silence the voices of the Cuban people in an era marked by a growing wave of self-determination and democracy. The Cuban people will not long be stifled in their desire to realize for themselves the better life that millions and millions more people around the world have achieved within the last decade. So by any reasonable calculus, by any rational predictor of the course of history, the days of the Castro regime are numbered.

The question that the substitute before us poses is should we now relent and allow the Cuban economy to expand? Should we give Castro thereby a new lease on life? Should we leave the Cuban people to suffer longer under what remains as an oppressive regime? Or instead, should we increase our economic pressure on Cuba which is working? Should we renew our commitment to a peaceful transition to democracy and political and economic freedom?

That is the choice we now face. And my answer to the question is to choose the latter course; to increase the economic pressure, and to strongly renew our commitment to a peaceful transition for the Cuban people to economic opportunity and political freedom.

The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act builds on the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992. It is a continuation and a strengthening of a policy that is working. This bill extends the economic sanctions to keep economic pressure on the regime in Cuba. At the same time, it extends a message of hope to the Cuban people by establish-

ing a basis for United States assistance to the democratic Cuba of the future.

Mr. President, the triumph of freedom over communism—the worldwide triumph of freedom over communism—cannot be considered complete while the people of Cuba, our neighbors, remain oppressed by a dictator on their island in our hemisphere.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this substitute. Changes have been made which I think improve the measure from the original introduced, and which I hope will broaden the base of those in both parties who can support this proposal.

Tonight, if that is when the vote on cloture occurs, I intend to vote for cloture. And I urge my colleagues of both parties to do likewise.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

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. BUMPERS. 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. BUMPERS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The issue before the Senate is the second-degree amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] to a first-degree amendment to the Cuba bill.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be temporarily laid aside that I be allowed up to 10 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

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

#### NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, this is really a very gratifying time for me to speak on this subject because it goes back to the time of my first year in the Senate, 1975.

I was put on the space committee by the Democratic steering committee. I did not request to be put on that committee and I did not want to be on it. We did not have much of anything to do.

And so after I had been here for a few months, I went to the chairman of the committee, Ted Moss, who was the senior Senator from Utah at the time, and I said, "Ted, I don't mind telling you I'm bored around here. I have been Governor, and there is a lot of action in the Governor's office. There is none here for a freshman with no clout."

I said I had been reading a theory that has been publicized by two chemists at the University of California-Irvine, named Rowland and Molina. "They have this theory they say they have worked out in a lab that shows"—and at that time this was how simple the idea was to me—"that the hair sprays we use on our hair in the bathroom in the morning over a period of

about 15 years waft their way into the stratosphere and they destroy a three-celled molecule called ozone, and that the ozone layer is what protects us from the ultraviolet rays of the Sun. It seems like an intriguing theory to me, very possibly true, and I would like to be able to chair just some ad hoc hearings and have people come in from around the country to testify for or against the Rowland and Molina theory."

Senator Moss said that was fine, I could do that, but I needed to get a Republican colleague to help me. So I recruited my good friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, who had not been here much longer than I had. I asked him: "Will you join me and we will hold hearings. We will get some atmospheric scientists from around the country to come in and testify." He said he would be glad to.

So we did. We held nine hearings. We had Dr. Elroy from Harvard, who was considered the premier atmospheric scientist in America. We had Dr. Robert Otten, who was the author of the greenhouse theory. And then finally we had Dr. Sherwood Rowland, who, along with Dr. Mario Molina, developed the theory of ozone depletion.

You can imagine how much publicity it got. Senators do not go to a hearing unless there are a lot of television cameras with their red lights on, and there were no television cameras interested in ozone depletion. So we were pretty lonely holding these hearings. And when it was over, I suggested that we offer a bill or an amendment in this Chamber at the earliest possible time to ban or to phase-out the production of what we call CFC's, chlorofluorocarbons, at the earliest possible time.

Senator DOMENICI did not think the hearings were conclusive enough to do that, and I could understand that because there were a lot of people in the country who were very reticent about accepting this theory.

Well, I heard that my colleague, Senator Packwood, who was on the Environment and Public Works Committee at the time, had an interest in it, so I went to see Senator Packwood. I told him about the hearings. I said I thought he and I ought to team up and see if we could not stop the manufacture of these so-called chlorofluorocarbons and he said he thought that it was a great idea. So we spent several hours talking about it. And then we offered the amendment.

And when it came time to vote, Mr. President, that hallway directly in front of me was so full of chemical industry lobbyists you could not get in here to vote. At that time this was a \$2 billion-a-year industry. When I saw that, I did not think we had much chance anyway; but when I saw that crowd out in the hallway, I knew we did not have a chance.

I think we got 32, possibly 35 votes. And believe you me, that was the most

liberal Senate I have ever seen. I shudder to think how many votes we would get under a similar situation today.

But the arguments abounded on this floor that this is not conclusive; there is not enough evidence to disrupt this industry. And we were only trying to phase it out; we were not trying to kill it all at one time. And all those industry arguments made about how this was even a conspiracy of the Soviet Union KGB, a disinformation attack by the Soviet KGB to sow seeds of discord in the United States.

My argument was simply this: If it takes 15 years for these chlorofluorocarbons to work their way into the stratosphere, even if we banned all CFC's at that moment, it would be 15 years before we would begin to reverse the damage that had already been done.

And I said, "This is the time, if there ever was a time, to err on the side of caution." These comments are not self-serving. I actually said those things on the floor of the Senate. I said them to everybody I could find to say them to, that I thought our committee hearings had produced enough evidence that the ozone depletion theory was real, that we ought to err on the side of caution and no great damage would be done if we were wrong.

Mr. President, we were not wrong. We were dead right. And the National Academy of Sciences started their studies. And in 1985, thanks to a slightly separate theory by Paul Crutzen, who was also honored yesterday, of the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, Germany we discovered the hole in the ozone layer developing over Antarctica. And it created such a stir in this Nation that we had the big 1987 Montreal Protocol. We agreed to phase out the manufacture of all chlorofluorocarbons—and, incidentally, the principal one being Freon gas in your refrigerators and automobile air conditioners—that we would phase out the manufacture of all of those by this year, 1995, and hopefully we are going to.

So, Mr. President, I really came to the floor to say, No. 1, I told you so—and that will get you about a half of one vote to say, "I told you so"—but more importantly than anything else, to extend my profound and sincere thanks and congratulations to Mario Molina, who was just a postdoctoral fellow working under "Sherry" Sherwood Rowland. Everyone calls him Sherry. Yesterday they were awarded the Nobel prize for chemistry, along with Dr. Crutzen, the three of them.

I cannot tell you how gratifying it is to me that the Nobel committee has chosen two people I feel that I have known all of my public life. As I say, I just came here this afternoon to publicly say on the Senate floor this Nation owes those two men a deep debt of gratitude. I am most grateful that we have people like that in this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I might first make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is there a consent order about voting today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a consent order under which a vote on cloture will take place at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. DOMENICI. On the pending matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I precede that with a remark to my good friend, Senator BUMPERS, after which I will go on in morning business?

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to Senator BUMPERS, I did not get here in time to listen to all of his remarks, but I vividly recall that we served on a little subcommittee. I was on that subcommittee, I might share with my friend and the Chair, because freshmen Senators then did not get very good assignments. And so one of my assignments was to the Public Works Committee, now Environment and Public Works. And that was a top assignment then because the senior Senator from New Mexico, who was a Democrat, was also on that committee, and he was second from the top.

I was not only on the Republican side, but I was the last and brandnew person. And then they gave me a seat on Space, which was being phased out. And it is in one of those subcommittees under the rubric of space that the Senator and I held hearings on this very strange phenomenon from whence came the Nobel awardees because of their research. I think that little subcommittee was the first to hold a hearing.

Mr. BUMPERS. Absolutely.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am not sure I understood the breadth at that point, but clearly while there are not answers on all of it, there are some very significant answers, and we have done a great deal in the United States against tough odds in reference to the combinations that are occurring out there, some of which we were causing with what we used.

I compliment the Senator on the remarks and compliment the awardees. I do not know them as well as the Senator does. I think it is rather a sensational award, and people ought to continue to do work like that if there are going to be Nobel awards for them for that kind of exciting work.

#### TRIBUTE TO RACHEL SCHLESINGER

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my wife Nancy and

my family, I would like to speak a few moments about Rachel Schlesinger, who died this past Tuesday. For the most part, when we hear the word "Schlesinger" around here, we think of Rachel's husband, Jim Schlesinger, who has held some very high Cabinet posts with both Democratic and Republican Presidents. But I do not want to speak about him today.

I want to just take a few minutes in my way to speak about Rachel Schlesinger, who died this past Tuesday. There are going to be a lot of eulogies for Rachel because there are so many of us who were touched in some special way by this remarkable woman. Let me add a few personal thoughts and sentiments about her.

Rachel, in my opinion, personified what one committed individual can do for those who are less fortunate, those who need special help, and those who cannot always fend for themselves. She was a gentle and unassuming lady. Those of us who saw her in action knew that behind her quiet exterior was a person of great strength and dedication to issues of importance to her and, in many instances, to her family.

Years before the issue of mental illness became as well understood as it is today, Rachel Schlesinger was speaking out and advocating for more research about this disease.

She testified in behalf of the mentally ill. She offered her support to those small, but valiant, organizations who worked so hard to share the message of this dread disease, which we now call mental illness or mental disease.

My wife reminded me how amazed she was that just a few months ago, while suffering her own health battles, she attended a meeting of the National Alliance of the Mentally Ill and was as gracious and friendly as ever, while suffering immensely from the disease that would finally cause her demise.

Rachel always believed more could and should be done to find a cure for mental illness, be it schizophrenia, manic depression, bipolar illness, or any of the dread illnesses that we choose now to call mental illness or mental disease.

She was a strong influential and outspoken communicator about this issue. We appreciate deeply all of her help, her selfless energies in behalf of this cause.

Another example of Rachel Schlesinger's great heart was her concern for the homeless. We remember that she handed out sandwiches from a food wagon. She was one who took time from her own busy schedule to lend a hand to those in need. Today, people say, and we learn this from our young generation, "If you're going to talk the talk, you better walk the walk." Well, Rachel was one of those who really did, she walked the walk.

Let me also mention one other facet of her life that so many people close to her admired, and that was her love of music. As a musician herself, Rachel