

saw music as a private expression of oneself as well as something that should be nurtured for the community and by the community.

Literally up until a few days before she died, she was a driving force in fundraising for the Arlington Symphony Orchestra. She had founded and for many years she had managed the highly acclaimed Arlington "Pops" concerts. She opened up her home on countless occasions for the orchestra's donor activities. No work or effort was too much to ensure that it survived.

She believed, quite simply, that music was a love that could be shared with others. She could be found wherever and whenever help was needed, and her devotion and great spirit will be forever remembered and missed by all those who benefited from and shared her deep love and passion of this beautiful music that she became so attached to.

Mr. President, some will comment in the days ahead about Rachel Schlesinger's full life, her exciting ventures in far places of the Earth, her wonderful family of eight children and her devoted husband who respected and admired her so deeply. All of these comments will be heartfelt and true. I would just like to close with the thoughts that Rachel was a very special person to those of us who were touched by her, by her enthusiasm and her personal commitment to so many good causes and important issues.

I share my wife Nancy's simple but heartfelt summation: "Rachel was, most of all, a caring person."

To her family and many friends, Nancy and I join you in our thoughts and our prayers and joy in having known a remarkable and wonderful lady, Rachel Schlesinger.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1976, the agriculture appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 28, 1995.)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that we successfully concluded the conference with the House on September 28 on the Agriculture appropriations bill. We worked out our differences. The other body has adopted the conference agreement, and it is now before the Senate. I urge the Senate to adopt it.

This bill appropriates funds for the Department of Agriculture, the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, the Food and Drug Administration and related agencies for the fiscal year that began October 1.

The funding level in the bill is \$63.2 billion. This represents a reduction in spending of \$5.8 billion from last year's level. It is less than the President's requested level of funding for these programs for the next year. It is actually a smaller amount than we agreed to when this bill was before the Senate. It is \$631 million less than the total appropriated by the Senate-passed bill, but it is \$615 million more than the level recommended in the House bill. I am pleased to report that the discretionary spending level is \$13.3 billion in budget authority and \$13.6 billion in outlays and that these amounts are within the subcommittee's discretionary spending allocations.

There are things that can be said about the fact that we do not have enough funds to provide levels of support that we would like for many areas under the jurisdiction of this committee, but this is a time of constraint, it is a time when we are trying to reduce the overall costs of Government, insist upon new efficiencies in the operation of Government agencies, and this bill is, therefore, consistent with our overall budgetary goals and policy goals.

The committee of conference on this bill considered 160 amendments in disagreement between the two Houses. It was our desire to complete conference on this bill before the start of the new fiscal year and we did that. I would like to thank all members of the conference committee for their support and cooperation in this effort. I believe this conference report reflects a mutually satisfactory resolution of the differences between the two Houses, and does so in a manner which reflects the funding requirements of the many programs and activities covered by the bill within the limited resources available.

Approximately \$39.8 billion, close to 63 percent of the total new budget authority provided by this bill, is for domestic food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Excluding the Food Stamp Program reserve, this represents an increase of \$1.5 billion above the fiscal year 1995 level for these programs, which include food stamps; commodity assistance; the special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children

[WIC]; and the school lunch and breakfast programs.

The \$260 million increase above fiscal year 1995 for the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program, as recommended in both the House and Senate bills, remains the single largest discretionary program funding increase provided by this bill.

The conference agreement accepts the House bill proposal to consolidate funding for commodity food assistance programs and provides \$166 million for this purpose. It also provides the House recommended level of \$65 million, \$32 million above the fiscal year 1995 level, for the Food Donations Program on Indian reservations; and maintains the fiscal year 1995 level of \$150 million, as proposed by the House, for the Elderly Feeding Program.

The House bill recommended no fiscal year 1996 funding for a Food Stamp Program reserve. The Senate bill provided \$1 billion for this purpose. The conferees have resolved this difference by agreeing to provide a \$500 million Food Stamp Program reserve. Although this reserve has not been required for a period of years, this amount will assure that sufficient funds are available to cover benefits in the event of an economic downturn or unforeseen event resulting in increased program participation levels.

With respect to rural development programs, the Senate-passed bill consolidated funding for seven rural development loan and grant programs, while the House bill consolidated funding for three programs—water and waste disposal grants and loans and solid waste management grants. The conferees have adopted the House bill position and have provided a total of \$487.9 million for this consolidated account. The conferees also have provided \$2.9 billion in total rural housing loan authorizations, \$415 million more than the House and \$42 million less than the Senate bill levels.

I am also pleased to report that the Senate bill's higher levels for farm operating and ownership loans were retained by the conferees. Loan authorizations totaling \$2.45 billion are provided for these important farmer assistance programs.

For discretionary conservation programs, the conferees have provided total funding of \$857.7 million. The conference agreement also retains the Senate recommendation providing for the enrollment of an additional 100,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program, the same as the fiscal year 1995 level.

In addition, this conference agreement provides \$53.6 million for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. It retains a number of Senate bill provisions, including the provision regarding poultry labeling regulations issued by the USDA, a provision which limits eligibility for the market promotion program, and a provision prohibiting the use of FDA funds for the Board of Tea Exports.

Mr. President, I realize that sacrifices are required of everyone if we are to reduce the Federal budget deficit. However, I regret that the resources required to be allocated in this bill to maintain essential food assistance benefits continues to reduce the remaining portion of the bill allocated to those programs so essential to agriculture and to rural America. These are beneficial programs. They help America's farmers to be competitive both here and abroad; they provide essential services to people in rural towns and communities across this Nation; they work to conserve and protect our Nation's natural resources.

Mr. President, Senate approval of this conference agreement is the remaining step required to send this appropriations bill to the President for signature into law.

I am proud of the work that the committee has done, both in developing the bill to present to the Senate and in conference. I hope the Senate will approve it.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his generous comments and his leadership for making possible the presentation of the conference agreement for the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies. This has been a very difficult year, but we have been able to reach an agreement with the House which has resulted in this conference report and I urge my colleagues to support it.

This conference report contains \$63.2 billion in new budget authority which is \$630.5 million below the bill passed by the Senate earlier this year and nearly \$5.8 billion below the amount contained in the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. I must point out to my colleagues that these reductions have not been taken lightly nor will they be lightly received. For far too long, this subcommittee has seen a dwindling of resources available to us to make the increasingly difficult choices of budget priorities. The programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee are often overlooked or misunderstood in their importance to our Nation as a whole and to the specific groups these programs are designed to serve. They do deserve our attention and they deserve our support. I only wish the allocation provided this subcommittee would have allowed us to do more.

The programs funded by this bill are programs that touch upon the lives of nearly every American. These programs range from school lunch and nutrition education for our Nation's children to promoting and enriching the research capacity on the land grant campuses across the country. These programs will enhance soil and water conservation, as well as promote the export of U.S. products, and provide

humanitarian assistance in areas of deprivation. Included in this bill are programs designed to provide housing to the poor, a better business climate for companies seeking to locate in rural areas, and better habitat for our Nation's wildlife. The funding included in this bill will protect the capacity of our Nation to produce an abundant and safe food supply for our people as many around the world.

This conference report contains more than \$700 million for the Agricultural Research Service and \$850 million for activities of the Cooperative State Research and Extension Services. This combined investment of more than \$1.5 billion in research and extension will be an important contribution to improve the quality and efficiencies of our Nation's productive capacity and make us more competitive in world markets.

Also provided is nearly \$545 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This amount is slightly above the amount provided by the House, but somewhat below the Senate figure. The Government's role in food safety is at a critical juncture as we move away from the organoleptic method toward a more effective microbiological inspection system based on sound science. The importance of the work of this agency must not be underestimated and I am concerned that higher levels of funding may be necessary during the transition of moving toward the updated system. Everyone has a stake in this challenge, including the producer, the processor, the marketer, and ultimately the consumer whose reliance on the integrity of this agency's mission must be without question.

In the area of conservation, this conference report provides \$630 million for the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Conservation Operation account to provide technical assistance and guidance to improve water quality, check soil erosion, and better protect our natural resource base. One hundred million dollars is provided to provide watershed and flood prevention services and \$77 million is included to enroll an additional 100,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program.

One of the areas in which the Senate was at strong disagreement with the House was that of rural development. To a large extent, the conference agreement more closely resembles the more acceptable funding levels contained in the Senate provisions. The section 502 rural housing program level was maintained at the Senate figure of \$2.7 billion, an increase of \$450 million above the House level. The water and wastewater programs provided through the Rural Utilities Assistance Program are included with nearly \$500 million in new budget authority, an amount more than \$50 million higher than that proposed by the House. Also, additional funds may be available for these programs if carryover funds in the WIC Program exceed \$100 million.

I do not know if carryover funds in WIC will exceed this amount. WIC is an extremely important program as well, and I hope that the WIC Program will be able to expand in a manner to utilize all available funds. However, if the carryover in this account continues to grow as it has in the past, I can think of no better use of these funds than to provide safe water and sanitary conditions to households which, in many cases, may be WIC recipient households as well.

In the area of nutrition, nearly \$8 million in child nutrition programs is provided, \$27.6 billion for the Food Stamp Program, and more than \$3.7 billion for the WIC Program, an increase of \$260 million above last year's level. The amount included in the conference report for domestic food programs exceeds that of all other programs combined, as it has in recent years. The conference report provides \$39.8 billion in domestic food programs which is 63 percent of the total amount provided in this Act.

The conference report also provides \$125 million for the Foreign Agricultural Service to promote the export of U.S. commodities including an increase for the foreign market development program. The market promotion program is included at the fiscal year 1995 level but with an amendment similar to the Senate provision prohibiting the allocation of Federal funds to large companies for branded advertising. During these times of fiscal constraint when funding is being reduced for rural housing, water and sewer programs, and many other services crucial for human welfare, it is incredible that we have been providing Federal grants to companies—many of which have advertising budgets of their own totalling millions of dollars—to advertise their products. The conference agreement contains a limitation on this program that is a first step in bringing some sanity to this program and helping restore taxpayer confidence in our ability to manage their hard earned tax dollars.

Mr. President, there are many other important items contained in this conference report that I will not take time to mention here. As I stated earlier, the programs in this act are vitally important to all Americans and I only wish our allocation had been more generous in order for us to provide greater assistance in areas that will otherwise suffer this coming year. I understand there has been some concern that savings were achieved from limitations on mandatory programs and, as former chairman of an authorizing committee, I empathize with those that may feel we should not have realized those savings. I can only respond by restating that this has been a most difficult year and savings from mandatory programs were only achieved when absolutely necessary and in areas where it was understood to cause the least harm. I honestly hope that the allocation process for fiscal year 1997 will not result in

the same pressures on our subcommittee as we have seen again this year. I must also honestly admit that I do not hold out much hope that such improvement is likely.

In closing, I want to say again what a pleasure it has been to work with my good friend and colleague from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN. He has, once again, proved that he has an excellent knowledge of the programs held under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee and that he is extremely fair and thoughtful in the deliberations culminating in the presentation of this conference report.

Mr. President, let me say that this has been a very difficult, difficult year for all of us in trying to start honestly toward a balanced budget by the year 2002. It has been especially difficult for some of us who are totally committed to the viability of America's agricultural system.

I had been out of town and I read a 2-week old *Newsweek* magazine last night. The article referred to the anger of the middle class. The article contained interviews of several people who expressed their views about Congress, with the usual statements: "Those clowns will never balance the budget." "The place is totally controlled by lobbyists." "I've lost faith in our country and our Government."

In all honesty, I relate and understand their anger and hostility. But I also want to say that I wish I could visit personally with each one of those people who made those remarks about what is going on here.

I would like to point out to them that this budget in this agriculture bill is almost \$6 billion—\$6 billion—less than last year.

The presiding Senator at this very moment, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, has just gone through the same kind of cuts in his subcommittee, and they are painful and they alienate still more people who lose some of their benefits, because it has been a draconian time here.

So I want to just say this bill, in my opinion, protects the things that really must be protected. It cuts where we feel we can afford to cut and, at the same time, provide, as best we can, for a viable agricultural economy in the country.

Mr. President, let me close by saying, despite the trauma of trying to craft a bill with these terrible, really, big cuts, it has been made much easier by working with my good friend, Senator COCHRAN, from Mississippi, whose knowledge of agricultural programs and, particularly, those programs in the agricultural appropriations bill, is legendary. He has been as careful as he could be about the interests of various Senators, but he has also been very realistic with them in telling them the so-called good old days are gone. You cannot accommodate all the requests here, all the interests. And considering the amount of money we had to spend, he has done an absolutely superb job.

Let me make one other comment because it goes without saying that I have always been unalterably opposed to the idea of term limitations. I listened to some of that debate last night. I felt like I was virtually the only one in the country that is opposed to term limits. The American people may favor term limits, but when you do, you lose the institutional memory, the unbelievable knowledge of people like Senator COCHRAN in areas like this. When you lose that, and the integrity and dedication of people like that, you lose something that takes a long time to rebuild.

So it was an honor for me, as ranking member on this committee, to work with him. I think we have come up with a bill that does everything we could possibly do within the limits and the amount of money we had.

I strongly recommend passage of this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the kind and generous remarks of my good friend and colleague from Arkansas. His support, assistance, and leadership in developing this bill and help in managing it on the floor of the Senate were greatly appreciated and very important to the final work product that was turned out by the Senate.

I hope that Senators will support the conference report, as recommended by both managers and both sides of the aisle. When this bill passed the Senate, it passed on a record vote, with only three dissenting votes. I think that is a strong statement of support that existed for the passage of our bill, and I am glad to say that much of the compromise that was necessary reflected many of the recommendations the Senate made during the conference. But it was a give and take and a very fair conference in every sense of the word.

I would like to make one further clarification with respect to the conference agreement on this bill. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report inadvertently fails to explain the conference committee's agreement regarding Agricultural Research Service laboratories proposed for closure in the President's fiscal year 1996 budget. The conference agreement provides funding to maintain the El Reno, OK; Sidney, MT; Clemson, SC, and Miami, FL, ARS laboratories. The other locations not transferred to non-Federal ownership, as proposed by both the House and Senate, are to be maintained as ARS worksites. The Houma facility is to be used as a work site of the ARS Center in New Orleans, LA.

Mr. BUMPERS. I was wondering if my colleague would take a moment to reiterate and confirm what is my understanding of the conference committee's actions concerning the Department of Agriculture's fresh poultry labeling rule. I understand that, by including the Senate-passed bill provision in the conference report, the conferees intended to prevent the final rule which was promulgated on August

25, 1995, from taking effect, and also to prevent USDA from using any funds to implement or enforce this regulation as promulgated. Is that my colleague's understanding as well?

Mr. COCHRAN. I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Arkansas raising this question. I would say to my friend that this is my understanding of the effect of the conference committee's action as well. As you may recall, the regulation as promulgated did not reflect the Department's findings in scientific research. It included a misleading label for those products not qualifying to be labeled "fresh" or "frozen." I would also remind my colleague that the Department's final regulation did not include any temperature variance for products. Therefore, the language of this act makes it clear that the rule as published on August 25 shall never go into effect unless the conditions of this statutory language is met. The burden is now upon USDA to submit a regulation to the appropriate committees for approval which resolves these critical issues in a satisfactory manner. I thank my colleague for his inquiry.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would be grateful if Senator BROWN would, for a moment, engage in a colloquy with me to discuss the intent of his amendment on bypass flows. This issue is very complicated. I would like to assure that we are clear on what facilities would be affected. Additionally, the Department of Agriculture is concerned that the amendment does not allow, among other things, its Office of General Counsel to defend litigation concerning administrative decisions of the USDA officials.

Mr. BROWN. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss further the intent of my amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill.

The provision I am speaking of is section 732 of the general provisions title in the conference report dealing with a water issue. After meetings with Secretary Glickman and his staff, we have come to an understanding regarding what this provision does. This amendment does not apply to new facilities. Further, the amendment would not apply to authorizations to expand facilities or their operations. This amendment only applies where the operators of facilities are applying for authorizations to continue operating in the same manner as they have been operating.

This amendment neither addresses the ability of the Department of Agriculture to assert administrative or judicial claims to water or water rights, nor defending proper administrative decisions of USDA officials.

Mr. BUMPERS. I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report accompanying the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The conference report provides \$62.6 billion in new budget authority [BA]

and \$45.6 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies.

All of the funding in this bill is nondefense spending.

When outlays for prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the final bill totals \$63.2 billion in BA and \$52.7 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1996.

The subcommittee is at its 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee 602(b) allocation totals \$63.2 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$52.8 billion in outlays. Within this amount, \$13.3 billion in BA and \$13.6 billion in outlays is for discretionary spending.

For discretionary spending in the conference report, the bill is essentially at the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for both BA and outlays.

The bill is \$1.6 billion in BA and \$1.1 billion in outlays below the President's budget request for these programs. It is essentially at the House-passed bill level in BA and \$26.5 million below the House bill in outlays. The conference report is \$405.7 million BA and \$759.4 million in outlays below the 1995 level.

The conference report includes mandatory savings of \$389 million in BA and \$249 million in outlays which are used to offset discretionary spending. Some of the savings duplicate those in the reconciliation bill.

The Congress is currently working on an omnibus budget reconciliation bill that seeks to achieve a balanced Federal budget by the year 2002. Congress must work to minimize the double counting of mandatory savings in the appropriations bills and the reconciliation bill in order to reach a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the final bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE—SPENDING TOTALS—
CONFERENCE REPORT

[Fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Nondefense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed		3,751
H.R. 1976, conference report	13,310	9,814
Scorekeeping adjustment		
Subtotal nondefense discretionary	13,310	13,566
Mandatory:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed	501	3,337
H.R. 1976, conference report	49,277	35,791
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs with Budget:		
Resolution assumptions	64	49
Subtotal mandatory	49,842	39,177
Adjusted bill total	63,152	52,743
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary	13,310	13,608
Violent crime reduction trust fund		

AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE—SPENDING TOTALS—
CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued
[Fiscal year 1996, in millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Mandatory	49,842	39,177
Total allocation	63,152	52,785
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary		
Nondefense discretionary		- 42
Violent crime reduction trust fund		
Mandatory		
Total allocation		- 42

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I want to express my great disappointment with a key provision of the conference report for H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 Agricultural appropriations bill. I deeply regret that important funding for the tribally controlled community colleges in the United States was largely cut from the bill.

During the Senate debate on H.R. 1976, I was successful in offering an amendment which provided \$4 million in extension and academic improvement funds to our nations tribal colleges. I was greatly assisted by Senators BINGAMAN, CONRAD, DOMENICI, and INOUE all joined me in this worthy effort.

While a relatively small amount compared to the over \$1 billion that will be spent at other universities throughout the United States, this \$4 million appropriation would have been a great boost to our long-neglected tribal colleges. They receive virtually no State or local funding, and are in desperate need of Federal assistance.

This conference report represents an unhealthy dose of the status quo in this regard. There are hundreds of millions of dollars for large State universities, and a few token dollars metered out to Indian colleges and universities.

Of course, the students educated at these tribal colleges, over 20,000 nationwide, are striving to build a future for themselves after growing up in the poorest communities in America. The level of poverty that faces native Americans would astound most of their fellow citizens.

The funds that I and a group of my concerned colleagues were seeking for tribal colleges were fully authorized in 1994 by legislation which gave partial "land grant status to tribal colleges and institutions. This designation was long overdue, for tribal colleges reside in largely rural areas, and Indian reservations are comprised of tens of millions of acres of agricultural land. Agricultural programs at tribal colleges would be a solid investment in Indian students and their communities.

For over a century the U.S. Department of Agriculture has provided large amounts of funding to State land grant colleges and historically black colleges. These funds support agricultural research, education, and extension services. It is time we recognized the vital mission of America's tribal col-

leges as well. This conference report was a prime opportunity to do so, yet we have faltered again.

Deleting the \$2.55 million that the Senate version of H.R. 1976 contained for extension programs at tribal colleges was unfair and unnecessary. It is yet another example of how little attention or concern is often given to the needs of native Americans by this body. At a time when several universities in the United States will receive over \$20 million each from the Department of Agriculture—and others have received as much as \$40 million in a single year—the managers of this bill cut the extremely modest amount provided to tribal colleges.

Let me make it quite clear that there was no reason for these funds to be revoked, except perhaps for the Senate to maintain its record of consistent inattentiveness to the plight of many native Americans. I oppose the conference report for this unnecessary and harmful deletion of funds. I will renew my efforts to assist our Nation's tribal colleges and Indian students at each appropriate opportunity in the upcoming year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BUMPERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC
SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF
1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2898

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, am I correct that the pending business is the amendment offered by Senator DOLE as a substitute to H.R. 927?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is my purpose today to reiterate my support as an original cosponsor of legislation introduced by Senator HELMS, now the substitute amendment offered by Senator DOLE, to the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act.

I was the Senate sponsor in 1992 of the Cuban Democracy Act.

This legislation reiterated the policy of the United States relative to the