

Russell, KS, without the benefit of a Jewish education, so they moved to Wichita where Hilda became super-intendent to the Hebrew school. When they found the Jewish education there insufficient, they moved to Denver. When that proved insufficient, they moved to New York City. When that was not enough, they moved to Jerusalem where Hilda and Arthur now reside—except for periodic visits to the United States to help in my many campaigns.

Hilda Specter Morgenstern is a model wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother. She is a real matriarch of the family. She tackles with equal ease an analysis of the ABM Treaty to help me in my Senate duties, or the change of diapers for her new, great-grandson.

I have urged her to follow the model of Golda Meir, the Milwaukee-born American, who later became Prime Minister of Israel. Hilda responded by telling me to become President of the United States first.

Happy 74th birthday, Hilda.

IN HONOR OF MORTON SPECTER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, 2 days from today, on October 19, 1993, the second anniversary will be marked of the passing of my brother, Morton Specter, an honest, hard-working American who paid more than enough taxes to be memorialized in a brief statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the eulogy which I delivered at his funeral in October 1993.

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

Ours is a very close family, so Morton's passing came as a real shock—not that it was totally unexpected because he had many medical problems—but perhaps a family is never really prepared for the finality of it all.

The words "family value" were never used in the Specter household. It wasn't necessary because we had them without talking about them. They evolved naturally from the example of our parents who struggled to achieve for their children what they never had—education and opportunity. As the oldest of four children, Morton set the example for Hilda, Shirley, and me. None of us would even consider doing less than our best or doing anything to embarrass our parents, considering their sacrifices.

The 1920's Depression left its mark on Morton at the tender age of ten. From his earliest days, he was a tireless worker—the hardest worker I've ever seen. At 11 or 12, he rode his bicycle on the streets of Wichita delivering bills of lading to railroad offices for Beyer Grain Co. As a teenager, he would go after dark to the golf courses, and wade the lakes to find golf balls which he would make sparkling white with peroxide bleach and sell in downtown office buildings.

When he wanted to get a job to earn money right after high school, my father talked him into going to Wichita U. for one year which turned into four and a college degree. In college he boxed, careful to protect his strik-

ingly handsome face, and acted in the school plays. He made a short trip to Hollywood when he was 19 or 20—hoping, I think to meet—or maybe even to become another Robert Taylor.

During World War II he answered the call of his country and went to Officers Candidate School and became an Ensign. We talked about reading the text books at that school after lights were out with a flashlight under his blanket.

After the war, he sold magazines door to door. His crew chief Walter Lewis said he covered twice as many houses as anyone else. I joined him in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, in June 1945 and at the first house we visited, where he was showing me the sales speech, the lady complimented him on being a super salesman. When he approached one house, a young girl ran excitedly to the house shouting: "Mommie, Mommie, here comes Dennis Morgan"—then a famous movie actor.

After the war he joined our father and Hilda's husband, Arthur Morgenstern, at the Russell Iron & Metal Co.—at first a junkyard, then an oil field equipment company and ultimately modest oil production.

He worked long hours Monday through Saturday, making telephone calls in the evenings, and on Sundays he would drive to the surrounding counties to look at oil rigs to salvage.

Morton did find time to meet and marry a beautiful young woman, Joyce Hacker. She stood by his side sharing his strenuous work schedules and the Kansas hot summers and windy cold winters. Last November 19th, they celebrated their 50th anniversary—a very rare quality in modern America. Joyce's steadfast devotion to Morton—especially during the last difficult years—was extraordinary.

Hilda, Shirley, and I returned to Kansas often to visit Morton and Joyce just as they traveled to our homes—as long as he was able. Our family was always on the telephone. Morton would also often call his nephews and nieces and their children and his aunts and uncles and cousins. He was a generous man, making certain his contribution to Allied Jewish Appeal was completed before the end of each year.

Morton made many trips to and through Pennsylvania to help on our many campaigns. There's nothing like a brother or a sister traveling upstate to local newspaper and radio stations to talk about their candidate brother.

When I saw him last Monday at the Wesley Hospital in Wichita, he wanted to know what was going on in the Senate and how Bob Dole was doing.

Bob's father and our father were friends in Russell more than 50 years ago. In the 1940's Harry Specter weighed truckloads of junk at the Russell Grainery operated by Doran Dole.

Our parents were very proud of him. How often I heard our mother Lillie Shanin Specter call him her "Motala." He will rest beside her as he expressed his wish during his lifetime in Montefiore Cemetery. For my sisters and me, he was a role model of integrity and hard work. He was a man of total honesty who valued his good name and impeccable reputation.

We have not waited until his funeral to tell him how we feel. We have expressed our feelings over the years—by words, but more importantly by deeds—visits and calls and caring.

For Joyce and our entire family and his many friends—I say: We all loved him very much and we all will miss him very much.

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY [LIBERTAD] ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I support the cloture motion which will be voted on this afternoon at 5 o'clock, because I believe that it is very important that this legislation be considered by the Senate and acted upon by the Senate.

While I ordinarily support an active international role for the United States and active involvement with other nations around the world, I believe that the current situation in Cuba presents a situation where we ought not to do anything to strengthen the hand of Fidel Castro. I believe that the legislation will increase the pressure on the Castro regime and lay the groundwork for future U.S. support for a democratic transition.

The State Department's 1994 human rights report to Congress paints a grotesque picture of repression by the Castro regime. It shows Government-organized mob attacks on dissidents. It shows nationwide political surveillance. It shows extrajudicial killings of Cubans attempting to flee; for example, the sinking of boats loaded with refugees by Government forces last year. It shows, by every significant human rights standard, the Castro regime has an appalling record on freedom of speech, of assembly, and freedom from arbitrary arrest.

Castro has been largely immune to the democratic changes that have swept the hemisphere during the past 10 years and what that regime has in common with totalitarian states such as the ones created by Erich Honecker in East Germany and Kim Il-song in North Korea.

Mr. President, the legislation will be a significant step forward in isolating Fidel Castro and in hastening the day when democracy can return to Cuba so that that community, that nation, may be liberated from Castro's totalitarian regime and may take its place in the family of nations as a productive nation and a productive society.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, at the outset, I want to make it clear that I strongly endorse the central objective of H.R. 927, namely, the peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. The Cuban people have too long been deprived the freedoms of speech, association, and self-expression. Like almost every American, I want to see that the repression of the Cuban people by the Cuban Government is ended. And, like almost every American, I want to see that long overdue economic reforms in Cuba are implemented, so that ordinary Cuban people can improve their standard of living.

These are not, however, the questions before the Senate. What is before the Senate is H.R. 927, and what we have to decide is whether the provisions of this bill will help move Cuba toward freedom, democracy, and greater economic

opportunity, or not. I would like to say that I believe the bill will work, but the simple fact is that it will not.

This legislation pursues a laudable objective the wrong way. It seeks to increase the pressure and isolation of Cuba by further tightening the trade embargo and encouraging United States allies and trading partners to terminate their trade relations with Cuba through punitive and retributive measures. That policy cannot and will not work.

The United States approach to Cuba has been virtually unchanged since the early 1960's. Since then, the United States has maintained a comprehensive trade embargo to isolate the Castro regime politically, to weaken it economically and, thereby, to pressure the Cuban Government into making the desired reforms. H.R. 927 is simply the latest in a series of legislative proposals that purport to provide the final push that will force the Cuban Government over the brink.

This new final push, though, is perhaps even less likely than the series of past final pushes to succeed, because it is not based on the economic, political, and diplomatic facts. Despite close to 35 years of U.S. trade embargo, the Castro regime remains in place.

Even more importantly, the embargo represents a policy orientation that the rest of the world seems to be abandoning. Our most loyal allies and other countries do not support the United States position on Cuba. In fact, the United States is the only country in the Western Hemisphere with a trade embargo of Cuba and one of only five countries that does not have formal ties with Cuba.

Moreover, it was only last year, October 1994, that the world community soundly rejected a proposal that was similar to H.R. 927—one that would broaden the embargo against Cuba—by a vote of 101 to 2. Apparently, our neighbors in the hemisphere and allies around the world believe that dialog and engagement, not confrontation, isolation, and threats, are the best ways to encourage change in Cuba.

The fact is that, without support of our allies and other countries, unilateral United States action against Cuba is unlikely to succeed and could have the unintended effect of unnecessarily increasing friction between the United States and its allies and trading partners.

For economic sanctions to work, strong international cooperation is required. When we have that cooperation, as in the case of South Africa, sanctions can work and can make sense as a policy alternative. The success of the sanctions directed at South Africa was due, almost exclusively, to our ability to convince our allies and other countries, through moral suasion, not punitive or retributive legislation, to support economic sanctions to change the domestic policies and behavior of South Africa.

On the other hand, when the United States acts unilaterally and tries to

bludgeon the rest of the world into line with our policy, the result is often failure. It is worth keeping in mind what happened when the United States acted unilaterally to try to prevent a natural gas pipeline in the former Soviet Union from being completed. The policy was a failure; the pipeline was built. However, major U.S. exporters were hurt. Caterpillar, in my own State of Illinois, lost a major sale to its largest international competitor, Komatsu, weakening Caterpillar, and strengthening Komatsu, in international markets for a long time.

Moreover, the United States policy created a major controversy with our closest NATO ally, Great Britain, and with France. They saw the U.S. policy as an infringement on their sovereignty.

This legislation raises important governmental, as well as practical and diplomatic, issues. Many experts see it as an encroachment on the President's authority under the Constitution to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States. For example, the President would be prohibited from providing foreign aid or international development aid credits to Russia and the other Newly Independent States if they continue to trade with or give money to Cuba. As the only remaining world superpower, we have widespread global interests, interests which do not all turn on the status of a particular country's trade relations with Cuba.

Mr. President, H.R. 927 is therefore unlikely to advance United States interests in Cuba. Instead, what it is more likely to do is to damage other U.S. interests. Increased political and economic pressure on Cuba is more likely to enable Castro to play his nationalistic card and use the United States as a scapegoat to explain away Cuba's economic problems than to weaken his grip on Cuba.

And even though it is unlikely to achieve the objectives for Cuba we all share, title III of this legislation will create a nightmare for the United States judicial system, potentially costing United States taxpayers billions of dollars to provide access to United States courts for property claim lawsuits filed by or on behalf of individuals who were not legally entitled to have their claims adjudicated in United States courts when their claims initially arose. The bill, in effect, extends a benefit to Cuban-Americans denied to other groups, including Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Americans of Eastern European descent, Chinese-Americans, and Vietnamese-Americans. Finally, U.S. taxpayers will also have to foot the bill for the litigation of trade suits pursuant to NAFTA and GATT/WTO.

Mr. President, what we really need is a new, innovative, and bold approach to Cuba, an approach based on the realities of the situation, an approach that can and will succeed. We need a policy based on our successes. If we can create a situation where we can get the

same kind of cooperating on sanctions against Cuba that we were able to put together in the case of South Africa, then a sanctions policy could work, and could be pursued. But if we cannot, we ought to take a lesson from some of our other successes. After all, we did not win the cold war by isolating the now former-Soviet Union, through a sophisticated, flexible policy that engaged the U.S.S.R. where that made sense.

Since unilateral United States sanctions are unlikely to be effective, and since legislation designed to force our trading partners into tighter sanctions against Cuba is more likely to create new problems than to solve the Castro problem, we ought to at least consider new approaches. We need to at least examine, for example, whether more extensive United States contacts with Cuba would strengthen Castro or strengthen the prospects for real democratic and economic reform in Cuba. What we cannot afford to do is to continue to pursue a policy that has not succeeded in the past, and that offers even smaller chances of success in the future. Unfortunately, that is fundamentally what H.R. 927 is all about; I therefore cannot support it. I urge the Senate to defeat this legislation, and to work toward a new policy toward Cuba that offers a better chance of bringing long overdue, fundamental democratic and economic reform to the Cuban people.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to address the vote for cloture on the Dole-Helms amendment to the Sanctions Act.

I will be voting for cloture because I wish to see this process move along. This bill has been pending all year, and it is time we addressed it and moved on. In voting for cloture, however, I want to make clear that I do not support this legislation. I think it is a mistake, and I do not believe it will achieve the intended results.

First, this bill will impose trade sanctions on many of our closest allies and trading partners throughout the world. That is not going to help the people of Cuba in any way, but it is going to hurt American companies doing business around the world.

Second, the bill creates an unprecedented right of action for legal claims of former property owners in Cuba. Not only will that impose a severe burden on our court system, it will do so without, in anyway helping the people who need it most—families and small property owners who lost their homes and businesses to the Castro regime. This new right of action will also put us into conflict with some companies headquartered in some of our closest allies who are now operating plants in Cuba.

As a result of both of these problems, the United States will find itself under immediate attack in the World Trade Organization.

This legislation will only add to the already overwhelming misery of the

Cuban people. I do not want to do that, and I know none of my colleagues do either. Certainly, we all want to see an end to the Castro regime—a cold war relic whose time has passed. I believe, however, that Castro's days are numbered. Communism has fallen around the world, and it will fall in Cuba as well. We should let it fall of its own weight, and then be there to assist the Cuban people in developing and nurturing a new democratic successor. This bill will not achieve that goal—in fact, it will move in the other direction. I urge Senators to oppose it.

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. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to now proceed as in morning business.

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

SCHOOLBUS SAFETY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss a matter that I have discussed on several other occasions on this floor over the last few months, and that is the issue of schoolbus safety in this country. I would like to update the Senate on the progress that we are making in this particular area.

The bad news, Mr. President, is that there are still, we believe, over 100,000 unsafe schoolbuses on the road in this country today, 100,000 schoolbuses that at this moment, at least in the Eastern time zone, the Eastern part of the country, are in the process of taking children home from school.

I have been involved in, and my staff has been involved in, trying to alert the school officials, schoolbus safety officials, in all the 50 States to this particular problem. And I think we are making progress on a number of fronts.

First, one of the major causes, as I have talked about before on this floor, of schoolbus fatalities is the drawstrings that appear around the waist and other parts of clothing of the coats worn by many schoolchildren today. As children get off of schoolbuses, this drawstring is liable to get snagged in the gap that exists between the bus wall and the handrail itself.

Since 1991, at least five children that we know of have been killed in this manner, have been stuck on the bus that that particular drawstring has caught, and they have been dragged by the bus and they have been killed.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to report that the Consumer Product Safety Commission is taking action on this

problem. Last month they recommended to the American Society of Testing Materials, the ASTM, that the drawstrings be shortened. Experts agree that this measure will help prevent these accidents.

This is, Mr. President, a big step—a big step—in the right direction. As a result of CPSC's recommendation, the ASTM has already announced a voluntary standard for the drawstrings. Drawstrings that are 4 or 5 inches in length are now banned.

The ASTM also announced plans for a research project to determine if there is any ideally safe drawstring length. The results of this study are to be announced on November 30.

Second, we, as a country, are starting to fix the buses. A bus manufacturing company bought some of the assets of another bus company, a company had gone out of business, a defunct bus company that was purchased. And the new bus company has decided voluntarily to provide materials to retrofit many of the dangerous buses made by the defunct company. It will do this at cost. That particular company is also trying to identify other unsafe buses that are still on the road so they, too, can be retrofitted.

Third, I have brought with me to the floor, Mr. President, a copy of a pamphlet that children are getting in an elementary school in my hometown of Cedarville, OH. This particular pamphlet gives good advice to parents. "Teach your children to look out for the straps and drawstrings. Be very careful when you are getting on and off the schoolbus."

This was provided courtesy of the Pupil Transportation Safety Institute, 1-800-836-2210. It is a very simple brochure, but a brochure that we hope will do some good.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I think parents all over America should get a pamphlet just like this. It is available from the Pupil Transportation Safety Institute. Let me again repeat the number, 1-800-836-2210. As the pamphlet says, "Schoolbus safety is a team effort." So, Mr. President, let us work together to make all these schoolbuses as safe as they can be.

RECONCILIATION

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would also like to talk about another issue this afternoon, and that is an issue that I discussed briefly this morning, an issue that we in the Senate will be debating for the next few weeks and an issue that has, I believe, historic importance, not just in this Senate but to this country, not just to this generation but to our children's generation and our grandchildren's.

I rise specifically today, Mr. President, to discuss the reconciliation bill that we expect to reach the floor sometime in the next 2 weeks.

This bill embodies the decision that the American people expressed last November. The American people last De-

cember decided that we need to make a fundamental change in course for our U.S. Government.

Many of us ran, many of us talked about these issues, and what were the commitments? I think we can summarize them as follows. There are many, but four essential commitments were made last November, four commitments that we will work over the next few weeks to carry out:

First, we need to balance the budget.

Second, we need to replace the welfare system with a system that rewards work and creates opportunity.

Third, we need to rescue Medicare from bankruptcy.

And fourth, we need to give some tax relief to the hard-working families of this country. Four basic simple things that I believe, if passed, if enacted, will fundamentally change the direction of this country.

While these are simple, I think it is fair to say that this is really an extremely ambitious agenda. Even to consider an agenda of this magnitude would make this a truly historic Congress. But in this reconciliation package, the Senate is about to pass this agenda, to actually pass it, and to send it on to the President of the United States.

Except for a few days at the beginning of 1953, the last time a Democratic President had to deal with a Republican Congress—with a Republican Congress—was from 1947 to 1949. In the 1948 election, the Democratic President accused the Republicans of running a do-nothing Congress. The current President is very well equipped with rhetorical ammunition. They work very hard on this at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, but I think that the charge that this is a do-nothing Congress is not one the White House will be using any time soon, or at least the White House will be using successfully any time soon, because the fact is, this Congress has stepped up to the plate and made some extremely tough decisions.

This Congress has passed a balanced budget plan for the first time, if we carry it out, since 1969. This Congress is fundamentally overhauling the welfare system, and just a few weeks ago on this floor, this Senate passed a historic welfare bill.

I believe this Congress will take the steps to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

This Congress is working to relieve the tax burden on working families.

Mr. President, this is the historic agenda the 104th Congress is prepared to send to the President of the United States. Let us make no mistake, this reconciliation package is the only proposal on the table that will achieve the goals of the American people.

Our national goals are to balance the budget and to let working families keep more of their own money. The Republican reconciliation package accomplishes both of these goals. Indeed, Mr. President, if you look at it a certain way, these two are, in fact, the