

3.1 million people in Minnesota and Kansas and Oregon and Massachusetts and California and Oklahoma, wherever, what is holding us up, why they are going to have to pay their lawyer, their accountant to file an amended return because some Senators wanted to have a little fun in the Senate and we were not interested in their welfare. We are not willing to take the word of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle about an amendment that already passed the Senate. As we learned since then, it should be corrected as pointed out by the Senator from Florida.

Now, maybe the Senator from Massachusetts feels that he has a special right in the Senate where he can have everything he wants voted on before anything else. It does not work that way. The Senator from New York wanted to have a vote yesterday on his amendment. I did not see anybody letting him vote. We had a filibuster going on on the other side, from Members on the other side of the aisle who would not raise their voice when we were first talking about helping Mexico. We could not get one Member on this side to stand up and say they supported the President of the United States. But they would not let Senator D'AMATO vote. No. That was a very important issue.

We are supposed to hold up 3.1 million filers, about 9 million people, because the Senator from Massachusetts wants to vote on his little sense-of-the-Senate thing first. He does not have confidence, apparently, in those of us on the Finance Committee.

That is his choice. That will be the choice of all those who support the Senator. So the moment of truth will come at noon on Monday when we have a cloture vote.

If we cannot get cloture on Monday, I do not know when the conference report will pass.

I wish to thank both Senators PACKWOOD and MOYNIHAN for their efforts to bring this to the floor and pass it to help millions of people in America. I guess maybe only a third will have to file amended returns. I do not know what it costs any more; probably \$50, \$100. You can add up the costs going to real people—the taxpayers.

But, again, if that is what the Senator from Massachusetts wants, we will do the best we can. And the best thing I can think of is to do as I have just done: File a cloture motion and indicate there will be no more votes today, and indicate we will be in tomorrow, if necessary. But, in any event, there will be a cloture vote at noon on Monday.

SITUATION IN HAITI

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, President Clinton is in Haiti today as part of the transition from American control to U.N. control. All Americans are proud of the performance of the men and women of our Armed Forces in Haiti. As always they have served where ordered with skill and courage. And all

Americans are pleased that the occupation of Haiti has gone as smoothly as it has.

We all support democracy in Haiti. That does not mean, however, that we should have occupied Haiti in the first place. And the transition to U.N. command serves as a reminder that all concerns about the Haiti operation are not over.

First, we would do well to remember that the problems in Somalia did not occur under United States command—they occurred after the operation was transferred to U.N. control. We learned the hard way that the agenda of Boutros Boutros-Ghali and the United Nations is not the American agenda. It is true the U.N. commander is an American—Gen. Joseph Kinzer—but the U.N. bureaucrats will be in the loop. The problem of Mission Creep has already been raised—in requests to disarm the Haitian population, for example. In my view, U.N. command of American soldiers should be avoided.

Second, the costs of Haiti are mounting daily; \$1½ billion have already been spent on the occupation and nation-building in Haiti. The tab is only going to go up—to \$2 billion or more. In a time of severe budget cuts, and in a time when foreign aid is being reduced, we must ask whether we can afford \$2 billion for Haiti.

Third, Haiti still has a long way to go. Elections called for in the Haitian Constitution have been postponed. Political assassination appears to be on the rise. Serious reports of involvement by the Aristide government in this week's murder have been made, and they deserve full examination. Little effort to reach out to parliamentary opponents has occurred. There are disturbing indications that President Aristide or his supporters are subverting the democratic process. Despite the ceremony today, we realize there are real problems in Haiti—and there will continue to be problems, no matter how long the United States or the United Nations stays in Haiti.

We all support genuine efforts at reconciliation and democracy in Haiti. We hope the long-delayed elections move forward in Haiti—that they are free and fair, that the results are respected by all Haitians, and that President Aristide keeps his promise to step down. As a recent article by President Clinton's former envoy to Haiti points out, the hard work of restoring democracy in Haiti was not returning President Aristide from exile—it is in building truly democratic institutions in a country that has never known them.

I ask consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1995]

A VOICE FOR ALL HAITIANS

Operation Restore Democracy landed more than 20,000 U.S. soldiers in Haiti and secured the return of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide on Oct. 15, 1994. "We have helped to

give the people of Haiti a chance to remake the democracy they earned, they deserve and they plainly wish for," said President Clinton on the eve of Aristide's return. Today that goal, which appears to have been eclipsed by the Clinton administration's need to portray Haiti as a foreign policy victory, is in danger of being subverted by some of Aristide's most ardent supporters.

The issue before Aristide is the election of some 2,000 local officials, 18 of the 27 senators and all 83 deputies, scheduled to be held June 4. There's little doubt among political observers that Aristide's Lavalas movement will win big. In fact, in some districts four and even five candidates are competing for the honor of representing their movement. But legitimate opposition parties charge that the Aristide government is stacking the Provisional Electoral Council with Lavalas loyalists and making arbitrary decisions that prejudice fair and open elections.

When former President Jimmy Carter traveled to Haiti recently to raise these concerns, he was greeted with obscene graffiti painted by Aristide supporters. The mildest epithets called our ex-president "a false democrat," "a thug" and a "danger to democracy." While Aristide praised Carter to his face, his close advisers characterized the ex-president as "tricky and sneaky" behind his back. Carter offered to perform the same role he did in 1990, when he and a group of international monitors ensured Aristide's free election in a political atmosphere that was even more problematic than it is now. It's a role he's played in Nicaragua, Panama and Guyana. This time Carter's services were turned down.

Why? Whether Aristide is leading the move to consolidate power at the expense of political opponents or permitting the more radical elements in his Lavalas movement a free hand is not clear. One former member of the coalition that supported Aristide's presidential candidacy in 1990 predicted to us that paramilitary groups would emerge if the political right is not given an opportunity to participate fully in the political process. Political violence and even civil war are possible in this highly polarized society, he says. And legitimate democrats are fearful and frustrated. They see the heavy-handedness of the Aristide camp as a portent of the authoritarianism that has plagued the political history of their country.

The fairness of the June elections raises the larger issue of political reconciliation in Haiti, which has been championed by Haitian politicians on all levels of the political spectrum as the key to the future of democracy in their country. Unfortunately, this goal was abandoned by the Clinton administration almost a year ago, when Aristide lobbied hard for U.S. military intervention to restore him to power. He got his way. Since then he has dismantled the Haitian military. Remnants of the old police force now operate under international supervision. And the new police force that is being trained poses no threat to him. Interestingly, the only attempt to politicize the police force—which the U.S. Embassy, to its credit, put an end to—came from the Aristide camp.

When Aristide's political rivals extended the olive branch in July 1993 during the New York Pact and again in the spring of last year, they were accused of advocating "power sharing" and pushed away. This came after first U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and then Vice President Gore assured Aristide in person that neither the United Nations nor the United States would accept any agreement that would threaten his constitutional power. It's important to remember that the Haitian

constitution of 1987 provides for a parliamentary system of government with executive authority divided between a president and a prime minister. Political reconciliation is necessary before the larger task of nation-building can begin.

Aristide has the opportunity to initiate a new, constructive phase in Haitian history. But first he must take the lead in creating a participatory political culture in which all Haitians have a voice. The coming elections are an excellent place to start. If he can bring himself to play a historically creative role, he may be able to convince Haitians steeped in cynicism that political comity is achievable. And once the promise of political stability is buttressed by visible signs of political reconciliation, he may find it easier to attract the private investment that his country desperately needs.

Rather than resting on laurels that can quickly turn to ashes, the Clinton administration should view the Carter visit as a wake-up call. It should take the lead in getting more international observers to monitor the June elections. And, more important, it should be urging Aristide to act as a true democrat and president of all the people of Haiti at this critical time.

Lawrence Pezzullo is former special adviser on Haiti to the Clinton administration. He and his son Ralph Pezzullo, an author and playwright, are writing a book on Haiti.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1995

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. on Monday, April 3; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, not beyond the hour of 12 noon.

At 12 noon, under provision of rule XXII, a live quorum will begin. Following the ascertaining of the quorum, a cloture vote will occur on the conference report to accompany H.R. 831. Additional votes can be expected to occur during Monday's session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REGARDING RULE XXII

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Saturday count as the intervening day necessary under rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator DASCHLE, the Demo-

cratic leader, because that will save a pro forma session tomorrow.

OFFICIAL SENATE PHOTOGRAPH

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Senators are also reminded that the official Senate picture of the Senate in session will be taken on Tuesday, April 4, at 2:15 p.m.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following the remarks of Senator DASCHLE, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DORGAN, and Senator SIMON, the Senate will stand in recess under the previous order.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

SELF-EMPLOYED HEALTH INSURANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am disappointed with the news that we will not have the opportunity to vote on the conference report. I do not think there is any doubt that when the conference report passes, it will pass overwhelmingly.

There is no need to file a cloture petition. There is not one Democrat holding up the conference report this afternoon—not one. Whenever we have that vote, it will be overwhelming. Cloture will be invoked overwhelmingly. I doubt that even one Democrat will oppose cloture. So to go for a cloture motion at this point is really meaningless. There is no need for it. No one is holding up the conference report.

Cloture is designed to break a filibuster. There is no filibuster. We have not even had a good chance to discuss it, much less filibuster it.

So for anyone to misunderstand what is happening here would be a very significant mistake. The fact is, we are on the floor this afternoon and we are prepared to work.

I had hoped that by now we would be in the middle of a good debate about protecting children. I thought we would have a good opportunity here to talk about helping 1 million children with the Democratic amendment that was offered this morning. That is what this debate was supposed to be all about today. The fact that that debate is not being held is, in and of itself, a very significant disappointment. Because the majority leader saw fit to offer a second-degree to our amendment, I also feel very disappointed.

The fact is that we ought to have an opportunity for an up-or-down vote on that amendment itself. If the Republicans have alternatives, we ought to discuss those. But we will save that argument for another day.

It was the majority leader's decision to take that legislation off the table and then to put the conference report before the Senate for consideration this afternoon.

All we were suggesting as part of that consideration is to deal with the matter the Finance Committee had taken up, and that was to eliminate a tax break providing millions of dollars of benefits to some of the wealthiest people in this country.

The headline in the Washington Post says it all: "Tax Break for Wealthy Expatriates Sparks Class Warfare Charges: 'Confiscatory Tax' on Rich Who Leave U.S. Denounced."

What kind of class are we protecting here, for heavens sake? What kind of class warfare is this?

The real class warfare is occurring by many Republicans who will not even allow us to have a vote on the minimum wage issue. That is class warfare; an unwillingness to provide those at the lowest rung of the economic ladder with a meaningful income. That, in my view, is what class warfare is all about.

Every Republican and Democrat ought to be opposed to providing expatriates a huge tax handout. There should not be any question about that.

But let there be no mistake: As strongly as we feel about this, as strongly as we want to address this issue, we are prepared to set it aside, to have a vote at a time certain next week so that we can move along the legislation dealing with the deductibility for the self-employed.

We want that to happen. We are going to vote for cloture on Monday. We are going to support it on Monday or Tuesday, whenever the leader decides to bring it up. And it is our desire to move this legislation along as quickly as possible.

So there is a nice ring, perhaps, to the indignation on the other side, but the fact is that ring rings pretty hollow when the truth is laid out. The fact of the matter is, very clearly, Democrats want just as much as Republicans to pass this legislation.

We offered a vote in relation to both Senator D'AMATO's and Senator KENNEDY's amendments on Tuesday morning and to pass the conference report today.

So the record ought to be very clear about this. We were going to break the logjam the Republicans caused yesterday with the D'Amato amendment. We were going to break the logjam that was created, in part, by the determination by some Republicans to protect the wealthiest among us, and we were prepared to have the votes next week, Monday and Tuesday, just as quickly as we could work out an arrangement for both Democrats and Republicans.

That is not going to happen, and I am disappointed. It is only 1:30. We should not have the afternoon off. We ought to have the ability to debate why we are leaving 1 million children unprotected as a result of the rescissions made in the supplemental that has been pending before the Senate all week.

We ought to talk about the ramifications of 5,000 kids being denied opportunities to get adequate child care and hundreds of thousands of children who