

Smith (MI)	Talent	Walsh
Smith (NJ)	Tanner	Wamp
Smith (OR)	Tauscher	Waters
Smith (TX)	Tauzin	Watkins
Smith, Adam	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith, Linda	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Snowbarger	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Snyder	Thompson	Weller
Solomon	Thornberry	Wexler
Souder	Thune	Weygand
Spence	Thurman	White
Spratt	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Stabenow	Tierney	Wicker
Stearns	Torres	Wise
Stenholm	Trafficant	Wolf
Stokes	Turner	Woolsey
Strickland	Upton	Wynn
Stump	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Stupak	Vento	Young (FL)
Sununu	Visclosky	

## NAYS—4

Conyers	Stark
DeFazio	Watt (NC)

## NOT VOTING—9

Clay	Hall (OH)	Towns
Dixon	McCollum	Weldon (FL)
Gonzalez	Schiff	Yates

## □ 1844

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1031

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1031, the American Community Renewal Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOEKSTRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### RECOMMENDING A CHANGE IN U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the subject of the

United States' relations with Cuba. It was my privilege to visit Cuba last week with my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] as part of a delegation in connection with the Human Rights Foundation. Our focus was on the present economic and political circumstances in Cuba and the relationship between the United States and that country, with particular focus on the health conditions in Cuba, and the impact, if any, of the United States' economic restrictions on Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inspired to speak this evening by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART], both of whom are friends and both of whom have spoken long and on this floor for human rights in Cuba.

I have two messages, and perhaps I should preface both of them by saying I do not consider myself an expert on Cuba. I was fortunate to spend 1 week there. I believe I was permitted to go where I wished to go. I was permitted to ask questions with no restriction. But I do not consider myself an expert. Still, I do wish to share my observations, largely at the urging of my two colleagues from Florida, who asked that I do so.

I wish to begin by emphasizing that there is a need for all Americans to continue to speak out on behalf of human rights in Cuba; that it is appropriate to call for full, free, and fair elections, including at the presidential level. I was informed during our trip there of the proximity of local elections, and also of the designation of multi-candidates for each available post in the assembly. Surely this is a positive development.

On the other hand, I was also informed that the Communist Party will still be the dominant basis for selecting the candidates for such offices, and that, obviously, should be opened up.

We were privileged to meet with the President of Cuba, Fidel Castro, we were privileged to meet with the Vice President of the Council of Ministers, and with the equivalent of the Speaker of the House, Senor Alarcon, and in each case we were able to raise any subjects that we wished.

When I met with Mr. Alarcon, I raised with him the issue of free and fair elections, access to prisons, and I emphasized the importance of allowing the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit the prisons of Cuba, and the presence of political prisoners.

His responses, as I took them down, were that there were still some prisoners in Cuban jails who, in his Government's belief, had received money from our Government to destabilize the Government of Cuba, and that that was the reason why they were in jail, although also other crimes.

He did not say that the International Committee of the Red Cross could visit those prisoners, and I urged him to do

so. Tonight, if members of his Government are listening, it seems to me that the Cuban Government would only benefit from permitting free access by international groups of such repute as the International Committee of the Red Cross in order to ascertain conditions in prisons on a regular basis.

Mr. Alarcon did point out that America has not been as critical of other nations in Latin America as we are of Cuba, and that may well be right. But I do want my colleagues to know that I raised the issue of human rights, of free and fair elections, and of political prisoners, and that those are serious issues and remain so to this day.

I emphasize now in my remaining time the most important lesson, though, that I learned. This was one that reemphasized a judgment that I had made preliminarily before I went to Cuba. That is that it is wrong and shortsighted and harmful to America to continue the embargo between our country and Cuba. The United States ought to trade with Cuba. We ought to trade as we trade with China, as we trade with Russia, as we trade with the countries coming out of the socialist systems.

When we trade we begin to develop an economic group of people, a group of people who are devoted to free markets, to the extent that there is a control over people's lives through the economy that is loosened by free trade, and there is also a very important humanitarian component.

One of the very important issues of our trip was health care. The Cuban Government made a point that even though officially trade in pharmaceuticals and medicines are not prohibited under the Helms-Burton law, there is intimidation that has been practiced or at least felt by American companies who would wish to send medicines to Cuba but feel it is not worth the difficulty of obtaining an end-use license, or making a certification that they would monitor those people who would use it, or guarantee that the medicines will never get into the hands of the Government.

These are very difficult obstacles to overcome, and so many American companies do not send medicines, with the result that the Cuban Government is able, and not inappropriately on all occasions, to say that the United States policy and Helms-Burton in particular is depriving their people of the full medical care that they might otherwise have. To the extent that is true, that hurts our country. It is not the intention of those Members of this body, our colleagues who voted for Helms-Burton, and it would serve the interests of all to end it.

I will conclude, if I might, Mr. Speaker, with just this one observation. When our plane left Nassau and touched down in Havana, the passengers applauded, and I thought, they must be happy to be coming home. When our plane left Havana and touched down in Miami through Nassau again, the passengers applauded.

There are people of good will on both sides of the Florida strait. Let us foster friendship, foster free market, foster trust in individual freedom, and I think a first step to doing so is to repeal the Helms-Burton Act; and at least, if we cannot do that, to allow the free trade in medicines and food.

#### TRIBUTE TO ARTENSA RANDOLPH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a national leader in the public housing movement, the late Artensa Randolph. Ms. Randolph departed this life Tuesday, August 19, at the age of 81. She chaired the Chicago Housing Authority's Resident Central Advisory Committee, and served as a member of the Chicago Housing Authority's Executive Advisory Committee.

She was truly a staunch advocate for the rights of tenants of public housing. She possessed an enormous amount of courage, energy, and tenacity to advocate on behalf of the disenfranchised and the dispossessed. She was guided by the principles of justice and fairness for all people. She was indeed a remarkable person who gave her very best at whatever she did. Her work reached well beyond Chicago, for she influenced public housing policies and decisions on a national level.

Ms. Randolph moved to Chicago from Pine Bluff, AR, in 1937, and worked in the stockyards. During the 1960's she became involved in the tenants' rights movement, and was elected president of the Washington Park Homes Local Advisory Council in 1976. Her life paralleled the rise of public housing, and in many ways she was the catalyst for bringing about positive change in the way tenants are treated. She brought a tremendous amount of knowledge, perseverance, and dedication regarding public housing issues.

While Artensa Randolph has left this place, her spirit as a fighter for justice, fairness, and equality for all tenants of public housing shall endure forever. She has left a legacy that will speak to the unmet challenges still confronting public housing and its residents. We must never forget the cause which she championed, that of the poor. We must always stand ready to be a voice for the voiceless, and continue to make public housing the best that it can possibly be.

Anyone who continues to work at the age of 81 as chairman of a large organization, who helps to make policy for people all over the Nation, is indeed a champion. That was the life and that is indeed the legacy of Artensa Randolph.

#### REPORT ON CODEL TO NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues in the House on a precedent-setting House CODEL visit to North Korea last month during our recess.

□ 1900

I was honored to lead a bipartisan delegation of seven members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in traveling on oversight business to Asia. Our trip happened to include 3 days and 2 nights in North Korea, and I will include for the RECORD the formal written statement of our delegation released about that portion of our trip.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact that the North Korean leadership welcomed a delegation of the size, seniority, and breadth of our seven-member group is very telling and somewhat remarkable, in my view. Crises are forcing the reclusive and anachronistic North Korean regime to reach out to the United States for assistance and pull back slightly on the veil of secrecy that has shrouded that nation for decades.

Even though our trip was obviously carefully managed by our hosts, we saw the signals of collapse during our visit. People really are starving; the infrastructure is crumbling; power shortages are routine; proregime propaganda is rampant; and the leadership, while refusing to concede failure, is tightening control and grasping for leverage.

After spending 48 hours in that isolated country, I felt as if I had been in a time warp, witnessing a life totally foreign to the American experience today, perhaps something back in the cold war days behind the Iron Curtain.

We repeatedly drove home the point that food aid distribution must be verifiable so that we can be sure it reaches the people who are most in need. And we were asked repeatedly about aid. We expressed hope that cooperation on the issue of MIA's would remain coming from the North Koreans and they have given us some cooperation. These are very positive signs.

But in response, the North Korean officials stated that the United States sanctions against them must be lifted and additional unconditional food assistance, and I stress the word "unconditional," must be provided.

The North Koreans did not acknowledge the need for internal economic, agricultural, or political reform, focusing instead on external factors as the root of the causes of their current difficulties. While they were cordial in their hospitality, and they did give us fine hospitality, these senior officials were obviously mistrustful of the United States. They also forcefully underscored their position that they would not negotiate with South Korea as long as the South's President, Kim Young Sam, remains in office. He is scheduled to remain in office until the end of this year.

In the short term, we should be principally concerned with establishing a

regular and more verifiable means of food aid distribution to ease the immediate crisis. I pointed out, and the others did, that Americans are a compassionate people willing to respond to human suffering in remote regions of the world. We have already provided about 60 million dollars' worth of aid, that adds up to about 100,000 metric tons of food, in relief of starving people in North Korea. Hopefully, it is going to people starving and not the military. But we were disappointed that during our visit we were not taken to see the food distribution centers, nor did we have access to the regions of the nation where food shortages are most severe.

However, we understand that our visit helped pave the way for a staff delegation from another committee to have greater access while in North Korea. In the longer term, an increasing presence of outsiders going about their business on behalf of nongovernmental relief organizations, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, Congress, and other organizations that have legitimate business there, should help force open the door between North Korea and the outside world.

Mr. Speaker, the signals are abundantly clear: The North Korean regime is dying. We must do our part to prevent that process from undermining the security of the peninsula and threatening America's vital interests in the region. Americans do have several good reasons for being interested in the future relations with the North Korean regime. Not just the humanitarian concerns and seeking to prevent the starvation of literally millions of people, but, second, our interests are very much at stake when we consider something on the order of 200,000 Americans and Korean-Americans are living and going about their business in South Korea within close range of the world's fourth largest army, with its massed artillery on the DMZ. And, we have very serious concerns about North Korea's activities in proliferating weapons of mass destruction to rogue nations and, in fact, that has been happening.

To the extent that our visit marked a milestone in the United States-North Korea relationship, I hope that the elite band of leaders in the North will not allow current events to foreclose the opportunity now at hand. I believe that the veil is lifting there, and I am certain to believe that a negotiated settlement bringing North Korea into this century certainly is better than any of the other alternatives using the military.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISIT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA—AUGUST 12, 1997

From August 9 through August 11, a bipartisan, seven-member Congressional Delegation (CODEL) from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) was