

Mr. STEVENS. Parliamentary inquiry: Does that include the substitute replacement for the amendment already adopted, No. 103?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it does.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc and agreed to.

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

The amendments (Nos. 103, as modified, 112, and 113) were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent it be in order to reconsider the amendments en bloc, and that the motion be laid on the table.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the measure pending before the Senate be temporarily set aside so we can have consideration of the Cuba rights resolution. I would like to turn the management of that over to Senator MACK of Florida.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. 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. GORTON. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

THE MISGUIDED ANTITRUST CASE AGAINST MICROSOFT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on Monday, my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, came to the floor to respond to a statement that I gave a week or so earlier on the Justice Department's misguided antitrust case against Microsoft.

Mr. President, this has become something of a habit for the Senator from Utah and myself. We have debated that lawsuit since well before it was commenced, more than a year ago.

I am happy to state that I want to start these brief remarks with two

points on which I find myself in complete agreement with Senator HATCH. First, during a speech on Monday, he joined with me in asking that the Vice President of the United States, Mr. GORE, state his position on whether or not this form of antitrust action is appropriate. I centered my own speech on the frequent visits the Vice President has made to the State of Washington and his refusal to take any such position. The Senator from Utah said:

Government should not exert unwarranted control over the Internet, even if Vice President Gore thinks that he created it.

I am delighted that the Senator from Utah has joined me in that sentiment. Now there are at least two of us who believe that the Vice President of the United States should make his views known on the subject.

Secondly, the Senator from Utah, in dealing with the request by the Department of Justice that it receive a substantial additional appropriation for fiscal year 2000 for antitrust enforcement, stated that he is concerned about the value thresholds in what is called the Hart-Scott-Rodino legislation relating to mergers and feels that the minimum size of those mergers should be moved upward to reflect inflation in the couple of decades since that bill was passed, therefore, questions at least some portion of the request for additional appropriations on the part of the Antitrust Division.

As I have said before, I believe that it deserves no increase at all, that the philosophy that it is following harasses the business community unduly, and inhibits the continuation of the economic success stories all across our American economy but particularly in computer software.

Having said that, the Senator from Utah and I continue to disagree, though I wish to emphasize that my primary disagreement is with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice of the United States and this particular lawsuit.

The disagreement really fundamentally comes down to one point: Antitrust law enforcement should be followed for the benefit of consumers. The Government of the United States has no business financing what is essentially a private antitrust case. If there are competitors of Microsoft who think they have been unsuccessful and wish to finance their own antitrust lawsuits, they are entitled to do so. The taxpayers of the United States, on the other hand, should not be required to pay their money for what is a private dispute, primarily between Netscape and Microsoft.

That remains essentially the gravamen of the antitrust action that the Justice Department in 19 States is prosecuting at the present time.

There is only the slightest lip service given in the course of that lawsuit or by the senior Senator from Utah to consumer benefit. This is not surprising, Mr. President, because there is no discernible consumer benefit in the demands of this lawsuit.

Consumers have been benefited by the highly competitive nature of the software market. They are benefited by having the kind of platform that Microsoft provides for thousands of different applications and uses on the part of hundreds of different companies all through the United States.

This is not a consumer protection lawsuit. I may say, not entirely in passing, that I know a consumer protection lawsuit when I see one. I was attorney general of the State of Washington for 12 years. I prosecuted a wide range of antitrust and consumer protection lawsuits. But every one of those antitrust cases was based on the proposition that consumers were being disadvantaged by some form of price fixing or other violation of the law. I did not regard it as my business to represent essentially one business unhappy and harmed by competition for a more effective competitor.

The basis of my objection to this lawsuit is that it is not designed for consumer protection. It is designed to benefit competitors. Some of the proposals that have appeared in the newspapers for remedies in case of success, including taking away the intellectual properties of the Microsoft Corporation, perhaps even breaking it up, requiring advance permission on the part of lawyers in the Justice Department for improvements in Windows or in any other product of the Microsoft Corporation, are clearly anticonsumer in nature.

The lawsuit is no better now than the day on which it was brought. It is not designed to benefit consumers. It ought to be dropped.

I am delighted that at least on two peripheral areas of sometime controversy, the Senator from Utah and I now find ourselves in agreement. Regrettably, we still find ourselves disagreeing on the fundamental basis of the lawsuit. I am sorry he is on the apparent side of the Vice President of the United States and the clear side of the Department of Justice of the United States.

I expect this debate to continue, but I expect it to continue to be on the same basis. Do we have a software system, a computer system in the United States which is the wonder of the world that has caused more profound and more progressive changes in our society than that caused in a comparable period of time by any other industry, or somehow or another do we have an industry that needs Government regulation? I think that question answers itself, Mr. President, and I intend to continue to speak out on the subject.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. Res. 57 be discharged from the Foreign Relations Committee and, further, that the Senate now proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 57) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the human rights situation in Cuba.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 1 hour, equally divided, on the resolution and that the only amendment in order be an amendment to the preamble which is at the desk.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the debate time, the resolution be set aside and the Senate proceed to a vote on the resolution, at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

I finally ask that following the vote on the adoption of the resolution, the amendment to the preamble be agreed to and the preamble, as amended, be agreed to.

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

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida may proceed for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity today to speak about Cuba and why the United States must make every effort to pass a resolution in Geneva at the U.N. Human Rights Commission condemning the Cuban Government.

The reality which I seek to convey today is very simply stated. Fidel Castro continues to run Cuba with absolute power, based upon the failed ideals of the Marxist revolution that he led 40 years ago. He is a tyrant, a dictator, and an enemy of freedom, democracy, and respect for basic human dignity.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been reflecting on my Senate career lately as I weighed my decision on seeking another term. Let me share one of those memories with you right now.

It was October 19, 1987, when I announced my candidacy for the Senate. I traveled to Key West, the southern most point in the Continental United States, to make my announcement. I chose this location for one simple reason. I knew my passion for foreign policy arose from a deeply held conviction that America's freedom could not be taken for granted, that our freedom was not complete so long as others suffered under the yoke of tyranny. Only 90 miles from where I declared my aspiration to be a U.S. Senator in order to take part in the fight against the enemies of freedom, Fidel Castro ruled with a failed ideology and a cruel iron fist.

It seems that I have been in the Senate for a long time—10 years—but if I were to travel to Key West today, I am sad to say, I could still point toward

Cuba and ask the same questions I did on October 19, 1987: What does it mean to live in peace if there is no freedom to worship God, no freedom to choose our livelihood, no freedom to read or speak the truth or to live for the dream of handing over a better life to our children and our grandchildren? Peace without freedom is false. The Cuban people are only free to serve their masters in war and in poverty.

Mr. President, I have many good friends in the Senate, and I have great respect for my colleagues. We share so much of our lives with each other each day. And even though we are divided on many issues, in our hearts there can be no division on our feelings for the suffering people of Cuba. The island so close to our shores serves as a tragic reminder of the human cost of tyranny and oppression and that freedom is not free.

Let me propose today that Fidel Castro has not changed in 10 years; in fact, he has not changed in 40 years. In the history books, 40 years can be covered in a single sentence. But in Cuba, it can also be an eternity.

I think about the 12 years since I made that speech. How many people have suffered and died needlessly in 12 years? How many screams of agony have reached for the heavens from Havana in 12 years? How many tears of sorrow and anguish have fallen in 12 years? I fear we will never know the true scale of suffering, even though it takes place so close to our shores.

Some of us have served in the Senate for a few years, some of us for 10 or 12, and some of us have been here for 30 years or more. Think what it must be like serving instead in one of Fidel Castro's prisons for all that time. In Cuba you could be imprisoned simply for doing what we do each day, and that is engage in the debate of ideas. Think about how different our lives would be if we lived in a similar environment.

I assure you, Mr. President, that the human spirit is a powerful thing. We know that throughout the world and throughout history mankind has struggled for freedom against the greatest of obstacles. That struggle lives, breathes, sweats, and thrives in Cuba today. But it does so at a great cost.

I have two short stories I want to share to demonstrate the price being paid in Cuba today.

There is a famous man known as Antunez. He began supporting freedom in Cuba in 1980. He has been in and out of prison for much of his adult life. As of February 1999, reports out of the prisons have him in poor health.

I want to read a quote from a letter he wrote and successfully smuggled out of Cuba 2 years ago. I quote:

On March 15 [1997], it will be seven years that I have been imprisoned but I have yet to lose my faith and confidence in the final triumph of our struggle. I am proud and satisfied that they will have been unable to—and will never be able to—bend my will, because I am defending a just and noble cause, the rights of man and the freedom of my country.

A second story: I have recently seen a March 10, 1999, statement of Dr. Omar del Pozo, which I want to share with you today. He was a prisoner of conscience, sentenced to 15 years in prison for promoting democracy and civil society in Cuba. Through the intercession of Pope John Paul II, Dr. Pozo was released and exiled to Canada after serving 6 years of the sentence.

It is interesting to note the comments of a man who owes his freedom from Cuba's prisons to the Pope's visit to Cuba. Listen to what he has to say about the so-called changes taking place within the Cuban Government. And I am now quoting:

In Castro's man-eating prisons, lives are swallowed, mangled, and spit out in what can only be described as his revolving-door of infamy. Some may claim that the fact that I am able to stand before you here today is because I am a product of engagement with Castro. While I am certainly grateful for the international outcry that created pressure on Castro to release me, it would be negligent of me not to recognize that as long as the dictator remains in power, there will continue to be political prisoners who are destined to become pawns to be handed over as tokens depending on the occasion . . . my release in no way benefited the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of men and women who were left behind.

Dr. Pozo's statement certainly rings true—that the visit of the Pope and his personal release and exile from his home do not, counter to popular belief, indicate a new day in Cuba.

He continues on in his statement. Again, I quote:

Forty years have passed, and a new millennium dawns, and still political prisoners exist in a country only 90 miles from the shores of the freest nation on earth. . . . In the confusion of clichés Cuba has become in the mass media: Castro and cigars, Castro and tourism, Castro and baseball, the terrible tragedy of Cubans and their legitimate needs and desires takes a backseat to the priorities set by the Comandante en Jefe and his regime. The truly tragic part is that there are some who, in the name of profit, are willing to compromise justice and play by his rules, with no regard for the welfare of the Cuban people.

Just as actions indicate no improvement in the Government of Cuba, one could argue that things are not really getting worse. In fact, the recent crackdown in Cuba is only a manifestation of the nature of the ruling regime. Again, let me quote from Dr. Pozo:

These past days, I have heard even experienced Cuba observers question why Castro has raised the level of repression at this point in time, considering the many gestures of goodwill he has received internationally prior to and following the Papal visit. The only possible answer is that it is the nature of the beast. Castro can not help it any more than he can help being a totalitarian dictator. It is who he is and will always be. It is because he is motivated by one thing and one thing alone: [and that is] absolute power. He wants to continue to stand on the backs of the Cuban people and he will persecute, torture and kill in order to accomplish his goal of being Cuba's "dictator for life." By now, everyone knows who Castro is and what he is capable of. From this point on, the field can only be divided between those who are willing to overlook his crimes and those who are not.

Again, I just point out, those were not my words. These are the words of an individual who was released from Castro's prison because of the pressure brought on by the international community and by the Pope's visit. What he is saying here is that nothing has changed as a result of the Pope's visit to Cuba. He is saying nothing has changed. And he is saying to us—not me saying, but he is saying to us—that “the field can only be divided [now] between those who are willing to overlook [Castro's] crimes and those who are not.”

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me once again say freedom is not free, but it is the most valuable thing that we know; it is, in fact, the core of all human progress. Freedom has everything to do with our spiritual, physical, and political lives. Without it—without freedom—what would we do? It is important to think about this in order to appreciate the words of the brave men and women in Cuba fighting for freedom, because they are, after all, fighting for everything and paying a large price indeed.

I want to reach out to my colleagues today. We loathe tyranny and oppression. So let us stand united behind our delegation in Geneva; let us proclaim our views at the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Let us stand tall and speak with unity, conviction, and strength. Let us proclaim: “The United States of America abhors tyranny and loves freedom. We oppose the enemies of liberty and we support those struggling for LIBERTAD.”

That, Mr. President, represents the meaning of this resolution in its entirety. I hope my colleagues will join me today in making this most important statement.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I understand that we have 1 hour equally divided.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield myself 10 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, my friend and colleague, a friend and colleague who, unfortunately, has recently announced that his next phase of life is going to be someplace other than the Senate, started with the story of where he commenced his campaign to come to the Senate—in the beautiful, unique community of Key West. In addition to Key West's physical proximity to Cuba, Key West also has a history which is very intertwined with the long efforts of the people of Cuba to achieve freedom.

It was during the period of the Cuban civil war in the 1870s, 1880s and into the 1890s that many exiles left Cuba and came to Key West to find freedom and

a place from which they could relaunch their efforts to achieve freedom in their homeland.

Jose Marti spoke many times in Key West to the exiled community of his dreams for a Cuba of independence and freedom. It is in Key West that there is the memorial for the USS Maine, the Tomb of the Unknown Sailor, for over 200 American sailors who were killed in Havana Harbor early in 1898—an event which contributed to the United States eventual declaration of war and involvement in what we refer to as the Spanish-American War. In Key West we find remnants of that long history of the yearning of the people of Cuba to live in freedom and independence.

After having won their independence in 1898, 60 years later, it was taken away from them. For four decades, they have lived under the oppressive rule of the dictator, Fidel Castro.

Last month, we recognized another dictatorship in this world, one that is not near to us but half a world away. The Senate passed a resolution calling for a condemnation of the human rights situation in China. We urged the United Nations Human Rights Commission to have that on their agenda at their soon-to-be-held meeting in Geneva. With this resolution, Senate Resolution 57, we take a similar position condemning the human rights situation in Cuba which, unfortunately, is considerably worse today than the situation in China.

This resolution calls on the President to make every effort to pass a resolution at the upcoming meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission condemning Cuba for its abysmal record on human rights. It also calls for the reappointment of a special rapporteur to investigate the human rights situation in Cuba.

Last year, for the first time in many years, no resolution on human rights in Cuba was passed by the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Perhaps this hiatus in U.N. condemnation of Cuba was due to the hopes that were raised as a result of the Pope's visit in January of 1998. Unfortunately, if that were the case, there has, in fact, been a significant worsening of the human rights situation in Cuba since the Pope's visit.

According to the independent group, Human Rights Watch,

As 1998 drew to a close, Cuba's stepped up persecutions and harassments of dissidents, along with its refusal to grant amnesty to hundreds of remaining political prisoners or [to] reform its criminal code, marked a disheartening return to heavy-handed repression.

The Cuban Government also recently passed a measure known as Law 80 which criminalizes peaceful, prodemocratic activities and independent journalism, with penalties of up to 20 years in jail.

The State Department's Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Cuba for 1998 notes that the government continues to systematically vio-

late the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens. Human rights advocates and members of independent professional associations, including journalists, economists, doctors, and lawyers are routinely harassed, threatened, arrested, detained, imprisoned and defamed by the government. All fundamental freedoms are denied to citizens. In addition, the Cuban Government severely restricts worker rights, including the right to form independent trade unions, and employs forced labor, including child labor.

The most recent example of this horrible repression in Cuba is the trial of four prominent dissidents—Vladimiro Roca, Marta Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne and Rene Gomez Manzano. They were all charged with sedition. After being detained for over 19 months for peacefully voicing their opinion, the trial of these four brave patriots has drawn international condemnation. To demonstrate the hideous nature of the Castro regime, Marta Beatriz Roque has been ill, believed to be suffering from cancer, and has been denied medical attention during her long period of detention.

During the trial, authorities have rounded up scores of other individuals, including journalists and dissidents, and jailed them for the duration of the trial. The trial was conducted in complete secrecy with photographers prevented from even photographing the streets around the courthouse. This trial reminds me of the worst days of Stalinist repression in the Soviet Union.

This week, Castro's dictatorship found the four dissidents guilty and sentenced them to terms ranging from 3½ to 5 years—5 years in prison for simply making a statement about democracy. This action has outraged the world.

This outrageous spectacle has caused even Castro's closest friends to rethink their relationship with Cuba. Canadian Prime Minister Chretien has indicated that Canada will review its entire relationship with Castro. The European Union issued a strong statement condemning this repression.

This is not the type of conduct that we have come to expect in our hemisphere, where Cuba remains the only nondemocratic government. This level of repression and complete disregard for international norms cannot be ignored. I hope that all of our colleagues will join my colleague, Senator MACK, and myself, in condemning the human rights situation in Cuba and calling for action at the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

Last month, we voted unanimously to support a resolution condemning human rights in China. Unfortunately, we have within 100 miles of our shores a situation in Cuba that is worse than that halfway around the world in China—a situation that deserves the full effort of our government to assure that it is not ignored by the international community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of newspaper items from the press in this country as well as in Europe, Latin America and in Canada, condemning the human rights abuses in Cuba.

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

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 18, 1999]

FREE FOUR DISSIDENTS, EUROPE TELLS CUBA
(By Andres Oppenheimer)

The 15-country European Union issued a strong statement Wednesday calling for the release of four Cuban dissidents who received harsh sentences in Havana this week, while European and Latin American officials said they are rethinking their recent overtures to the island.

In a statement issued in Brussels, the EU said the Cuban dissidents, who received prison terms of between 3½ and 5 years for publishing a pamphlet criticizing the government, had been exercising the universally recognized right to freedom of expression. "The European Union cannot accept that citizens who do so be criminalized by state authorities," the statement said.

The four dissidents—Vladimiro Roca, Felix Bonne, Rene Gomez Manzano and Marta Beatriz Roque—are well known intellectuals who were arrested after publishing a manifesto titled *The Homeland belongs to all*.

The French news agency AFP reported Wednesday that Cuba's failure to release the four could lead to Cuba's exclusion from upcoming talks between the EU and African, Caribbean and Pacific Rim developing countries. EU officials were not available late Wednesday to comment on the report.

The EU recalled that it had expected the four dissidents to be released last year when it agreed to Cuba's request for observer status in its discussions with developing countries who are beneficiaries of Europe's Lome economic cooperation agreement.

"The EU therefore repeats its calls for the prompt release of the four and will continue to evaluate the development of this matter," the statement said.

"In addition, the EU wants to convey its disappointment at the fact that neither diplomats nor foreign news media were allowed to attend the trial of the dissidents, despite the fact that their relatives had been told that the trial would be open to the public," it said.

The EU also said it was concerned about the temporary detention and house arrest of several dozens people connected to the imprisoned dissidents and by new Cuban laws that "curtail the exercise of citizen's rights."

Although Cuba customarily rejects such denunciations as intervention in its internal affairs, the EU statement is considered significant because the European group has steadfastly maintained friendly diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba in the face of threats of retaliation from powerful critics of Cuba in the U.S. Congress.

The Helms-Burton Act, which imposes sanctions on countries investing in Cuban property confiscated from U.S. citizens, was aimed at some European investors but their governments have challenged the law and refused to back down.

In a telephone interview hours before the statement was released, Sweden's international cooperation minister, Pierre Shori, told *The Herald* that the recent developments in Cuba are "alarming." Shori said that "the toughening of the laws against dissidents goes against what the Cuban authorities have said in their dialogue with the European Union."

The EU statement came a day after Canada said it was reconsidering its support for Cuba's return to the Organization of American States (OAS) after Monday's sentencing of the four dissidents. Cuba's OAS membership was suspended in 1962.

The EU statement did not mention the possibility of excluding Cuba from the first European-Latin American summit, to be held June 28-29 in Rio de Janeiro. Fifteen European and 33 Latin American and Caribbean presidents, including Cuba's Fidel Castro, are expected to attend.

The EU condemnation of Cuba's latest crackdown against peaceful opponents, however, marks a possible reversal of the island's ties with the European Union, which had been warming up since 1996 and appeared ready for a significant improvement since Pope John Paul II's visit to the island last year.

Meanwhile, top officials from several Latin American countries—including Chile, Uruguay, Argentina and El Salvador—said their governments were rethinking whether to attend a summit of Ibero-American countries in Havana in November. Nicaragua has already announced it will not attend.

Latin American foreign ministers are to discuss participation at the Havana summit at a meeting in Veracruz, Mexico, on Friday. But a senior Mexican official said Mexico—which presides over the Veracruz meeting—will oppose any effort to organize a boycott of the Cuba summit and that such a move "is not on the agenda."

[From the Financial Times, Mar. 17, 1999]

CUBA: TRADING PARTNERS PROTEST
(By Pascal Fletcher)

Cuba has jailed our well-known political dissidents accused of sedition, drawing condemnation from the U.S. and criticism from leading trade and investment partners Canada and Spain.

The jail sentences announced on Monday ranged from 3½ to five years and were less than those sought by the prosecution. But foreign diplomats said they still sent a strong message from Cuba's one-party Communist government that it would not tolerate opposition, even when it is peaceful.

Jean Chrétien, Canada's prime minister, who had asked Fidel Castro, Cuba's president, to release the four, described the sentences as "disappointing" and added his government would be reviewing the range of its bilateral activities with Havana. José Maria Aznar, Spanish premier, said the jail terms were a "step backwards" for human rights in Cuba.

The four—Vladimiro Roca, Félix Bonne, René Gómez and Martha Beatriz Roque—were convicted of inciting sedition after they criticised one-party communist rule, called for a boycott of elections and urged foreign investors to think twice about investing in Cuba.

Mr. Roca, the son of Cuban Communist party founder Blas Roca, was jailed for five years.

Mr. Bonne and Mr. Gómez each received four-year sentences and Ms. Roque three-and-a-half years. All had already been held for 20 months.

U.S. President Bill Clinton called for their immediate release, saying they had not received a fair trial.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1999]

THE HAVANA FOUR

Vladimiro Roca, Martha Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne, Rene Gomez: Note those names. They are dissidents in Communist-ruled Cuba who went to trial in Havana yesterday. These brave people were jailed a year and a

half ago for holding news conferences for foreign journalists and diplomats, urging voters to boycott Cuba's one-party elections, warning foreigners that their investments would contribute to Cuban suffering and criticizing President Fidel Castro's grip on power. For these "offenses" the four face prison sentences of five, or six years.

Castro Cuba has typically Communist notions of justice. By official doctrine, there are no political prisoners, only common criminals. President Castro rejects the designation of the four, in the international appeals for their freedom, as "prisoners of conscience." Their trial is closed to the foreign press. Some of their colleagues were reportedly arrested to keep them from demonstrating during the trial.

Fidel Castro is now making an energetic effort to recruit foreign businessmen to help him compensate for the trade and investment lost by the continuing American embargo and by withdrawal of the old Soviet subsidies. He is scoring some success: British Airways, for instance, says it is opening a Havana service. Many of the countries engaged in these contacts with Cuba do so on the basis that by their policy of "constructive engagement" they are opening up the regime more effectively to democratic and free-market currents than is the United States by its harder-line policy.

The trial of the four provides a good test of this proposition. The four are in the vanguard of Cuba's small nonviolent political opposition. Acquittal would indicate that in this case anyway the authorities are listening to the international appeals for greater political freedom. But if the four are convicted and sentenced, it will show that the regime won't permit any opposition at all. What then will be international crowd have to say about the society-transforming power of their investment?

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 11, 1999]

"THE SADNESS I FEEL FOR CUBA STAYS ON MY MIND"

(By Raul Rivero)

HAVANA.—From my cell I could see Tania Quintero, Cuba Press correspondent, her face shadowed by the cell's iron lines. From her cell, she could hear the hoarse voice of Odalys Cubelo, another Cuba Press correspondent. And one could feel the presence of Dulce Maria de Quesada, dissident, quiet and silent, sitting on the edge of the gray cement bed.

Not too far from this dark basement, where we were being held, the trial of the four members of the Working Group of Internal Dissidence was taking place.

Tania wanted to be present at the trial because she is a first cousin of Vladimiro Roca, one of the accused. Odalys wanted to cover the trial as a journalist, and Dulce Maria, a retired librarian and dissident, wanted to be there because she felt that she had the right to show a gesture of solidarity with the accused.

I also wanted to follow the trial as a journalist, as a Cuban citizen and as a friend of the four intellectuals being tried. Yet I was jailed with eight common prisoners accused of violence, assault, armed robbery and pimping.

Of course, many ideas crossed my mind, and I experienced many feelings during those 30 hours in jail. As days go by, however, it is the shame and sadness I feel for Cuba that stays on my mind.

I ask myself, what are these professional and decent women doing in a police-station cell? What is going on in Cuba that honorable daughters of this country, belonging to three different generations and from different political origins and upbringings, may be arrested on the streets and placed in a cell

with women accused of prostitution and armed robbery?

I felt more pain for the imprisonment of those three friends than for my own jailing. This is because I perceived their punishment as a symbol anticipating a sacrificial pyre.

Tania and Odalys—like Marvin Hernandez, who had been imprisoned for 48 hours and began a hunger strike in Cienfuegos—have demonstrated professionalism, integrity and discipline while going through this exercise of independent journalism in Cuba.

A few hours after being relatively free to go home, I was to have a unique “meeting” with Marta Beatriz Roque Cabello [one of the dissidents being tried]. There she was in my living room, the brilliant economist who loves poetry and good music, wearing her prisoner’s uniform—on my TV screen. A state broadcaster was insulting her, calling her a stateless person and a “marionette of imperialism.”

Since Marta’s “visit” was so peculiar, I almost commented aloud to her about a note that she sent me from the Manto Negro [Black Cloak] prison at the end of 1998. “Here we are,” she had written, “without any apparent solution but with a lot of faith in God, because there is nothing impossible for Him.”

Marta asked me to put together for her “some material on neoliberal business globalization and the financial crisis in Asia. I want to state my opinions on the subject.” A strange request from a woman in prison, it’s true. Marta’s presence in the kind of Cuba that we have can be disquieting and odd.

Her note concluded: “Say ‘hello’ to Blanca and tell her I recall her great coffee. I hope God allows me to drink some of it soon, sitting in your living room.”

There I had been with Tania, Odalys and Dulce Maria in the jail, and Marta later “came” to my home, and I couldn’t even offer her coffee.

[From the London Economist, Mar. 6, 1999]
COSY OLD CASTRO?

Like any old troupier, Fidel Castro has a neat sense of timing, and surefooted ability to confirm both his friends and his critics in their views. It is three years since his air force cruelly shot down two unarmed planes sent provocatively towards Cuba by an exile group. The result was Bill Clinton’s signature on the Helms-Burton act, tightening still further the American embargo against the island. Helms-Burton is not, in fact, the most damaging piece of such American law, but the regime hates it. It was no coincidence that last month Mr. Castro proposed, and his rubber-stamp legislature at once approved, fierce penalties for all who “collaborate” with the American government—or, specifically, with foreign media—in the effort to strangle Cuba’s economy or upset its socialist system. The few brave Cubans who dare to criticise the regime, and even to publish their views abroad, said this was aimed at them. And, as if to confirm it, the regime chose this week to put on trial—for just one day, and almost out of public view—four of the best-known dissidents.

Their offense, among others, is to have published in mid-1997 a document entitled “*La Patria es de Todos*,” “The Fatherland Belongs to All”—a claim deeply offensive to Mr. Castro’s Communist Party, which likes to claim Cuba, its anti-colonial past and its present alike as exclusive party property. The four heretics were promptly arrested. Even though the new law was not applied to their case, they now risk sentences of years in prison, for the crime of telling the truth.

Mr. Castro has thus confirmed his admirers’ unwavering belief in his unwavering ad-

diction, after 40 years of power, to the basics of Stalinism. Cuba’s official media, of course, approve; and even abroad the sort of lickspittles who 40–50 years ago swallowed the show-trials of Eastern Europe can be found to defend this fresh attack on those whom they smear as “so-called” dissidents (if not common criminals, nut-cases or both). More important, Mr. Castro has comprehensively thumbed his nose at outsiders who thought that, while reluctantly opening chinks of free-market into Cuba’s economy he might also open chinks for free thought and free speech. These hopefuls included Pope John Paul, who came visiting 14 months ago, and whose visit did indeed win freedom (albeit mostly in exile) for some dissidents, and greater freedom for his church. Its inter-American bishops’ conference was held last month in Cuba, for the first time. But even as the bishops met, the new gagging law was going through.

This renewed assault on free thought must worry those governments—in Latin America, in Canada and Europe—which argue that constructive engagement may get Mr. Castro to loosen his grip. An Ibero-American summit is due to be held in Cuba this year. Spain has talked of a royal visit, though the trials have already led it to rethink. Even Mr. Clinton has recently made some gestures towards Cuba’s citizenry, if only to have its regime spit them back in his face.

The stick plainly does not work: the American embargo no more promotes freedom in Cuba today than for decades past. But neither, on current form, do dialogue, trade and investment, and the carrot of more if only Mr. Castro would let go a little. His successors may soften, hoping to preserve his achievements (yes, they exist) and their own power, while loosening the handcuffs of Marxist economics and thought-control. But the old ham himself, it seems, aims to hoof on.

[From the Globe and Mail, Mar. 3, 1999]
CUBA’S FAVOURITE PATSY
(By Marcus Gee)

Last April, Jean Chrétien flew down to meet Cuba’s Fidel Castro, becoming the first Canadian prime minister to do so since 1976. By all accounts they got along famously. Mr. Chrétien praised Cuban-Canadian friendship and told a few jokes. Mr. Castro praised Cuban-Canadian friendship and told a few jokes. Mr. Chrétien had just one thing to ask of his host: Could Cuba please release four Cubans who had been jailed for criticizing the government.

On Monday, 10 months later, Mr. Castro gave his answer. He put the four on trial for sedition. Marta Beatriz Roque, Felix Bonne, Rene Gomez Manzano and Vladimiro Roca—the so-called Group of Four—face jail terms of up to six years for “subverting the order of our socialist state.” Their crime: urging voters to boycott Cuba’s rigged one-party elections and scolding foreign investors for propping up the Castro regime.

The decision to press on with the trial despite protests from Canada and others is yet another example of Mr. Castro’s determination to crush all opposition to his ragged dictatorship. It is also final, definitive proof that Canada’s Cuba policy has failed. With the opening of this caricature of justice, that policy lies gutted like a trout on a pier.

Ottawa calls its policy “constructive engagement.” When it took office in 1993, Mr. Chrétien’s government decided to step up contacts with Cuba. More high-level visits, more trade and investment, more development aid.

The idea was to set Canada apart from the United States, which has tried for years to bring down Mr. Castro with a trade embargo

and other pressure tactics. The U.S. strategy had clearly failed; so Ottawa would try a gentler, more Canadian approach. By “engaging” Mr. Castro, we would win his confidence and persuade him of the error of his ways, meanwhile tweaking Uncle Sam’s nose and winning a new market for Canadian exporters.

In a visit to Cuba in 1997, Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy persuaded Mr. Castro to let Canada help Cuba build a “civil society”—a favourite Lloydism. Canadian MPs would visit Cuba to impart their wisdom about parliamentary democracy. Canadian lawyers and judges would tell their Cuban counterparts how an independent justice system works. Canadians would even help Cuba strengthen its citizens’ complaint process, a kind of national suggestion box.

All this came to pass. The practical effect on human rights in Cuba: zero. Mr. Castro’s human-rights record remains the worst in the Americas. Cuba is still a one-party state where elections are a sham, the judiciary is still a tool of state oppression, independent newspapers and free trade unions don’t exist, and more than 300 Cubans still languish in jail for “counter-revolutionary crimes.”

Far from allowing a civil society to flourish, Mr. Castro has been cracking down. Just two weeks before the trial of the Group of Four, the rubber-stamp National Assembly passed a new anti-subversion law that sets penalties of up to 20 years in jail for anyone “collaborating” with the tough U.S. policy on Cuba. Clearly aimed at Cuba’s tiny group of independent journalists, the law would make it a crime, for example, to talk to the U.S.-funded Cuban-language Radio Martí. Cuba’s fear of bad press is so intense that it jailed a Cuban doctor for eight years after he talked to the foreign press about a dengue fever epidemic in the city of Santiago.

Mr. Castro’s one concession to Canada, if it can be called that, has been to release a dozen or so political prisoners and let them come to Canada—in other words, to send them into exile. When Mr. Chrétien came tuque in hand to Havana last April, bleating about the value of “dialogue over confrontation,” his host used him as a backdrop for a rant against the U.S. embargo, which he compared to genocide.

Yet his gains from the cozy relationship with Canada have been huge. His strategy for many years has been to drive a wedge between the United States and its allies on the Cuba issue. Helped by the stupid Helms-Burton law, which seeks to penalize foreign companies that do business with Cuba, he has been making new friendships in Europe, the Caribbean and Latin America. The friendship of Canada, a country renowned for championing human rights, is by far his biggest coup. And he didn’t even have to ask.

In its summary of Canada’s Cuba policy, the Department of Foreign Affairs explains why Cuba has been so keen on Canada’s friendship. “Given our longstanding relations, Canada’s status as a technologically advanced North American nation, and the lack of a heavily politicized agenda, Canada has been seen as a trusted interlocutor with a balanced perspective.” Down at the pub, they call that a dupe.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the AFL-CIO, John J. Sweeney, directed to Fidel Castro, dated March 5, 1999, condemning the human rights conditions in Cuba.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL OR-
GANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, March 5, 1999.

Dr. FIDEL CASTRO,
*President, Republic of Cuba, Plaza de la
Revolucion, Havana, Cuba.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The AFL-CIO, representing over 13 million working men and women in the United States, vigorously objects to your government's recent measures to silence all opposition in your country, including the passage of laws proscribing freedom of expression with the penalty of death, and increasingly violent physical attacks, arrests, and other forms of harassment perpetrated against pro-democracy activists.

Despite Pope John Paul's historic visit to your country, during which he asked the world to open itself to Cuba and for Cuba to open itself to the world, and the subsequent release of several political prisoners, these most recent measures promulgated and implemented by your government make for a giant step backward. A number of victims of this most recent wave of repression were independent trade union activists.

Some human rights activists have termed the recent campaign of repression as the most significant operation since the 1996 break-up of the Concilio Cubano. On March 1, security forces detained dozens of local activists and blocked foreign observers, including the chief U.S. Envoy to Havana, from attending the trial of the so-called "Group of Four." Vladimir Roca the son of the deceased Cuban Communist hero Blas Roca, Marta Beatriz Roque, an economist, Felix Bonne, an academic, and Rene Gomez, an attorney, have been jailed for the past 19 months for holding news conferences for foreign journalists and diplomats, for urging voters to boycott your country's one-party elections, for warning foreigners that their investments would contribute to Cuban suffering and for openly criticizing the Communist Party. Such actions would be considered a normal exercise of freedom of expression in any democratic society. We also understand that the defendants are jointly accused of "other acts against the security of the state in relation with a crime of sedition." For these "offenses", the four defendants face prison sentences of five to six years. Although your government denies holding prisoners of conscience, it labels the four, as it does other opposition figures, as "counter-revolutionary" criminals.

The unwarranted arrests, threats and physical intimidation are in direct violation of the rights defined and protected by the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which Cuba is a signatory.

The AFL-CIO respectfully requests that your government rescind these most recent measures of repression, as well as freeing the scores of prisoners of conscience who still inhabit your country's jails. The AFL-CIO also wishes to acknowledge and condemn the recent campaign of government-sponsored repression which victimized the individuals mentioned in the list which is enclosed. Although a number of these individuals have been released from state detention, they should never have been arrested in the first place.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SWEENEY,
President.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I commend our distinguished colleagues from Florida, Senators BOB GRAHAM and CONNIE MACK, for their leadership in the bipartisan effort to defend the rights of the Cuban people.

Their Senate Resolution No. 57—of which I am a proud cosponsor—is a

timely reminder to the administration that the United States must speak out clearly in behalf of those whose own voices are choked by communist repression—be they in China or Cuba. Our principled, consistent defense of human rights must be heard at the upcoming meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

In recent weeks, Fidel Castro has executed a brutal crackdown on courageous Cubans and independent journalists who seek freedom from the heavy-handed treatment imposed on them by the Castro government.

Just this week, he sentenced four prominent, peaceful dissidents to up to 5 years in prison for daring to criticize Castro's failed communist experiment.

There's nothing new about Castro's brutality. But the latest Castro crackdown is significant because it violates Castro's commitments to the Pope. The Pope asked Castro to "open up to the world" and to respect human rights. Castro's reply has now been heard: He gave a bloody thumbs-down to the Pope's plea.

The latest crackdown also comes despite years of Canadian coddling and European investment in Cuba. The Canadians' self-described "policy of engagement" has served to prop-up the Castro regime but has done nothing to advance human rights or democracy.

Those who have urged unilateral concessions from the United States in order to nudge Castro toward change surely will now acknowledge that appeasement has failed—as it always does.

The U.S. response to this latest wave of repression must be resolute and energetic. We must invigorate our policy to maintain the embargo on Castro, while undermining Castro's embargo on the Cuban people.

We should make no secret of our goal: I myself have declared publicly and repeatedly that, for the sake of the people of Cuba, Fidel must go. And, whether he goes vertically or horizontally is up to him.

Since the Pope's visit to Cuba, I have urged the administration to increase United States support for Cuban dissidents and independent groups, which include the Catholic Church. Once again, I call on the Clinton administration to increase U.S. support for dissidents, to respect the codification of the embargo, and to work with us on this bipartisan policy.

Castro's recent measures make clear that he is feeling the heat from our efforts to reach out to the Cuban people. That is why Castro is trying to crush dissidents and independent journalists, who are daring to tell the truth about his regime. That is why he has made it a criminal offense for Cubans to engage in friendly contact with Americans.

Castro's cowardly brutality—when one pauses to think about it—shows that he is a weak and frightened despot. His cruelty should make us more determined than ever to sweep Castroism onto the ash heap of history.

Senate Resolution 57 calls upon the administration to use its voice and vote at the upcoming meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission to support a strong resolution that will condemn Castro's systematic repression and appoint a special rapporteur to document the regime's willful violations of universally recognized human rights.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. Res. 57, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the human rights situation in Cuba.

I am pleased to join Senator GRAHAM, MACK and my other colleagues in support of this resolution. This is a timely resolution. As the U.N. Human Rights Commission is preparing to meet in Geneva later this month, we are witnessing a new crackdown on human rights in Cuba.

This week, four prominent dissidents were sentenced to jail terms ranging from three and a half to five years by the Cuban government. Their crime—exercising their right to speak and support a peaceful transition to democracy.

These courageous people, Vladimiro Roca, Rene Manzano, Felix Bonne, and Marta Beatriz Roque, were arrested for their peaceful criticism of the Communist Party platform. They were held over one year without being charged. They were tried in a closed door proceeding that violated all standards of due process. Scores of human rights activists and journalists were arrested before and during their trial to prevent demonstrations of support for the accused. Fidel Castro ignored calls from the Vatican and the Canadian government for their release. Yesterday, the European Union issued a strong statement calling for their release.

The trial prompted international outrage, but came as little surprise for those who have followed Castro's policy of eliminating peaceful dissent. The government regularly pursues a policy of using detention and intimidation to force human rights activists to leave Cuba or abandon their efforts. The four dissidents bravely rejected the Cuban government's offers to go into exile rather than face trial.

One year after the Papal visit, an event which many hoped would bring greater openness to Cuba, Fidel Castro has slammed the door closed on the world and on the Cuban people. 1999 has brought about no change in Castro's unyielding policy of stifling human rights. To the contrary, Castro is tightening his iron grip on the Cuban people.

First, he began the year by rejecting the Administration's expanded humanitarian measures. Among other initiatives, the measures establish direct mail service between the U.S. and Cuba, and expand remittances to individual Cuban families and charitable organizations. These measures, designed to ease the suffering of the Cuban people caused by 40 years of

communism, were called acts of "aggression" by the Cuban government.

Second, a new security law for the "Protection of National Independence and Economy" was passed by the Cuban government in February. The law criminalizes any form of cooperation or participation in pro-democracy efforts. It imposes penalties ranging from 20 to 30 years, for those found to be cooperating with the U.S. government. Government officials have already warned human rights activists that violations are punishable under the new law.

And third, the State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices details the same human rights abuses as last year and the year before. One is hard-pressed to find any improvements. The Report repeats last year's finding that the Cuban government's human rights record remains poor. It reiterates the finding that the government continues to "systematically violate fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens." Security forces "committed serious human rights abuses."

The examples of human rights violations in the Report are numerous, and startling. Human rights activists are beaten in their homes and outside churches. People are arbitrarily detained and arrested. Political prisoners are denied food and medicine brought by their families. Even children are made to stand in the rain chanting slogans against pro-democracy activists.

I would, therefore, say to those countries seeking increased ties with Cuba—take a look at this record. Do not lend any credibility or legitimacy to a government that denies its people basic human rights, and punishes those seeking a peaceful transition to democracy.

While the Western Hemisphere gradually moves towards greater respect for human rights, Cuba remains mired in its communist past. Once again, it is the Cuban people who suffer.

This resolution demonstrates that the United States' Senate stands united, not divided, in condemning human rights abuses in Cuba. It also sends a strong message to not only the U.N. Human Rights Commission, but also to the Cuban people. We will stand with you and support you until the day that you are free.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Mr. MACK. There are no further speakers on my side, so I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are no other speakers on our side of the aisle, so I also yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MACK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 114

(Purpose: To transfer funds from the environmental programs and management account of the Environmental Protection Agency to the State and tribal assistance grant account)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is one of the relevant amendments listed by the majority leader. It is on behalf of Senator CRAPO, dealing with the transfer of funds from the environmental programs and management account of the EPA to the State and tribal assistance grant account. This has been cleared on both sides, and I ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), for Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 114.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 58, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 4. . WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

Of the amount appropriated under the heading "ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT" in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105-276), \$1,300,000 shall be transferred to the State and tribal assistance grant account for a grant for water and wastewater infrastructure projects in the State of Idaho.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 114) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to remove from the list Senator DEWINE's amendment on steel and Senator MURRAY's amendment on rural schools.

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

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk and consider, en bloc, the following amendments:

A Kohl-Harkin-Durbin amendment to provide funding for conservation technical assistance; a Bond-Durbin-Ashcroft-Grassley-Frist-Harkin amendment for additional funding for section 32 assistance to producers; a Byrd amendment to provide additional funding for rural water infrastructure; a technical amendment of my own regarding the provision of emergency assistance made available for fiscal year 1999; a Feinstein-Boxer amendment to increase the emergency funds made available for emergency grants to low-income migrant and seasonal workers.

The last amendment deals with a \$5 million increase which we believe is offset with the current bill. The others are offset.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 115 THROUGH 119, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send the amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) proposes amendments numbered 115 through 119, en bloc.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 115

(Purpose: To provide funding for conservation technical assistance)

On page 37, line 9 strike "\$285,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$313,000,000".

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding Section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i), an additional \$28,000,000 shall be provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation in fiscal year 1999 for technical assistance activities performed by an agency of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out any conservation or environmental program funded by the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for \$28,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act."

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, today, along with Senators HARKIN and DURBIN, I introduce an amendment to add \$28 million this fiscal year to the Conservation Reserve Program CRP, run