

National Guard men and women. We had 3 active-duty battalions from the East coming to fight fires in Montana. People came from everywhere—from 48 States and 3 countries—to Montana. Across the West, some 30,000 brave individuals battled wildfires during this season.

We did not lose any lives in our State, thanks to the combination of solid training, sensible fire strategy, and good luck. The dangers faced by these individuals, however, were obviously real. Think of the danger we put people into.

Last year, we took time to remember the Mann Gulch fire. That was a huge fire in Montana which blew up about 50 years ago. Thirteen National Forest Service smoke jumpers died in that blowup. They were fighting a fire 10 miles away from Helena, 10 miles from the photo I showed earlier. It was not thought to be a fire that was going to threaten lives or property. An observer described the Mann Gulch fire with these words:

A terrific draft of superheated air of tremendous velocity had swept up the hill exploding all inflammable material, causing a wall of flame 600 feet high to roll over the ridge and down the other side and continue over ridges and down gulches until the fuels were so light that the wall could not maintain enough heat to continue. This wall covered 3,000 acres in 10 minutes. Anything caught in the direct path of the heat blast perished.

Just 6 years ago, we lost 14 smoke jumpers in a similar firestorm near Glenwood Springs, CO. This fire, like the Mann Gulch, was considered routine, and these were not even the most deadly fires in the West's history. It is important to remember those who gave their lives fighting wildfires. It is also important to celebrate those who put their lives on the line day after day to keep our homes and communities safe.

A simple thank you does not seem to be enough to show our appreciation for these people and for everything they have done. That is why I have come to the floor to announce I am introducing legislation to honor and commemorate the selfless sacrifices each of these individuals has made to keep our families and our homes safe.

The legislation will direct the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the U.S. Department of Defense to work together to create a commemorative pin or badge that will be issued to each firefighter at the end of a fire season. This will serve as an emblem of the vital service they have provided and a symbol of our gratitude, much as a soldier might receive a band to record a tour of duty, because those who fight wildfires really are soldiers who put their lives on the line every day in defense of the people, communities, the lands of America. These courageous men and women need to be recognized as the heroes they are.

As we properly focus on the work these brave firefighters do for us, let us

not forget the work we must do for them, for it is only by creating and funding sensible forest management policy and by guiding development to reduce the risk to homes and property posed by wildfires that we can keep more of our firefighters out of harm's way and prevent future tragedies like Mann Gulch.

As we commemorate our firefighters, let us make sure we rise to the task of putting aside our differences and working together for commonsense policies that will keep our forests healthy and firefighters safe.

Again, I say thank you, thank you to all the heroes—firefighters, volunteers, Government employees, ordinary citizens—who pulled together to protect life and home in Montana and across the West. Please know that we are truly grateful for everything you have done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before my colleague from Montana leaves the floor, I commend him for his fine remarks. Connecticut is a long way geographically from the State of Montana. The Nation was transfixed over this past summer watching events unfold in the West and particularly in his State where so many millions of acres were engulfed in flames.

I express the strong feelings of all of us across the country on the tremendous work these firefighters have done and note further that we just passed as part of the Defense authorization bill a provision, the Fire Act, which will, for the first time, provide financial resources much along the lines of the COPS programs for fire departments, the 30,000 of them that exist in this country—volunteer, paid, and combination departments—to assist local communities and States in providing the sophisticated technology today which firefighters need, particularly the volunteer departments, where chemical and toxic substances and the tragedies of this summer demand a talent, education, and training unlike people even imaged a few years ago.

I commend the Senator from Montana for his fine work and express my sincere thanks to him and the fine people of Montana as well for a job well done.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SSSSIONS). The motion to proceed.

I believe the Senator has a time request to propound.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

OPPOSITION TO CUBA PROVISIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I express my strong opposition and disappointment with the outcome of last night's Agriculture appropriations conference report with respect to U.S.-Cuba pol-

icy. It is rather ironic that those who rail against Fidel Castro's dictatorial behavior seem to have adopted some of his tendencies; namely, a willingness to abuse the democratic process and go against the will of the majority in the Congress.

The proposed changes in the bill with respect to the sale of food to Cuba are modest at best since these exports can only be financed using third-country private commercial credit or cash. Such restrictive financing terms are a major hurdle for American exporters to overcome and are likely to significantly discourage any significant increases in such exports.

With respect to the codification of existing travel restrictions on Americans wishing to travel to Cuba, I think this action is shameful and irresponsible. I predict the authors of this provision will live to regret deeply having taken away this and future administrations' discretion to grant licenses on a case-by-case basis in circumstances that do not fall into the now codified categories of permissible travel.

I also believe that Cuban Americans who want to keep in touch with their family members in Cuba are going to be extremely critical of the fact that their ability to visit loved ones is now frozen in statute.

I say to the authors of this provision that they are only kidding themselves if they think this is going to stop Cuban Americans who are determined to visit their family members in Cuba several times a year from doing so. Sadly, they are going to encourage otherwise law-abiding individuals to break the law. I think that is regrettable.

I am supportive of other provisions of this legislation which will dramatically loosen the licensing and financing restrictions on sales of food and medicine to other countries that have been designated as terrorist states—North Korea, Iran, Sudan, and Libya. I strongly believe food and medicine should not be used as a sanctions tool, since the impact of denying such sales falls most heavily on innocent men, women, and children in these countries.

This is not to confuse our sincere and deep objections and strong opposition to the Governments of North Korea, Iran, Sudan, and Libya. But, it is not an American tradition to take food and medicine and make them a sanctions tool on a unilateral basis. We have understood in the past that you do not blame the innocent civilians of populations for the cruel regimes of their dictators and rulers. It is not in the American spirit to say to an innocent child—in any one of these countries—that if we are able to get food and medicine to you, you ought to be denied it as a tool of U.S. foreign policy.

I find it appalling that Cuba has been singled out, because in this bill we now say food and medicine can go to North Korea, Iran, Sudan, and Libya, but not to a little country of 11 million people 90 miles off our shore. I think that is

regrettable. Cuba has been singled out for even more restrictive treatment than countries that are far more of a potential threat to United States foreign policy and national security interests than Cuba has ever been.

I am sure the average American is extremely puzzled by the decision just taken by the Agriculture appropriations conferees. I do not blame them for being confused, to put it mildly, and puzzled. Didn't the House and Senate go on record in support of less restrictive conditions on the sale of food and medicine to Cuba? Seventy Senators—70—voted to lift restrictions on the sale of such items; 301 Members out of the 435 Members of the House did so as well. And, 232 Members of the House also are on record in favor of lifting all travel restrictions to Cuba.

Yet despite these overwhelming votes by both Chambers—majorities, bipartisan majorities—the advocates of “tightening the screws,” as they like to say, on Castro are always quick to say they hold no ill will against the Cuban people. Yet I somehow suspect that the residents of Havana or Santiago, Cuba, will not be applauding our recent actions in Washington.

But that isn't what last night's conference decision was about, in any event. Very little we do in Washington with respect to Cuba has anything to do with winning the hearts and minds of the Cuban people. Rather, it is about attempting to win the hearts and votes of the residents of some sections of the country—hardly a wise and moral way, in my view, to make foreign policy decisions.

Earlier this year, Senator LEAHY and I introduced legislation that would take United States policy in a different direction with respect to the island of Cuba. A companion bill was introduced in the House by MARK SANFORD. The bill is entitled the Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act of 2000. It would have lifted the archaic, counterproductive, and ill-conceived ban on Americans traveling to Cuba.

We offered this legislation because we believe the existing restrictions on travel hinder rather than help our efforts to spread democracy as well as unnecessarily abridge the rights of ordinary Americans. We were taught in civics class that the United States was founded on the principles of liberty and freedom. Yet when it comes to Cuba, our Government abridges these rights with no greater rationale than political and rhetorical gain.

It is one thing if Castro does not want to let an American citizen in. I understand that. He is a dictator. What I do not understand is a democratic government saying to its own people you can't go somewhere. Cuba lies just 90 miles from America's shore. Yet those 90 miles of water might as well be on a different planet. We have made a land ripe for American influence a forbidden territory. In doing so, we have enabled the Cuban regime to be a closed system with the Cuban people

having little contact with their closest neighbors on this Earth.

I note that in a few weeks the President of the United States is going to travel to Vietnam, a Communist government. There are 58,000 names on a wall just a few blocks from here of Americans who died in that conflict. Yet we have found it possible to rebuild diplomatic relations, economic relations, and even an America President will travel to a nation that only a few years ago we were in hostile conflict with and has a government with a political philosophy of which today we fundamentally disagree. Yet 90 miles off our shore there is a country to which you cannot even go to try to make a difference, and enlighten people about what democracy means.

Surely we do not ban travel to Cuba out of concern for the safety of Americans who might visit the island nation. Today Americans are free to travel to Iran, to Sudan, to Burma, to Yugoslavia, and to North Korea—but not to Cuba. Is there anyone who would come to this Chamber and suggest to me it is less dangerous to be in Sudan or Burma or Yugoslavia than the island nation that is 90 miles off our shore? I doubt it.

You can fly to Iran. They held hostages, we all recall, back in the 1979–1980 period, yet I can go to Iran today. I can fly there, if I want, without restriction. But I cannot go 90 miles off our shore to the island of Cuba. What an inconsistency.

If the Cubans want to stop Americans, as I said, from visiting their country, then that is their business. I disagree with it, but I would not be surprised that under a dictatorship they might pass such laws or prohibit such travel. But to say to an American citizen that you can travel to Iran, where they held American hostages for months on end, to North Korea, which has declared us to be an enemy of theirs completely, but you cannot travel 90 miles off the shore of this Nation to the island of Cuba is more than just a mistake, in my view.

To this day, some Iranian politicians believe the United States to be “the Great Satan.” That is what they like to call us. We hear it all the time. Just two decades ago, Iran occupied our Embassy and took innocent American diplomats hostage. To this day, protesters in Tehran burn the American flag with the encouragement of some officials in their Government. Those few Americans who venture into such inhospitable surroundings often find themselves pelted by rocks and accosted by the public.

Similarly, we do not ban travel to the Sudan, a nation we attacked with cruise missiles several years ago for its support of terrorism; to Burma, a nation with one of the most oppressive regimes in the world today; to North Korea, whose soldiers have peered at American servicemen through gun sights for decades; or Syria, which has one of the most egregious human

rights records and is one of the foremost sponsors of terrorism.

I fail to see how isolating the Cuban people from democratic values and ideals will foster the transition to democracy in that country. I fail to see how isolating the Cuban people from democratic values and from the influence of Americans when they go to that country to help bring about change we all seek serves our own interest.

The Cuban people are not currently permitted the freedom to travel enjoyed by many peoples around the world. However, because Fidel Castro does not permit Cubans to leave Cuba and come to this country is no justification for adopting a similar principle in this country—a great democracy.

We need to treasure and respect the fundamental rights we embrace as Americans. Travel is one of them. If other countries want to prohibit us from going there, that is their business. But for us to say that citizens of Connecticut or Alabama cannot go where they would like to go is not the kind of restraint we ought to put on our own people.

Today, every single country in the western hemisphere is a democracy, with one exception: Cuba. American influence, through person-to-person and cultural exchanges, was one of the prime factors in this evolution from a hemisphere ruled predominantly by authoritarian and military regimes to one where democracy is the rule.

Our current policy toward Cuba limits these exchanges and prevents the United States from using our most potent weapon, in my view, in our effort to combat totalitarianism, and that is our own people—our own people. They are some of the best ambassadors we have ever sent anywhere. They are the best ambassadors to have.

Most totalitarian regimes bar Americans from coming into their countries for that very reason. These countries are afraid of the gospel of freedom that might motivate their citizens to overthrow dictators, as they have done in dozens of nations over the last half century. Isn't it ironic that when it comes to Cuba, we do the dictator's bidding for him in a sense? Cuba does not have to worry about America spreading democracy. Our own Government stops us from doing so.

There is no better way, in my view, to communicate America's values, our ideals, than by unleashing the average American men and women to demonstrate, by daily living, what our great country stands for, and the contrasts between what we stand for and what exists in Cuba today.

I do not believe there was ever a sensible rationale for restricting Americans' right to travel to Cuba. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and an end to the cold war, I do not think any excuse remains today to ban this kind of travel. This argument that dollars and tourism will be used to prop up the regime is specious. The regime seems to

have survived 38 years despite the draconian U.S. embargo during that entire period. The notion that allowing Americans to spend a few dollars in Cuba is somehow going to give major aid and comfort to the Cuban regime is without basis, in my view.

Political rhetoric is not sufficient reason to abridge the freedoms of American citizens. Nor is it sufficient reason to stand by a law which counteracts one of the basic premises of American foreign policy; namely, the spread of democracy. The time has come to allow Americans—average Americans—to travel freely to Cuba not make it even more difficult to do so.

Mr. President, a small number of individuals in the Congress may have temporarily succeeded in hijacking the democratic process with respect to this issue and in thwarting the will of the majority with respect to loosening U.S. restrictions on travel and sales of food and medicine to Cuba. But let me assure you that this issue is not settled. Those of us who want to see meaningful change in our Cuba policy will be back next year raising this matter on the floors of the House and Senate. And I predict that when the democratic process is allowed to work, the results of last night's conference will be decisively reversed and U.S. policy toward Cuba will be finally put on the right track and the prospects of a peaceful democratic transition in that country greatly enhanced, and the 11 million Cubans will know that the American people care about them despite their strong objections to the Government which runs that country today.

I yield the floor and 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. BYRD. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that Mr. DOMENICI, and then Mr. MCCAIN, have orders for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may briefly speak now, and that I may also be recognized following the speech by Mr. MCCAIN and the speech by Mr. DOMENICI for not to exceed 45 minutes.

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

MAUREEN MANSFIELD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Wednesday, September 20, the Senate lost one of its own family members. Not a member with a capital "M," elected by the people, but an unpaid, unsung, but O so important member of the Senate family. On Wednesday, Maureen Mansfield,

the beloved wife of former majority leader Mike Mansfield, passed away.

It is safe to say that without the efforts, energy, dedication, and love of Maureen Mansfield, the Senate and the people of Montana might never have benefited from the extraordinary talents of Mike Mansfield. Like myself, Mike was raised by an aunt and uncle after the death of his mother when he was just 3 years old. During the First World War, Mike Mansfield dropped out of school and joined the Navy, and he also served with the Army and the Marine Corps.

Upon his return to Montana, he worked as a mucker in the copper mines and did not resume the schooling he had left in the eighth grade.

Maureen, a high school teacher when her younger sister introduced her to Mike, encouraged him to return to school. She helped him to apply to Montana State University and helped him complete his high school equivalency courses before completing college. She cashed in her life insurance and worked as a social worker in order to support her husband in school. Then both of them went on to earn Master's degrees. Maureen Mansfield did not believe, and disproved, the old saw that you cannot change a man and that all efforts to do so are futile.

Mike Mansfield's congressional career also benefitted from Maureen Mansfield's support. Maureen would campaign for Mike in Montana, sometimes on her own when Mike could not get away from Washington. Mike Mansfield served five terms in the House before his first election to the Senate. In the Senate, Lyndon Johnson picked Mike for party whip.

In those days, it was different from what it is now because a leader would not pick another Member for the office of party whip. That is a matter that the Members will resolve.

Mike went on to serve as Majority Leader himself for sixteen years, longer than any other Senator. I served as his party whip. I continued to hold Mike Mansfield in the highest respect. Mike and Maureen have always been good friends to me and Erma, and we will both miss their companionship and the very deep affection and esteem with which they treated each other, and which sustained them through 68 years of marriage.

Erma and I have 5 more years to go before we can say we have been married 68 years. But Mike and Maureen set an example as an exemplary creative family in that regard.

Mike Mansfield never lost his appreciation for his wife's support. He always readily gave Maureen the credit that he felt she was due and which I, having enjoyed the same kind of love and support from my wife, readily endorse. These talented, organized, gracious women, such as Maureen Mansfield and Erma Byrd, could have commanded armies. They could have run universities or won Senate seats in their own right. But they chose instead

to hitch their stars to the wagons of their husbands. And Mike Mansfield and I are definitely the better for it. I believe, too, that the nation is better off as result as well.

The demands of the Senate, particularly the demands placed upon Majority Leaders, are stressful, time-consuming, and exhausting. It is even more than a two-person job. I could concentrate on Senate matters knowing that Erma was there at home to support me and to give the love, affection, and attention to our two daughters that they so much deserved. I am here to say that one old adage is certainly true, and we have all heard it many times. That is, behind any great man is an even greater woman. To the extent that I ever wanted to be great, I have been denied that. But I can say that I have Erma to thank for whatever I have been able to accomplish. I know Mike Mansfield would say the same about Maureen.

Now that Maureen has found new life in the shelter of God's hand, I hope that Mike, his daughter Anne, and his granddaughter might sympathize with the words of "The Beyond," penned by Ella Wheeler Wilcox (1855-1919):

It seemeth such a little way to me,
Across to that strange country, the Beyond;
And yet, not strange, for it has grown to be
The home of those of whom I am so fond;
They make it seem familiar and most dear,
As journeying friends bring distant countries near.

And so for me there is no sting to death,
And so the grave has lost its victory;
It is but crossing with bated breath
And white, set face, a little strip of sea,
To find the loved ones waiting on the shore,
More beautiful, more precious than before.

We miss her here, but she surely waits for Mike.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, first, I want to congratulate Senator BYRD on his comments with regard to the very distinguished Mike Mansfield, and what happened to him recently with the passing of his beautiful and wonderful wife. I, too, in reading about him—I didn't experience as much of him as the Senator from West Virginia did—but he did things in a rather sensational and unique way.

Even though I didn't know him as long as the Senator from West Virginia, and didn't feel his presence as much, he is a very wonderful American.

Can you imagine in his early life what he did, how he became educated and found himself majority leader of the Senate? He did that for a long time, and is still the recordholder.

Mr. BYRD. He is. He was majority leader longer than any other Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Frankly, from what I understand, he did it with a very cool hand. Maybe it was different in those days. It was less confrontational than today, as I understand it—with no criticism and no inferences; just that it was different when he was leading.