

to certain parts of the FECA embodied in this legislation.

This bill would authorize felony prosecutions of knowing and willful FECA violations involving improper contributions aggregating \$25,000 or more during a calendar year. It would also increase the statute of limitations to 5 years, which is the standard statute of limitation for Federal offenses. In addition, the bill would direct the Sentencing Commission to promulgate guidelines. Finally, the bill would clarify that foreign nationals who are not permanent residents may not donate to a candidate or political party as well as make clear that the FECA's prohibition on conduit contributions applies to any type of donation.

I am glad to join in cosponsoring this legislation again, as I did in the last Congress, and urge its prompt passage.

To the extent that we are frustrated by campaign finance abuses, I believe passage of this legislation is a better use of this body's time than the open-ended fishing expedition into open and closed cases.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 601. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on certain accounts at depository institutions, to increase flexibility in setting reserve requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 601

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Checking Regulatory Relief Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. INTEREST-BEARING TRANSACTION ACCOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR ALL BUSINESSES.

Section 2 of Public Law 93-100 (12 U.S.C. 1832) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) TRANSFERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any depository institution may, before September 1, 2002, permit the owner of any deposit or account on which interest or dividends are paid to make up to 24 transfers per month, for any purpose, to another account of the owner in the same institution. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent an account offered pursuant to this subsection from being considered a transaction account (as defined in section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) for purposes of that Act."

SEC. 3. SAVINGS AND DEMAND DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS AT DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) NOW ACCOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR ALL BUSINESSES.—Section 2 of Public Law 93-100 (12 U.S.C. 1832) is amended to read as follows: "SEC. 2. WITHDRAWALS BY NEGOTIABLE OR TRANSFERABLE INSTRUMENTS FOR TRANSFERS TO THIRD PARTIES.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any depository institution (as defined in

section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act) may permit the owner of any deposit or account to make withdrawals from such deposit or account by negotiable or transferable instruments for the purpose of making payments to third parties. With respect to an escrow account maintained in connection with a loan, a lender or servicer shall pay interest on such account only if such payments are required by contract between the lender or servicer and the borrower, or a specific statutory provision of the law of the State in which the security property is located requires the lender or servicer to make such payments."

(b) REPEAL OF PROHIBITIONS ON PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON DEMAND DEPOSITS.—

(1) FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.—Section 19(i) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371a) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) [Reserved]."

(2) HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT.—Section 5(b)(1)(B) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(b)(1)(B)) is amended in the first sentence, by striking "savings association may not—" and all that follows through "(ii) permit any" and inserting "savings association may not permit any".

(3) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 18(g) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) [Reserved]."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on September 1, 2002.

SEC. 4. INCREASED FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD FLEXIBILITY IN SETTING RESERVE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 19(b)(2) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "the ratio of 3 per centum" and inserting "a ratio not greater than 3 percent"; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking "and not less than 8 per centum".

By Mr. DOMENICI.

S. 602. A bill to reform Federal election law; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce my own version of campaign finance reform, the Common-Sense Federal Election Reform Act of 2001.

I am again introducing straightforward reform legislation to deal with six principal areas: (1) the super-wealthy candidate; (2) party soft money; (3) inadequate hard money limits; (4) increased disclosure for certain communications; (5) paycheck protection; and (6) unlawful fundraising activities.

This bill addresses the issues that I have raised over and over again on the floor of the Senate whenever we have debated campaign finance reform. As I've said before, the biggest problem with our elections is that they no longer belong to the voters.

My bill makes six fundamental changes to existing campaign finance laws. First, it helps solve the wealthy candidate problem. Over the past decade we have witnessed the growing tide of multi-millionaire candidates financing their campaigns and effectively shutting out other qualified candidates through the sheer power of their own wealth. Something must be done to stem this tide so that the electorate hears the voices of all the candidates

and not just those with extraordinary personal wealth.

The teacher, police officer, military man or woman, and the like must have an equal chance to participate as candidates in our dynamic political process. Perhaps more importantly, if the current system is allowed to stand, the public will hear only the views of the super-wealthy. Elections will become, even more than today, nothing more than a choice between two Wall Street financiers or two corporate magnates. My bill helps ensure that a candidate prevails on the strength of his ideas not the size of his personal bank account.

The bill tackles the problem without offending the First Amendment. Indeed, there are no limits on the wealthy candidate's right to spend his or her own money on his or her campaign. Rather, the bill simply levels the playing field by increasing the outdated individual contribution limits for the opponent of the self-financing candidate.

Let me explain in very general terms how it works. In New Mexico, if the wealthy candidate spends personal funds on his or her campaign in excess of approximately \$400,000, the opponent could raise contributions from individuals at three times the current limit or \$3,000 per election. If the wealthy candidate exceeded \$800,000 in personal expenditures, the opponent could raise individual contributions at six times the current limit or \$6,000. Finally, where the millionaire candidate spends in excess of \$2,000,000 of personal funds, the party coordinated expenditure limits are eliminated for the opponent candidate.

This does not violate a wealthy candidate's constitutional right to use personal funds on his or her own campaign. It merely enables the non-wealthy candidate to participate in the process so that the public hears the opinions of all the qualified candidates regardless of their personal fortune.

Another important aspect of this provision states that a candidate who incurs personal loans in connection with his or her campaign cannot repay himself or herself in excess of \$250,000 with contributions received after the election. It creates a perception of impropriety for a candidate, who once elected, uses the prestige of office to raise contributions to repay personal debt incurred during the campaign.

In addition to the wealthy candidate problem, the bill addresses the soft money issue. It caps soft money contributions at \$50,000 per individual during each election cycle. I have long felt that Congress should limit soft money to reduce the perception that extraordinary wealthy people can buy influence through substantial, unregulated contributions to the political parties.

Third, my bill modestly increases the regulated or "hard" money individual contribution limits that are now 25 years old. For example, under this legislation, individuals can contribute

\$5,000 to a candidate rather than the current \$1,000 limit. These increases are long overdue. Campaigns are very expensive and it takes too much of a candidate's time to raise the necessary money at the outdated \$1,000 limits. This bill will permit candidates to spend more time presenting their views to the public and less time attending fund raisers. Certainly, no one can argue that in today's world \$5,000 is enough to buy influence.

Fourth, my bill increases disclosure requirements for certain communications. The legislation calls for the disclosure of certain information by anyone who spends more than \$25,000 or more on radio or television advertising that mentions a federal candidate by name or likeness. I have long felt that disclosure is the best way to pursue campaign finance reform. Disclosure is the best policy because it does not infringe the constitutional rights of individuals and groups to engage in political speech.

Fifth, the bill deals with the use of union dues for political activities. Mr. President, I can think of no other campaign activity that is more un-American than the mandatory, compulsory taking of union dues for political purposes. The essence of democracy is that political speech must be voluntary. For many union workers, that is not the case. Indeed, unions are made up of forty percent Republicans, and yet nearly all the union money that is spent on political activity goes to the Democratic party. My bill requires the unions to get the prior, written permission of all members before using their dues for political purposes.

Finally, my bill addresses illegal fundraising activities. It clarifies that soft money is a "contribution" under federal election laws. Thus, it makes absolutely clear that government officials cannot use federal property to raise any campaign funds, including soft money. The bill also provides increased criminal penalties for violations of the foreign national provisions and for contributions made in the name of another.

My record is clear. Today, for at least the fourth time, I am introducing a comprehensive campaign finance bill so that my constituents in New Mexico know where I stand on campaign finance reform.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SNOWE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BIDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DAYTON, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. BOXER):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, Senators SCHUMER, SARBANES, SNOWE, DODD, KERRY, FEINGOLD, LIEBERMAN,

BIDEN, CANTWELL, MURRAY, FEINSTEIN, CLINTON, CORZINE, DAYTON, MIKULSKI, BOXER and I are reintroducing the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. In doing so, we reaffirm our strong commitment to the ERA and full equality for women in our society.

Enactment and ratification of the ERA is essential to ensure that the law reflects our country's commitment to equality by guaranteeing equal rights for women. Existing statutory prohibitions against sex discrimination have failed to guarantee basic educational and employment opportunities for women that are equal to those available to men. The need for a constitutional guarantee of equal rights continues to be compelling.

In the absence of the ERA, too little progress has been made on women's rights, especially in the area of economic opportunity. An unconscionable gap between the earnings of men and women persists in the workforce. Today, women continue to earn only 72 cents for each dollar earned by men. Taking home less than 3/4 of a paycheck for a full days work is still a common experience for far too many women.

Sex discrimination continues to permeate many areas of the economy. While women with college degrees have made significant advances in many professional and managerial occupations in recent years, more than half of working women remain clustered in a narrow range of traditionally female, traditionally low-paying occupations. And female-headed households continue to dominate the bottom rungs of the economic ladder. When a family with children is headed by a woman, the likelihood is high that the family is living in poverty. In 1999, 41.9 percent of all families headed by single mothers lived below the poverty line.

Plainly, much remains to be done to secure equal opportunity for women. Enactment of the Equal Rights Amendment alone will not undo generations of economic injustice, but it will encourage women in all parts of the country in their efforts to obtain fairness under the nation's laws.

We know from the ratification experience of the 1970's and early 1980's that the road to adoption of the ERA will not be easy. But the extraordinary importance of the effort requires us to persevere. We should approve the ERA in this Congress, and begin the ratification process anew. The ERA must take its rightful place in America's founding document.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of our joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Con-

stitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SECTION 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SECTION 3. This article shall take effect two years after the date of ratification."

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 62—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KYL, Mr. HELMS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. SANTORUM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 62

Whereas, according to the Department of State and international human rights organizations, the Cuban government continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights violations against the Cuban people and to detain hundreds more as political prisoners;

Whereas the Castro regime systematically violates all of the fundamental civil and political rights of the Cuban people, denying freedoms of speech, press, assembly, movement, religion, and association, the right to change their government, and the right to due process and fair trials;

Whereas, in law and in practice, the Cuban government restricts the freedom of religion of the Cuban people and engages in efforts to control and monitor religious institutions through surveillance, infiltration, evictions, restrictions on access to computer and communication equipment, and harassment of religious professionals and lay persons;

Whereas the totalitarian regime of Fidel Castro actively suppresses all peaceful opposition and dissent by the Cuban people using undercover agents, informers, rapid response brigades, Committees for the Defense of the Revolution, surveillance, phone tapping, intimidation, defamation, arbitrary detention, house arrest, arbitrary searches, evictions, travel restrictions, politically motivated dismissals from employment, and forced exile;

Whereas, workers' rights are effectively denied by a system in which foreign investors are forced to contract labor from the Cuban government and to pay the regime in hard currency knowing that the regime will pay less than 5 percent of these wages in local currency to the workers themselves;

Whereas these abuses by the Cuban government violate internationally accepted norms of conduct;

Whereas the Senate is mindful of the admonishment of President Ernesto Zedillo of Mexico during the last Ibero-American Summit in Havana, Cuba, that "[t]here can be no sovereign nations without free men and women. Men and women who can freely exercise their essential freedoms: freedom of

thought and opinion, freedom of participation, freedom of dissent, freedom of decision.”;

Whereas President Vaclav Havel, an essential figure in the Czech Republic's transition to democracy, has counseled that “[w]e thus know that by voicing open criticism of undemocratic conditions in Cuba, we encourage all the brave Cubans who endure persecution and years of prison for their loyalty to the ideals of freedom and human dignity”;

Whereas former President Lech Walesa, leader of the Polish solidarity movement, has urged the world to “mobilize its resources, just as was done in support of Polish Solidarnosc and the Polish workers, to express their support for Cuban workers and to monitor labor rights” in Cuba;

Whereas efforts to document, expose, and address human rights abuses in Cuba are complicated by the fact that the Cuban government continues to deny international human rights and humanitarian monitors access to the country;

Whereas Pax Christi further reports (September 2000) that these efforts are complicated because “a conspiracy of silence has fallen over Cuba” in which diplomats and entrepreneurs refuse even to discuss labor rights and other human rights issues in Cuba, some “for fear of endangering the relations with the Cuban government”, and businessmen investing in Cuba “openly declare that the theme of human rights was not of their concern”;

Whereas the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva provides an excellent forum to spotlight human rights and expressing international support for improved human rights performance in Cuba and elsewhere;

Whereas the goal of United States policy in Cuba is to promote a peaceful transition to democracy through an active policy of assisting the peaceful forces of change on the island;

Whereas the United States may provide assistance through appropriate nongovernmental organizations to help individuals and organizations to promote nonviolent democratic change and promote respect for human rights in Cuba; and

Whereas the President is authorized to engage in democracy-building efforts in Cuba, including the provision of (1) publications and other informational materials on transitions to democracy, human rights, and market economies to independent groups in Cuba; (2) humanitarian assistance to victims of political repression and their families; (3) support for democratic and human rights groups in Cuba; and (4) support for visits and permanent deployment of democratic and international human rights monitors in Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the Senate condemns the repressive and totalitarian actions of the Cuban government against the Cuban people.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the President should establish an action-oriented policy of directly assisting the Cuban people and independent organizations to strengthen the forces of change and to improve human rights in Cuba;

(2) such policy should be modeled on the bipartisan United States support for the Polish Solidarity (Solidarnosc) movement under former President Ronald Reagan and involving United States trade unions; and

(3) the President should make all efforts necessary at the meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva in 2001 to obtain the passage by the Commission of a resolution condemning the Cuban government for its human rights abuses, and to secure the appointment of a Special Rapporteur for Cuba.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the resolution I am privileged to introduce today condemns the human rights practices in Cuba, urges assistance to non-governmental organizations that are working to achieve greater freedom and respect for human rights in Cuba, and supports a strong United Nations resolution against Cuba at the UN Human Rights Commission session that begins this week in Geneva. The UN Commission's annual meeting is an ideal opportunity to focus the spotlight of world opinion on the appalling human rights conditions in Cuba and to underscore our support for those who continue to champion the cause of freedom for the Cuban people.

The repressive situation in Cuba is not new. Indeed, the United States has been closely watching events in Cuba for more than 40 years and trying to find ways to foster democratic changes; changes that have since swept through the rest of our hemisphere and around the world. My distinguished colleagues in Congress and various administrations over the years have not always agreed on how best to help the Cuban people achieve the fundamental rights we enjoy here in America. But we overwhelmingly agree on what is the root of the problem in Cuba: Fidel Castro.

As we well know, his totalitarian regime has systematically repressed the fundamental rights of the Cuban people and denied them the most basic of freedoms. This oppression has not eased with time but has in fact become worse, as is documented in disturbing detail in the State Department's recently issued Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2000.

In early 1998, Pope John Paul II visited Cuba, a remarkable historic event that raised a glimmer of hope that perhaps the Castro regime would relax some of its repressive practices, particularly with regard to religious organizations of all types, including the Catholic Church to which great numbers of Cubans are faithful. In that same year, the UN Human Rights Commission did not renew the mandate of its Special Rapporteur on Cuba, with the understanding that the Cuban government would improve human rights practices if it were not under formal sanction by the United Nations.

But, I am sorry to say that, according to the State Department's report, human rights practices in Cuba have actually become worse. Despite the Pope's visit, Castro's government continues to clamp down on religious groups, requiring them to register, but then not registering them, so that they must meet illegally. It refuses to issue required permits to religious groups to build places of worship, but harasses groups that resort to meeting in private homes. It limits access by churches to the media and printing facilities. It withholds visas to priests and nuns. It conducts surveillance, infiltration

and harassment of religious professionals and lay persons. And when the UN Human Rights Commission passed a new resolution expressing concern over this situation in April 1999, the Cuban government responded by organizing a protest march of about 200,000 people in Havana. Such marches are not voluntary; attendance of workers and school children is taken and workers have been threatened with imprisonment for not showing up.

As hard as it is to imagine, the Cuban government's repression of human rights activists is even more severe than that experienced by religious groups. Not a single human rights organization is recognized by the government. Under Cuban law, any unauthorized assembly of more than three persons can be punished by imprisonment and, predictably, no public meeting has ever been approved for a human rights organization. Human rights advocates and independent journalists are routinely arrested, detained and subjected to interrogation, threats, degrading treatment and unsanitary conditions. Even more disturbing is that the Cuban Constitution, rather than being the foundation for the rule of law and freedoms, actually provides the justification for this repression. It contains sweeping provisions that allow the denial of what few civil liberties even exist in Cuba for anyone who actively “opposes socialism” or appears “dangerous.” As a result, the police arrest people at will or subject them to therapy or re-education. The Constitution is simply a sham, a license to oppress.

The penalties for opposition to these intolerable conditions are severe. Criticism is considered “enemy propaganda” and can result in up to 14 years imprisonment. According to the State Department report, this “enemy propaganda” includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international reports on human rights violations, and foreign newspapers and magazines. In late 1999, Amnesty International reported that approximately 200 persons were arrested around the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to prevent them from commemorating that event. Human rights activists described the escalation of arbitrary arrests and detention as the worst in a decade. They estimate there are currently between 300 and 400 political prisoners in Cuba.

This massive oppression sounds archaic, a relic of another time, the stuff of a Cold War world that has been relegated to the history books. But it is not history in Cuba. It is the harsh reality of everyday life. Cuba remains a world of informers, block committees that report on their neighbors and co-workers, infiltrators in groups that the government thinks might be subversive. Cuba is a place where teachers write evaluations of their students' “ideological character” and that of their parents, evaluations that follow the children throughout their schooling and determine their future education and careers. Cuba is a nation

where the government monitors phone calls, controls and limits Internet access, and restricts the ability to purchase fax machines and photocopiers. Recently, two Czech citizens, one a member of Parliament and the other a student activist, were arrested in Cuba for the "crime" of meeting with dissidents and bringing them pencils and a computer.

The resolution my colleagues and I are introducing today condemns these repressive and indefensible policies of the Castro regime. It calls for the United States to implement a policy supporting the non-governmental organizations in Cuba that are working toward a more open society, respect for human rights and greater political, economic and religious freedom for the Cuban people. Our support should be modeled on the assistance that we gave to the former Communist nations of eastern Europe, such as Poland in the 1980's, where the U.S. funded non-governmental institutions like the Solidarity trade union movement that were working tirelessly for democracy and a free economy. This resolution also calls for active U.S. support for a strong United Nations resolution on Cuba at the current session of the UN High Commission for Human Rights to demonstrate broad international condemnation of Cuba's human rights record. America must stand as a light on this bleak horizon. I urge my colleagues to lend their voices in support of this resolution and for the promotion of basic human rights and dignity for the Cuban people.

I ask unanimous consent that the Introduction to the State Department's report on human rights in Cuba be printed in the RECORD.

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

CUBA—COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES FOR 2000

[Released by the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, U.S. Department of State, February 2001]

Cuba is a totalitarian state controlled by President Fidel Castro, who is Chief of State, Head of Government, First Secretary of the Communist Party, and commander-in-chief of the armed forces. President Castro exercises control over all aspects of life through the Communist Party and its affiliated mass organizations, the government bureaucracy, and the state security apparatus. The Communist Party is the only legal political entity, and President Castro personally chooses the membership of the Politburo, the select group that heads the party. There are no contested elections for the 601-member National Assembly of People's Power, ANPP, which meets twice a year for a few days to rubber stamp decisions and policies already decided by the Government. The Party controls all government positions, including judicial offices. The judiciary is completely subordinate to the Government and to the Communist Party.

The Ministry of Interior is the principal organ of state security and totalitarian control. Officers of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, FAR, which are led by President Castro's brother, Raul, have been assigned to the majority of key positions in the Ministry

of Interior in recent years. In addition to the routine law enforcement functions of regulating migration and controlling the Border Guard and the regular police forces, the Interior Ministry's Department of State Security investigates and actively suppresses opposition and dissent. It maintains a pervasive system of vigilance through undercover agents, informers, the rapid response brigades, and the Committees for the Defense of the Revolution, CDR's. The Government traditionally uses the CDR's to mobilize citizens against dissenters, impose ideological conformity, and root out "counterrevolutionary" behavior. During the early 1990's, economic problems reduced the Government's ability to reward participation in the CDR's and hence the willingness of citizens to participate in them, thereby lessening the CDR's effectiveness. Other mass organizations also inject government and Communist Party control into citizens' daily activities at home, work, and school. Members of the security forces committed serious human rights abuses.

The Government continued to control all significant means of production and remained the predominant employer, despite permitting some carefully controlled foreign investment in joint ventures with it. Foreign companies are required to contract workers only through Cuban state agencies, which receive hard currency payments for the workers' labor but in turn pay the workers a fraction of this, usually 5 percent in local currency. In 1998 the Government retracted some of the changes that had led to the rise of legal nongovernmental business activity when it further tightened restrictions on the self-employed sector by reducing the number of categories allowed and by imposing relatively high taxes on self-employed persons. In September the Minister of Labor and Social Security publicly stated that more stringent laws should be promulgated to govern self-employment. He suggested that the Ministry of Interior, the National Tax Office, and the Ministry of Finance act in a coordinated fashion in order to reduce "the illegal activities" of the many self-employed. According to government officials, the number of self-employed persons as of September was 156,000, a decrease from the 166,000 reported in 1999.

According to official figures, the economy grew 5.6 percent during the year. Despite this, overall economic output remains below the levels prior to the drop of at least 35 percent in gross domestic product that occurred in the early 1990's due to the inefficiencies of the centrally controlled economic system; the loss of billions of dollars of annual Soviet bloc trade and Soviet subsidies; the ongoing deterioration of plants, equipment, and the transportation system; and the continued poor performance of the important sugar sector. The 1999-2000 sugar harvest, just over 4 million tons, was marginally better than the 1998-99 harvest. The 1997-98 harvest was considered the worst in more than 50 years. For the tenth straight year, the Government continued its austerity measures known as the "special period in peacetime." Agricultural markets, legalized in 1994, provide consumers wider access to meat and produce, although at prices beyond the reach of most citizens living on peso-only incomes or pensions. Given these conditions, the flow of hundreds of millions of dollars in remittances from the exile community significantly helps those who receive dollars to survive. Tourism remained a key source of revenue for the Government. The system of so-called tourist apartheid continued, with foreign visitors who pay in hard currency receiving preference over citizens for food, consumer products, and medical services. Most citizens remain barred from tourist hotels, beaches, and resorts.

The Government's human rights record remained poor. It continued to violate systematically the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens. Citizens do not have the right to change their government peacefully. There were unconfirmed reports of extrajudicial killings by the police, and reports that prisoners died in jail due to lack of medical care. Members of the security forces and prison officials continued to beat and otherwise abuse detainees and prisoners. The Government failed to prosecute or sanction adequately members of the security forces and prison guards who committed abuses. Prison conditions remained harsh. The authorities continued routinely to harass, threaten, arbitrarily arrest, detain, imprison, and defame human rights advocates and members of independent professional associations, including journalists, economists, doctors, and lawyers, often with the goal of coercing them into leaving the country. The Government used internal and external exile against such persons, and it offered political prisoners the choice of exile or continued imprisonment. The Government denied political dissidents and human rights advocates due process and subjected them to unfair trials. The Government infringed on citizens' privacy rights. The Government denied citizens the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and association. It limited the distribution of foreign publications and news, reserving them for selected party faithful, and maintained strict censorship of news and information to the public. The Government restricts some religious activities but permits others. Before and after the January 1998 visit of Pope John Paul II, the Government permitted some public processions on feast days, and reinstated Christmas as an official holiday; however, it has not responded to the papal appeal that the Church be allowed to play a greater role in society. During the year, the Government allowed two new priests to enter the country, as professors in a seminary, and another two to replace two priests whose visas were not renewed. However, the applications of many priests and religious workers remained pending, and some visas were issued for periods of only 3 to 6 months. The Government kept tight restrictions on freedom of movement, including foreign travel. The Government was sharply and publicly antagonistic to all criticism of its human rights practices and discouraged foreign contacts with human rights activists. Violence against women, especially domestic violence, and child prostitution are problems. Racial discrimination occurs. The Government severely restricted worker rights, including the right to form independent unions. The Government prohibits forced and bonded labor by children; however, it requires children to do farm work without compensation during their summer vacation.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator LEIBERMAN and other Members of the Senate as an original sponsor of a bipartisan resolution critical of human rights practices in Cuba. The resolution we are introducing today urges the President to develop initiatives to assist the Cuban people and independent organizations in Cuba in their struggle for change, human rights and democracy. Our resolution cites U.S. support for Solidarity in Poland in the 1980s as a model to emulate. The resolution also urges the United States to take an active role in approving a resolution condemning Cuba at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva that is underway as we speak.

The recent arbitrary arrest of two Czech citizens, a legislator and a student, by Cuban authorities in Cuba reminds us of the extent to which the government will go to squash expressions of freedom and opposition to the regime. The two Czech citizens understand the arbitrary nature of their arrest because they have been victims of suppression in their own personal struggle for freedom and democracy in their own country a few years ago.

As Human Rights Watch noted, Cuba has "a highly effective machinery of repression." Journalists, writers, intellectuals, and anyone else who disagrees or dares to challenge the regime risk harassment, imprisonment or other harsh treatment. Human rights repression in Cuba is one of the most serious impediments to improved relations with the United States.

The goal of our resolution is to encourage a peaceful transition to democracy through transparent initiatives that will support human rights groups in Cuba, make available materials and relevant literature on human rights, and provide humanitarian assistance to nongovernmental organizations on the island.

My criticism of human rights practices in Cuba is consistent with my criticism of our unilateral economic sanctions against Cuba. There is no inherent incompatibility between these two critiques. A pro-engagement policy can be a pro-human rights policy in much the same way it was in our policy towards central and eastern European countries during the cold war.

I believe that programs, such as those of the National Endowment for Democracy and its core institutes, can help promote democracy and political freedoms in Cuba and are likely to be more successful in promoting change than economic coercion. Contacts and interactions through trade, travel, tourism, student exchanges, and other forms of engagement will, in my view, yield more positive results in changing Cuba and improving Cuban human rights practices than isolation and punitive sanctions. This may not be true in all cases where we have differences with other countries, but I believe it has merit with respect to Cuba.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join Senator LIEBERMAN and the other sponsors in supporting this resolution and that some day Cuba will join Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and other states around the world in making the transformation from tyranny to freedom and democracy.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, as Americans, we sometimes take for granted the fundamental rights for which our forefathers fought and on which this great nation was founded. We must not forget, however, that there are places in the world where people are denied these basic freedoms. Sadly, even with the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the spread of freedom and democracy in Eastern Europe and the Baltics,

there are countries that still do not have freedom of press, assembly, movement, religion or association; where people do not have the right to peacefully change their government; and where individuals do not have the right to due process.

Cuba is one such country, a nation that, despite our efforts over the past 40 years, remains subject to the dictatorial rule of Fidel Castro. Castro retains power over the Cuban people through force, fear, and deprivation. A 1999 Human Rights Watch Report, Cuba's Repressive Machinery: Human Rights Forty Years After the Revolution, summarized the deplorable situation in that country, stating,

Over the past forty years, Cuba has developed a highly effective machinery of repression. The denial of basic civil and political rights is written into Cuban law. In the name of legality, armed security forces, aided by state-controlled mass organizations, silence dissent with heavy prison terms, threats of prosecution, harassment, or exile. Cuba uses these tools to restrict severely the exercise of fundamental human rights of expression, association, and assembly. The conditions in Cuba's prisons are inhuman, and political prisoners suffer additional degrading treatment and torture. In recent years, Cuba has added new repressive laws and continued prosecuting nonviolent dissidents while shrugging off international appeals for reform and placating visiting dignitaries with occasional releases of political prisoners.

Clearly, it is time to explore a different approach to dealing with Cuba. It is important that, as the era of Fidel Castro's rule comes to a close, we work to establish a long-term relationship with the Cuban people.

During the 1980's President Reagan was a champion for human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, standing up for freedom, democracy, and civil society. He passionately spoke of American values and God-given rights, and more importantly, backed his words with action. In his 1982 "Evil Empire" speech before the British House of Commons, President Reagan stated:

While we must be cautious about forcing the pace of change, we must not hesitate to declare our ultimate objectives and to take concrete actions to move toward them. We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings.

Poland is but one example of the success of this firm stance. Pope John Paul II, after he visited Cuba in 1998, said, "I wish for our brothers and sisters on that beautiful island that the fruits of this pilgrimage will be similar to the fruits of that pilgrimage in Poland."

Senator LIEBERMAN has introduced a resolution calling upon the United States to offer assistance to Cuban people and independent organizations, modeled after President Reagan's support for the Polish Solidarity Movement. Though our debate on the embargo is sure to continue during this Congress, Senator LIEBERMAN's resolution outlines the basic problem on

which we can all agree. Fidel Castro's human rights record is deplorable, and the situation continues to deteriorate. Furthermore, this resolution proposes a solution that supports the strengthening of civil society in Cuba, offering hope to the people there who are struggling to emerge from beneath the shell of communism. It also calls upon the U.S. delegation to this year's meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission to actively support the passage of a resolution condemning Cuba for its human rights violations.

As we continue to enjoy the fruits of liberty, we have an obligation, as Americans, to take a stand against Castro's regime and assist the Cuban people in a peaceful transition to democracy. We have an opportunity, beginning with the passage of this resolution, to reach out to the Cuban people through the wall of repression that Castro has built around his small island, so that they may some day taste the freedom and justice that we have been afforded not by chance, but by the hard work and perseverance of those who believed that life should not be any other way. With our help, the Cuban people can further their progress down the road to democracy.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, democracy and the rule of law are the norm in the Western Hemisphere, but the Cuban people remain denied the blessings of freedom. And the violations of their rights by Fidel Castro's regime are widespread, well-documented, and impact upon every aspect of their lives.

Policymakers in Washington may wrangle over the details of how United States policy in Cuba should be implemented, but we can all agree that the Cuban people need and deserve our support to bring about change in their country.

It is important to underscore that the Cuban people aren't passively waiting for change. They are taking peaceful action every day trying to advance the cause of freedom and democracy. This often costs them their physical freedom, their jobs, their families—even their homeland.

Despite these endeavors, Castro remains as intransigent and repressive as ever. Since January, he has stepped up efforts to beat down Cubans who dare to hope for liberation by jailing and harassing those who speak out.

Not content to simply control the Cuban people, Castro has also intensified his harassment of foreigners who provide moral or material support to pro-democracy dissidents.

Swedes, Czechs, Lithuanians, Mexicans, and Americans have been detained by Castro's police in recent months for meeting with or giving money, printed material, and other help to Cuban dissidents.

Mr. President, foreign governments have been maligned for "licking the Yankee boot" because they support passage of a U.N. Commission on Human Rights resolution condemning the human rights record in Castro's Cuba.

Foreign officials have been not-so-cordially invited to cancel visits to Cuba because they had dared to suggest that there is room for improvement in Cuba's human rights record.

Therefore, Castro is essentially criminalizing contact with the Cuban people and trying to bully democratic countries into abandoning their principles—and thereby abandoning the Cuban people.

We won't be bullied—and our allies in Europe and Latin America must not let themselves be bullied either.

It is against this back-drop that I am joining Senator LIEBERMAN and a distinguished, bipartisan group of my colleagues today in introducing a resolution regarding the human rights situation in Cuba, a resolution that is designed to give momentum to efforts to pass a U.N. Human Rights Commission resolution on Cuba when it convenes in Geneva this month.

It is also designed to give momentum to a more pro-active and creative U.S. policy of working with the Cuban dissident community modeled on President Reagan's successful efforts to help Poland's Solidarity Movement work for change during the cold war.

Most importantly, it is a message to remind the Cuban people that the United States stands solidly with them in their peaceful struggle for freedom. I am confident that other Senators will want to join Senator LIEBERMAN in supporting this important resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 63—COMMEMORATING AND ACKNOWLEDGING THE DEDICATION AND SACRIFICE MADE BY THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE LOST THEIR LIVES WHILE SERVING AS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MILLER, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mr. FRIST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. REID, Mr. BAYH, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 63

Whereas the well-being of all citizens of the United States is preserved and enhanced as a direct result of the vigilance and dedication of law enforcement personnel;

Whereas more than 700,000 men and women, at great risk to their personal safety, presently serve their fellow citizens as guardians of peace;

Whereas peace officers are on the front line in preserving the right of the children of the United States to receive an education in a crime-free environment, a right that is all too often threatened by the insidious fear caused by violence in schools;

Whereas 150 peace officers lost their lives in the line of duty in 2000, and a total of

nearly 15,000 men and women serving as peace officers have now made that supreme sacrifice;

Whereas every year, 1 in 9 peace officers is assaulted, 1 in 25 peace officers is injured, and 1 in 4,400 peace officers is killed in the line of duty; and

Whereas, on May 15, 2001, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in the Nation's Capital to join with the families of their recently fallen comrades to honor those comrades and all others who went before them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes May 15, 2001, as Peace Officers Memorial Day, in honor of Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled in the line of duty; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am joined by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senators HATCH and LEAHY, along with 34 other Senators in introducing this resolution to keep alive in the memory of all Americans the sacrifice and commitment of those law enforcement officers who lost their lives serving their communities. Specifically, this resolution would designate May 15, 2001, as National Peace Officers Memorial Day.

As a former deputy sheriff, I know first-hand the risks which law enforcement officers face everyday on the front lines protecting our communities. Currently, more than 700,000 men and women who serve this nation as our guardians of law and order do so at a great risk. Every year, about 1 in 9 officers is assaulted, 1 in 25 officers is injured, and 1 in 4,400 officers is killed in the line of duty. There are few communities in this country that have not been impacted by the words: "officer down."

In 2000, approximately 150 federal, state and local law enforcement officers have given their lives in the line of duty. This represents more than a 10 percent rise in police fatalities over the previous year. And, nearly 15,000 men and women have made the supreme sacrifice.

The Chairman of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, Craig W. Floyd, reminds us, "Despite improved equipment and better training, law enforcement remains the deadliest profession in America. On average, one officer is killed somewhere in America every 57 hours. At the very least, we must ensure that those officers, and their families, are never forgotten."

On May 15, 2001, more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in our Nation's Capital to join with the families of their fallen comrades who by their faithful and loyal devotion to their responsibilities have rendered a dedicated service to their communities. In doing so, these heroes have established for themselves an enviable and enduring reputation for preserving the rights and security of all citizens. This resolution is a fitting tribute for this special and solemn occasion.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting passage of this important resolution.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I am proud to rise today as an original cosponsor of Senator CAMPBELL's resolution designating May 15, 2001, as Peace Officers Memorial Day. I commend Senator CAMPBELL for his efforts to honor these brave men and women, and thank all of our Nation's law enforcement officials and their families for the daily sacrifices they make as they work to enforce our Nation's laws and ensure the safety of all American citizens.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, 107 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty in 1999. Forty-two of these officers were killed feloniously and 65 died accidentally. An additional 55,026 officers were assaulted in the line of duty.

From 1990 to 1999, 28 Arkansas law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty. Eleven of these officers were feloniously killed and 16 died accidentally. During the year 2000, Patrol Officer Lewis D. Jones, Jr. of the Forrest City Police Department and Captain Thomas Allen Craig of the Arkansas State Police lost their lives, and in the current year, Trooper Herbert J. Smith of the Arkansas State Police was killed in a car accident while rushing to assist a sick child.

Accordingly, I offer my condolences to the families and friends of Patrol Officer Jones, Captain Craig, Trooper Smith, and all of the other law enforcement officials who have died in the line of duty. I am deeply appreciative of their sacrifices and am sorry for their loss.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 137. Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

SA 138. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 139. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. NICKLES (for himself and Mr. GREGG)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 140. Mr. SPECTER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 141. Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, supra.

SA 142. Mr. GRAMM proposed an amendment to the bill S. 143, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission, and for other purposes.

SA 143. Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. SCHUMER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 143, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 137. Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend