

to, by procedure, hold up the proceedings of the House; but we wanted, such as it was, to have as much of a debate as we could on an issue of major concern to the American people. I think that we all recognize that we come to this floor with differences of opinion, or range of opinion, on issues. Sometimes we can act in a bipartisan way, and that is great for the American people. They expect and deserve us to try and seek a common ground.

Where we do not have it, though, we must stand our ground; and I do not see why we could not have an opportunity to have a fuller debate on the subject. I do not understand why the Republicans would be afraid of a motion to recommit to save Social Security; and I hope that this does not proceed, because I think it could be very damaging to our relationships in this House; and I know that we want to proceed in as much of a bipartisan fashion as possible.

I thank the gentleman for the information.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2002, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3231, THE BARBARA JORDAN IMMIGRATION REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2002

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight on Monday, April 22, to file a report to accompany H.R. 3231.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2002.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Office of the Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DENNY: This is to notify you that effective today, April 17, I am resigning my seat on the House Transportation Committee.

Sincerely,

JOHN COOKSEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE AND COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 391), and I ask unan-

imous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 391

Resolved, That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Education and the Workforce: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.

Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Sullivan of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3763, THE CORPORATE AND AUDITING ACCOUNTABILITY, RESPONSIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2002, AND H.R. 3231, THE BARBARA JORDAN IMMIGRATION REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2002

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today a "Dear Colleague" letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for H.R. 3763, the Corporate and Auditing Accountability, Responsibility and Transparency Act of 2002.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to this bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment, one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 23, to the Committee on Rules up in H-312 here in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Financial Services, which is expected to be filed on Monday, April 22. The text will be available on the Web sites of both the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

In addition, today a "Dear Colleague" will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is also planning to meet next week to grant a rule on H.R. 3231, the Barbara Jordan Immigration Reform and Accountability Act of 2002. The Committee on Rules may grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for H.R. 3231.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment to this bill should submit

55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 12 noon on Wednesday, April 24, to the Committee on Rules in H-312 in the Capitol.

Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which will be available on the Web sites of both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 22, 2002

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2002

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, April 22, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 23, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOOLEY of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2646 (an Act to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011) be instructed: to agree to the provisions contained in section 335 of the Senate amendment, relating to agricultural trade with Cuba.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion that I am offering today is one which is advancing and continuing the policy of economic engagement that this country has embraced. It is a policy to ensure that we can provide economic opportunities for all sectors of our economy, whether it be the farmers in California, Missouri, or Washington, or wherever else in this country.

It ensures that we are going to be able to provide for the sale of goods to Cuba, and to make one minor modification to our existing law, which is to allow private financing of the sale of those goods. This is an important step forward if we truly are committed to trying to provide for additional markets for our farmers in this country.

It is also an important step forward because many of us believe by advancing a policy of economic engagement which is consistent with this motion, it will also do more than we could otherwise in terms of ensuring that we are going to see progress in the advancement of democracy, the advancement of personal freedoms in Cuba itself.

We have been able, I think, to have a case study in terms of what a policy of isolation has done in Cuba over the past 40 or 50 years, when we have seen very little progress in seeing the advancement of personal freedoms in Cuba. We have found in other areas of the world where we have reached out and we have engaged in trade, we have actually seen not only economic opportunities, but we have seen significant progress on the social front with the advancement of democracy, the advancement of human rights, the advancement of religious freedoms.

I am confident if this body instructs the conferees to adopt the Senate position, we will be providing benefits for U.S. citizens, but also we will be empowering the citizens of Cuba to be more successful in improving the quality of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Dooley "sell them the rope" motion. The section in the compromise legislation of the year 2000 on this issue relating to financing specified that "United States persons" cannot finance sales to the Cuban dictatorship, and "United States persons" was defined as "the Federal Government, any State or local government, or any private person or entity."

The Senate provision strikes that entire section, including, thus, the prohibition on financing by "the Federal Government." So the Senate financing provision is not as limited as its supporters here allege. It will make available public financing to the Cuban dictatorship.

Last year, the dictatorship was forced to close over 12,000 hotel rooms in its all-important tourist industry. Its currency is worthless. The dictatorship defaulted on \$500 million in loans just in the year 2001. So what is the dictator betting everything on? U.S. tourism dollars and the agricultural lobby in the U.S. Congress.

Today we see the agricultural lobby at work here for the dictatorship, despite the current realities of the bankrupt Cuban dictatorship, despite the fact that the Cuban dictatorship continues to provide safe harbor to terrorists throughout the world, despite the fact that Castro serves as the world's primary money launderer for international terrorism, providing his so-called "revolutionary banks" not just for Puerto Rican FALN terrorists, like those who took their stolen millions from the U.S. to Cuba, but laundering money as well for drug dealers, international terrorists, and corrupt politicians.

A few months before 9/11, the Cuban dictator visited Syria, Iran, and Libya. In Iran, he declared "Together, Iran and Cuba will bring the United States to its knees."

In August, Irish IRA terrorists based in Cuba were arrested in Colombia helping the FARC terrorists there improve their urban bomb-making capabilities.

Basque ETA terrorists continue to be based and trained in Cuba to this day.

More than 90 U.S. felony fugitives wanted by the FBI for hijacking, murder, armed bank robbery, the sales of explosives to Libya, and kidnapping remain in Cuba and continue to receive protection by the dictatorship to this day.

The only one of the seven terrorist states that has had 17 spies arrested in the last 3 years, 17 spies arrested, awaiting trial or already convicted, agents spying for the Cuban regime in the United States, the only one of the seven terrorist states that has had those spies arrested and convicted is the Cuban regime.

On September 21, a senior analyst at the Defense Intelligence Agency was arrested for spying for the Cuban government. The FBI was forced to arrest her before they would have wanted to, because according to intelligence community sources, Castro shares intelligence with Middle Eastern enemies of the United States.

Last month, on March 19, the State Department's Office of Intelligence and Research declared that the Cuban dictatorship has "an offensive biological warfare research and development effort. Cuba has provided dual-use biotechnology to rogue states. We are con-

cerned that such technology could support biological weapons programs in those states."

And, as we speak, the U.S. administration is encouraging governments throughout the world to say no to pressure from totalitarian elements in their countries, and to vote in favor of the resolution criticizing the human rights situation in Cuba at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, my high school teacher, Judd Davis, used to tell me that Lenin was fond of saying that "some capitalists will sell even the rope for us to hang them with." What we are seeing here today is that on that matter, Lenin was right: There are some capitalists who would sell even the rope with which they would be hung.

Cuba is in this hemisphere. It is the only country oppressed by tyranny in this hemisphere. In this hemisphere, democracy is required by international law. So while my heart goes out to the Chinese people, the use of the China analogy is hypocritical and it is wrong.

The signal that we need to be sending to Cuba is that there will be no normalization until all the political prisoners are freed and free elections are scheduled. That is President Bush's position, and that is what this Congress has stated repeatedly in the past.

This "sell them the rope" motion is as untimely as it is wrong. There will be a democratic transition in Cuba soon, and the people will do business with those who did not do business with their jailers. It is unfortunate that so many are working so hard to put themselves on the blacklist of those who a free and democratic Cuba will never do business with. For those interested in sales to Cuba, democratic Cuba will not do business tomorrow and forever with those who today worked to provide dollars to the totalitarian dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and those who would direct that the conferees accept the Senate provisions to remove the restrictions on financing agricultural products to Cuba.

I am not known to be a hostage to the agricultural lobby, but certainly I do believe that trade is essential if we are going to attempt to persuade those people who have dictatorships that democracy is the way that they have to go.

I do not really believe we can just shut ourselves off from these people, and continue to have an embargo and deny them access to food and medicine, and at the same time expect that the

people are going to look at us as an example of what a better way of life is. I do not really think that we should be held hostage by the People's Republic of Miami in our foreign and our trade policy.

It seems to me that when we take a look at a billion people in China, we are taking a look at a dictatorship. When we take a look at the people in north Vietnam or North Korea, we are taking a look at dictatorships. As a matter of fact, Members do not have to be as old as I am to know that we have taken a look at dictatorships in the past, and even so today, without denying our ability to export to these countries.

So it just seems to me that after the hurricane in Cuba, Americans, for humanitarian reasons, decided that we would offer food and medicine to the people in Cuba. That led to some provisions being made that we could have limited exports to the people in Cuba.

Well, what is wrong, if the House has said and the Senate has said that American farmers should be allowed to export their products, why can we not assist them in making certain they get paid for their products?

So I know this is a very emotional issue, but we cannot allow ourselves to be blinded by emotion at a time when we are saying, look at democracy, look at our farmers, look at productivity, look at better products, look at lesser prices, and allow us to go into that market and compete with everyone else. Let our kids get over there, let them be ambassadors for good will, remove the restrictions in terms of the Cubans and Americans, and let us all work hard for a better understanding, and to bring democracy to Cuba.

Do not threaten those people who vote one way or the other that the new government in Cuba is going to punish those people who voted to relax the embargo. Nobody has designated who is going to lead the new Cuba. If we knew that, maybe we could take a different foreign policy. If some people know who is going to succeed Castro, maybe they should share it with us, because it could be worse than we might expect, than what we are getting today.

But we do not know these things. That is why we should not allow our food policy to be governed by our political policies. For 40 years, those people who said, no, no, no, no, no, have found out that this guy that runs Cuba has survived half-a-dozen Presidents.

Let us give freedom a chance, let us give trade a chance. I congratulate those who have put this motion together to instruct the conferees.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I am sure that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) considers the

reference to my hometown as "the People's Republic of Miami" to be an example of his piquant wit. I find it to be personally offensive, and I would ask him to please refrain from such characterizations.

But it is a shameful day today. It is shameful today that as former Cuban political prisoners stand before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva calling for the international condemnation of the Castro regime's systematic violations of human dignity, civil liberties, and fundamental freedoms, today in this Chamber, a vivid symbol and an instrument of democracy, we are discussing a measure that will provide the Castro dictatorship with the financial means to continue its oppression and its enslavement of the Cuban people.

It is shameful that, as the U.S. State Department Report on Human Rights Practices reports, the use of child labor and forced labor in Cuba's farming sector is mandated, yet this Congress is considering a measure which our assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights, and labor underscored at a recent congressional hearing would serve to promote the use of child and slave labor by the Castro regime in the agricultural sector.

It is shameful that, as we approach the commemoration of our Memorial Day, when we pay homage to our courageous veterans, some would seek to provide funds to a regime which sent Cuban agents to torture American POWs at a camp in Vietnam called the Zoo.

It is shameful that, as a global war on terrorism intensifies, some in the Congress would be seeking to provide funds to the Castro dictatorship, a country which every recent administration, be it Republican or Democrat, has officially labeled as a State sponsor of terrorism.

It is shameful that, as Columbian President Pastrana, in visiting Capitol Hill this very week, just yesterday outlined, among other details, Cuba's role in supporting narco-terrorists, and its support and training, directly or through such entities as the IRA and the Basque terrorist group ETA, of terrorist operations in the Western Hemisphere, that this body today would consider providing funds to that Castro regime to further these terrorist efforts which undermine the stability of our region.

It is shameful that, as the Castro regime expands its biological weapons capabilities and builds even stronger cooperative agreements in this arena with Iran and Iraq, some would seek to facilitate these efforts, which directly threatens U.S. national security. In 1998, a Department of Defense report raised concerns about the potential of Cuba's biotechnology sector to be used for offensive purposes.

In October of 2001, Dr. Ken Alibek, the former head of Russia's biological weapons program, testified before the Committee on Government Reform on

the very real threat posed by Cuba's biotech sector.

□ 1515

In the October 2001 edition of the journal "Nature Biotechnology," Jose de la Fuente, the former director of research and development at the Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology in Havana, disclosed that technology and agents for treatments of a number of diseases were sold by Cuba to Iran's terrorist regime, technology and lethal agents which can be used to produce anthrax bacteria or smallpox virus.

It is shameful that we would be considering a measure that would provide funds to a regime whose leader, Fidel Castro, joined Iran's Ayatollah in May of last year to underscore their commitment to "bring America to its knees." Those were Fidel Castro's own words just months ago, months before 9-11. Castro said, "Together, we can bring America to its knees."

It is shameful that we are going to support a tyranny whose so-called attorney general, Juan Escalona, and I say "so-called" because there is no real justice system in Cuba. It is a dictatorship, a totalitarian state with no respect for civil liberties and which pays none of its debt. So we will be actually subsidizing with our tax dollars all of these great sales that my colleagues would like to make to Fidel Castro.

Juan Escalona, when referring to the transfer of al Qaeda prisoners to Guantanamo Naval Base, was quoted in January of this year saying that he hoped that 15 or 20 of these anti-American terrorists would get out and kill Americans stationed at our base in Guantanamo.

These were the words of a high-ranking Cuban official. He wants the al Qaeda prisoners to kill our American servicemen and -women in Guantanamo base in Cuba and Castro says nothing. This is the attorney general.

It is shameful that as our FBI, CIA, and Defense Intelligence Agency work to repair the significant damage already done to U.S. national security by Cuban espionage in our country, we would be seeking to reward that Castro regime by providing it with access to financing to continue its terrorist and espionage activities against the United States.

It is shameful that we would allow a regime that has killed American citizens to continue to act with impunity by rewarding it with access to much needed funds, funds which will never reach the Cuban people. Do not fool yourselves. Do not try to fool the Congress. Funds which only help maintain Fidel Castro in power.

Mr. Speaker, the provision referenced in this motion to instruct conferees has nothing to do with helping the small farmers of America because these small farmers are the heart and soul of our country, the core of American values and principles, values which they would never seek to betray

in this manner. No. The provisions in this Senate farm bill that this motion refers to is to benefit agricultural giants who wish to make profit from trading with America's enemies.

If this was truly about helping America's farmers, then the Senate would have moved the Andean Trade Promotion Act, and it would have given the gentleman from California's (Mr. DOOLEY) farmers those free markets to sell to.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the anniversary of a failed attempt to restore freedom and democracy to Cuba: the Bay of Pigs invasion. In a month we will commemorate the centennial anniversary of Cuban independence. So, Mr. Speaker, today I stand here and I ask my colleagues whom we wish to emulate: those who betrayed the Cuban freedom fighters in 1961 by not providing aerial support to those who landed at the Bay of Pigs, or do we wish to emulate those Rough Riders who, 100 years ago, stood side by side with the Cuban liberators and charged up San Juan Hill and helped Cuba gain its independence?

Do we wish to support the Cuban people in their struggle to free themselves from their bondage, or do we wish to help their oppressor to continue its subjugation of its people and continue threatening the U.S. and, indeed, the hemisphere and the free world?

If we are to stand for what is right and just, as we did with the Afghan people, we must vote "no" on this motion to instruct conferees and hold the House position on the farm bill.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

This motion would instruct conferees to recede to the Senate provision in the farm bill to lift current limitations on the financing of private sales of food and medicine to Cuba.

My reasons are very simple. It is good farm policy, it is good trade policy, and it simply is the right thing to do. It also is the position that reflects the will of the House.

On July 20, 2000, the House voted 301 to 116, 301 to 116, to lift all sanctions on the sale of food and medicine specifically to Cuba. Mr. Speaker, the House has spoken on this issue. It has spoken with a clear, strong, bipartisan voice.

Unfortunately, the will of the House, and I might add the will of the Senate, has been frustrated and undermined. Cumbersome restrictions remain on private financing for food and medicine sales to Cuba. Unlike farmers everywhere else in the world, American farmers cannot obtain credit from a U.S. entity to finance private sales to Cuba. Instead, our farm exporters must either arrange for credit through an

overseas bank or insist on cash in advance from Cuba.

The current restrictions on securing private financing are a competitive barrier for our farmers. They need to be eliminated. The Senate provision does so. The House should recede to the Senate and open up the markets between Cuba and our agricultural exporters.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers and banks are savvy enough to weigh the risks in doing trade with Cuba. I trust them. I ask my colleagues to trust them.

We hear a lot of talk about democracy. Well, we need a little democracy in the House of Representatives. Let us uphold the will of the majority. Let us uphold the mainstream opinion in this Congress and vote to support the Dooley motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished whip, great friend of freedom and democracy for the Cuban people.

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, America has forces deployed all around the world as we root out the international terrorist networks. We have served notice to every Nation that there is no middle ground in the struggle to vindicate freedom.

President Bush divided the world into two camps with a very basic guiding principle: either you are with us or you are with the terrorists. Every country must choose between freedom and a culture of murder and destruction.

This misguided campaign to relax the embargo against Fidel Castro's evil regime is a retreat from a very bright line division between freedom and tyranny. We risk clouding our resolve against terror here in our own hemisphere. The supporters of this initiative may believe that by engaging Cuba their approach would bring constructive results, but nothing in Cuba takes place without Castro's blessing, and Castro profits by every business transaction in Cuba. Easing the embargo would only empower a tottering dictator.

For decades, Fidel Castro's Cuba has cultivated, trained, and harbored both individual terrorists and groups using murder to make political statements. Castro's Cuba is a temple to violence. Their handiwork cost American lives like the New Yorkers murdered and maimed by the Fraunces Tavern bombing carried out by Cuban-trained terrorists.

There is no denying that Cuba is a safe haven for terrorist fugitives. Castro shelters Basque ETA terrorists, Colombia FARC and ELN terrorists, and terrorist officials from the Irish Republican Army. Castro is intertwined in the axis of evil.

Just 1 year ago, Castro visited three other state sponsors of terrorism: Iran,

Syria, and Libya. In Tehran, Castro said: "Iran and Cuba, in cooperation with each other, can bring America to its knees. The U.S. regime is very weakened and we are witnessing this weakness from up close." That was Castro talking.

Castro sold advanced biotechnology to the Iranian government. The United States believes that Cuba has at least a limited offensive biological warfare capability. Castro is sharing dual-use biotechnology with rogue states.

Ken Alibek, the former Soviet Union's top chemical and biological warfare expert, told Congress that "Cuba has a perfectly developed system of engineering and is capable to develop genetic engineering agents. They've got the desire to develop genetically engineered biological weapons." That is what a former Communist in the Soviet Union said.

In other words, Castro is funneling resources to develop the world's most diabolical weapons, and he shares these evil exports with the world's most dangerous and unstable regimes.

We can be certain that any economic activity between the United States and Cuba will only serve to supply additional fuel to Castro's engine of repression. The proceeds of joint ventures and trade and terrorism do not empower the men and women of Cuba. They are bled into the Castro regime.

We also know that Castro is continuing his attempts to penetrate U.S. intelligence agencies and even our Armed Forces. Last month, last month, the Defense Intelligence Agency's top Cuba specialist pled guilty to spying for Castro over 16 years. There is little doubt that Castro's espionage is made available to our enemies. Perhaps it even makes its way to the al Qaeda.

There is no sign that September 11 did anything to shift Castro's reflexive hostility toward democracy and freedom. He smeared America's response to terrorism. Said Castro: "Their capacity to destroy," their being us, "capacity to destroy and kill is enormous, but their traits of equanimity, serenity, reflection and caution are, on the other hand, minimal."

We know with dead certainty that Castro systematically brutalizes and oppresses the Cuban people. He drags his people through hardship, servitude, and despair; and any fair appraisal of Cuba's long support for terrorist groups and Castro's current behavior leads to an unavoidable conclusion. Without a clear break from terrorist sponsorship and the adoption of fundamental human rights and democratic reforms, the embargo must be upheld.

Even if we set aside our deep reservations about empowering Castro through economic activity with the United States, there are other doubts that remain. What is the likelihood that any American farmer would actually be paid by Castro for the goods exported to Cuba?

Castro's track record is just abysmal. Two years ago, Cuba failed to pay

money owed to the French. Last year Castro also defaulted on over \$500 million in debt owed to Spain, South Africa and Chile. Castro is a bad credit risk. We should be seeking to open real markets with the actual capacity to pay for the products exported to them.

Members should reject this motion to instruct by standing with the President against state-sponsored terrorism and tyranny. Vote "no" on the motion to instruct.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1985]
F.B.I. AIDE TESTIFIES TO ESPIONAGE
CONFESSION

Less than an hour after his arrest last fall on espionage charges, Richard W. Miller confessed passing a secret document to a Soviet intelligence agent, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation office in Los Angeles testified Friday in Federal District Court here.

It was the fifth straight day the jury heard evidence that Mr. Miller, then an F.B.I. agent, had admitted passing classified documents to the K.G.B., the Soviet intelligence agency. The previous testimony focused on admissions Mr. Miller made in five days of interrogation before his arrest last Oct. 2.

But Richard T. Bretzing, the chief F.B.I. agent here, testified that after Mr. Miller was taken into custody he said he had given the secret 53-page "Reporting Guidance: Foreign Intelligence Information" to his lover, Svetlana Ogorodnikov, a Russian emigre, Mr. Bretzing said Mr. Miller made the admission while he was being taken from his home in Bonsall, Calif., to the bureau's San Diego office.

Arrested on espionage charges the same day as Mr. Miller, who is 48 years old, were Mrs. Ogorodnikov, 35, and her husband, Nikolay, 52. Both pleaded guilty at their trial earlier this summer and were sentenced to prison.

EARLIER TESTIMONY SUPPORTED

The Government contends that Mr. Miller was involved in a sexual liaison with Mrs. Ogorodnikov and agreed to provide Soviet intelligence agents with classified material through the Ogorodnikovs in return for \$65,000.

The defense, which will open its case next week, contends that Mr. Miller cultivated a relationship with Mrs. Ogorodnikov as part of a one-man mission to infiltrate the K.G.B. and rescue his 20-year career as an F.B.I. agent.

Earlier this week a Portland, Ore., woman testified that hours before his arrest Mr. Miller telephoned her and told her he was in trouble. The woman, Marta York, testified that Mr. Miller had said he had "only passed one" classified document to Soviet agents.

Mr. Miller's attorneys, who characterized the woman's testimony as "very damaging," were surprised Friday when the prosecution presented a witness to buttress her testimony.

The witness, Gary Allan, an Oregon social worker, testified that he was in Mrs. York's home last Oct. 2 when she received a phone call from a "close friend" named "Richard" who was in the F.B.I.

After the call Mr. Allan said Mrs. York was "agitated" and "excited," and talked about it. "She said she had learned he had gotten into trouble as a result of his relationship with a woman who she identified as a Soviet agent," Mr. Allan testified. Information Termed Secret "Did she tell you that Richard's relationship with the Russian woman was an intimate relationship?" asked Russell Hayman, an Assistant United States Attorney.

Mr. Allan responded, "It's fair to say that, yes." He then said Mrs. York had told him that her F.B.I. friend "had shared information with the Russian agent."

Mr. Hayman asked, "What type of information?" Mr. Allan replied, "She described the information as secret."

Mr. Bretzing testified Friday that, in the five days before Mr. Miller's arrest, he urged the agent to "unburden" himself.

The defense contends that Mr. Miller was so overcome by Mr. Bretzing's spiritual appeal that he began confessing. Mr. Miller was excommunicated from the Mormon Church early last year for adultery. Mr. Bretzing is a Bishop in the church.

But Mr. Bretzing rebuffed defense suggestions that he exploited Mr. Miller's ties to the Mormon Church to elicit a false confession.

"I believed that he had done things he knew to be unlawful and a betrayal of the country," Mr. Bretzing said, referring to Mr. Miller. "I believed from his teachings in the F.B.I. and as a youngster in the Mormon Church, he had every reason to feel guilt."

Stanley Greenberg, a defense attorney, asked "And you tried to appeal to that guilt?"

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district whose mainstay is agriculture, and for the last 4 years and now going into our fifth year our farmers are in very, very bad straits.

As a matter of fact, I would agree with the gentlewoman from Florida when she says that our farmers are the heart and soul of America. They are the heart and soul of our American values, but they are hurting; and our farmers overwhelmingly want to sell their commodities to Cuba. As a matter of fact, they have sold \$73 million of commodities to Cuba in the last 6 months. Those have been cash sales, and Cuba has paid up front for those purchases.

Up until we imposed the embargo on Cuba 40-plus years ago, my farmers sold the bulk of their rice to Cuba. They lost that market when the embargo was imposed, and they have really never gotten those markets back again from any other country.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, the other day, the Friday before last, I helped to load 250,000 bushels of my farmers' rice onto the barges in Carthersville, Missouri. It was my farmers' rice, not a company's rice, my farmer's rice. And I am absolutely shocked and saddened when I hear my colleague from Florida say that any firm or farmers who sell their commodities to Cuba will be blacklisted by the Democratic government that may take over when Castro leaves office, dies or is elected. That is shameful, as my other colleague from Florida said.

Let me talk a little bit about a couple of other things. The administration has recently revoked the visas of several Cuban officials who represent their trading company, Alimport. Those officials were coming to Michigan, to

North Dakota, to Missouri and other States to purchase commodities for future sales; and, unfortunately, our administration said it was not their policy to encourage agricultural sales to Cuba.

If our farmers are hurting, if our American economy is hurting and we want to have an open trade policy, it is pretty hypocritical not to allow people who want to purchase our commodities to come and do so.

When we are talking about private financing, we are talking about a company entering into a private financial agreement with the country of Cuba. It is a private company. If they want to take the risk, they should be allowed to take the risk because this is, I thought, a democracy where we were free to make those decisions on our own.

Mr. Speaker, our policy towards Cuba should not be one that is based on a family feud, but rather it should be a policy based on helping the American economy and the American farmer.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the family feud is about, but I do know that the shameful attitude is one of standing with the dictatorship; and it is normal and I think to be expected that people, once they are free, do not want to do business with those who collaborated with a dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the start that I admire my friend from California with whom I have worked so closely on so many issues. This is one issue where we disagree, and disagree strongly.

While I would like nothing more than to see democracy and free market trade with Cuba, and while my family in Cuba would like nothing more than to see democracy and free markets and greater access to food, subsidizing trade with a regime on the U.S. terrorist list that has threatened us in the past, that is one of the world's worst human rights abusers, that gives its citizens none of the religious or political freedoms we Americans hold dear, is not helping the Cuban people, it is only helping the dictatorship.

I have taken that constant position, whether it be in China or any other totalitarian place in the world. I wish so many of my colleagues who take that position in those countries would take that position here. Cuba can get food from almost anywhere else in the world. But the fact is the Cuban regime and its failed economic models ration the food that eventually gets to the ordinary people; and rationing food is a control mechanism over the populous.

My family in Cuba gets a ration card, and no matter how much food comes

into Cuba, they ultimately can only purchase that amount that they are controlled by the government to have access to. When a government rations food, they obviously control the people because they are waiting in long lines, not thinking about a democracy or overturning a dictatorship, but waiting in long lines to get a mere subsistence.

This is a regime that goes so far as to prohibit their own citizens from privately producing its own agricultural food. It is failed economics that does not give them the hard currency to purchase food. Financing Castro, whether it is food sales or any other kinds of sales, supports the very system that actually prevents the Cuban people from getting freedoms, rights, and, yes, even food without government control.

Some of us look at the motion which I understand my colleague is doing to help farmers in his district and throughout the country, but we look at it and say ultimately it finances oppression, totalitarianism, and I do not think that we can count on the regime to honor its debt. This is not about the private sector simply taking risks on their own because maybe we can make an argument for that, that if the private sector wants to take the risk, they should have the opportunity. If they lose, they lose.

But under this instruction and the Senate's provisions, in fact, the Federal Government's different programs of financing can finance the food sales. Therefore, it is not the private sector making their market decision, it is the taxpayers of this country ultimately who will lose when Castro, who has a long history of not paying debt, ultimately does not pay. That is, I think, a poor statement for American taxpayers to be subsidizing a regime, a dictatorial regime, that ultimately controls its people by rationing its food.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we need to do is deal with the Freedom to Farm Act which was a catastrophe for the farmers. Let us not foot the bill for oppression and dictatorship, and let us not allow the Cuban people to be controlled by food rationing. Let us stand with them against dictatorship and against the motion.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to provide some clarification, the motion and the Senate language retains section 908(a) which has the prohibition that does not allow for any public financing or assistance in the sale of products. So when Members are making contentions that this is going to result in a subsidization of trade and allow for public financing, this amendment does nothing of the sort because it retains the language in section 908(a).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all state my admiration for the sponsor of this motion. This motion is a promotion of democracy. It is for free trade and it is to replace a 40-year-old failed policy with a new idea on foreign policy.

As a new Democrat, as a member of the Cuban Working Group which is a bipartisan group of Members of Congress, I rise in strong support of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, unilateral sanctions on humanitarian products such as food and medicine have been ineffective, totally ineffective, in trying to influence and change the Cuban Castro regime for the past 40 years.

This motion is not even a motion to remove the embargo, which 85 percent of Americans would probably support, this motion simply lets the private sector move forward without restrictions for our agricultural community to do trade with Cuba. This is modest. This is a small step forward for freer trade and replacing a failed policy.

Unilateral sanctions have failed, and they have hurt our farmers across the board. It is not a way to implement American foreign policy. This embargo is hurting Indiana farmers. If we somehow were to get this embargo replaced, the impact on agricultural products, fisheries, and forest products to Cuba from Indiana alone would reach an annual export rate of \$29 million, and create 791 new jobs in our State. That is a good policy for Indiana and for farmers and for our economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with this. We now trade with Vietnam, whom we fought a war with. We trade with China with 1.2 billion people; why can we not trade with Cuba? Eleven million people, a small island to the south of Florida, do not let it be held hostage to presidential electoral politics.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a fighter for human rights.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Dooley motion to lift current human rights limitations on the financing of private agricultural sales to Cuba. While the motion in support of section 335 of the Senate version of the farm bill purports to assist American commercial interests, it is absolutely clear that the prime beneficiary would be the Castro dictatorship.

Amazingly, it seems to escape the notice and concern of certain Members of Congress that the Cuban dictator not only tortures thousands of people in Cuba, but he is also a terrorist. Cuba continues to share the dubious distinction of being named a terrorist state by the U.S. State Department, joining countries like Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korean, Sudan and Syria, great company, and we want to trade more with these individuals?

Last year as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) pointed out earlier, when Castro was in Iran, and this was in the Agence France Presse, he said after meeting with the Iranians, "The U.S. regime is weak, and we are witnessing this weakness close up." He also said that Iran and Cuba, tightly together, in cooperation with each other, can bring America to its knees.

Mr. Speaker, "bring America to its knees," and we want to reward this terrorist, Castro, by trading more with him? The mention was just made that in China and Vietnam, we trade with them, why not Cuba. There has been no amelioration of human rights abuses in those countries.

I would ask my colleague, the author of this motion, has the gentleman read the country reports on human rights practices with regard to Cuba? Has the gentleman read it? No.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman and every Member who wants to lift this part of the sanction to read this. It reads like an indictment of the Cuban dictatorship.

This report points out over and over again in this 21-page, single space country report, out of the State Department, that harassment, murder, killing, beatings—if one steps out of line in Cuba, bang, they come at you and beat you with their fists. And we want to reward this dictatorship?

The gentleman from California mentioned China. China has gotten worse in its human rights. Read that report. It is over 60 pages put out by the U.S. Department of State. We cannot aid and abet dictatorship. He is a terrorist. He is a mass violator of human rights, and he would be the prime beneficiary of the gentleman's motion and the Senate language. I urge a "no" vote on this. This is wrong. It makes us, however unwittingly, accomplices in crimes against humanity.

The Government's human rights record remained poor. The Government continued to violate systematically the fundamental civil and political rights of its citizens. Citizens do not have the right to change their government peacefully. 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, including human rights activists. The Government failed to prosecute or sanction adequately members of the security forces and prison guards who committed abuses. Prison conditions remained harsh and life threatening. The authorities routinely continued 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 faithful party members, and maintained strict censorship of news and information to the public. The Government restricted some religious activities but permitted others. The Government limited the entry of religious workers to the country. The Government maintained tight restrictions on freedom of movement, including foreign travel and did not allow some citizens to leave the country. 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 were problems. Racial discrimination was a problem. The Government severely restricted worker rights, including the right to form independent unions. The Government prohibits forced and bonded labor by children; however, it required children to do farm work without compensation.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is not about condoning any of the human rights abuses or any of the infringements upon personal freedoms in Cuba.

Those of us who are advancing this policy and this motion believe very strongly that a policy of engagement is one that is going to do more to improve the situation in Cuba, just as many of us believed when we were advancing a policy of economic engagement with China, it was a policy that was going to result in improvement in religious freedoms and human rights that are so important to the citizens there.

Mr. Speaker, many of us would take exception to the characterization that in our offering of this motion, we are actually working to the detriment of the interest of people in Cuba and elsewhere.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in favor of the motion to instruct conferees. I rise because I represent a lot of farmers in California, farmers who traveled with me to Cuba a month ago, people who want to sell what they grow to the Cuban Government, to the Cuban people. The irony is that it is not the Cuban Government that will not let them sell it to them, it is our government.

That is why they are asking us to instruct these conferees to lift what they consider just un-American restrictions on their ability as businesspeople in this country who grow food for people, regardless of their political affiliation, and see that that food can be sold to Cuba. In fact, the rice farmers from California and the wine grape growers from California that were with us indicated that they had sold, the rice growers had sold rice to Cuba, were very pleased with the sale, had gotten paid in a timely fashion and President Castro asked them right across the table, "I'll buy a billion dollars more of

American product if you will get your licenses to sell."

So that is what this is about. It is about getting the ability for American farmers to sell their crops. What does it mean to a place like California? We looked at what we could trade in Cuba. It comes out to about \$98 million in lost trade of the products that we produce in California that we could be selling to Cuba. About \$280 million would be to agricultural-related industries. Cuba is a market for rice, feed, grains, oilseeds, beans, wheat flour, animal products fertilizers, forest products, herbicides, pesticides and farm machinery. Many of these products are big business in California.

Currently with restrictions, the U.S. has had \$35 million in sales to Cuba in the last 3 months. So the interchange is happening, but it is a very difficult one. I would just ask, and there is a lot of emotion in here, but I cannot understand why people would care if President Castro gets credit for feeding hungry children. My God, our country can rise above that and start helping 11 million people eat.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), who knows that Castro has never been elected to anything, much less that he deserves to be called Mr. President like the prior speaker called him in an embarrassing, shameful way.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleagues, Fidel Castro can buy products from the United States today, and he has been. But he has to pay cash. And what we want to do with this, what you want to do with this motion is you want to allow him to get credit.

Let me just tell you what credit he has honored in the past. He owes \$120 million to Spain. No payments. They are trying to restructure the loan. He owes \$170 million to France. He defaulted on \$10.5 million. They are trying to restructure that loan. He owes \$20 million to Chile. No payments on that. \$400 million to Mexico; past due, but they are trying to restructure the loan. If he wants to pay cash, he can buy it. But the reason he wants to get credit is because he knows long term that he is going to be able to get out of the debt. And ultimately, I think my colleagues who have made this point in the past are accurate; it will be borne by the taxpayers of America. The money will be borrowed and eventually when it gets up to such a level, the financial institutions that lend it are going to be complaining to high heaven and the government will bail them out. And so henceforth the taxpayers of the United States will be paying for the food that Castro gets.

Let us look at what Castro is. He is still a terrorist. He is working with the FARC guerrillas in Colombia. They are selling heroin and cocaine by the carload to American youth. And they are terrorists. They are kidnapping and killing Americans down there, and

they are holding them hostage and he works with them. They even wear Che Guevara hats, berets, because they support Castro. They go back and forth to Cuba on a regular basis. He is not for democracy. He is not for human rights. He supports terrorism, and now he wants credit from the United States.

The fact of the matter is, my colleagues, we should not be giving it to him. I have businesspeople in my district that have come to me and say, "We want to do business with Fidel Castro." My answer to them is, when Fidel Castro starts allowing democracy in Cuba, when he starts allowing human rights, when he starts taking steps in the directions that we believe ought to be taken, then we will consider those things. But so far Fidel Castro has done none of these things. He goes around the world condemning the United States, saying he is going to bring us to our knees and we want to kiss him on both cheeks. I think that is a mistake. Until we see a manifest change in Castro's behavior, we should not be giving him credit. If he wants to buy American products, let him pay cash. Let him pay cash. And when he starts showing some changes in human rights and moving toward democracy, we will start looking at credit.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to make a couple of observations. I find it remarkable that some of my Republican colleagues have so little confidence in our private financial institutions that they do not think and trust that they will do the due diligence in terms of making a determination on the ability of an entity within Cuba to make good on the loans that they might offer in order to finance a sale of U.S. products into Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend's, the gentleman from California, motion to instruct our conferees to agree to the Senate provisions repealing the existing restrictions against the use of American private sector financing of our agricultural exports to Cuba.

It is high time that we bring our trade policy with Cuba, a market with solid potential for a number of job-creating export industries, in line with the fundamental principles and objectives which govern our trade policy with the rest of the world. I for one as a matter of principle have never been a supporter of unilateral sanctions as an effective instrument of United States foreign policy. Such actions also often cost us shares in foreign markets. Other colleagues have also raised morally principled concerns on the inclusion of food in any sanctions policy. I am proud that this body has already moved in a bipartisan manner to exclude agricultural products from our embargo against Cuba. It was a step in the right direction to bring an outdated 20th century policy into the 21st

century, a policy which has obviously not achieved the desired results and is ridiculed by our friends and allies across the world.

However, that small step was followed by a step backwards, when we excluded our own financial community from being able to provide financing to our own private sector. Our embargo has already cost our businesses and consumers billions of dollars. Do we really want to send American businesses who want to export American-made goods to banks in other nations?

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our economy is struggling to recover, when our farmers are facing difficult conditions, and when we seemingly find ways to take one step backward every time we take a step forward in reclaiming our global leadership and international trade, it is indeed high time we stop preventing our financial sector from financing legal exports to a \$100 million market only 90 miles away from our shores.

I thank the gentleman from California for this motion, and I urge our conferees to follow the bipartisan leadership demonstrated by the other body; and let us end these sanctions on U.S. banking and financial institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 1¼ minutes remaining and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California being the maker of the motion has the right to close.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I would ask the gentleman how many speakers he has.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. We have at least three.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dooley motion to instruct conferees to the farm bill. It reveals existing restrictions against private financing of agricultural sales to Cuba. It is an opportunity to help innocent people suffering under repressive regimes and truly help our farmers who are facing record low prices.

Our foreign policy must be to help, not punish, people who suffer under repressive regimes. Unilateral agricultural sanctions end up hurting the most vulnerable in a target nation, eroding their confidence in the United States as a supplier of food and as a supplier of hope. Human Rights Watch reports that the U.S. embargo has not only failed to bring about human rights improvements in Cuba, it has actually, and I quote, "become counterproductive to achieving this goal."

We are not defending the Cuban Government or its poor human rights record. We must always speak strongly against the abuse of human rights in this world. But current U.S. policy to-

wards Cuba hurts 11 million innocent Cuban men, women, and children; and it denies our farmers a vital export market. This policy has cost America important export markets. The USDA estimates that trade sanctions reduce U.S. agricultural exports by over \$500 million per year. U.S. wheat farmers have been shut out of 10 percent of the world wheat market. Soybean farmers could capture as much as 60 percent of the demand for soybeans. We need to help American farmers, but we need to help the innocent people of Cuba. We are talking about food.

I urge my colleagues to please support the Dooley motion. It makes sense. It is humanitarian and maybe in a change in policy we can help to bring about a change in a regime that, yes, in fact has abused human rights. Let us help to see if we can get this back on track.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for showing the leadership on this important issue. I rise in support of the motion to instruct to adopt the Senate language to lift the embargo that has existed against Cuba all of these years. A sensible and fair trade policy is an essential feature of economic growth in this country, but the 40-year trade embargo against Cuba has not only been unfair, it has been a failure. Castro is still there. Yet it is our American farmers that are hurt the most by the inability to export to a country just 70 miles off from our coast.

It is time to try engagement. At a time as we live in today when we are importing oil from such regimes as Saudi Arabia and Yemen, even Venezuela and even Iraq, to claim that we should not be trading with Cuba is the height of hypocrisy. Yet what is funny about this whole debate is the American people have been way out ahead of policymakers in this country, especially Presidential candidates as they go down to Florida and to the opposition to this very motion. In fact, in a recent poll conducted on this very issue, over 85 percent of the American people think that the United States should end all restrictions on the sale of food and medicine to the island of Cuba. And a majority of Members now are on record on repeated occasions of supporting lifting the embargo. The most recent vote in the House came down to a 301 to 116 opinion to lift the embargo. The most recent vote in the Senate passed 70 to 28. These votes indicate that there are veto-proof majorities in both the House and the Senate to deal with this issue. Yet it for too long has been tied up in Presidential electoral politics in the State

of Florida. A majority of both the House and the Senate agriculture committee members favor lifting these restrictions. And even a majority of the conferees existing on the farm bill today favor lifting the restrictions. It is time to end this unfair trade policy. It is time to try engagement and let the sunshine in and also help the American farmers in the process. I thank my friend for his leadership.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dooley motion. Let me just say that I rise in support of what is best for America. As Americans, we have been negligent. We have allowed for this policy to be hijacked. It is now up to us to really look in terms of what is happening and begin to do the right thing. Nothing brought this to light any better than the situation with Elian, the young man who, when we saw that situation, it brought to light the fact that we need to begin to do the right thing. The right thing is to begin to trade.

When we look at American support as indicated earlier, there is support there for the sale of food and medicine to Cuba. An October 2000 public opinion poll found that over 85 percent of Americans support that. And so it is about time that we begin to do the right thing. The majority of the Members of this Congress have repeatedly voted in favor of that measure. But it continues to be hijacked. A majority of both the House and the Senate agriculture committees support unrestricted food and medicine sales to Cuba. The embargo prevents U.S. businesses from doing good business, and it does not make any sense. When we look at it and say we expect them to have an electoral process and vote, I believe that strongly. But if you hold that to every single country that has a dictator or has other forms of government that do not elect their officials, we would not be having too much trade throughout this world, and it does not make any sense.

□ 1600

The other most important thing we need to remember is that when it comes to our national security, I have always said we should act unilaterally and act as quickly as possible. But when it is not in our interests in terms of national security, and I sit on the Committee on Armed Services, and I have never been given information in terms of the threats that are out there. Our major threats come from other countries.

So when we look at that, we ought to act in a multilateral perspective and reach out to Latin America. All of Latin America has always questioned why do we have this policy that is irrational and blinded.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, with regard to a couple of points made by the colleague who just spoke, he said that he has heard, and he is on the Committee on Armed Services, of no threats by the Cuban regime. Obviously he has not heard the debate that has gone on for one hour, because my understanding was that 17 spies were convicted or arrested in the last couple of years. No other terrorist state has had anywhere near that many spies arrested, in some instances, for spying on U.S. military installations, which is something that goes counter to national security. The highest ranking spy in the Defense Intelligence Agency, my understanding, is that spy was arrested for spying for the Cuban terrorist state, and that would be contrary to national security. My colleague said he never heard of anything along those lines, so I am glad we had this opportunity to inform him.

Our law is clear. Normalization requires freedom for political prisoners, legalization of unions, the press and political parties, and the scheduling of free elections. Now, if you ask the American people a question, do you support those three conditions for normalization, do you support in this hemisphere that all people should have the right to free elections and to no political prisoners and to freedom for political parties and labor unions and the press, I know what the answer to that question would be. It would be overwhelmingly supported. So it all depends on how you ask the question.

This Congress has always stood in favor of free elections and freedom for the political prisoners and freedom of political activity and free speech in effect for the Cuban people. Cuba, as has been said before, is in this hemisphere. The international law and inter-American law requires democracy in this hemisphere. It states that representative democracy is the only form of government in this hemisphere.

Cuba remains in this hemisphere, despite what some would like on the other side of this debate. It remains in this hemisphere, and the Cuban people deserve our continued solidarity, and not financing for the terrorist regime, which is what in effect this amendment would make possible. So vote down the Dooley amendment.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the sincerity and passion of the gentleman's opposition to this amendment, but I think at times the rhetoric has probably gone beyond the issues that are at hand here.

This amendment, what we are talking about really relates solely to the sale of food and medicine from the United States to Cuba. Currently we allow for the sale of food and medicine to Cuba, but we require that it be paid for in cash, or the U.S. interest that is selling the food and medicine to Cuba would have to secure financing from a

third party country. All this amendment does is says that a sale of U.S. food and medicine to Cuba can now be financed by a private institution in the United States.

That is what this debate is all about. It is about how we can facilitate the sale of U.S. agricultural products that are important to provide the sustenance to a lot of families in Cuba. It is about how can we facilitate the sale of U.S. drugs to a lot of the families in Cuba by providing an element of private financing.

I just want to clarify an issue that was brought up at times saying this will allow for the public financing of goods to Cuba. This bill does not do that. In fact, it retains the language that I wanted to read into the record, which is section 908(a). It says, "In general, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no United States government assistance, including United States foreign assistance, United States export assistance, and any United States credit or guarantees shall be available for exports to Cuba or for commercial exports to Iran, Libya, North Korea, or Sudan."

My colleagues need to fully understand that, again, what we are talking about here is simply a measure that will provide for the ability to provide for private financing of food and medicine.

There was also some contention made, well, why do we need to be providing for the U.S. be able to provide food and medicines to Cuba? They can get those from other countries. But what is clear is if the United States wants to have the most influence into Cuba, is that we need to enhance and expand upon our interaction and our engagement. That is what this measure will do.

I ask my colleagues to support this measure. It is a step forward in terms of providing greater economic opportunities in many sectors of our economy, and also is a step forward in ensuring that we will have a positive form of economic engagement which can make a difference in the quality of life of the residents and citizens of Cuba.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support my good friend from California and his motion to instruct the conferees on the Farm Security Act, which would repeal the existing restrictions against private financing of agricultural sales to Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, at issue here is whether we want to help American farmers, or leave in place restrictions that are costing them millions of dollars each year. Given that the national farm economy is depressed, it is important that we do what we can to help American farmers and their families. With one simple adjustment in our policy, we can help them recover billions of dollars in lost trade. According to a recent study, U.S. farmers are losing close to \$1.26 billion in agricultural exports and about \$3.6 billion in exports related to agriculture because of these restrictions.

The U.S. Senate has taken the first step in easing agricultural trade restrictions, and the House of Representatives should follow. The

Senate position has garnered wide support from a broad array of agricultural interests. The National Farm Bureau, the USA Rice Federation, the dairy industry, wine sellers, all support lifting the restrictions. The California Farm Bureau supports lifting restrictions because it knows that California agriculture stands to reap great benefits from trade with Cuba. Up to \$98 million in agricultural products, and \$287 million in related sales could be generated, simply by lifting the restriction on private financing.

The Cubans are ready, willing, and able to purchase our goods. They have stated publicly that they would buy over a billion dollars' worth of agricultural goods if we would only lift restrictions, and help expedite licenses to allow them access to the same lending terms to which other countries have access. Let's help the American farmers. Let's trust them manage their own business and their own risks. Lifting the restrictions would give them this freedom.

This is a simple vote, will we agree to instruct the House conferees to agree with the Senate—which has already realized the necessity of this change in policy—or do we continue with a failed policy, which helps no one and hurts American farmers? I urge my colleagues to support this move, and vote "yes" on the Dooley motion to instruction the conferees.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the H.R. 2646, the motion to instruct conferees on the Farm Security Act to repeal restrictions against private financing of agricultural sales to Cuba.

Doing business with Cuba means doing business with Castro, it is that simple. So long as Cuba's dictator maintains his stranglehold on every aspect of Cuban life, lifting any aspect of the embargo would mean subsidizing Castro. The truth is that Cuba can get food from almost anywhere in the world. However the Cuban Government chooses to ration the food that it does receive and even goes as far as to prohibit its citizens from producing their own. Under Castro, every aspect of the economy is controlled by the Cuban Government. In Cuba there is no such thing as free enterprise. By sending our products into Cuba, we are only giving Castro the symbolic victory and propoganda he craves. By sending our agriculture products into Cuba, we are only providing assistance to a dictator and a terrorist.

The Cuban Government is characterized by its systematic trampling of civil rights and political freedom, the killing of civilians, the subhuman conditions of its prisons and by a legal system that perpetuates the violation of human rights. According to Amnesty International, no other country of Cuba's size has held so many political prisoners for so long under such inhuman circumstances of atrocity and terror. These atrocities are not some far off history of a generation ago. They are happening today, in jails closer to Miami than we are to my home in New Jersey.

By lifting these sanctions with nothing in exchange from the Cuban Government—no free elections, no commitments on human rights, no civil liberties—we are betraying the very people that this embargo was designed to help. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2646 and to remain steadfast in their support for the Cuban people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BACA moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2646, an Act to provide for continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, be instructed to agree to provisions contained in section 452 of the Senate amendment, relating to restoration of benefits to children, legal immigrants who work, refugees, and the disabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my motion to instruct on H.R. 2646.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the Congressional Hispanic caucus, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and a bipartisan group of colleagues for working so hard within the conference committee to restore food stamp benefits to working, taxpaying legal residents, and I state, to taxpaying legal residents.

We all agree that the time has come for Congress to ensure that all legal residents are eligible for food stamps. America provides aid to hungry people all over the world, yet we do not take care of everyone who needs it right here at home.

Children of legal immigrants to our Nation are starving. It is as simple as that. With the passage of welfare reform in 1996, almost all legal immigrants lost food stamp eligibility. In 1998, Congress realized it had gone too far. But it only restored food stamps to

benefit kids and elderly who arrived in our country before 1996. Thousands of immigrants who arrived here in the last 5 years will never receive any help from us for their nutritional needs.

The current law does nothing to help them feed their children, many of whom are United States citizens. Let me say that again, many who are United States citizens. Kids who are United States citizens are starving under the current law. This must stop. It can stop with us.

This motion instructs the 2002 Farm Security Act conference to restore much-needed food stamp benefit to legal, permanent residents. I state, to legal, permanent residents. It would allow legal residents who have been in the United States for 5 years to apply for food stamps if they are low income. This is what the President has proposed. I state, this is what the President has proposed.

It would allow children to be eligible for food stamps, regardless of when they entered the United States. This provision is also contained in the farm bill that the Senate brought to the conference committee. It would reduce the current requirement that an immigrant accrue 10 years of working history to qualify for food stamps to 4 years of work to qualify.

Why should all of us support this motion? Because it makes sense, both fiscally and morally, and because strong bipartisan support already exists for restoring food stamps to legal immigrants.

Support for restoring benefits crosses ideological and partisan lines. President Bush's 2002 budget includes a proposal to restore food stamps to legal immigrants, and I state, to legal immigrants, who have lived in the United States for 5 years. Newt Gingrich even stated that the restrictions on legal immigrants' eligibility for food stamps were one of the provisions in the welfare law that went too far; that went too far. Members from both sides of this aisle in both Chambers support restoration.

Also the children's restoration is very inexpensive. It is already built into the \$6.4 billion allotment for the nutrition title. The cost is \$200 million. That is a small price when compared to the entire \$150 billion farm bill.

Restoration of the food stamps to immigrants with significant work history costs nothing. CBO scored the enhancement at zero. It will simplify the process and help people at no cost to the taxpayers, at no cost to the taxpayers.

Immigrant children need food stamps. Children, more than any other group, need access to healthy diets. I state, children, more than any other group, need access to healthy diet.

Research indicates that children who do not receive adequate nutrition have poor health development. We talk about imposing performance standards on kids in school, but how can kids perform when they go to school with an empty stomach? It is very difficult to perform if you have an empty stomach.

Section 452 of the Senate farm bill and the alternative of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) include this provision for children.

Immigrant children are twice as likely to live in homes where parents pay more than 50 percent of their income in rent. We will make sure that poor kids receive the nutrition they need to one day lift themselves out of poverty, and I state, to lift themselves out of poverty.

Restoring benefits to immigrant children will help with this effort to reach citizen children. Over 85 percent of immigrant families have mixed status, households that include at least one citizen child. Confusion about eligibility and fear about their immigrant status has caused these hard working parents to stay away from the program, even when these kids are eligible, and yet it affects their daily lives as they are going to school.

Our current anti-immigrant food stamp program causes that fear. These are American citizens, American children we are talking about, yet they do not have access at the same time that kids who are born citizens. According to USDA from 1994 to 1998, 1 million citizens of immigrant parents left the food stamp program, representing a 74 percent decline for this group. It is time that we helped these American children.

Working immigrants need food stamps. Low-wage working immigrants should be granted access to food stamp as work support. Legal immigrants are just as likely as natives to work, but they are two times as likely to be poor. Forty-three percent work in jobs paying less than \$7.50 an hour, and wages have risen more slowly for immigrants than natives over the last decade.

This motion builds on principles already established under the current law. Currently legal immigrants, individuals or couples that can show a combined work history of 10 years, are exempt from food stamp restrictions on legal immigrants. The notion behind this exemption was that no family with a demonstrated work history should be prohibited access to critical work support.

The Senate bill builds upon the principles of fairness, and so should we. I state, the Senate bill builds upon the principles of fairness, and so should we. It would allow low-income individuals or married couples that can demonstrate, and I state, that can demonstrate, a combined workforce history of 4 years, to begin food stamp eligibility. Four years of work is measured by earning 16 quarters of earnings under the Social Security system.

It is time that all hard-working, tax paying, and I state, hard-working, tax paying residents of this country, are eligible for the same benefits in times of difficulty. Many of our veterans who served are legal permanent residents. This would allow them also to be eligible as well. When tax day rolls around,