to comment about anyone's motives last year. It is water under the bridge. I made some comments at that time that I think perhaps were misunderstood, was taken piecemeal out of the television interview.

But once again, I state very, very clearly that my view is that people are not corrupted by a meal or a present or a trip or a golf game. But the appearance is not one that the American people believe gives them the same fair deal that some on the special inside track has.

I hope my colleagues will agree to support this amendment which includes the very same gift ban that they claimed to support last year. As a matter of fact, it won 95 to 4, I believe was the count—overwhelming. The eyes of America are on the new leadership and on this Congress. If we cannot bring ourselves to ban gifts from lobbyists it will be a sign that for all of the talk of reform we are still back in politics as usual. The fact of saying one thing but doing another, the fact of putting special interests first and the ordinary citizens last, would be a terrible and deeply disturbing message for this Congress to send, and we ought not to do that.

So I hope that my colleagues will join me.

Let it be voted upon. Let us take the count and see what happens. That is what the American people are entitled to know. What do the Members of this body really believe when they say they want to change things? It is easy. Get a tally of the vote, and it adds up to 100. Whichever way the majority rules is what will be done.

So I would like to see it done with support from both sides of the aisle, in the spirit of the new mood of cooperation. I hope it can be done. I think it is very important to set the record straight, and you do it step by step. This is a very important first step.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I just want to respond to some of the comments from my colleague from Kentucky about this amendment, the gift ban provisions. My colleague said that he thought it could be improved upon, but again I point out that this is precisely the language of the proposal introduced by the majority leader and 36 other Republicans. Mr. President, I can go through the provisions of this gifts proposal—and I guess I would like to ask my colleague, what would you want to improve on? What do you want in and what do you want out?

Mr. President, what I have heard on the floor of the Senate in the last hour or so really startled me. And I think it is going to be a huge problem for our country. The word ''governing'' was used earlier. Again, Mr. President, people were talking about meals. It is not just meals. There are examples of trade association-paid trips to the Bahamas, Hawaii, you name it. We ought to end this practice. But I would like people in the country to know—and I was amazed that I heard my colleague from Kentucky just say it so clearly. He said, ''This is about control.'' That is what this is about? So, colleagues, this is not about merit, this is not about reform. When everyone ran for office, they talked about reform. I doubt whether very many of my colleagues talked about control. That is what this issue is about. Do not vote for an amendment that puts an end to a practice that leads people in our country to believe that something is wrong with the way we conduct business in Washington. Do not respond to what people want us to do now. Continue with this practice, as egregious as it is, and do it because of control. That is what I heard my colleague say from Kentucky, that this is about control.

I thought it was about merit. I thought this was about reform. I thought this was about the Congressional Accountability Act. I thought this was about making Senators more accountable. I thought this was about good government.

Mr. President, I may or may not be a little out of line. I am just speaking for myself as one Senator from Minnesota, but if the definition of control now in the Senate is that, by definition, any amendment introduced from our side of the aisle bumps up against control and, regardless of merit, will be voted down, that is very different from the way in which I thought the Senate operated—at least during the time I have been here. If that is what this is all about—control—then I will have this amendment on gift ban up on the floor over and over and over again, and I guess we will be talking about control and control and control over and over again.

I thought that this was a legislative process, a democratic process, an amendment body, and Senators voted amendments up or down on the basis of their own independence and on the basis of merit, not on the basis of control.

So, Mr. President, I yield the floor for the moment, but I would be interested in some response by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, since I do not think people in the United States of America in this past election voted for control. They voted for good change. They voted for reform. They voted for reaching beyond our parties. They voted for doing the right thing, albeit people have different definitions of doing the right thing. They did not vote for control. I think this debate now about this amendment has become bigger than the amendment. It has a great deal to do with the way we are going to conduct ourselves here in the Senate. I would be interested in a response from my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENSIBLE VIEWS ON CUBA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a very prescient and sensible article about Cuba which appeared in the Winter 1994 Newsletter of the Duke Family Association.

The article, entitled Fidel Fading: U.S. Should Play Role in Cuba, was written by Biddle Duke, a journalist working in Santa Fe. He has visited Cuba twice in recent years, most recently last spring, when he served as an aide to two Washington-based public policy groups, the Appeal to Conscience Foundation and the Council of American Ambassadors.

Mr. Duke makes a strong case for modifying United States policy on Cuba. The economic crisis there has become so acute, he says, that it can be used in effect as a lever for normalized relations. He recommends that the United States send humanitarian aid and lift the embargo at least partially. While offering a hand of conditional friendship we should push for a free and open Cuban society.

I concur with Mr. Duke's views and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Duke Family Association, Winter, 1994]

FIDEL FADING: U.S. SHOULD PLAY ROLE IN CUBA

(By Biddle Duke)

Everywhere in Cuba one hears and sees the despair. A 24-year old engineer works three days a week as a building supervisor for less than the equivalent of three dollars a month, has two thin meals a day, meat once a week, and spends much of his time hanging out on Havana's waterfront. On Friday in April he is swimming off the rocks with this brother.

''We've got schools and doctors, but what good is that without food or medicine or jobs?'' he tell an American visitor in Spanish.

In the same breath, he asks, ''Can you spare some dollars?''

Then, sardonically, ''Viva la revolucion.''

Throughout the country, people seem to be waiting for something to happen.

They are a people waking from the dream of communist Cuba's heyday of the 1970s and '80s when Fidel Castro worked the world stage like a master of the game, and his face and his nation became synonymous with third world sovereignty and nationalism; when Cubans fought proudly for working class freedom around the globe.

They are waking from the glorious delusion of Soviet subsidies to the tragic anachronism of present-day Cuba. Cubans are all in something of national pause, standing on

a cusp of their history, either dazed in the disbelief that their dreams are shattered, or cynical or despondent.

In Cuba's dire economic crisis there is a tremendous potential force for change. Basic foods, medicine, oil, gasoline and electricity are strictly rationed. Transportation is poor and undependable. Whole chunks of the nation are regularly hit with black outs. Infant mortality is up. So is suicide.

Cubans in exile and those remaining in Cuba are ready to listen and make some steps toward reconciliation. The country is poised for change. And, most importantly, it is vulnerable.

Cuba's malaise has opened the door for the United States to play a critical role in Cuba's future. In the mold of our approach to China, Vietnam and South Africa, we should offer a hand of conditional friendship while still pushing for a free and open Cuban society.

Our national and political conscience dictates that we respond to Cuba's plight by at least encouraging humanitarian aid shipments. And, in doing so, this nation can send a powerful message: Our capitalist democracy works. Despite its many shortcomings, the United States has the medicine and food to spare for many in need, especially Cubans, so close to us historically and culturally.

Encouraging aid should be the Clinton administration's first step in making friendly overtures to the Cuban people and pushing Fidel and his intransigent Marxist Leninism into obsolescence. The administration should initiate a bargaining process over the embargo which should include a combination of diplomatic overtures and policies to improve communication between Cubans and Americans.

Although Fidel might use U.S. aid to blow a little breath into the dying corpse of his revolution, the U.S. free press is easily more effective over the long run in spreading the truth about the food and medicine that would be making it into the Cubans' hands. Already, CNN and other TV stations are captured by thousands in Cuba by pirate satellites. Radio Marti, out of Florida, offers a daily diet of information from the outside world to Cuban listeners. The message to Cubans from all of these sources would be loud and clear: What you are getting is American goodwill. And if it is not reaching you, blame Fidel.

The powerful message of freedom already is carried via the vibrant but informal links that exist between the 1.2 million American Cubans and their friends and families in Cuba. The administration should encourage this exchange by negotiating for direct postal and telephone service between our two nations; the exchange of students, teachers, artists, writers and other professionals; allowing travel to Cuba by American tourists; and permitting U.S. journalists to be stationed there.

Underlying all these proposals should be a request by the administration to begin official discussions on the embargo with Havana and an agreement to raise the level of the U.S. envoy if Cuba does the same. The ultimate goal would be full diplomatic relations.

The rest, and perhaps most significant elements of the embargo, principally the prohibition of the U.S. investment in Cuba, as well as a prohibition on most commerce, could be lifted over the long term if political conditions in Cuba and the nation's human rights record improve.

Setting the stage for negotiations would put the United States in command, no matter what Fidel's reaction would be. If he balked, Castro would have difficulty explaining to his hungry people why he turned down food and medicine, the scarcity of which define the embargo to most Cubans. If he agreed to a gradual opening of relations, the irrepressible forces of capitalism and social reform, some of which are already evident, in all likelihood would sweep the nation.

Cubans are proud and patriotic, and Fidel plays on this. As long as the United States is inflexible on the embargo, we remain the imperialist enemy in their minds, and the revolution, the Cuban struggle to get out from under our thumb, goes on. But if the administration allows aid shipments and sets up a bargaining table, and Fidel does not step up, he will look like the defiant, stubborn dinosaur that he is. And something of a hypocrite, since he continually is calling for an end to what he calls the ''blockade.''

The administration has so far taken the least politically taxing course on Cuba, which is to maintain the antagonistic status quo. And that's unlikely to change until after the 1996 election. In order to carry Florida, many believe Clinton must let the conservative wealthy Cuban American National Foundation dictate Cuban policy, which pushed for the strengthening of the embargo as recently as 1992.

The truth is that many exiled Cubans want the embargo at least partially lifted, enough to help those left on the island through these tough times. And many Americans wonder why the embargo, which was imposed in 1962 by President Kennedy, wasn't dissolved with the end of the Cold War.

A growing number of conservatives and liberals and some of the nation's leading newspapers already have advocated an end to the embargo, saying that it is an antiquated policy that is hurting Cubans, not Fidel's regime. They argue rightly that Cuba and the spread of communism no longer are threats to our stability or the stability of the hemisphere. Communism and the Cuban revolution are indisputable failures.

Interestingly, Fidel is not a complete failure to Cubans. He's all they have; just Fidel, who thumbed his nose at the United States and put Cuba on the geopolitical map. But that's not enough anymore.

A young Cuban woman told me this story of two old brothers who lived together in the hills. They had fought in the revolution and believed in it. Now, hungry and old and crushed by the reality of the revolution's failure, one of them hanged himself with his belt in the rafters of his house. When the guardia came to take his body away, the other man asked that the belt be left behind to remind him of his brother and the reason he took his life. After the guardia departed, the second brother used it to hang himself. These are the stories of Cuba these days.

Optimism drives us all, and the future of Cuba, the dreams of almost two generations of Cubans who've grown up both in exile and under the delusion of the revolution, could be realized in coming decades. Second to the Cuban people, the United States is the most important force for positive change on the island. Americans have a choice: between provoking change with obsolete and misplaced hostility or encouraging it, as we did in South Africa, as constructive, engaged critics.

There is a chance that we could strangle Cubans into a violent revolution. And there is a chance that we could offer them some choices and hope, and help them make the right decisions.

Biddle Duke has been to Cuba twice, most recently this spring, as an aide to Washington-based public policy groups, the Appeal of Conscience Foundation and the Council of American Ambassadors. He is a journalist working in Santa Fe and is a former reporter for The New Mexican.

TIME TO OVERHAUL UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD CUBA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as I look at the vast array of foreign policy issues the 104th Congress will address, United States policy toward Cuba stands out in my mind as the most in need of a dramatic overhaul. I believe all my colleagues agree on the goals of United States policy toward Cuba—promoting a peaceful transition to democracy, economic liberalization and greater respect for human rights while controlling immigration from Cuba. Where some of us may differ, however, is on how we get there. In my view, current policy is not only outdated and ineffective, but, far worse, it is counterproductive to fostering these goals and contrary to U.S. national interests.

Rather than tightening the embargo and further isolating Cuba, as the United States has done, we should be expanding contact with the Cuban people and lifting the embargo. I say this not because I believe the Cuban Government should be rewarded; in fact, I am disappointed that the Cuban Government has failed to make meaningful steps towards political reform and improving human rights. Nor do I believe that it should be done as a quid pro quo. We should lift the embargo simply because it serves the U.S. national interests by helping foster a peaceful transition to democracy.

In my view, greater contact with the Cuban people will plant the seeds of change and advance the cause of democracy just as greater exchange with the West helped hasten the fall of communism in Eastern Europe. In his posthumously published book, former President Nixon wrote that ''we should drop the economic embargo and open the way to trade, investment and economic interaction * * *.'' Nixon believed we would better help the Cuban people by building ''pressure from within by actively stimulating Cuba's economic contracts with the free world.'' William D. Rogers, who served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs for the Ford administration, also believes the embargo should be lifted. As he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year, ''The breakup of the Soviet system occurred not because we cut off trade and human interchange, but because we didn't.''

United States travel restrictions to and from Cuba, only 90 miles away, are among the most prohibitive in the world. At this point, only United States government officials and journalists are allowed to travel to Cuba without having to obtain a license, and only a handful of Cubans are allowed to travel to the United States. I would ask my colleagues, do we not have enough faith in the power of our system to let contact between our citizens flourish?

Current policy not only denies the United States the opportunity to promote positive change in Cuba, but it increases the likelihood of widespread