

Third, I am concerned about the vitality of our communities. These small bookstores in so many of our communities do more than just sell books. Yes, they sell publications and they make it possible for young people in rural America and inner cities and others to have a comfortable place to learn, but they are also a huge addition to Main Street in so many parts of rural Oregon and, I am sure, in Kansas where the Presiding Officer resides. Having been born in Wichita, we have talked before about life in rural America.

I do not want to see those small bookstores becoming part of the Main Street of yesteryear in rural America. I am very concerned that if this proposed merger goes forward, as it is currently structured, it really will put a hardship on a lot of main streets in rural communities and will diminish the vitality of many of those towns.

I admit to growing up a bit skeptical of some of these large megastores. As I said, my dad was an author, and I spent a lot of Sunday afternoons going through some of those megastores with my dad trying to persuade them to put one of his titles that did not fit their view of what was popular up close, up close to where the consumers were when they stopped to browse in the window. My father was concerned about the concentration of economic power in the bookselling business.

I tell you, I think this deal, if it goes forward as structured, will confirm a lot of the worries that my dad and others like him have had about our country and where the bookselling business is going.

Finally, I think we all understand that the bookselling business has changed certainly on the Internet. The Presiding Officer has worked with me on legislation which has been important to me such as the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

The Internet has changed the bookselling business. There is no question about the fact that with Amazon.com and others in the business of selling books on line, the business has changed very dramatically. But I do not buy the idea that Barnes & Noble had to merge with Ingram in order to take on Amazon. I do not buy that idea at all.

I think there is a role in our country for a variety of ways for consumers to order publications. I think there is an important place for the small bookstore, especially because of the contributions they make to main streets in rural communities and inner cities. I certainly do not want to hold back on-line shopping. That is why I was a principal sponsor in the Senate of the Internet Tax Freedom Act. So I do not take a back seat to anybody in terms of trying to ensure that we take advantage of all the technological innovations that are available for the consumer.

What concerns me about this proposal is that a lot of small bookstores

are not going to be able to survive. A lot of small bookstores are going to find it difficult to survive if Barnes & Noble has proprietary information about them, about their volume, about their sales practices, about the way they do business, and if that information is used against small bookstores.

So I believe the Federal Trade Commission has in front of it an issue of extreme importance, one which will dramatically affect intellectual freedom, one which has great implications for antitrust policy and the consumer, one which will be vital to the well-being of communities and main streets across this country. I believe the Federal Trade Commission is going to rule soon on this proposed acquisition. I believe they are going to act in the interest of the consumer. I appreciate the opportunity to bring the Senate up to date on this important economic matter.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

#### FAMILY FARMERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor briefly today to talk about two issues. First, tomorrow the appropriations conference begins between the House and the Senate on the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. That includes specifically the President's request for emergency appropriations to be made for some agricultural spring planting loans, some emergency appropriations to be made for the purpose of helping the victims of Hurricane Mitch in Central America, and then since that time the President has made new recommendations on emergency funding for the Defense Department needs as a result of the actions in Kosovo.

The House of Representatives took a request by President Clinton for nearly \$6 billion in added funds for the military especially, but including some humanitarian relief for the actions in Kosovo, and added to that \$6 billion of emergency funding nearly \$7 billion more, to reach a total of close to \$13 billion in emergency funding.

A number of us believe that, while we are on the subject of emergencies and in a supplemental appropriations conference, it would be inappropriate to add \$7 billion to the defense budget for emergency needs relating to Kosovo—although some of it has very little relationship to Kosovo, it has a relationship to what is called "readiness" in defense accounts and other things—that it would be inappropriate to consider that without considering other emergency needs here at home on the domestic front. One of those is agriculture.

The plight of the family farmer in this country has been pretty well described by myself and others on the floor of the Senate in recent months. The Congress did some emergency work last fall to provide some income support to family farmers above and

beyond the current farm bill. But it is not nearly enough.

We now come to May of 1999, at a time in which prices for many commodities in agriculture, in constant dollars, are at Depression level, and we are going to lose thousands, tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of family farmers if we decide to do nothing. Tomorrow's conference between the House and Senate may be the only opportunity that exists this year to provide support for emergency funding, to add some income price support to family farmers, which they desperately need.

This chart shows what is happening in rural America. This map shows counties marked in red which are being depopulated in our country. These are counties that have lost at least 10 percent of their population in the last 18 years. You can see on this map the large red area that shows the middle of this country—the farm belt—is being depopulated, people are leaving.

Why are people leaving the farm belt in droves, and especially now in more recent years? Why are people leaving their family farms, leaving the farm belt, and leaving rural counties? The answer is, family farmers cannot make a living when they produce grain and then have to sell it at a price far below their cost of production. It does not work that way. You go broke. Bad trade agreements, concentration in agricultural industries—there are a whole series of reasons—but the central reason, it seems to me, is low prices. If you do not get a decent price for that which you produce, you are not going to be able to make a decent living.

The question for this country is, What kind of price supports are available to farmers when market prices collapse? Every one of us in this Chamber would prefer that farmers received their prices from the marketplace. But when the marketplace collapses, farmers load a couple hundred bushels of wheat on their trucks, drive to the elevators, are told that wheat has no value, or has very little value, then the question for Congress is, Do we want family farmers in our future? And, if we do, What kind of income support are we willing to offer to create a bridge over that price valley when prices collapse?

The largest enterprises, the big agri-factories, will make it across that valley. They are big enough, strong enough, have the financial resources to make it across that price valley. It is the family farmer who will not make it. So the question for the Congress is, Do we care about family farming? And, if we do, what can we do to provide some income support when prices collapse?

A number of us will offer, during this deliberation in the conference between the House and the Senate on emergency needs, a proposal to restore some emergency funding to family farmers. There are lots of ways of doing that. I have my own feeling about how to do

it. Senator HARKIN and I, along with Senator CONRAD and others—Senator HARKIN and I, incidentally, will be in the conference tomorrow, are prepared to offer some proposals to deal with emergency needs, it is not just the Defense Department that has emergency needs, family farming is in a full-scale emergency in this country.

This Congress must take steps to save it. Tomorrow, again, Senator HARKIN, myself and some others in the conference on appropriations, of which Senator HARKIN and I are conferees, intend to raise this question in a very forceful way and push very aggressively for action on an emergency basis with our colleagues.

Republican and Democrat colleagues here in this Chamber understand that we face a very serious problem. All of my colleagues who come from the farm belt have said the same thing. Family farmers are in trouble. There is no disagreement about that. There might be some disagreement about the mechanism by which we address this question, but I think everyone here, with whom I share the long-term interests of the welfare of family farming, believes that we need, during periods of collapsed prices, to provide some income price support. The question is how do we do that. My hope is the first step will be tomorrow during the conference that we have with the House of Representatives.

#### KOSOVO

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I may address one additional issue, this deals with Kosovo and Mr. Milosevic. There was a piece published in the Washington Post on Sunday, written by Mark S. Ellis, that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on Kosovo.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DORGAN. The piece by Mr. Ellis is entitled "Non-Negotiable, War Criminals Belong in the Dock, Not at the Table."

I wanted to bring this piece to the attention of my colleagues because Mr. Ellis says it well. He points out that we are at a time and a place, dealing with Mr. Milosevic in Kosovo, when it is all of our responsibilities to bring Mr. Milosevic to justice.

Some would say, well, how do you arrest someone who is not accessible to you? It doesn't matter, as far as I am concerned, whether it's possible to apprehended and arrest him. We have a responsibility in this case, just as I felt we did in the case of Saddam Hussein, to make the case against these leaders for the war crimes they have committed and to bring them to trial before an international tribunal, try them, and, hopefully, convict them as war criminals. To not do that, it seems to me, will be to continue to have to deal with people who have committed

genocide and war crimes that have brought unspeakable horror to the people of Kosovo, and to continue to have to deal with them in the future.

I know some in this country and elsewhere say the problem is, if you push aggressively to try Mr. Milosevic as a war criminal and ultimately have to negotiate with him some sort of negotiated settlement in the Balkans, it is very hard to negotiate with someone you have identified as a war criminal. That is a lot of psychobabble, as far as I am concerned.

We have already decided this fellow is a war criminal by virtue of our actions in NATO. NATO decided that the genocide and ethnic cleansing that were occurring in Kosovo could not be allowed to stand.

I think it might be useful to read through a list of some of the allegations. By no means is this a definitive list, it is just a small sliver: the village of Goden, the execution of 20 men and then the burning of the entire village; Malakrusa, 112 men shot and their bodies burned; Pastasel, 70 ethnic Albanian bodies discovered; Pec, at least 50 ethnic Albanians killed and buried in their own yards; Podujevo, the execution of 200 military age men and 90 percent of the village burned as well; summary execution; robbery; rape; forced expulsion.

We now have seen the march of nearly 1 million people displaced from their homeland, villages burned, looted, and plundered. One refugee said, "16 special policemen appeared shooting their automatic weapons in the air. Two families had strayed from the group and the Serbs opened fire, killing every member of both families, except for a 2-year-old boy who had been protected by his mother. She hid the baby in front of her and saved him. I saw this with my own eyes," this refugee said, "maybe 150 feet from me."

In 1992, Secretary of State Eagleburger publicly identified Mr. Milosevic as a war criminal; 1992, 7 years ago. Mr. Eagleburger is one of the most respected foreign policy thinkers in our country. He said Mr. Milosevic was a war criminal in 1992. What does that mean, to say someone is a war criminal or for our country to allege someone is a war criminal, if we decide to do nothing about it, if an international tribunal exists by which someone can and should be tried but we decide, no, we don't really want to do that in the face of mass executions, in the face of ethnic cleansing? We say we really don't want to do that because we may need to negotiate a settlement to this conflict.

It was a mistake not to go to an international tribunal and convict Saddam Hussein as a war criminal so that forever after he would be branded a war criminal. He is now, many years later, of course, still running Iraq. He does not have the stigma of having been convicted in absentia as a war criminal. He should have. The same, in my judgment, is true of Mr. Milosevic.

To read a paragraph from Mr. Ellis's wonderful piece in the Washington Post, he said:

When I watched the bus loads of new arrivals enter Stenkovec camp, I saw a small girl's face pressed against the window. Her hollow eyes seemed to stare at no one. History was being repeated. In his opening statement at the Nuremberg trials in 1945, U.S. chief prosecutor Robert H. Jackson said, "The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant, and so devastating that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored because it cannot survive their being repeated." Jackson was expressing the hope that law would somehow redeem the next generation that similar atrocities would never again be allowed. Today, we must hold personally liable those individuals who commit atrocities in the former Yugoslavia. To negotiate with the perpetrators of these crimes not only demeans the suffering of countless civilian victims, it sends a clear signal that justice is expendable, that war crimes can go unpunished. Inevitably, lasting peace will be linked to justice, and justice will depend on accountability. Failing to indict Milosevic in the hope that he can deliver a negotiated settlement makes a mockery of the words "Never Again."

I am not an expert in this region. I have been to Yugoslavia, when it was Yugoslavia. I sat at an outdoor restaurant on a beautiful evening and watched wonderful people, just like my neighbors in Regent, ND, just like North Dakotans or Kansans or other folks, and it occurred to me that it was a wonderful country with a lot of wonderful people. Of course, we now know that what has happened as a spark occurs in an area, and Mr. Milosevic follows up the spark with ethnic cleansing, producing a calamity. We see the horrors inflicted on people, in some cases by their previous neighbors, that you would have thought unthinkable. Something is dreadfully wrong when the rest of the world allows a dictator like Mr. Milosevic to inflict ethnic cleansing and the kind of horror he has inflicted on the people of Kosovo.

That is why NATO and the United States have engaged in airstrikes. It is why all of us hope this conflict ends soon and that Kosovars are returned to their homes. Also, Mr. Milosevic, at least from my standpoint, should be brought before an international tribunal and tried even in absentia, if necessary, as a war criminal and convicted as a war criminal to send a signal to the world that this new world order will not allow this to go unpunished.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, May 9, 1999]  
NON-NEGOTIABLE, WAR CRIMINALS BELONG IN  
THE DOCK, NOT AT THE TABLE  
(By Mark S. Ellis)

Just a few weeks ago, I stood among a sea of 20,000 desperate people on a dirt airfield outside Skopje, Macedonia, listening to one harrowing story after another. I had come to the Stenkovec refugee camp to record those stories and to help set up a system for documenting atrocities in Kosovo.

As I collected their accounts of rape, torture and executions at the hands of Serbian troops, I was struck by the refugees' common yearning for justice. They wanted those