

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be. The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I apologize to my friend from North Dakota. I hope during the next hour and 15 minutes we can also make some progress toward getting rid of a number of the amendments, in addition to those cleared. I hope we can move in an orderly fashion to dispose of the Smith amendment, as amended. We can move forward and give Senator DODD an opportunity to move forward with what he desires to do.

In effect, I hope we can do more than just deal with cleared amendments. The arrangement between Senators LOTT and DASCHLE is that we would have the right on a subsequent piece of legislation to legislate. That is what we want to do. We have cooperated. We have moved expeditiously in getting rid of that very large Defense appropriations bill in a matter of a day and a half. I hope in the next hour and a half we are able to come up with a formula whereby we move to the legislative authorization bill and do some legislating.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will consult with my distinguished leader on that subject.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia will yield for a question.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I agree with the comments that were made, and I know the desire is to move the Defense authorization bill forward with some dispatch. I indicated previously that I intend to offer an amendment dealing with sanctions on food and medicine. There are national security issues which have compelled us to impose sanctions, which include food and medicine, on countries.

We have debated this at great length. We had 70 votes for this policy last year in the Senate. Seventy percent of the Senate said they want to strip out food and medicine sanctions. We also have this in our appropriations bill, but I understand the legislative leadership is going to strip it out, and they have the capability from a parliamentary standpoint to do that.

The only option for those of us who want to get this policy done is to put it in a bill that is amendable, like this bill. It is my intention to offer an amendment. I will accept a short time limit when I do so. It is not my intention to hold things up. This has been debated at great length, and 70 percent of the Senators said we want to end sanctions on food and medicine with respect to sanctions that exist around the world.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I advise my distinguished colleague of the following situation: One of the amendments pending at the desk is a Warner-Dodd amendment which establishes a

Presidential commission to examine the overall policy between the United States and Cuba. It is my intention, if the parliamentary situation develops and I can do this, to ask that that amendment be withdrawn.

I do that with the greatest reluctance, but I have an obligation as manager of this very critical piece of legislation, the annual authorization for the Armed Forces of the United States, to compromise in my own objectives. One of them, of course, is to support the Senator's goals and to support the establishment of a commission. I have to do that because two colleagues, very respectfully, in a very friendly and forthright manner, told me that if the Warner-Dodd amendment remains on the authorization bill, we can anticipate—and I use the magic words—a prolonged debate on the Warner-Dodd amendment. That prolonged debate, I have to interpret, is a means by which to deprive the ability of the managers to move forward in an expeditious manner on the authorization bill.

In recognition of that, I have indicated to my two distinguished colleagues and good friends that I am going to withdraw my amendment, if I can, from a parliamentary standpoint. I can only anticipate those two Members, and indeed probably others, will indicate to the managers that should the distinguished colleague from North Dakota desire to offer that amendment, whether it is today or at some future time that will be available, we can anticipate prolonged debate on the armed services authorization bill. That is as much as I can say at this point in time.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understand that. The two managers, Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN, are doing a remarkable job of trying to move this legislation forward. It is not my intent to cause difficulties, but I do not want one or two Senators holding up the will of 70 percent of the Senate, saying this country ought not use food and medicine in sanctions anymore.

If I were assured by somebody that the efforts we have underway—Senator ASHCROFT, myself, Senator GORTON, Senator DODD, and others—to strike these sanctions of food and medicine in other pieces of legislation that are coming to the floor were somehow protected, that would be one thing. It is quite clear to me, and the leadership said to me publicly: We intend to dump them; it does not matter how many people support it, we intend to dump them, get rid of them.

The only opportunity I have is to force my way into this bill. If we have an up-or-down vote on this, 70 percent of the Senate and 70 percent of the House says this country will never use sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine, which is wrong, and the only chance I have to do that is on a piece of legislation such as this.

As my colleague knows, we seldom have a piece of legislation on the floor that is open for amendment. This one

is. I give the Senator my assurance that we do not need long debate on this at all. We can debate this in a very short order because we had extensive debate last year. Seventy Senators said let us not any longer use food and medicine on sanctions.

Mr. WARNER. The distinguished Senator knows the rules of the Senate, and further I sayeth not.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend from North Dakota will yield.

First, I join Senator WARNER in thanking him for allowing, with such graciousness, as always, the interruption of his presentation.

Secondly, he has a very important amendment. It is an amendment on which this Senate has voted, and this vehicle is a perfectly legitimate vehicle for legislation. It is one of the few opportunities we have for legislation. It is because there are such few opportunities that it has attracted this many potential amendments. I do not think anyone needs to apologize for that.

Senator WARNER—the way he works so well—and I will attempt to work with him and attempt to accommodate Senators who wish to offer amendments to this legislation. They need no apologies. We will try to work through it.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for not just intending to offer an important amendment again, but being willing to take a very short time agreement on it, which means we can move the bill along.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my good friend from Michigan and I have a responsibility to get the bill passed. I have been discouraging, as best I can, colleagues from bringing to the floor amendments which are not clearly germane to the central purposes of the annual authorization bill.

I hope I am not interpreting his comments as inviting, in contrast to my discouraging, such amendments. It is going to take a joint effort.

I commend our distinguished colleague, Senator REID of Nevada. He has been most helpful, and Senator LOTT on my side has supported me in trying to get this bill moving. As a matter of fact, Senator LOTT has given us this time this morning. He has represented to me he will try henceforth to give us time in between appropriations bills, which understandably is the prime function of the Senate.

Please, let us not encourage matters by way of amendment which are not clearly germane to this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. If my good friend will yield for a comment on that, I happen to share with him the desirability of moving this bill, but I also understand the need of colleagues to offer legislation in the Senate. That is why we are here.

The way I would accomplish the goal which the good Senator from Virginia has just laid out—a goal I share—would be to encourage colleagues who feel strongly about amendments, as the

Senator from North Dakota does, and understandably so, to agree to short time agreements. The shorter the time agreement we can get on some of these amendments, particularly amendments which have been debated for a long time before, is a way in which we can expedite the passage of the bill, and that is the way in which I think effectively we can do that.

Mr. WARNER. We ought to conclude this saying no matter how laudatory it is to get short time agreements, practically speaking I can think of several amendments on our side which will not be given short time agreements on the other side and reciprocally is the situation. We ought to stick to the premise of bringing up those matters that are germane.

Mr. LEVIN. I can think of amendments on both sides that could require extensive debate, but there may be occasions where cloture is an appropriate way in this Senate. We have rules for that. With some of these amendments which have been waiting to be offered for so many months, I think the best way to do it is deal with them within the rules of the Senate. Happily, this is not one of those amendments. We should not in any way suggest the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is involved in that particular issue. He is willing to take a short time agreement. I think we ought to put that in the bank, get this amendment up early, and dispose of it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, given the shortness of the hour, we should yield the floor so our colleague can finish. Perhaps there are others who wish to speak, too.

SANCTIONS IN FOOD AND MEDICINE—Continued

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I might continue, let me again speak of my admiration for the two managers. This isn't a case, however, of being either encouraged nor discouraged with respect to amendments. It is about the rules of the Senate. And I know the rules. I have the right to offer the amendment, and I will do that, but I will do that with consideration to the two managers, understanding that they have a job to do to try to get this bill out. So I will do it in a manner that says, let's have a reasonable time agreement.

But this is about national security. The reason we have imposed sanctions on other countries is because we have national security interests about the behavior of these countries. And if, in the interest of national security, we have said this country shall continue to impose sanctions on the shipments of food and medicine, then I say this country is wrong, and we must change the law.

We had been close to changing the law last year but failed, because there are only a few people—a handful of people; determined people—in the Congress who insist that they want to con-

tinue using food and medicine as a weapon.

The absurdity of it, of course, is that Saddam Hussein has never missed a meal. Does anybody think Saddam Hussein has ever missed breakfast because we are not able to send much food to Iraq? Does anybody think that Fidel Castro has missed dinner because we have imposed sanctions on the shipment of food to Cuba? If either of them take medication, do you think they miss their daily dose of medication because we have sanctions? Of course they have not missed either dinner or medication. Saddam Hussein and Fidel Castro do just fine, thank you.

It is hungry people, sick people, and poor people who live in their countries who are injured by this. It is not the best of America to say we want to include sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to other parts of the world because we are concerned about the behavior of their leaders. That is not the best of what America has to offer.

There are a couple of reasons I have to describe this issue in such repetitive terms. One is, I represent a farm State. Our family farmers say all the time: You tell us to go operate in the open market, to produce our grain and then go sell it in the open market. We have these folks who created this farm program called Freedom to Farm, but some of them have forgotten there also ought to be a freedom to sell. What about the ability to sell that grain to these countries?

There are \$7.7 billion in agricultural sales—nearly 11 percent of all the wheat purchases in the world—by the countries with which we have sanctions. So we say to farmers: You have the freedom to farm, but you do not have the freedom to sell. You cannot move your wheat to Cuba. We will let Cuba buy its wheat from other countries—from Europe, from Canada, from Argentina. They all sell, but the United States will not.

Farmers have the legitimate right to ask the question: Why? Why would you do this to family farmers? Why would you penalize family farmers by making so much of the world's wheat market and so much of the world's grain market off limits to family farmers?

This chart shows a list of farm groups that support lifting the sanctions on food and medicine. It is a list that includes virtually all of them. I do not know of any farm group that thinks this policy is smart, thoughtful, or reasonable. Every farm organization in the country representing family farmers believes we ought to discontinue using food as a weapon.

What about medicine? Dr. Patricia Dawson, a breast surgeon from Seattle, WA, Providence Hospital, says:

The embargo appears to have a disproportionate impact on women and children by limiting access to new medications and technology.

In every one of these countries with which we have sanctions, I bet you will

find a disproportionate impact on women and children. If anyone has the time, go talk to Congressman TONY HALL who went to North Korea and came back and made the report about hunger and malnutrition in North Korea. See what is going on in that country. Then ask yourself: Does it make any sense at all for this country to withhold food shipments to North Korea, or anywhere for that matter? The answer is a resounding no, of course not.

As I indicated when I started, there are two reasons for me to believe so strongly about this. One, this country has developed a policy that is wrong at its core. It is wrong for America. It is wrong for our family farmers. It is morally wrong, in my judgment, for a country that is the breadbasket of the world and produces such a prodigious amount of food to be telling other countries that, by the way, we will use our food in a punitive way if you do not behave. Mr. or Mrs. Leader of Another Country, we will decide that food is off limits to those who want to purchase commodities for your country.

What on Earth could provoke a country such as ours to believe that is a smart, sensible, or reasonable policy? It is not reasonable. It is not moral.

From a more selfish standpoint, I would say it is not fair to our family farmers. This morning someplace in my home State of North Dakota there is a family farmer who is driving a load of grain to a country elevator someplace. When that farmer gets to the country elevator, that farmer is going to be told that the food he produced—starting in the spring, gassing up the tractor, plowing a straight furrow, planting some seeds, and hoping and praying that seed is going to grow; and when it grows, finally being able to come out with a combine and harvesting the crop, and putting it in the bin, and then putting it in the truck, and then the elevator—that farmer is going to be told at the elevator that the food he produced from the work he did has no value; that food is food that does not have much value for the world at all.

So the price is collapsed. And the farmer scratches his or her head and says: I don't understand that. We have more than half a billion people going to bed with an ache in their belly because they didn't have enough to eat yesterday. Every single minute, up to eight children, die—every single minute—because of the winds of hunger around the world. Yet our farmers are told somehow their food does not have value, and those poor people who live in these countries—Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, and Iraq—are told American food, by the way, is off limits to you because we do not like the way your leaders behave.

So you poor folks in those unfortunate countries, you can't do much to kick Saddam Hussein out of Iraq, but we can prevent you from having access to American food. You can't even buy it.