

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.

That is just wrongheaded public policy. I intend to change it. As I indicated, Senator GORTON from Washington cosponsored the amendment I offered on the Agriculture appropriations bill. Senator ASHCROFT offered a nearly identical amendment on the floor of the Senate last year. The Senate will be dealing with this.

Finally, as I conclude, I say to those Senate leaders who believe they are going to be able to strip it out of the legislation this year, strip it out of the appropriations bill where I added it to the Agriculture appropriations bill, I am not going to let you do that. You might have the capability of stripping it out of that bill. I have the capability and the right on the floor of the Senate to add it to this bill.

Some say they don't want to do it because it does not pertain just to defense. It pertains to national security. I have a right under the rules to add it. I have to get a vote on it, but I have every right to offer it as an amendment. I intend to offer it. I will accept a short time agreement, but I intend that this Congress, with a wide majority of Senators and Representatives, will support this. I intend that this Congress will not be hijacked by a handful of legislative leaders who are trying to protect a dinosaur of a policy that represents the worst of America—the use of food and medicine as a weapon in economic sanctions.

So if we have not gotten a decade past that mentality then something is fundamentally wrong with this country. This country should stand up for its family farmers, first, to say that you have the freedom to sell; and, second, it ought to stand up as a world leader to say that we will not use food as a weapon. Poor people around the world, people who live in countries that need our food, have the right to buy it, have the right to expect it, and have the right to have access to it under a range of programs. This country should no longer penalize those poor people and those hungry people.

I came to the floor as I saw there was a morning business opportunity just to say to the two managers—I like them, they are good friends; and they will grit their teeth and wring their hands and mop their brows—but I intend to offer this amendment. I have a right to do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF GENERAL JOHN A. GORDON, U.S. AIR FORCE, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now

go into executive session and proceed to the nomination of Gen. John A. Gordon, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. John A. Gordon, United States Air Force, to be Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, Department of Energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. Under that ruling, without objection on my part, time will be charged equally to both sides.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, momentarily, we will vote on the nomination of a very distinguished citizen of our country. I want to elaborate in these few minutes about his distinguished career.

We know he has been nominated to be the first Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, as well as the first administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration at the Department of Energy. We are all familiar with General Gordon's record. He took on many challenging assignments over these years in the Department of Defense and currently is Deputy Director for the Central Intelligence Agency.

I would like to go back and give a brief history of the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration and the position for which General Gordon has been nominated.

The Administration was established by title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000. That consolidated all of the national security functions of the Department of Energy under a single, semi-autonomous organizational unit. This reorganization represents the most significant reorganization of the Department of Energy in more than 20 years.

The Congress did not take this action lightly. We established this new entity in response to a multitude of reports and assessments which called for changes in the Department of Energy's "dysfunctional" organization structure. The reports include the 1997 "120-day study" issued by the Institute for Defense Analysis, the 1999 Chiles Commission report, and the 1999 Foster Panel report—just to mention a few. However, the most compelling report was issued by President Clinton's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board in June 1999. That bipartisan report stated that:

... real and lasting security and counter-intelligence reform at the weapons labs is

simply unworkable within DOE's current structure and culture. To achieve the kind of protection that these sensitive labs must have, they and their functions must have their own autonomous operational structure free of all the other obligations imposed by DOE management.

The President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board went on to make the following recommendations to the President and Congress, (1) create a new semi-autonomous agency and (2) streamline the management of the DOE weapons labs management structure by abolishing ties between the weapons labs and all DOE regional, field and site offices, and all contractor intermediaries. The committee was very careful to fully implement the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board's bipartisan recommendations, exactly as they were presented to President Clinton.

The overarching goal was to establish, for the first time in many years, a clear chain of command for the Department's national security programs. Some disagree with the final product, but I believe we accomplished that goal. It is now time for General Gordon to make this new entity work.

I have been trying for some weeks to get this nomination up. Just think: Last year, we passed structural reforms. It was signed into law by the President. And here we are almost a year later—just today—about to confirm the President's nominee to head this new entity.

We have vested a considerable amount of authority in the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration; that is, General Gordon. We trust that he will use it in the best of U.S. national security.

I have come to know this fine man very well over the months that I have worked with him in connection with this nomination. I can tell the Senate without any equivocation that I do not know of a more qualified person, a man whose background, whose achievements, whose every step in life better qualifies him, including a character I think that is beyond question, to take on this important responsibility.

With regard to some details about him, the general entered the Air Force through the Reserve Officer Training Corps Program in 1968.

His early assignments were in research and development and acquisition where he was involved in improving the Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missile—ICBM—and in developing and acquiring the Peacekeeper ICBM. He served with the U.S. Department of State in the politico-military affairs. Later, he commanded the 90th Strategic Missile Wing, the only Peacekeeper ICBM unit. He served in the National Security Council in the areas of defense and arms control, including oversight and completion of START II negotiations. The general then became senior member of the staff of the Secretary of Defense, and later the Director of Operations, Air Force Space Command, responsible for overseeing