

Farm bill—the current law—and this new farm bill is over \$270 million in additional assistance during collapsed prices to family farmers. Now, that help is not just for family farmers; it shows up on many of our main streets and supports our jobs in a rural State such as North Dakota.

I cannot say strongly enough how important this bill is. It took us too long to get done, but it is done. I appreciate the work that all of us did together and the cooperation in the final analysis to get it to the President. I am pleased and relieved that this morning, finally, this bill is now signed into law.

SELLING FOOD TO CUBA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me talk about two other issues briefly. One is a letter I received last Friday from Secretary of State Colin Powell. This relates to a decision by the State Department to cancel the visas for Cubans coming to our country to buy additional food. Since the hurricane, they have purchased over \$70 million in American food. That is available for them to purchase because I and my colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, and others changed the law to allow food sales to Cuba. Strangely enough, they have to pay in cash and do it through a French bank; nonetheless, they can finally buy American food.

We ought never use food as a weapon, and we have done it for 40 years with Cuba. That is over. They are now buying food from this country. We had a group of people representing Alimport, including Pedro Alvarez and others, coming to this country to buy food. They were coming, in fact, to North Dakota and they were going to buy dried beans and wheat. They were granted a visa by the State Department, and then immediately that visa was revoked. I asked Secretary Powell, "By what authority was it revoked and why?"

Let me use a couple of charts to see what happened on this issue. This is a news story about it:

A State Department official confirmed Wednesday that the administration policy is not to encourage sales of food to Cuba.

In the letter from Secretary Powell, he disavows that, but that is what they told us: It is our policy not to encourage food sales to Cuba. I said it is a brainless policy to decide you do not want to sell food to Cuba; you ought to sell food to Cuba. We sell it to China, a Communist country. We sell it to Vietnam, a Communist country. And we are told we do not want to sell food to Cuba? Does anybody think Fidel Castro has not eaten a meal along the way because we had an obstruction on the sale of food to Cuba? No, it just hurts sick people, poor people, and hungry people. This is what this policy has represented.

At a hearing last week when I raised this question with Secretary Powell, he

said: I have never heard of this policy not to encourage food sales to Cuba. In fact, he said additional sales should be encouraged so long as American farmers benefit.

The Farm Bureau said the cancellation of Mr. Alvarez's visa will adversely affect the sale of corn, rice, wheat, poultry, soybeans, lentils, and eggs, valued at \$35 million.

I received a four-page letter from Secretary Powell. Frankly, it does not answer any of the questions. It says Mr. Alvarez's visa was revoked because of a 1985 then-President Ronald Reagan directive. He also said: Mr. Alvarez was here once before and he lobbied to undermine the U.S. embargo. I guess when he was here before, he said Cuba would like to have a circumstance where they could buy food from American farmers. The State Department considers that undermining America's interest. Give me a break. Mr. Secretary, that does not undermine anything. I hope the State Department and others will pay a little more attention to the issue of terrorists getting bombs, not Cubans buying dried beans and wheat.

The subcommittee which I chair is going to hold a hearing, and I will ask the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Reich, to come to Congress and explain who decided to revoke these visas.

TRADE AUTHORITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak to the underlying legislation we will be on following the vote on the judgeship this afternoon. That is the trade bill. We are going to be discussing once again so-called fast-track trade authority. I am not going to support the bill, but I do have some amendments.

I think fast track is fundamentally undemocratic. Our trade deficit is ballooning; it is now over \$450 billion in merchandise trade deficits. And every time we have had a new agreement, we have been injured further.

I am going to offer several amendments to fast track when it is before the Senate. One deals with wheat from Canada. The unfairly subsidized wheat coming in from Canada has injured our farmers in a dramatic way. The International Trade Commission says this wheat trade is unfair, and the trade ambassador, to his credit, says it is unfair. But there is no specific remedy. It is a five-point remedy in the sweet by-and-by; we will never quite get to it.

My amendment will say we want specific remedies identified and reported to us within 6 months of what the trade ambassador is going to do to take specific action and remedy the unfair wheat trade that exists with Canada and the unfair trade that exists in other markets with respect to Canada. That is No. 1.

No. 2, this administration is proposing on June 30 to allow long-haul Mexican trucks into this country. That is in contravention of everything Con-

gress debated just months ago on this issue. I am going to offer an amendment that tries to stop that.

Mr. President, you know and I know and everyone in this country knows Mexican truckdrivers are not driving with the same safety requirements imposed in Mexico that we impose in this country. They do not have the same safety inspections. They do not have the same requirements with respect to length of service or hours of service or logbooks. I ask everyone to read the newspaper accounts of people riding with Mexican long-haul truckers, and you will discover the truckers drove continuously for 24 hours or drove unsafe equipment.

The fact is this administration on June 30 is going to allow those long-haul Mexican trucks to come into this country to do long hauls, and that is wrong, it is unsafe, and it ought not happen.

The safety requirements the Senate would have imposed some months ago when we debated this issue are nowhere near in place. The inspection stations do not exist. The compliance and enforcement requirements in Mexico do not exist. The fact is, we are going to have American families driving up and down American streets and highways with long-haul Mexican trucks and no one is going to know whether that driver has been driving 24 straight hours or driving a rig with faulty brakes because it has not been inspected. I am going to offer an amendment on that issue.

In addition, I am going to offer an amendment dealing with Cuba, and that amendment will impose the same circumstances that were dropped out of the agriculture conference just last week. The amendment is very simple. It says when Cuba buys grain from our country, it ought not have to pay cash through a French bank; it ought to be able to buy grain with commercially accepted credit from our country.

I am going to support the Dayton-Craig amendment which is very important. Our trade negotiators are prepared to negotiate away antidumping authority, the ability on behalf of our producers to remedy trade that is unfair because someone else is dumping into our marketplace. If we eliminate the antidumping remedies, we will put our producers in desperate trouble. Their amendment is right on point. I intend to ask to cosponsor that amendment, and I will be very supportive of it.

I also will be supportive of an amendment to be offered by Senator DURBIN and will ask to be a cosponsor of that. That amendment deals with labor and environmental standards with respect to trade. The issue for this country should continue to be this: We want people to access the American marketplace, to give the American consumer the widest range of goods from all around the world, but we want it, when those goods come in as a result of trade, to be fair trade.

We do not want goods that come from prison labor in China. We do not want goods to come into our marketplace that are made by 12-year-old kids working 12 hours a day being paid 12 cents an hour. That is not fair trade. It is not what this country ought to support, and it is not what we ought to allow into our marketplace.

Conditions of fair trade are very important, and as we discuss trade in this Chamber with the advent of the fast track debate, it is very important for us to say to the American people that there is an admission price to the American economy, and the admission price to other countries is that their markets must be open to us and their markets and laws must represent fair trade with this country. That is not a standard that now exists.

I do not want to put a wall around our country. I believe in expanded trade. I believe in greater trade opportunity. But I believe also this country needs to have the spine and the backbone to stand up for its own economic interest and demand that trade be fair trade.

That will represent the several amendments I will be offering and supporting, including the three I mentioned I will be offering soon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from North Dakota for several comments he made. I particularly commend him for his comments about the issue regarding Cuba and how we might do a better job than we have over the past 40 years of bringing democracy to that country.

After 40 years of failed policies, one might think a new approach would be in order. I take note as well that as we speak today, a former President of the United States, President Carter, is in Cuba speaking to dissidents and human rights activists, as well as members of the Government of Cuba. That kind of exposure, that kind of engagement is going to do more to bring about the change we want to see in Cuba than the insistence of a failed policy we have followed for the past four decades.

I commend my colleague from North Dakota for his comments.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to express my deep disappointment at the announcement made last week by Under Secretary of State John Bolton with respect to the "unsigned," as they have called it, of the International Criminal Court. This decision, in my view, is irresponsible, it is isolationist, and contrary to our vital national interest.

Many of our closest allies—in fact, every one of our NATO allies—has put their faith and vision in this new legal instrument, the International Criminal

Court. To date, 66 nations have ratified the International Criminal Court and over 130 nations have signed on to this particular effort, including those nations I mentioned—all of our NATO allies—countries such as France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the like. These are governments with deep ties to our Nation. We share a deep sense of common values, a deep sense of democracy, and a deep sense of justice.

It is outrageous that the United States has now put itself in a position of joining only a handful of rogue nations that are frightened to death of the International Criminal Court as we enter the 21st century. We should be joining these countries and supporting them in their commitment to making the Court work and strengthening international respect for the rule of law. That is what we stand for as Americans. That is what we are trying to export around the world. In addition, we try to export the notion of justice, of fair justice, such as the symbols we see outside this building a block away: The Supreme Court, Justice blindfolded with the scales equally divided.

That is what we have stood for as a nation for more than two centuries. What a great shame it is that as we enter the 21st century, in an effort to establish an international criminal court of justice, the Bush administration is going to "unsigned" a document, a treaty, that I think would have gone a long way to helping us achieve the very goals incorporated in the Treaty of Rome.

We should have been rejoicing that finally with the entry and divorce of the court, any individual who commits genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity would be on notice that he or she would be prosecuted for those offenses. I find it disheartening there is a lack of historical perspective when it comes to this issue. Let's remember it was the atrocities of World War II, the Holocaust, that lead to the establishment of the Nuremberg Tribunal to bring those who committed such acts of violence and human rights violations to justice, which highlighted the fact that there was a void in the international legal system. Those who participated in the Nuremberg process came to believe strongly that a permanent international criminal court should be established to try future heinous international criminals. The hope was that the existence of such a court would also serve as a deterrent to those who might consider committing such crimes.

Unfortunately, the proposal floundered during 50 years of superpower rivalry, but the United States kept arguing that we ought to do this, through Republican and Democratic administrations. Conservatives, liberals, moderates all suggested and all argued at one time or another for the importance of the establishment of such a court.

I have no doubt that such a court would have been extremely useful had

it existed during the last quarter of the 20th century. It should still be fresh in our minds the fact that the end of the cold war, and the explosion of ethnic brutality led to the necessity of creating ad hoc tribunals for Rwanda and Yugoslavia, but there was no means available for trying the Idi Amins and Saddam Husseins of this world, or others who have been able to evade their nation's justice. With very few exceptions, the world has stood helpless in the face of such crimes against humanity.

Had the court existed, it just might have deprived these tyrants of the safe havens from prosecution. It just might have deterred some of the worst atrocities and also prevented the U.S. service members from being sent into harm's way to reestablish the rule of law.

President Clinton, to his credit, appreciated that fact, and that is why he signed the treaty. He was not starry-eyed about it. However, he recognized that additional safeguards with respect to the operation of the court were needed in order to reassure those skeptical about the international organization, and he rightly decided that since the court was still a work in progress, and given the role of the United States as a leader in the promotion of the rule of law, that it was in the national interest of the United States to remain engaged with our allies as they moved forward to bring the Rome statute into force.

Some in the United States harbor the unreasonable fear that Americans will be taken before this tribunal on politically motivated charges, fears that I believe are unfounded but fears that have not been dispelled with the erasing of our signature. U.S. men and women in uniform are no safer today than they were before Monday's announcement. In fact, I argue they are in greater jeopardy because the court, as it is presently construed, does have flaws because we disengage from rewriting the court to try to establish better rules—the court is going into existence in a matter of weeks. Whether we signed it or not, it is becoming the international rule of law, and today that court could have been stronger had we decided to remain engaged in helping frame the structure of the institution.

These men and women in uniform may be in some jeopardy, and my hope would be they would not, but had we stayed engaged in this process, we could have eliminated even that slight possibility. Moreover, to the best of my knowledge, what we have done with respect to the ICC, the "unsigned" of a treaty, is without precedent. I am sure there are legal scholars on diplomacy that can correct me if I am wrong, but I cannot find a single example in the more than two centuries of history where an American President has unsigned an agreement.

Think of the precedent-setting nature of that act. Let's be clear: The