

will undoubtedly be a successful one. We will build the houses. I think we will build a lot more than 51 houses. That is our target. Benjamin Franklin once wrote: "Well done is better than well said." I think that may particularly apply to the Senate. We talk frequently about things. Here is a chance for us to do something about homeownership.

I think it is going to be a great project for us to be able to put people in homes. I can come to the floor today in the middle of National Homeownership Week and tell you that we should be committed to end homelessness across the country and eliminate poverty housing, but instead of telling you that, I would rather show you. I would rather pick up a hammer and demonstrate my commitment to affordable housing, nail by nail.

I am proud to come to the floor today and discuss this important initiative. This Senate is saying that words of support are not enough. Nothing less than the sweat of our brows will do in expressing how committed the Senate is in making the American dream of homeownership a true reality.

I thank the Chair and hope we are going to be able to adopt this resolution yet today. I believe it has been cleared.

PARTICIPATION IN AND SUPPORT OF ACTIVITIES TO PROVIDE DECENT HOMES FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 319, submitted by myself and others. I believe it is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 319) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Senate should participate in and support activities to provide decent homes for the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, we have 55 cosponsors in the Senate on this bill. My understanding is it has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, that there is no objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and, finally, any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 319) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 319

Whereas the United States promotes and encourages the creation and revitalization of

sustainable and strong neighborhoods in partnership with States, cities, and local communities and in conjunction with the independent and collective actions of private citizens and organizations;

Whereas establishing a housing infrastructure strengthens neighborhoods and local economies and nurtures the families who reside in them;

Whereas an integral element of a strong community is a sufficient supply of affordable housing;

Whereas affordable housing may be provided in traditional and nontraditional forms, including apartment buildings, transitional and temporary homes, condominiums, cooperatives, and single family homes;

Whereas for many families a home is not merely shelter, but also provides an opportunity for growth, prosperity, and security;

Whereas homeownership is a cornerstone of the national economy because it spurs the production and sale of goods and services, generates new jobs, encourages savings and investment, promotes economic and civic responsibility, and enhances the financial security of all people in the United States;

Whereas although the United States is the first nation in the world to make owning a home a reality for a vast majority of its families, 1/3 of the families in the United States are not homeowners;

Whereas a disproportionate percentage of families in the United States that are not homeowners are low-income families;

Whereas the community building activities of neighborhood-based nonprofit organizations empower individuals to improve their lives and make communities safer and healthier for families;

Whereas one of the best known nonprofit housing organizations is Habitat for Humanity, which builds simple but adequate housing for less fortunate families and symbolizes the self-help approach to homeownership;

Whereas Habitat for Humanity is organized in all 50 States with 1544 local affiliates and its own 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporate status and locally elected completely voluntary board of directors.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity will build its 100,000th house worldwide in September 2000 and endeavors to complete another 100,000 homes during the next 5 years.

Whereas Habitat for Humanity provides opportunities for people from every segment of society to volunteer to help make the American dream a reality for families who otherwise would not own a home; and

Whereas the first week of June 2000 has been designated as "National Homeownership Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) everyone in the United States should have a decent home in which to live;

(2) the Members of the Senate should demonstrate the importance of volunteerism;

(3) during the year between National Homeownership Week 2000 and National Homeownership Week 2001, the Members of the Senate, Habitat for Humanity, and contributing organizations, should sponsor and construct 2 homes in the District of Columbia each of which should be known as a "House That the Senate Built";

(4) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed primarily by Members of the Senate, their families and staffs, and the staffs of sponsoring organizations working with local volunteers involving and symbolizing the partnership of the public, private, and nonprofit sectors of society;

(5) each "House That the Senate Built" should be constructed with the participation of the family that will own the home;

(6) in the future, the Members of the Senate and their families and staff should participate in similar house building activities in their own States as part of National Homeownership Week; and

(7) these occasions should be used to emphasize and focus on the importance of providing decent homes for all of the people in the United States.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I am delighted we were able to pass S. Res. 319. We are going to build some houses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Kansas. I believe I am a cosponsor of his resolution. If not, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I think the Senator from Kansas has described it well. I am proud that the Senate has adopted the resolution. I think what Habitat for Humanity has done is really quite remarkable. I am glad he calls attention to it on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MAGGIE MILLER

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to let my colleagues know about a woman who, this morning, is working at the post office in Knox, ND. Knox, ND, is a little town of 42 people, but it is big enough to have a post office.

Just recently, the postmaster of the Knox, ND, post office, a woman named Vivian Seter, retired. Upon Vivian's retirement at age 73, Maggie Miller took over the job.

Now maybe my colleagues are thinking there is nothing unusual in that. But Maggie is 83 years old, and she just took over the running of the post office in Knox from her 73-year-old friend Vivian.

The post office has cut its hours a bit since Maggie took over, so it is open now from 8:30 until 10:30 a.m. In fact, in about 10 minutes from now, central time in Knox, ND, Maggie will be hanging it up for the day. But for now, at age 83, after working 62 years in the postal system, Maggie has assumed the reins of the Knox Post Office.

The reason I mention this today is that I have talked a lot over the years about rural values. There is something quite remarkable and unique about life in the small towns of rural America. I represent a wonderful State, North Dakota, with a lot of small communities. Knox, ND, is one of them.

There are also a lot of hard-working, remarkable people in these small towns, and Maggie Miller is one of them. Again, she has been working for the postal system for 62 years, and I read in the newspaper that the postmaster from Rolla, ND, had to come

train her for her new position. Vivian, the retiring postmaster, joked: She has only been doing this 62 years, so she needs a little training.

The article I read about her said that last year Maggie, who was age 82 at the time, bowled a 204. Then she broke her wrist and has had to take the summer off. But Maggie being Maggie, she vows to make a comeback to her bowling league.

When I saw this story in the paper, I just had to call Maggie. When she answered the phone, I said: Maggie, this is BYRON DORGAN calling from Washington, DC. I wanted to tell you that it is wonderful that you are stepping in as postmaster at age 83. Maggie said: Tell me another one. I said: No, Maggie, it really is BYRON DORGAN. And she said: I bet it is.

So Maggie, if you happen to be watching this debate in Congress, I really did call you. I say congratulations. You have a lot of spunk. I am proud of all the things you have done and of the values that you represent of folks in small towns helping each other and working together. I know the post office in many small towns is the hub of the community, and I am confident you will serve Knox well.

Congratulations to Maggie and to the town of Knox.

SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will speak for a few moments about the issue of the sanctions on food and medicine that exist in this country with respect to other countries.

I have a chart that describes what has happened to our family farmers. I represent a State with a lot of wheat growers. This chart shows what has happened to the price of wheat. As my colleagues can see, it has collapsed. Over a period of a few years, the price of wheat has just flat collapsed. I guess it is because the grain markets have determined that the food our family farmers produce does not have much value.

So our farmers, at a time when their prices have collapsed, are struggling mightily. They have a very difficult time trying to deal with collapsed prices. Yet all their expenses continue to increase. They have a difficult time understanding what is happening in the world relative to their prices and to people around the world who need what they produce.

This is a picture that is in stark contrast to the graph that shows a collapse in the price of wheat. This is a picture of hunger. This picture is all too typical in some parts of the world. Starvation, deprivation, desperate hunger, hundreds of millions of people go to bed with an ache in their belly because they didn't have enough to eat. Millions and millions of children don't have enough to eat. Every eight seconds, one child dies because of hunger and hunger-related causes. Yet a fam-

ily farmer who plows the ground in the spring and tends to the crop, and is lucky enough to get a crop off in the fall, takes that load of wheat to the elevator only to be told by the grain trade: The food you have produced doesn't have value.

Farmers wonder if so many people in the world are so hungry, if so many live in starvation, and suffer from deprivation, and go to bed hungry, why is it that the food we produce in such abundant quantity in this country has no value?

As we talk about this disconnection—indeed, it is a disconnection of what we produce and what the world so desperately needs and the hunger that exists around the rest of the world, and then for our producers to be told that what they have produced doesn't have value—we have a policy in the United States that says: There are certain countries in this world whose behavior is such that we want to impose an economic embargo. Included in that embargo, we, as a country, want to prohibit the sale of food and medicine to those other countries. That is current policy. In fact, almost 11 percent of the wheat export market in the world has been off limits to our family farmers because of sanctions that we have applied against other countries.

North Korea, Iran, Cuba, and others have been told, the United States of America will not move grain and medicine to these countries because they are behaving outside the norm of international behavior and therefore, we impose sanctions. Those sanctions include food and medicine. That is wrong-headed public policy, and it should never have happened in the first place. It is a bipartisan mistake by administrations over the years that have included food and medicine in the economic sanctions. We should never include food and medicine in sanctions we impose against other governments. We should never use food as a weapon. We should never include medicine as a part of a sanction—to use medicine as a weapon. We ought to decide now that we are going to change that policy.

A bipartisan group of us, myself in the Appropriations Committee, joined by Senator SLADE GORTON from the State of Washington, with the support of Senator ASHCROFT, Senator DODD, and a group of others, have offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to say: No more; let us abolish all sanctions on food and medicine shipments everywhere in the world. It passed. It is in the Agriculture appropriations bill that will come to the floor of the Senate.

That is not new. We passed it last year as well, by 70 votes in the Senate. Because of one issue, it got hijacked by some legislative leaders and did not become law. They are planning to hijack it again.

The issue is Cuba. We have legislative leaders who say Cuba is a different story. We must maintain sanctions against the shipment of food and medi-

cine to Cuba. They want to retain the entire embargo with Cuba. But the 40 years of embargo has failed.

The question is—when you have an experiment, a laboratory experiment, and this is a real experiment, a real laboratory, for 40 years you have an embargo against Cuba and it doesn't work—who will be the first to stand up and say: This does not work; maybe we ought to do something else?

We are not talking about the entire embargo with respect to Cuba. We are just talking about the issue of food and medicine and the sanctions that now apply to shipments of food and medicine to Cuba. The legislative leaders are intending to hijack this position once again. Our intent to repeal that sanction is going to be hijacked once again, unless we find a way to stop it.

The Washington Post today wrote an editorial, "Food for Cuba." They make the point that there is no justification for having sanctions on food and medicine for Cuba, and there is no justification. It is interesting that the debate over normal trade relations with China produces all these folks who come to the floor of the House and Senate and say: We must engage with China. Engaging with a Communist nation will inevitably move that nation in a more constructive direction. More trade and more direction towards open markets will inevitably improve things in a country such as China.

If that is the case, why is it not the case with Cuba, also a Communist country? Why is it the case that engagement with China is productive in moving them towards better human rights and towards a more constructive direction, but it is not the case in Cuba? The answer is the current embargo that exists with Cuba makes no sense at all. Sanctions against the shipments of food and medicine, not only to Cuba but to the other sanctioned countries in the world, is not moral policy. It is not moral for this country, in my judgment, to use food and medicine as part of sanctions. It is wrong.

I started by talking about farmers. Yes. I have an interest to try to make sure farmers have the opportunity to serve markets. Those who support Freedom to Farm. I don't; I don't think it has worked. We need to ask the same question with respect to markets. If you say the Freedom to Farm approach is something that is important for farmers, what about the freedom to sell? Freedom to Farm—what about the freedom to sell? Farmers are told they have the freedom to farm. What about the freedom to sell their products to Cuba, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Iran, or the freedom to sell their wheat to Libya?

If we have in the coming weeks the kind of chicanery that went on last year to hijack this policy, to hijack those Republicans and Democrats who say we must end these sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine to all countries—and, yes, including Cuba—if