

As Secretary Rice outlined in her confirmation hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year, Zimbabwe remains one of the outposts of tyranny.

And as Secretary Rice rightly remarked, "America stands with oppressed people on every continent."

At the time, she referenced Natan Sharansky and what he calls the "Town Square Test," saying that the world should apply that test. To quote the Secretary directly, "if a person cannot walk into the middle of the town square and express his or her views without fear of arrest, imprisonment, or physical harm, then that person is living in a fear society, not a free society. We cannot rest until every person living in a 'fear society' is living in a 'free society.'"

These remarks are even more relevant in light of current events. The people living in Zimbabwe's cities are clearly living in a society of fear. Their town squares are literally being torn down—the rubble crushing the people of that country.

I look forward to working with the Administration, and supporting international efforts to provide meaningful assistance to the people of Zimbabwe.

CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise to speak a moment about why I am strongly opposed to the Dominican Republic/Central American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Bill, or CAFTA it is often referred to. CAFTA threatens a proud heritage and a way of life in Louisiana that dates back more than 250 years. Our great-great-great grandfathers were raising cane long before our country was even born. Since 1751, Louisiana sugar cane farmers have been farming the fertile soil of our great State. Before the marble Walls of Congress were ever erected, Louisianans built an industry that would weather hurricanes, the Great Depression and even the Civil War.

These farmers have good reason to be proud. American sugar producers are among the most efficient in the world. Two-thirds of the world's more than 100 sugar-producing countries produce at a higher cost than the U.S. And in my State of Louisiana, farmers produce about 20 percent of the sugar grown in the United States and currently rank fourth in the Nation in production of sugar, producing an average revenue of \$750 million per year.

But today, we are prepared to deal this proud industry a death blow. We are talking about undoing centuries of tradition and stripping away jobs from efficient Louisiana farmers. As passed, this trade agreement would have a serious and harmful effect on sugar producers in my State: CAFTA will equal job loss and financial despair for 27,000 Louisiana sugar workers and farmers. Along with additional bilateral trade agreements, CAFTA could cost my

State \$750 million in direct sugar sales, as well as \$2 billion in industry-related revenue each year.

In any trade negotiation, there are losses and there are wins. Oftentimes we are willing to accept the impacts these deals might have on our domestic producers because in the long run the good outweighs the bad. But that is not the case. CAFTA is a relatively small trade deal with a group of countries whose combined economies are smaller than that of New Haven, CT. Nearly half of all Central Americans earn less than \$2 a day, and they simply cannot afford the meats or crops we have to sell. That is why the Louisiana Farm Bureau has joined other State farm bureaus, the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, and numerous national farm groups in opposing CAFTA. Even our own Government's economic estimates say that CAFTA will mean little to agriculture or to our country as a whole; and these are known to be quite optimistic estimates. That is because as the administration points out time and time again—we already dominate the import market of this poor region.

According to estimates by the U.S. International Trade Commission, CAFTA would actually increase our trade deficit with Central America while benefiting our economy by less than one-hundredth of 1 percent. That is worth repeating again. The administration's economists say that CAFTA will increase our trade deficit with the region while boosting our own economy by less than 0.01 percent.

This same study concluded that for other farmers CAFTA would have "a negligible impact on total U.S. production and employment." Why then are we talking about dismantling my State's sugar industry? U.S. farmers and ranchers get little in return for sending thousands to the ranks of the unemployed.

So what we have here is another raw deal for Louisiana sugar. I urge my colleagues to take a long, hard look at our country's current agricultural trade agenda. This year, the USDA says America will import as much food as we export. The agricultural trade surplus that stood at \$27 billion less than 10 years ago is now gone. The promises made to farmers during the NAFTA debates have come up flat. And the promises that will be made today about CAFTA are contradicted by the administration's own estimates.

In closing, let me say I support free trade, so long as it is fair. Fair free trade requires that all players operate on as equal and level a playing field as possible, accountable to the same labor laws, environmental standards, and governmental intervention. To sacrifice even one job for a trade deal that will deepen our agricultural trade deficit is a travesty. And, having to tell thousands of hard-working farmers in Louisiana that they must look for work, because sugar was used as a bargaining chip, is unacceptable.

ZIMBABWE

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to express my shock and alarm over the most recent turn taken in Zimbabwe's deepening political and economic crisis. As my colleagues know, the ruling regime in Harare recently launched a massive campaign to destroy the homes of hundreds of thousands of urban Zimbabweans, evicting men, women, and children—in at least one case reportedly evicting even AIDS orphans—under the auspices of "driving out the rubbish."

Many analysts believe that the Government is attempting to forcibly relocate the urban population—which tends to support the political opposition—to rural areas in order to diffuse resistance to its repressive policies. The ruling party may also be attempting to revitalize the agricultural sector, which has been devastated by its policies, through this campaign of forced relocation to rural areas. What is certain is that this kind of deliberate displacement of people in a country where 3 to 4 million already need food assistance is an absolute outrage.

Sadly, this is what we have come to expect from President Mugabe and his cronies. This same government has refused food assistance for hungry people; manipulated available food assistance for political purposes; systematically attacked the independence of the judiciary; silenced independent media voices; and created, often through coercion, brutally violent youth militias to terrorize civilians.

I commend Chairman MARTINEZ for speaking out so forthrightly on this issue. I am pleased to join him here today. I have also joined with my colleague, Senator DURBIN, in working to encourage U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan to treat this crisis with the urgency it deserves, and I also thank him for his leadership. And I recently joined with Senator MCCAIN to assure Secretary of State Rice of the strong, bipartisan support that exists here for an energized Zimbabwe policy.

But we can and must do more to oppose this campaign of abuse. We must continue to speak plainly to Southern African leaders about the toll that their silence about this ongoing crisis takes on their credibility, and about the loss of investor and donor confidence in the region that is a consequence of Zimbabwe's ceaseless downward spiral over the past 5 years.

The administration has spoken out commendably regarding the Zimbabwe crisis, but more could be done to take action that would bolster their tough talk. Targeted sanctions could have more bite, and the U.S. and other key donors could more clearly link support for laudable initiatives such as the New Economic Partnership for Africa's Development to restoration of respect for civil and political rights and the rule of law in Zimbabwe.

Those of us who have followed the crisis in Zimbabwe often feel a sense of frustration as we watch so much of