

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives for Coloring Bone Cement; FD&C Blue No. 2; Aluminum Lake on Alumina", received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5118. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers", received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-5119. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Application Period for Temporary Housing Assistance; 64 CFR 46852; 08/27/99" (RIN3067-AC82), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5120. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the adequacy of the nation's marine transportation system; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5121. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Campaigns", received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-5122. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chemical Weapons Convention, Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations; States Parties; Licensing Policy Clarification" (RIN0694-AB67), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5123. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transfers of Capital from Banks to Associations" (RIN3052-AB80), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5124. A communication from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Stamp Program: Food Stamp Provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997" (RIN0584-AC63), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5125. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule: 1998-Crop Peanuts, National Poundage Quota, National Average Price Support Level for Quota and Additional Peanuts, and Minimum Commodity Credit Corporation Export Edible Sales Price for Additional Peanuts" (RIN0560-AB81), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5126. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "High-Temperature Forced-Air Treatments for Citrus" (Docket No. 96-069-4), received September 7, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5127. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area" (Docket No. 98-083-6), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5128. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Milk in the Southwest Plains Marketing Area—Suspension" (DA-99-06), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5129. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Increased Assessment Rate" (FV99-948-1 FR), received September 2, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5130. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Fiscal Period Change" (FV99-955-1 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-5131. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Changes to Pack Requirements" (FV99-906-3 IFR), received September 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-348. A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Latimer County, Oklahoma relative to the English language, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title.

S. 566. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to exempt agricultural commodities, livestock, and value-added products from unilateral economic sanctions, to prepare for future bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations affecting United States agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106-157).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

S. 1578. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ferroniobium; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 182. A resolution designating October, 1999, as "National Stamp Collecting Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCAIN:

S. 1577. A bill to assure timely, rational, and complete Federal Communications Commission resolution of all pending proceedings reexamining the current radio and television broadcast stations ownership rules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

BROADCAST OWNERSHIP REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will make federal radio and television ownership rules Y2K compatible.

When Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 almost four years ago, we recognized that the forty-year-old rules restricting broadcast station ownership were badly outdated and in need of change. They reflected a mass media industry made up of radio stations, TV stations, and newspapers—and that's all. None of the dominant new multichannel media like cable TV, satellite TV, or the Internet figured in, because they didn't exist.

But they exist now, and they have transformed the way Americans get their news, information, and entertainment. As more and more people turn to cable channels and the Internet as their preferred means of electronic

communications, the audience and revenues of the big TV networks have plummeted, and the number and circulation of daily newspapers have spiraled downward.

The days when Huntley, Brinkley and Cronkite on the air, and the *Times*, the *Post*, and the *Tribune* at the breakfast table dominated our perspectives on the issues are forever gone. In their place are CNN, CNBC, MSNBC, and the innumerable web sites available on the Internet.

Even more important, Americans today are no longer just passive recipients of the news and views doled out by a handful of powerful TV networks and daily newspapers. Today, thanks to the Internet, anyone on line can pose questions and exchange perspectives with anyone else on line.

In other words, the days when network news and big-city newspaper editors were the dominant opinionmakers are long over. But the restrictive ownership rules that were a product of that time aren't over. Like so many federal regulations, they live on, despite the fact that they're as out-of-date as Alice Kramden's ice box.

The proliferation of alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment hasn't just made the old ownership rules useless—it's actually made them harmful. Faced with daunting competition from these new media, broadcasters, and especially newspaper owners, must have the opportunity to realize the increased operating economy and efficiency that liberalized ownership rules make possible. If we do not allow this to happen, we place the future of these older media in even greater doubt in today's hypercompetitive market.

Congress recognized all this when it directed the FCC to review all its broadcast ownership rules every two years. Although the Commission recently overhauled some of these rules, it left two others intact—the national network ownership limit and the ban on owning a daily newspaper and a broadcast station in the same market.

That's not consistent with what Congress told the Commission to do, and it isn't fair. We told the Commission to reexamine all the rules precisely because all the rules, not just some of the rules, have been rendered counterproductive by the changes that have taken place in the electronic mass media marketplace. In fact, the rule that's arguably the most hopelessly anachronistic is the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban—yet the FCC shows no sign of budging on it.

Mr. President, this bill corrects this situation. With respect to the national TV ownership limits, it follows the approach Congress used in the 1996 Telecommunications Act by raising the national audience reach limitation from 35 to 50 percent, and allows the FCC to raise it further if the public interest warrants it. It eliminates the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban, but would allow the FCC to reimpose it

if the Commission can do so by January 1, based on the extensive record that has been pending before them for over three years.

Mr. President, there are lots of policy cobwebs that have kept these rules in place despite the permanent and unmistakable changes the electronic media market has undergone. Some of them spring from the notion that broadcasting, as a free rider on the public's multibillion-dollar spectrum, can and should be subject to regulation over and above that of other media. Others are stubbornly ingrained notions of how powerful the TV networks and newspapers are. Still others—the least worthy—are scars left over from what particular newspapers have had to say on their editorial pages.

Nobody is less sympathetic than I am to the fact that broadcasters, unlike other users of the public's spectrum, pay nothing for the privilege. But subjecting them to anachronistic, even counterproductive, rules isn't a substitute for lost spectrum revenues. And remembrances of things past, whether they be the long-gone days of network TV hegemony or old stories in the local newspaper, are no way to deal with the problems of the present.

Uncle Miltie TV ownership rules don't work in a Chris rock media market. Let's face that fact, shed our outdated notions, and finish the job the FCC didn't.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1577

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Broadcast Ownership Reform Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The contemporary electronic mass media market provides consumers with abundant alternative sources of news, information and entertainment, including radio and television broadcast stations, cable television systems, and the Internet.

(2) Due to the advent of digital technology, these alternative sources of electronic news, information and entertainment are converging as well as proliferating.

(3) The simultaneous proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media renders technology-specific regulation obsolete.

(4) The public interest demands that the Federal Communications Commission reexamine its technology-specific regulation of electronic mass media to assure that it retains its relevance in the face of the proliferation and convergence of electronic mass media.

(5) Section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 recognized that there is a particular public interest need for the Federal Communications Commission to periodically and comprehensively reexamine its radio and television broadcast ownership rules, which predate the proliferation and convergence of alternative competing electronic sources of news, information and entertainment.

(6) Although the Commission has reexamined and revised its broadcast duopoly and one-to-a-market ownership rules, it has not completed long-pending reexaminations of its national television station ownership restrictions or the newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership prohibition.

(7) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its pending broadcast cross-ownership rules fails to recognize, as Congress did in enacting section 202(h), that the proliferation and convergence of alternative electronic media implicates the bases of the national television ownership rules and the newspaper broadcast cross-ownership rules no less than the bases of the local radio and television station ownership rules.

(8) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve all its broadcast cross-ownership rules will affect all potential buyers and sellers of radio and television stations in the interim, because the current restrictions will prevent networks and newspaper publishers from engaging in station transactions to the extent they otherwise might.

(9) The Commission's failure to simultaneously resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast crossownership restrictions is arbitrary and capricious, because it treats similarly-situated entities—those bound by ownership rules that predate the advent of increased competition from alternative electronic media—differently, without any consideration of, or reasoned analysis for, this disparate treatment.

(10) The increase in the national television audience reach limitation to 35 percent mandated by section 202(c)(1)(B) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 was not established as the maximum percentage compatible with the public interest. On the contrary, section 202(h) of that Act expressly directs the Commission to review biennially whether any of its broadcast ownership rules, including those adopted pursuant to section 202 of the Act, are necessary in the public interest as a result of competition.

(11) The 35-percent national television audience reach limitation is unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(12) The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restriction is unduly restrictive in light of competition.

(13) The Commission's failure to resolve its pending proceedings on the national television ownership and newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership restrictions simultaneously with its resolution of the proceedings on the duopoly and one-to-a-market rules does not serve the public interest.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN NATIONAL TELEVISION AUDIENCE REACH LIMITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Communications Commission shall modify its rules for multiple ownership set forth in section 73.355(e) of its regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.355(e)) by increasing the national audience reach limitation for television stations to 50 percent.

(b) FURTHER INCREASE.—The Commission may modify those rules to increase the limitation to a greater percentage than the 50 percent required by subsection (a) if it determines that the increase is in the public interest.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF NEWSPAPER/BROADCAST CROSS-OWNERSHIP RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule under section 73.355(d) of the Federal Communication Commission's regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.355(d)) shall cease to be in effect after December 31, 1999, unless it is reinstated by the Commission under subsection (b) before January 1, 2000.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1579. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve the authorities of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the provision of counseling and treatment for sexual trauma experienced by veterans; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

VETERANS SEXUAL TRAUMA TREATMENT ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, legislation authorizing a program within the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) which will offer counseling and medical treatment to veterans who suffered from sexual abuse while serving in the armed forces.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those who have served or are currently serving their country in uniform. Countless men and women, and their families, have served this country with courage, honor and distinction. Today, as they have throughout this proud nation's history, they stand ready to answer the call to duty, and they deserve, at the very least, to serve free from the threat of sexual abuse and harassment. And yet, an estimated 35 percent of all female veterans report at least one incident of sexual harassment during their military service. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

The Veterans Sexual Trauma Treatment Act, which is similar to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative GUTIERREZ, will enable former military personnel who were subjected to sexual harassment or abuse while in the military to receive proper medical and psychological care. The legislation does so by extending and improving the VA's abuse counseling initiatives.

The bill makes permanent a program to require the VA to provide counseling to veterans to overcome psychological trauma resulting from a physical assault or battery of a sexual nature, or from sexual harassment, which occurred during active military service. Under current law the program authorizing such counseling expires in 2001.

The bill authorizes the program to include appropriate treatment, and requires a VA mental health professional to determine when such counseling and treatment is necessary. Currently, the VA Secretary makes this determination.

The bill also calls for the dissemination of information concerning the availability of counseling services to veterans, through public service and other announcements. It also calls for a report on joint DOD/VA efforts to ensure that military personnel are informed upon their separation from service about available sexual trauma counseling and treatment programs.

Most importantly, the bill eases restrictions under the existing program. I find it very troubling, for example, that women with fewer than two years of service are not eligible for counseling, even if they separated from the military due specifically to incidents of harassment or abuse.

According to the DOD, over 5 percent of female active duty personnel have been sexually assaulted while in the service. And a recent survey conducted for the Pentagon found that between 1988 and 1995, the percentage of active duty women who reported that they had received uninvited or unwanted sexual attention stood at 55 percent, while the percentage for men stands at 14 percent.

The survey also reported that 78 percent of female respondents said they had experienced one or more specific types of unwanted behaviors from a range of specified inappropriate behaviors.

Eighty eight percent of females said the harassment occurred on a base; 74 percent said the harassment occurred at work; 77 percent said it occurred during duty hours; 44 percent said that military coworkers of equal rank were the perpetrators; and 43 percent said the perpetrator was of a higher rank.

These findings are very disturbing. The data illustrates just how widespread this problem is, and indicates the need for a program to treat victims upon separation from active duty service. I credit the DOD with working to reduce the prevalence of sexual harassment in the military. However, as long as there is harassment and abuse in the military, it is vital that victims have access to counseling while on active duty and after separation from the service as well.

We expect active duty servicemen and women to make extraordinary sacrifices to safeguard the democracy we cherish. We should not expect them to accept abuse and harassment while they serve.

The legislation I am introducing today is aimed specifically at ensuring that veterans have access to abuse counseling after they leave the military. It has the backing of the VFW, Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Legion, and AMVETS.

I urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this legislation.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. KERREY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CONRAD):

S. 1580. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to assist agricultural producers in managing risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

RISK MANAGEMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce on behalf of myself, Senator KERREY of Nebraska, and a bipartisan group of 17 of our colleagues—including a majority of the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the “Risk Management for the 21st Century Act.”

This legislation represents a significant step in improving the risk management tools available to producers throughout the United States.

In early March, Senator KERREY and I joined to introduce S. 529, the “Crop Insurance for the 21st Century Act.” At the time, we stated that we did not necessarily believe it was “the bill,” but that we hoped it would serve as the starting point for a discussion that would lead to the introduction of a comprehensive piece of legislation to improve the risk management tools available to producers throughout the U.S. and which could be supported by a majority of our colleagues.

I believe this is that bill. Going back to last fall and through this spring and summer, we have been involved in literally hundreds of hours of discussions with producers, commodity and farm organizations, insurance providers, insurance agents, and Members of the House and Senate regarding what needs to be done to improve the risk management tools available to our farmers and ranchers.

The bill we introduce today is the product of these many discussions.

This bill includes many of the provisions included in the original Roberts/Kerrey legislation, but it also includes many new provisions recommended during our discussions with Members and agricultural organizations. These include:

An inverted subsidy structure.

An equal level of subsidy for revenue insurance products.

APH adjustments for producers suffering multiple years of crop losses.

APH adjustments for new and beginning farmers, those farming new land, and those rotating crops.

Instructions to undertake alternative rating methodologies for low risk producers and regions and crops with low participation percentages and to then implement this new rating system. This at the request of many of our southern colleagues.

Changes in prevented planting and incentives to encourage producers to take additional risk management measures. Similar to car insurance, if you take drivers education classes you get an additional discount on your premium. Under our legislation, producers who take additional risk management steps will also receive a bonus discount on their premiums.

Authority for several pilot programs, placing special emphasis on policies to explore coverage for livestock and to expand the quality and levels of coverage available to specialty crops.

Mr. President, in addition to the many changes mentioned above, our legislation also provides for major changes in the Risk Management Agency (RMA) and the regulatory process governing the crop insurance program.

We change the members of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's Board of Directors to include:

Four Farmers from geographic regions to be determined by the Secretary.

One member active in the crop insurance industry.

One member with reinsurance expertise.

The Undersecretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, the Undersecretary for Rural Development, and the USDA Chief Economist.

Make the FCIC the overseer of RMA.

Create an Office of Private Sector Partnership to serve as a liaison between private sector companies and the FCIC Board of Directors.

Allow companies to charge minimal fees to other companies selling their products, in order to allow the recovery of research and development costs.

Mr. President, our legislation also focuses on several areas that I want to place special emphasis on because they are areas that I know are of interest to many of my colleagues and which some often think those of us in the Midwest and Plains States tend to ignore.

The first deals with program compliance. We have heard complaints from some of our colleagues and specific commodity groups that fraud exists in several areas of the country. Let me make clear, Senator KERREY and I oppose any attempts to defraud the crop insurance program.

To prevent this fraud, the legislation calls for penalties of up to \$10,000 for producers, agents, loss adjusters, and approved insurance providers that attempt to defraud the program. It also allows for USDA to remove producers from eligibility for all USDA programs if they have defrauded the program. Furthermore, agents, loss adjusters, and approved companies that do business in the program could be banned from participation for up to five years if they have committed fraud.

Mr. President, these provisions are strong and they are clear—those who attempt to defraud the program and taxpayers will be punished.

Mr. President, another concern that Senator KERREY and I have heard repeatedly is the lack of emphasis and prioritization for specialty crops and development of new crop insurance and risk management tools for these crops. We have included many provisions in our legislation to address these concerns.

These specialty crop provisions include:

Changes in the Noninsured Assistance Program that we believe will make it easier to obtain assistance and funding through changes in which commodities can be covered and by allowing payments in some instances regardless of an area trigger occurring.

Several pilot projects geared specifically towards looking at the feasibility of Gross Revenue and Whole Farm Revenue policies that include coverage for specialty crops.

Requiring the newly created Office of Private Sector Partnership to include staff with specialty crop expertise.

Allow RMA to spend up to \$20 million per year to create partnerships with Land Grant Universities, the Agricul-

tural Research Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and other qualified entities to develop and implement new specialty crop risk management options.

Requires 50 percent of RMA's research and development funds to go to specialty crop products development. Additionally, 50 percent of these R&D funds must be contracted out to organizations and entities outside RMA.

Reaffirms the authority of the Specialty Crops Coordinator in RMA. The bill also allows the Specialty Crops Coordinator to make competitive grants for research and development of new products in the specialty crops area.

Contains provisions regarding sales closing dates and the issuance of new policies.

Orders the Specialty Crops coordinator and the FCIC to study the feasibility of offering cost-of production, Adjusted Gross Income (AGI), quality-based policies, and an intermediate coverage level (higher than current CAT coverage) for specialty crops.

Requires the Board to annually review and certify that specialty crops are adequately covered. If insufficient coverage is available for a commodity, the Board can require RMA to undertake R&D activities.

Provides mechanisms whereby the Secretary must take steps to improve participation in the program when total participation for a crop in an individual state falls below 75 percent of the national participation average.

Mr. President, these changes for specialty crops are significant and we believe they give important attention to a group of producers that has often felt neglected in U.S. agricultural policy. I hope that our colleagues will agree and that they will join us in supporting this legislation.

Mr. President, let me also state that I realize some will argue that specific provisions should have been included in this legislation that currently are not. I understand these concerns, but as we developed this bill, we had to determine the priorities of each agricultural region and commodity groups. There is something from this bill that all of us would like to see included, including Senator KERREY and myself, but as a whole it is I believe the best package available.

I also realize that some in this body claim that crop insurance is not necessary and that we do not need to act on this legislation this year. I could not disagree more.

Mr. President, every year our producers put the seed in the ground and believe that with a little faith and luck they will produce a crop. But, sometimes the creeks do rise and the multiple perils of drought, flood, fire, hail, blizzard, pests, and disease get the better of our producers. They must have the tools to manage these risks.

The agricultural and lending communities have spoken loudly, and they all have continually expressed the need to improve the risk management tools

available to producers throughout the U.S. It is time for us to move towards action on this issue. The House Agriculture Committee approved legislation prior to the August recess. It is time for the Senate Agriculture Committee to do the same. A majority of the Committee has said as much by supporting our legislation.

Mr. President, we know there are many disagreements within members of the Senate in regards to specific agricultural policy. In fact, Senator KERREY and I have disagreements of our own on the underlying Farm Bill. However, we all agree that our producers today cannot be successful without access to new, improved, and adequate risk management tools. This legislation accomplishes these needs, and I urge my colleagues to join us in working towards an improved crop insurance program and risk management tools.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 37

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 37, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the restriction on payment for certain hospital discharges to post-acute care imposed by section 4407 of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to remove the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 391

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 391, a bill to provide for payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 562

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 562, a bill to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat methamphetamine abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals