

American science a chance. Invest in the future of weapons science, not in the past of weapons testing by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

## EXHIBIT No. 1

	U.S.	U.S.-U.K.
Total tests by calendar Year:		
1945	1	0
1946	2	0
1947	0	0
1948	3	0
1949	0	0
1950	0	0
1951	16	0
1952	10	0
1953	11	0
1954	6	0
1955	18	0
1956	18	0
1957	32	0
1958	77	0
1959	0	0
1960	0	0
1961	10	0
1962	96	2
1963	47	0
1964	45	2
1965	38	1
1966	48	0
1967	42	0
1968	56	0
1969	46	0
1970	39	0
1971	24	0
1972	27	0
1973	24	0
1974	22	1
1975	22	0
1976	20	1
1977	20	0
1978	19	2
1979	15	1
1980	14	3
1981	16	1
1982	18	1
1983	18	1
1984	18	2
1985	17	1
1986	14	1
1987	14	1
1988	15	0
1989	11	1
1990	8	1
1991	8	1
1992	7	1
1992	6	0
Total tests	1,030	24
Total tests by location:		
Pacific	4	0
Johnston Island	12	0
Eniwetok	43	0
Bikini	23	0
Christmas Island	24	0
Total Pacific	106	0
Total S. Atlantic	3	0
Underground	604	24
Atmospheric	100	0
Total NTS	813	24
Central Nevada	1	0
Amchitka, Alaska	3	0
Alamogordo, New Mexico	1	0
Carlsbad, New Mexico	1	0
Hattiesburg, Mississippi	2	0
Farmington, New Mexico	1	0
Grand Valley, Colorado	1	0
Rifle, Colorado	1	0
Fallon, Nevada	1	0
Nellis Air Force Range	5	0
Total Other	17	0
Total tests	1,030	24
Total tests by type:		
Tunnel	67	0
Shaft	739	24
Crater	9	0
Total underground	815	24
Airburst	1	0
Airburst	52	0
Balloon	25	0
Barge	36	0
Rocket	12	0
Surface	28	0
Tower	56	0
Total atmospheric	210	0
Total underwater	1,030	24
Total tests	1,030	24

Total detonations by purpose: Joint US-U.K., 24 detonations; Plowshare, 35 detonations; Safety Experiment, 88 detonations; Storage-Transportation, 4 detonations; Vela Uniform, 7 detonations; Weapons Effects, 98 detonations; Weapons Related, 883 detonations.

176 detonations (1980-1992) 14 detonations (1980-1992).

Note: Totals do not include two combat uses of nuclear weapons, which are not considered "tests." The first combat detonations was a 15 kt weapon airdropped 08/05/45 at Hiroshima, Japan. The second was a 21 kt weapon airdropped 08/09/45 at Nagasaki, Japan.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, yesterday President Clinton sent a written request to the Senate asking that we "postpone" a vote on the CTBT. In light of the President's outburst on Friday lashing out at Senate Republicans, and his adamant declaration that he would never submit a written request asking the Senate to withdraw the CTBT from consideration, his decision to send just such a letter is interesting.

His letter, was a baby-step in the right direction, insufficient to avert a vote on the CTBT today. The President is clearly playing poker with the Senate, but he doesn't have a winning hand, and I think he knows it.

The President sent this letter only because he realizes he has failed to make a compelling case for the treaty, and failed to convince two-thirds of the Senate that this treaty is in the national interest. He knows that if we vote on the CTBT today, the treaty will be defeated.

His letter did not meet both the criteria set by me and others. For example, he requested: (a) that the treaty be withdrawn and (b) that it not be considered for the remainder of his presidency.

The President has repeatedly dismissed the critics of this treaty as playing politics. Look who's talking. In his mind, it seems, the only reason anyone could possibly oppose this treaty is to give him a political black eye. Putting aside the megalomania in such a suggestion, accusing Republicans of playing politics with our national security was probably not the most effective strategy for convincing those with substantive concerns about the treaty.

The fact is, we are not opposed to this treaty because we want to score political points against a lame-duck Administration. We are opposed because it is unverifiable and because it will endanger the safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal. The White House and Senate Democrats have failed to make a compelling case to the contrary. That is why the treaty is headed for defeat.

Of course, treaty supporters want to preserve a way to spin this defeat into a victory, by claiming that they have managed to "live to fight another day." That's probably the same thing they said after President Carter requested the SALT II Treaty be withdrawn. But they will be fooling no one but themselves.

Before this debate is over, it must be made clear that to one and all this CTBT is dead—and that the next President will not be bound by its terms. The next administration must be left free to establish its own nuclear testing and nuclear non-proliferation policies, unencumbered by the failed policies of the current, outgoing administration.

Without such concrete assurances that this CTBT is dead, I will insist that the Senate proceed as planned and vote down this treaty.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 4:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

# AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I am pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on H.R. 1906, the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The conference agreement provides total new budget authority of \$60.3 billion for programs and activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture with the exception of the Forest Service, which is funded by the Interior appropriations bill.

The Food and Drug Administration and Commodity Futures Trading Commission are included also, and expenses and payments of the farm credit system are provided.

The bill reflects approximately \$5.9 billion more in spending than the fiscal year 1999 enacted level and \$6.6 billion less than the level requested by the President.

It is \$418 million less than the House-passed bill level and \$391 million less than the Senate-passed bill level.

I must point out that we, of course, are constrained with the adoption of this conference report by allocations under the Budget Act. The bill is consistent with the allocations that have been made to this subcommittee under the Budget Act, and it is consistent in other respects with the Budget Act.

The increase above the fiscal year 1999 enacted level reflects the additional \$5.9 billion which the administration projects will be required to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

The conference report also provides an additional \$8.7 billion in emergency appropriations to assist agricultural

producers who experienced weather-related agricultural and market losses during 1999.

This was a difficult conference. We met on two occasions. House conferees at one point asked for a recess in our deliberations to discuss some of the difficult issues that were confronting the conferees. As a matter of fact, after the request for the recess for a conference among House conferees, we never were able to get back into a formal meeting with the House conferees. It was an unusual procedure because of that.

Negotiations took place Member to Member, Senator to conferee among a lot of interested Members of the House and Senate on a wide range of issues. Some of the most contentiously involved issues weren't in the bill, one of which was the dairy proposal for reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact, and an authorization for additional regional compacts.

There was a discussion of the Senate-passed provision relating to sanctions and trying to change the policy by changing the statute with respect to the authority of the President to impose unilateral sanctions against the export of U.S. agricultural commodities.

These involve situations where we are trying to influence the conduct of other nations using interruption in trade from the United States to put pressure on these other countries. Senator ASHCROFT of Missouri had led the effort in the Senate to put language in the Senate bill on that subject.

The House conferees insisted on a provision that would have imposed special restrictions on trade with Cuba. This ended up being a very difficult issue to resolve, and finally was left out of the conference report at the insistence of the House.

We tried to work out other disagreements.

We think that it is a balanced bill, and it addresses a wide range of needs for funding for this next fiscal year—agricultural research, food and nutrition programs, agricultural support programs, conservation programs—trying to insist that we do an effective job to protect the environment as it relates to agricultural production and the needs of production agriculture.

I hope the Senate will look with favor on the bill. The House adopted the conference report on October 1, I believe, by a substantial margin. We hope the Senate will look with favor and act accordingly.

Including Congressional budget scorekeeping adjustments and prior-year spending actions, this conference agreement provides total non-emergency discretionary spending for fiscal year 2000 of just under \$14 billion in budget authority and \$14.3 billion in outlays. These amounts are consistent with the revised discretionary spending allocations established for this conference agreement.

It was a difficult conference. After two meetings, the House conferees re-

quested a recess. Because of some intractable issues, the House proposed to bring the conference to a close without reconvening the conference committee. This was not a procedure I preferred, but one that was necessary to reach a conference agreement on this appropriations measure so that it could be approved by the Congress and sent to the President as close as possible to the start of the new fiscal year. I wish to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator KOHL, and the chairman of the House subcommittee, Congressman SKEEN for their hard work on this bill and their cooperation in achieving this conference product.

I am pleased to report that this conference report provides increased funding of \$51.9 million for activities and programs in this bill which are part of the administration's "Food Safety Initiative." In addition, the conference report provides \$649 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, an agency critical to maintaining the safety of our food supply, \$32 million more than the fiscal year 1999 level.

This conference agreement also provides increased appropriations for agriculture research programs. An appropriation of \$834 million is provided for the Agriculture Research Service, \$49 million more than the fiscal year 1999 level and \$25 million more than the Senate-passed bill level. Total funding of \$950 million is provided for research, education, and extension activities of the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, \$31 million more than the fiscal year 1999 level and \$19 million more than the Senate-passed bill level.

Approximately \$35 billion, close to 58 percent of the total new budget authority provided by this conference report, is for domestic food programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These include food stamps; commodity assistance; the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); the school lunch and breakfast programs; and the new school breakfast pilot program funded at \$7 million. The conference adopted an appropriations level of \$4,032 billion for the WIC program, \$6 million less than the Senate bill level and \$27 million more than the level recommended by the House. More recent data on actual participation rates and food package costs indicates that this appropriation will be sufficient to maintain a 7.4 million average monthly WIC participation level in fiscal year 2000.

For farm assistance programs, the conference report provides \$1.2 billion in appropriations. Included in this amount is the full increase of \$80 million above the fiscal year 1999 level requested by the administration for Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses, as well as appropriations to meet or exceed the fiscal year 2000 farm operating and farm ownership loan levels included in the President's budget request.

Appropriations for conservation programs administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service total \$813 million, \$13 million more than the House bill level and \$5 million more than level recommended by the Senate.

For rural economic and community development programs, the conference report provides appropriations of \$2.2 billion to support a total loan level of \$7.6 billion. Included in this amount is \$719 million for the Rural Community Advancement Program, \$640 million for the rental assistance program, and a total rural housing loan program level of \$4.6 billion.

A total of \$1.1 billion is provided for foreign assistance and related programs of the Department of Agriculture, including \$113 million in new budget authority for the Foreign Agricultural Service and a total program level of \$976 million for the P.L. 480 Food for Peace Program, \$39 million above the budget request.

Total new budget authority for the Food and Drug Administration is \$1.1 billion, \$70 million more than the fiscal year 1999 level and \$5.1 million more than the Senate-passed bill level, along with an additional \$145 million in Prescription Drug Act and \$14.8 million in mammography clinics user fee collections. Included in the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration is the full \$30 million increase requested in the budget for food safety, along with the Senate-recommended increase of \$28 million for premarket approval activities. The additional funding provided to the FDA for premarket approvals will hopefully enable the agency to speed up device, drug, food additive, and other product review times to prevent unnecessary delays in getting new products to the market.

For the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, \$63 million is provided; and a limitation of \$35.8 million is established on administrative expenses of the Farm Credit Administration.

Title VIII of this conference report provides emergency relief to agricultural producers and others who have suffered weather-related and economic losses. Senators may recall that during consideration of this bill in the Senate, an amendment was adopted providing over \$7.6 billion in disaster assistance for agricultural producers. The conference agreement essentially retains the amendment adopted by the Senate and provides \$1.2 billion for 1999 crop losses for a total of \$8.7 billion.

Included in the emergency assistance provided is: \$5.54 billion for market loss assistance; \$1.2 billion for crop loss assistance; \$475 million for soybean producers; \$400 million for 2000 crop insurance discounts; \$328 million for tobacco producers; \$325 million for livestock and dairy producers; \$82 million for producers of certain specialty crops; and reinstatement of the cotton step-2 program.

On May 14 of this year, the conferees on the Hurricane Mitch and Kosovo

supplemental appropriations bill included language in the statement of managers recognizing the likelihood that additional disaster assistance would be needed for agricultural producers this year. The conferees called on the Administration to submit requests for supplemental appropriations once it determined the extent of the needs.

In June, 21 Senators joined me in writing the President to bring this statement of managers language to his attention and to invite the administration to submit a request for supplemental appropriations. As of today, we have received no response to our letter nor a request for any funds for farmers. Other Members of Congress have made similar requests of the administration with the same result.

On September 15, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture testified before the House Agriculture Committee that the estimated needs for crop losses was between \$800 million and \$1.2 billion. This bill provides the full \$1.2 billion that the Secretary estimated was needed. While I understand that these estimates were issued prior to Hurricane Floyd, it is my understanding that damage estimates are still being formulated.

A USDA press release dated September 17, 1999, states:

The Congress, along with the Clinton Administration, is also currently working on emergency farm legislation which, if enacted, could offer additional assistance to farmers and ranchers in North Carolina, as well as other states affected by natural disasters.

I do not believe we should delay disaster assistance until these estimates are complete. I believe we should take care of what we know is needed now and come back to address new estimates when they are received from the Administration.

Mr. President, this administration does not deserve credit for one penny of the emergency assistance in this bill. It has been "sitting on the fence." It has submitted no requests for funding, nor offered any assistance in formulating this plan.

Other Senators may be concerned that this legislation does not contain legislative provisions regarding dairy or to relax unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. Senators should remember that neither the House nor the Senate versions of this bill included legislative provisions regarding dairy policy. Therefore, it was beyond the scope of this conference.

With respect to sanctions reform, this Senator supports sanctions reform like the majority of other members who voted for the sanctions amendment during Senate consideration of this bill, but an appropriations bill is not the right vehicle for the enactment of this large policy issue. Further, on July 26, the Senate voted 53 to 45 to reinstate rule 16, which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill.

Mr. President, this conference report was filed on Thursday night, Sep-

tember 30, and was passed the following morning by the House of Representatives. Senate passage of this conference report today is the final step necessary to send this fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill to the President for signature into law.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report. Many of our farmers and ranchers continue to face an economic crisis. Others continue to suffer from extreme weather conditions, including severe drought and flooding. It is time we act now to provide them some relief and this conference report, when signed into law, will do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, at the outset, I compliment my distinguished colleague from Mississippi for the outstanding work that he has done as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations.

I have had the pleasure to work with Senator COCHRAN for some 19 years now. We have been on the subcommittee together for that time and the full committee for that time. There is no more difficult area in the Senate than working out a farm bill on the Agriculture appropriations bill because, candidly, the farmers are faced with so many problems. These are subjects very near and dear to my heart because I grew up in farm territory in the State of Kansas. I was born in Wichita and moved to Russell County, KS, when I was 12, worked on a farm as a teenager, drove a tractor, and have some firsthand experience with the problems which the agricultural community has.

I am very much concerned with a number of provisions in the bill. I declined to sign the conference report, and with great reluctance because of the hard work that the chairman has done and others have done. I intend to vote against the conference report, although I think there are enough votes present to pass it. There is a cloture motion pending. The issue has been raised as to whether there would be an attempt to filibuster. It may be that the issues can be worked out without a filibuster. I hope the issues can be worked out. But if the filibuster vote comes up I will vote against cloture to continue the consideration of this issue, even though I realize fully the importance of resolving our appropriations bills in the very immediate future.

The reasons that I am concerned about the provisions of the bill relate to two issues.

First, it is my view that Mid-Atlantic States, and my State of Pennsylvania specifically, have not gotten a fair share of the disaster assistance. The Agriculture appropriations bill provides for \$8.7 billion in disaster assistance. But the vast majority of this money goes to farmers in the Midwest to compensate for low commodity prices. It may be that the disaster assistance is a broader category than you

might expect, or perhaps the disaster assistance is modified by the fact that some \$7.5 billion goes to the Midwest to compensate for low commodity prices. Only \$1.2 billion is provided for natural disasters. That \$1.2 billion must compensate not only for the drought but also the disasters including Hurricane Floyd, flooding in the Midwest, livestock loss, and fishery loss. Pennsylvania alone has sustained \$700 million in drought loss. The Mid-Atlantic States have suffered \$2.5 billion as a result of the drought this summer.

Year after year, Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic Senators have supported massive aid packages to farmers in the Midwest—some \$17 billion between August 1998 and June 1999. Now that the Mid-Atlantic farmers are facing a real crisis, my view is the Congress has not provided sufficient compensation.

There is another issue of concern; that is, the amendment which I was prepared to offer in the conference. Senator COCHRAN has accurately described the conference. It was rather anomalous.

At about 7:15, the House conferees asked for a recess of 10 to 15 minutes. And more than an hour and a half later they had not returned.

Although many of the conferees wanted to vote to extend the Northeast Dairy Compact and to allow Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, New Jersey, and Virginia to join, the leadership in the House was opposed. I believe the Northeast Compact ought to be reauthorized, and a number of States, including Pennsylvania, ought to be permitted to join.

Without going into elaborate arguments, this is to provide price stability without any cost to the Government, but to the benefit of consumers. The price fluctuated from as much as \$17.34 in December of 1998 to a little over \$10 in January of 1999. With that kind of instability, it is very difficult on the farmers.

There is another issue about option 1-A which some 60 Senators and 240 House Members have recommended; contrary to that very large majority, the Secretary of Agriculture proposed a rule which was different, 1-B. Dairy compact legislation was offered on April 27, 1999, by Senators JEFFORDS and LEAHY. I joined with 40 cosponsors. When the Senate considered the issue of dairy pricing and compacts on August 4, 1999 on a vote for cloture, we received 53 votes—short of the 60 majority.

It is my hope yet we will work out the compact for the Northeastern United States and also the 1-A pricing. These are matters which impact very heavily upon my State and upon the farmers far beyond my State as a national matter.

With reluctance, I intend to vote against the conference report and to support the postcloture for extended debate to try to bring about greater equities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. KERREY. Madam President, I rise in support of the conference report, though I have many of the same reservations I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania express. I was not present to hear the comments of the Senator from Mississippi, but I suspect he has reservations about the conference report, as well.

As was pointed out, the conference was adjourned as a result of the decision by the House not to come back. Many matters that were not in this conference report such as sanctions, probably would have been in the report. My guess is we are moving toward some kind of resolution of that particular issue that did not make it into the conference report.

We did not get additional money in the legislation for Farm Service Agency employees. I think we will need that. I don't think it is fair to ask the Farm Service Agency to find the money from other programs, that basically the farmers will have to pay to deliver this program themselves.

There was an effort to get—and I think we have succeeded—bipartisan support to provide some resources for a very heavily attacked sector of our agricultural economy, the hog industry, where there are not only low prices but also significant structural changes going on. We had an innovative proposal for cooperatives that enabled Members to come up with a win-win solution without having to put a bunch of money in the program and enabled Congress to use some ideas that this very important part of our agricultural sector had worked out on their own. I regret that is not in this legislation.

There are a number of other things I would prefer to see included, and as a consequence I was disappointed that the conferees were not able to complete their work. Nonetheless, this is an extremely important piece of legislation for Nebraska. I appreciate in the Northeast there are some concerns there may not be a sufficient amount of resources in this bill to satisfy concerns, but the problem, of course, is that most of the disaster occurs as a consequence of problems with low prices that are affecting the feed grain section, and rice and cotton as well. That is where the big money is. Most of the crops are not grown in the Northeast and that tends to produce apparent inequities. There is almost nothing we can do about that kind of inequity.

In the legislation I appreciate the inclusion of mandatory price reporting. The chairman and I had a little colloquy on that a year or so ago. I appreciate that being included in this legislation. A great deal of effort has been made in the meantime since last year's Agriculture appropriations bill between lots of different sectors of the involved economy: the livestock producers, packers, and feedlot operators. I appreciate that is in the legislation because I think it is a very important

part of trying to make the market work to enable people who are running cow-calf operations and feedlot operations to get good price discovery. It is simply a way to ensure that the restructuring that is going on in the industry doesn't prevent the kind of price discovery needed in order to get a good market functioning.

Last, I think this growing requirement to come back to Congress to fund disaster programs underscores the urgency of reexamining the Freedom to Farm contract that was not supposed to expire until 2002. Remember, in 1996, we promised the Freedom to Farm bill would be a lot less expensive than previous farm bills. We have already spent more than we anticipated for the entire 7 years of the program in the first 4 years alone. Obviously, we are not done. We are heading to a point where we will spend as much as we did at the peak of the 1980s.

Talking to farmers where I come from in Nebraska, I am hard pressed to find many that think Freedom to Farm has worked. They are not very enthusiastic about getting another big check from the Government. They would rather have modifications in the farm bill similar to what the Nebraska corn growers presented to the House agricultural committee hearing in Nebraska, saying bring back the farmer loan reserve, uncup the loan rates, make some adjustments in the center on trade, on sanctions. There are lots of things that can be done to make the program better. My hope as we consider this additional disaster payment is that we understand there is a way to operate this farm program and spend a lot less money.

In all the talk about the failed farm policies of the past, we never spent more than \$6 billion a year through the 1970s when we had a system called normal crop acreage. It was not the heavy hand of government. There was a single base planted; farmers had flexibility coming in. If farmers wanted to have Freedom to Farm, they didn't have to sign up for the farm program. It ought to be voluntary. We had a program in the 1970s that was a lot more efficient, a lot less costly, and a lot more flexible for the farmer. This is getting more and more complicated, more and more difficult, with more and more trips to the Farm Service Agency than anybody anticipated.

My hope, as we debate this conference report, is that one of the things we start to consider is that in 2000 the Senate Agriculture Committee needs to take up, as the House Agriculture Committee will do, the question of whether or not we ought to rewrite Freedom to Farm in order to not only save the family farm but also to save the taxpayer getting repeatedly hit for the bills of agricultural disasters that may not be created by Freedom to Farm.

I see my good friend down here, Senator ROBERTS of Kansas. He heard me talking about Freedom to Farm and he

rushed to the floor to defend himself. I am not saying that Freedom to Farm has caused the problem. I am simply saying I do think it is time to reexamine it. We should do it in a calm and bipartisan fashion. This Freedom to Farm is getting more and more expensive with fewer and fewer satisfied customers.

Last, I also hope the Senate Agriculture Committee will be able to resolve some differences that we have over crop insurance and we can enact crop insurance reform yet this year. The Senate conference with the House has already taken action. This is by no means the only thing we need to do to help people manage the risk, but Senator ROBERTS and I have listened to farmers, written a bill, we have almost 20 cosponsors, a majority of people on the Agriculture Committee. The distinguished chairman of the committee has some terrific ideas, as well, incorporated in his legislation.

My hope is, with 14 legislative days remaining, we can pass that out of the Senate Agriculture Committee and take it up on the floor, pass it here, get it to conference with the House, and get that signed and on to the President. There is money in the budget to do it. There is money in the disaster program to make it easier for people to afford the premiums.

It is consistent with what most of us have been talking about in terms of trying to give the farmers something they can use to manage their risk.

I say finally, I appreciate very much the difficulty the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has had. Senator COCHRAN had no easy task of trying to produce a conference report. There are things in it I would love to change. I know I cannot change them. But I will vote for this legislation and hope the President will sign it and hope it gets into law as quickly as possible so cash can get into the hands of people who desperately need it in order to survive.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from Vermont. Who yields time to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the leaders on this side, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for all his tremendous work on this bill. Most of what I wanted, however, did not succeed. It was not because of his lack of effort. He has put a tremendous amount of time in trying to make the bill more acceptable to those of us who live in the Northeast.

It is with great disappointment that I stand before the Senate to express my reasoning for opposing the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture appropriations bill, the bill that provides funding for agriculture programs, research and services for American agriculture.

In addition, the bill provides billions of dollars of aid for farmers and ranchers throughout America who have endured natural and market disasters. However, and most unfortunately, it neglects our Nation's dairy farmers.

I understand the importance of funding these programs and the need to provide relief for farmers. However, dairy farmers throughout the country and the drought stricken Northeast and mid-Atlantic regions have been ignored in this bill. For these reasons, I must vote against this bill.

The Agriculture appropriations bill provides \$8.7 billion in assistance to needy farmers across the country. I believe they should receive the help of the Federal Government. What is troubling is that dairy farmers are not asking for Federal dollars, but instead are asking for a fair pricing structure for their products, at no cost to the Government.

The drought-stricken Northeastern States are not asking for special treatment, just reasonable assistance to help deal with one of our region's worst drought.

Weather-related and market-related disasters do occur and we must as a nation be ready help those in need. In Vermont, in times of need, a neighbor does not have to ask another for help. Vermonters are willing to help, whether it is plowing out a neighbors snow covered driveway or delivering hay to Midwestern States during one of their worst droughts, which we did some years ago to save Wisconsin and Minnesota from terrible problems.

This summer weather conditions in the Northeastern and mid-Atlantic put a tremendous strain on the region's agricultural sector. Crops throughout the region were damaged or destroyed. Many farmers will not have enough feed to make it through this winter. Water for livestock and dairy operations dried up, decreasing production and health of the cows.

The Northeastern and mid-Atlantic States were not asking for much. Just enough assistance to help cope with the unpredictable Mother Nature.

America's dairy farmers need relief of a different kind. There is no need for the expenditure of Federal funds. Commodity farmers are asking the government for relief from natural and market disasters. Dairy farmers are asking for relief from the promised Government disaster in the form of a fair pricing structure from the Secretary of Agriculture. That is all we are asking.

Unless relief is granted by correcting the Secretary's Final rule and extending the Northeast Dairy Compact, dairy farmers in every single State will sustain substantial losses, but not because of Mother Nature or poor market conditions, but because of the Clinton administration and a few here in Congress have prevented this Nation's dairy farmers from receiving a fair deal.

Unfortunately, Secretary Glickman's pricing formulas are fatally flawed and

contrary to the will of Congress. The Nation's dairy farmers are counting on this Congress to prevent the dairy industry from being placed at risk, and to instead secure its sound future.

Secretary Glickman's final pricing rule, known as Option 1-B, was scheduled to be implemented on October 1 of this year. However, the U.S. District Court in Vermont has prevented the flawed pricing rule from being implemented by issuing a 30 day temporary restraining order on Secretary Glickman's final rule. The court finds that the Secretary's final order and decision violates Congress' mandate under the Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and the plaintiffs who represent the dairy farmers would suffer immediate and irreparable injury from implementation of the Secretary's final decision.

The temporary restraining order issued by the U.S. district court has given Congress valuable additional time to correct Secretary Glickman's rule.

We must act now. With the help of the court, Congress can now bring fairness to America's dairy farmer and consumers.

Instead of costing dairy farmers millions of dollars in lost income, Congress should take immediate action by extending the dairy compact and choosing Option 1-A.

The Agriculture appropriations bill which includes billions of dollars in disaster aid seemed like the logical place to include provisions that would help one of this country's most important agricultural resources without any cost to the Federal Government.

Giving farmers and consumers a reliable pricing structure and giving the States the right to work together at no cost to the Federal Government to maintain a fresh supply of local milk is a noble idea, and it is a basic law of this Nation.

It is an idea that Congress should be working towards. Instead, a few Members in both the House and Senate continue to block the progress and interest of both consumers and dairy farmers.

This Congress has made its intention abundantly clear with regard to what is needed for the new dairy pricing rules. Sixty-one Senators and more than 240 House Members signed letters to Secretary Glickman last year supporting what is known as Option 1-A, for the pricing of fluid milk.

On August 4 of this year, you will recall the Senate could not end a filibuster from the Members of the upper Midwest, but did get 53 votes, showing a majority of the Senate supports Option 1-A and keeping the Northeast Dairy Compact operating. Most recently, the House passed their version of Option 1-A by a vote of 285 to 140.

Both the House and Senate have given a majority vote on this issue. Thus, I felt very hopeful that its inclusion would have been secured in the Agriculture appropriations bill or some other place.

Thanks to the leadership of Chairman COCHRAN, the Senate stood firm on these important dairy provisions in conference. For days he worked hard to hold the line to include these. His farmers should be very appreciative of his efforts to bring about another compact of a demonstration program for the Southeast. The Southeast is another special area of the country that needs help just to organize their pricing system better to help farmers survive.

Although the House would not allow the provisions to move forward, both Chairman COCHRAN and Senator SPECTER led the fight for the dairy provisions. Farmers from Mississippi and Pennsylvania should be proud of the work and commitment of their Senators.

In fact, dairy farmers throughout the country should be thankful for the tremendous support their livelihoods have received from Chairman COCHRAN, Senator SPECTER, Senator BOND, and others on the Agriculture appropriations conference. Since then, there have been opportunities supported by the Senate to extend the compact and both times it failed because of lack of support in the other body.

With the Senate's leadership, the dairy provisions had a fighting chance in the conference committee. Unfortunately, time and time again House Members rebutted our efforts to include Option 1-A and include our dairy compacts in this bill.

If not for the actions of the House conferees dairy farmers could embrace this bill.

The October 1, 1999, deadline for implementation of the Secretary's rule has come and gone, but with the help of the district court, Congress still has time to act.

We must seize this opportunity to correct the Secretary of Agriculture's flawed pricing rules and at the same time maintain the ability of the States to help protect their farmers, without additional cost to the Federal Government, through compacts.

I understand the significance of the disaster aid in this bill and do not want to prevent the farmers and ranchers throughout the country from receiving this aid. However, in order to protect dairy farmers in my State, as well as farmers throughout the country, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 20 minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are going to be voting on the cloture motion on the Agriculture appropriations conference report. I come without

great enthusiasm for this bill, although I admit there is much in this bill that is important and necessary. The process by which this conference report comes to the Senate is a horribly flawed process.

We face a very serious farm crisis. Part of this legislation deals with that crisis. This appropriations bill deals with the routine appropriations that we provide each year for a range of important things that we do in food safety and a whole range of issues at the U.S. Department of Agriculture and elsewhere dealing with agricultural research and more. But it also deals with what is called the emergency piece in the Agriculture appropriations bill to respond to the emergency in farm country these days.

We have seen prices collapse. We have seen flooding in North Dakota of 3 million acres that could not be planted this spring. We have seen some of the worst crop disease in a century. We have seen substantial problems with the import of grain coming into this country that has been traded unfairly. We have seen the shrinking of the export market with financial problems in Asia. The result has been a buffeting of family farmers in a very tragic way, many of whom are hanging on by their fingertips wondering whether they will be able to continue farming.

We attempted to include some emergency provisions in this piece of legislation. This legislation does, in fact, contain emergency help for family farmers. I wish it contained that help in a different manner than it does. It contains it in a payout called the AMTA payment. This bill will actually double the AMTA payment.

The problem with that is there will be a fair number of people across the country who will receive payments who are not even farming, are not even producing anything, yet they are going to get a payment. There will be people in this country who will get payments of up to \$460,000. I expect taxpayers are going to be a little miffed about that. So \$460,000 to help somebody? That is a crisis? That is not a family farm where I live. Taking the limits off, and allowing that kind of payment to go out, in my judgment, is a step backward.

Most important, the Senate passed, by 70 votes, a provision that says: Let us stop using food as a weapon. Let us no longer use food and medicine as part of the embargoes that we apply to those countries and governments around the world that we think are behaving badly. By 70 votes, this Senate said: Let us stop using food as a weapon. Let us not use food and medicine as part of an embargo. This conference report does not include that provision because it was dropped. That is a step backward, in my judgment. We ought to have adopted the Senate provision that says: Let us not use food as a weapon. Let us stop using food as part of an embargo.

There was no conference. It started. It went on for a couple of hours. The

Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN, who chaired it on our side, did the right thing. He opened it up for amendments. We had an amendment, had a vote, and the vote did not turn out right for some other folks in the conference, so they decided to adjourn. That was it. Never heard from them again. Then the leadership decided to put together this bill, and they coupled together a conference report. And so here it rests now for our consideration. I am not enthusiastic about it.

But having said that, I likely will support it because farmers need emergency help, and they need it now. I do want to say that as harsh as I was about this process—and it was an awful process—I made it clear some weeks ago, when I talked about this, that Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi was not part of the reason this process did not work. On our side, he chaired the conference. And he did, I think, what should have been done. He opened it up for discussion, the offering of amendments, and to hold votes. That is exactly the way conferences should work. I applaud the Senator from Mississippi. As always, even under difficult circumstances, he is someone with whom I enjoy working and someone for whom I have great respect.

But in this circumstance, we must pass some emergency help for farmers. This bill contains some of that emergency help. It fails to contain other things that I think are very important. It seems to me, all in all, on balance, this legislation will probably proceed forward; the President will sign it; we will get some help out to family farmers; and come back again and see if we can provide some additional assistance when prices collapse and when that assistance is necessary.

It is especially the case we will need additional disaster help. I do not think the \$1.2 billion will do the job that is necessary all around the country to respond to disasters. Senator CONRAD has described on the floor, as have I, the 3 million acres that did not get planted this spring because of flooding. Those producers need help. To be a farmer and not to be able to farm, having all of your land under water, that is what I call a disaster. The amount of money in this bill is not enough to deal with all of these issues all around the country, so I think we are going to have to come back and add to that and try to provide the resources that are necessary.

But again, let me yield the floor because I know others would like to speak. I say to my colleague from Mississippi, I appreciate the fair manner in which he proceeded.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I know time is limited, so I would ask the indulgence of the senior Senator from Mississippi

and assume that the RECORD stretched on for hours for the praise I would put upon his shoulders. Actually, I do not say that as facetiously as it may sound.

I have served here for a lot of years. I know of no Senator who is a finer Senator, with more integrity or greater abilities than the senior Senator from Mississippi. On top of that, he is one of the closest friends I have in the Senate. I know he has driven mightily in this bill to include a lot of things necessary for parts of the country, staying within the caps.

My concern is one in the Northeast, that while we hear of talk about supplementals to help us later on—the administration or whoever saying, the check is in the mail—this does not help us. In my little State of Vermont, we have witnessed over \$40 million just in drought damage. Most of our feed grains were lost this year. Without some assistance, many of our farmers are not going to make it through the winter. In the last 2 years, they have suffered through an ice storm where it dropped to 30 below zero. There has been flooding and two summers of drought.

Congress authorized \$10.6 billion in disaster payments in fiscal year 1999. The Northeast and the Mid-Atlantic got 2.5 percent of that. Today or tomorrow we will likely pass \$8.7 billion in disaster assistance. Our farmers will get about 2 cents out of every dollar.

According to Secretary Glickman, the drought resulted in a total of \$1.5 to \$2 billion in damages already this year. The recent rains did not alleviate that. Our farmers need additional funding now that is targeted for crop, feed, and livestock losses caused by the drought. We need drought funding for the crop loss disaster assistance program to help cover crop losses, livestock feed assistance to address feed shortages, the Emergency Conservation Program to restore failed water supplies.

Without funding targeted drought recovery, most of the \$1.2 billion will likely go to the Southern States to recover from Hurricane Floyd. And they need that funding. I am not asking we take that funding away from them. I am asking we take care of their needs, but let's not neglect the needs of the Northeast and the mid-Atlantic States.

I wish we would vote against cloture. Then the President would say, wait a minute, maybe we ought to put together a supplemental request for victims of Hurricane Floyd, so the \$1.2 billion in the Agriculture appropriations bill could be used for drought relief.

We in the East, east coast Senators, Northeast Senators, have always been there to vote for disaster assistance for other parts of the country, even though it has not affected us: earthquake assistance for California, flood assistance for the Mississippi Valley, drought assistance in the Upper Plains.

When I became chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I brought the Agriculture Committee out to North and



South Dakota and elsewhere to emphasize why we needed drought relief, even though what we did was going to cost us in the Northeast. Drought relief for Kansas or any other place cost us in increased feed prices, in taxes. But we did it because it was the right thing to do. We have done it in cases of hurricane assistance for Texas, Louisiana, North and South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, and other States. All we would like is somebody to step back and say, wait a minute, why don't we get back to the administration and say, what are you going to request so this actually takes care of everyone.

Obviously, I was disappointed that we did not have extended the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact. But my concern would be the same today, whether it was there or not, because of the drought issues. I am concerned that lifting the Cuban embargo for food and medicine that was passed by the Senate by 74 or 75 votes, the Ashcroft amendment, was not included.

I would like to take a moment to reiterate the importance of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact and my disappointment that its extension is not in this bill. The Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact has proven itself to be a successful and enduring partnership between dairy farmers and consumers throughout New England. Thanks to the Northeast Compact, the number of farmers going out of business has declined throughout New England—for the first time in many years. If you are a proponent of states' rights, regional dairy compacts are the answer. Compacts are state-initiated, state-ratified and state-supported programs that assure a safe supply of milk for consumers.

Indeed, half the Governors in the nation, and half the state legislatures in the nation, asked that the Congress allow their States to set their own dairy policies—within federally mandated limits—through interstate compacts. And the dairy compact passed with overwhelming support in these States—in Arkansas, for instance, the Compact passed the Senate with a vote of 33 to 0 and the House passed it with a vote of 91 to 0. In North Carolina, the Compact passed the Senate with a vote of 49 to 0 and passed the House with the overwhelming majority of 106 to 1. Clearly, there is tremendous support for dairy compacts in these states.

Since the Federal policies are not working to keep farmers in business, these states acted to make sure that dairy farmers stay in business so that consumers can be assured of fresh, local supplies milk. If you support interstate trade, the Northeast Dairy Compact has proven itself to be the answer. Once the Compact went into operation, the Office of Management and Budget reported an 8 percent increase in sales of milk into the compact region from New York and other neighboring States to take advantage of the higher prices. If you support a balanced budget, dairy compacts are the answer.

The Northeast Compact does not cost taxpayers a single cent.

This is very different from the costliness of many farm programs—including many which are being funded through this appropriations bill. If you support farmland protection programs, dairy compacts are the answer. Major environmental groups have endorsed the Northeast Dairy Compact because they know it helps preserve farmland and prevent urban sprawl. In fact, the New Times reported on the importance of the Compact for the environment. In an article entitled "Environmentalists Supporting Higher Milk Price for Farmers" it was explained that keeping farmers on the land maintains the beauty of New England.

And if you are concerned about the impact of prices on consumers, regional dairy compacts are the answer. Retail milk prices within the compact region are lower on average than in the rest of the nation. I would be pleased to compare retail milk prices in New England against retail milk prices in the Upper Midwest.

A GAO report, dated October, 1998, compared retail milk prices for various U.S. cities both inside and outside the Northeast Compact region for various time periods. For example, in February 1998, the average price of a gallon of whole milk in Augusta, ME, was \$2.47. The price for Milwaukee, WI, was \$2.63/gallon. Prices in Minneapolis, MN, were much higher—they were \$2.94/gallon. Let's pick another New England city—Boston. In February 1998, the price of a gallon of milk was \$2.54 as compared to Minneapolis, MN, which was \$2.94/gallon. Let's look at the cost of 1 percent milk for November 1997, for another example.

In Augusta, ME, it was \$2.37/gallon, the same average price as for Boston and for New Hampshire and Rhode Island. In Minnesota, the price was \$2.82/gallon. I could go on and on comparing lower New England retail prices with higher prices in other cities for many different months. I invite anyone to review this GAO report. It is clear that our Compact is working perfectly by benefiting consumers, local economies and farmers. This major fact, that in many instances retail milk prices in the Compact region were much lower than in areas in the Upper Midwest, has been ignored by our opponents. I would also like to point out that before the Compact, New England lost 20 percent of its dairy farms from 1990 to 1996—we lost one-fifth of our farms in just 6 years. If farms had kept going under at that rate, the prices of milk in stores could have dramatically increased.

In June I received a letter from the National Grange strongly supporting the Northeast Dairy compact. They represent 300,000 members nationwide, and I want to read a few lines from their letter. It states that "regional dairy compacts offer the best opportunity to preserve family dairy farms." It continues by stating that:

The heightened interest and support at the state level for dairy compacts is based largely on the outstanding accomplishments of the Northeast Dairy Compact. There is recognition in the dairy industry that states must work together to strengthen their rural economies and ensure fresh, local supplies of milk to their urban areas.

The Grange letter notes that "the Northeast Compact has been extremely successful in meeting this goal by balancing the interests of processors, retailers, consumers, and dairy farmers."

The Grange goes on to support the Southern Dairy compact since a Southern Compact would "provide dairy farmers in that region with a stable price structure for the milk they produce while assuring the region a viable supply of locally produced milk." I want to repeat that OMB studied the Compact and concluded that consumer prices in the region were on average five cents lower per gallon than the average for the rest of the nation and that farm income had increased significantly. OMB also reported that the Compact put more pregnant women, infants, and children on the WIC program than would have been the case without the Compact. The Compact has also been challenged in court and has been upheld as constitutional.

The Compact does not harm other States. Contrary to what some opponents may suggest, the Dairy Compact did not cause a drop in milk production in other regions of the country such as the Upper Midwest. In fact, in 1997, Wisconsin had an increase in production of 1.7 percent while the Compact was in operation. This fact refutes another incorrect criticism of the Compact. Contrary to allegations of Compact opponents, interstate trade in milk has greatly increased as a result of the Compact according to OMB. Milk sales into the Compact region increased by 8 percent—since neighboring New York and other farmers wanted to take advantage of the compact.

It should also be noted that farmers in the Compact region are now milking about the same number of cows over the past couple of years—they did not suddenly expand their herds to take advantage of the Compact as opponents had incorrectly feared. Comparing Vermont's milk cows and production from April of last year to April of this year, note that Vermont's milk production did increase—but by only 2.6 percent. This is slightly less than the increase for Wisconsin. However, the number of cows being milked remained the same for Vermont. Farmers were not buying more cows and expanding their operations under the Compact, and production increases were less than other States.

So if all these points are refuted by the facts, what is the real agenda of those from the Upper Midwest? Based on newspaper accounts from the Upper Midwest, I think I know the answer. I know that the Upper Midwest massively overproduces milk—they produce far more than they can consume—and thus want to sell this milk

in the South. They do not even attempt to refute the point that they are trying to sell their milk outside the state. However, it is very expensive to ship milk because milk weighs a lot, it has to be refrigerated, and the trucks come back empty. I have read press reports about how they want to dehydrate milk—take the water out of milk—and then rehydrate it by adding water in distant states.

The Minneapolis Star Tribune explained that Minnesota farmers want to sell “reconstituted milk in Southern markets.” The article from February 12, 1992, points out that “technology exists for them to draw water from the milk in order to save shipping costs, then reconstitute it.”

Regular milk needs refrigeration and weighs a lot and is thus expensive to ship. Also, only empty tanker trucks can come back since nothing else can be loaded into the milk containers. But dehydrated milk can be shipped in boxes. By taking the water out of milk, the Upper Midwest can supply the South with milk.

I realize that according to a St. Louis Post-Dispatch article in 1990 that “Upper Midwest farmers say technological advances in making powdered milk and other concentrates has improved the taste and texture of reconstituted milk.” However, the House National Security Committee had a hearing on this reconstituted milk issue in 1997. I will quote from the hearing transcript: “the Air Force on Okinawa decided that the reconstituted milk was not suitable for the military and as a quality of life decision they closed the milk plant and opted to have fluid milk transported in from the United States.” There was a great article in the Christian Science Monitor a few years ago that talks about the school lunch program.

It mentions the first time the author, as a first-grader, was given reconstituted milk. He said: “Now, I like milk. . . . But not this stuff. Not watery, gray, hot, reconstituted milk that tasted more like rusty pump than anything remotely connected with a cow. We wept. We gagged. We choked.” The second problem with the strategy of Wisconsin and Minnesota farmers selling their milk down South is what about ice storms or snow? What happens when flooding or tornado damage or other problems stop these trucks laden with milk?

Southern parents might not be able to buy milk at any price any time an ice storm hits the Upper Midwest if the South does not have fresh, local supplies of fresh milk.

Just remember the panic that affects Washington, DC, when residents think we might get what is called in Vermont a “dusting of snow.” In this debate on the Northeast dairy compact, I was very hopeful a few months ago that we could work out an amendment on dairy which would be satisfactory to most members. The National Farmers Union made a great proposal which could

have helped dairy farmers throughout America. The President of NFU, Leland Swenson, discussed the recent loss of millions of dollars by dairy farmers “when the milk price suddenly dropped by 37 percent” in 1 month. In a letter to many Members of Congress, he pointed out that “family dairy producers will be subject to even greater economic disaster when the support price is completely phased out at the end of the year.” The National Farmers Union came up with an idea that would greatly benefit farmers in the Upper Midwest, the South, the West, the Northeast and the rest of the country. As their letter states, the proposal “will also help consumers by ensuring a steady supply of fresh milk and quality dairy products at reasonable prices.”

The NFU proposal consisted of: dairy compacts for the South and the Northeast; amendments to the federal order system that help farmers; and, third, a dairy price support at \$12.50 per hundredweight. NFU concludes by saying that this proposal would “provide a meaningful safety net for dairy farmers throughout the nation.” Compacts for the Northeast and the South, a good support price for the Upper Midwest, the Midwest, Florida, the Southwest, and the West, and reform to Federal order system. All three components would have helped dairy farmers in every region. I know the huge processors launched a massive and expensive campaign against all elements of this NFU proposal. The processors, unfortunately, are for very low dairy prices. These giant multinational processors have bought dozens and dozens of full-page ads and sent snow globes to members of the Congress. Their ads demonstrate what they are against. They oppose: an extension of dairy price supports; increases in price supports; interstate dairy compacts; and other reforms to the federal order system designed to keep dairy farmers in business. They propose instead, as do other opponents of this compromise, nothing—they have no proposals that would help dairy farmers.

Time will show that the opponents of this National Farmers Union package, these large processors, are making a costly error. If their policies of extremely low prices for dairy farmers continue to drive thousands of farmers out of business each year—eventually milk prices will dramatically increase. Unfortunately, I may only be able to say at a later date that “I told you so.”

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be very brief. The Senator from New York and the Senator from North Dakota want to speak.

On a personal level, I thank Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi for his fine work.

I am sympathetic to what my colleagues from the Northeast have to

say. They do not believe they really have been in the picture when it comes to disaster relief. I make a commitment, as a Senator from the Midwest, to fight very hard with them to do better on disaster relief before we leave here over the next 4 weeks or 5 weeks. As a matter of fact, I have a lot of concerns about this disaster relief bill as well and this financial package. I am not sure the farmers in northwest Minnesota are going to figure in. We have had a lot of wet weather. They haven't been able to plant their crops.

I am very worried that they actually are not going to get this disaster assistance. I also worry about the formula. Altogether, this is an \$8.7 billion relief package. I worry about the way in which it is delivered. As I have said before, I think the AMTA payments all too often go to those least in need without enough going to those most in need.

Finally, on the negative side, this is all a very painful way of acknowledging that our farm policy is not working. It is a price crisis. Our farmers can't make it on these prices. We are going to lose a whole generation of producers unless we get the loan rate up and get prices up and unless we have a moratorium on these acquisitions and mergers. I am determined to have a vote on the moratorium bill. I am determined to have a vote on doing something to get the prices up for family farmers. That is what speaks to the root of this crisis, which is a very painful economic crisis and a very painful personal crisis because an awful lot of good people are being driven off the land. The only thing this does is enable people to live to maybe farm another day.

I say one more time to the majority leader, I want the opportunity to come out with amendments and legislation that will alleviate some of this pain and suffering. I know other Senators feel the same way.

Finally, I think I lean heavily toward voting for this only because we need to get some assistance out to people. In Redwood County, which has really been through it, we get about \$23 million more to cover production losses in beans and corn from AMTA payments. I am told by Tracy Beckman, who directs our FSA office, that Minnesota will receive about \$620 million in AMTA payments to be distributed to about 62,000 eligible producers.

I don't think this emergency financial package is anywhere near close to perfect. I think it is flawed in a number of ways. I think we are going to have to do better on disaster relief. But I desperately want to get some help out to people. I think at least this is a step in that direction. We all can come back over the next couple of weeks and do more.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is recognized.



Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, under the authority of the leadership, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have received a number of letters from farm organizations and other groups supporting the adoption of the conference report or supporting invoking cloture so we can get to consideration of this conference report. Included among these groups are the American Farm Bureau Federation, asking for a vote on cloture this afternoon; the National Corn Growers Association; the National Association of Wheat Growers; the U.S. Rice Producers Association; the American Soybean Association; International Dairy Foods Association; the National Barley Growers Association; the Louisiana Cotton Producers Association, and others.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM  
BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Park Ridge, IL, October 12, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: The American Farm Bureau Federation supports passage of H.R. 1906, the conference report on FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations. We urge you to vote for cloture this afternoon.

We are thankful to the members of the conference committee for their diligent work in securing much needed financial assistance for farmers who are suffering from this year's devastating drought and low commodity prices.

However, we remain disappointed by the process which rendered inadequate levels of funding for weather disaster assistance, excluded trade sanctions reform and did not make needed changes in dairy policy. We appreciate the efforts of members of the House and Senate who worked for these needed changes.

Farm Bureau will continue to work to secure these beneficial changes in farm policy. Sincerely,

DEAN KLECKNER,  
President.

NATIONAL CORN  
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, October 8, 1999.

Hon. CHARLES S. ROBB,  
U.S. Senate, Russell Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ROBB. On behalf of the 30,000 members of the National Corn Growers Association (NCGA), I strongly urge the United States Senate to pass the fiscal year 2000 agriculture appropriations conference report. America's farmers are facing Depression-era low prices and the political posturing that continues to delay delivery of the desperately needed \$8.6 billion farm assistance package puts these farmers at risk.

I cannot stress enough the importance of this farm aid package and the importance of its timely passage. In many cases, the market loss assistance payment will be the only way many of our farmers will meet their end-of-year expenses.

The NCGA urges Congress to vote "aye" on cloture, preventing an impending filibuster from further delaying the bill, and vote "aye" on final passage. Acting immediately on this bill will allow us to get this appropriations process behind us and to then turn our attention to the challenge of crafting long-term policy solutions that will restore

the health of the agricultural economy and help us avoid the need for future emergency assistance packages.

NCGA looks forward to working with Congress on those long-term goals in the months to come. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNN JENSEN,  
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF WHEAT GROWERS,  
Washington, DC, October 10, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture  
Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN: As President of the National Association of Wheat Growers (NAWG), and on behalf of wheat farmers across the nation, I write to commend you and the subcommittee on your hard work in completing the FY2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

I believe that the emergency assistance package included in the bill will go a long way in meeting the needs of America's wheat producers. At the same time, however, I am very disappointed that the sanctions reform provisions of the Senate's version of the bill were not included in the conference report. NAWG remains committed to lifting all U.S. unilateral sanctions on food and will continue to work towards this goal.

It is my understanding that a handful of your colleagues are attempting to block the adoption of the conference report in an effort to address policy matters outside the bill's intended scope. This is unfortunate.

NAWG encourages all Senators to vote for cloture and final adoption of the conference report as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

JIM STONEBRINK,  
President.

U.S. RICE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,  
Houston, TX, October 1, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural  
Development and Related Agencies, U.S.  
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The U.S. Rice Producers Association (USRPA) represents rice producers in Mississippi, Missouri, Texas, and California, as well as affiliate members that include rice millers, marketers, and other allied businesses. We are writing to express our strong support for the passage of the conference report on H.R. 1906, the fiscal year 2000 agricultural appropriations bill. While this bill is not perfect, it will help to address some of the critical concerns of American rice producers who are facing record low prices.

Emergency Assistance: H.R. 1906 includes a package of emergency economic assistance that will be critical to the economic survival of rice producers across the nation. With prices for rice projected to fall by more than one-third compared to last year's already low prices, the enactment of this direct emergency assistance is imperative.

Equitable Marketing Loan Payments: H.R. 1906 includes a provision to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to correct the inequitable treatment received by a number of rice producers when the benchmark World Market Price for rice was significantly adjusted downward in August by the Department of Agriculture. For a number of producers, particularly in Texas and Louisiana, only the enactment of this provision can address this issue.

Comprehensive Sanctions Reform: We are disappointed that the conference report fails to enact reforms regarding our government's use of unilateral agricultural sanctions. We

oppose restrictions on the free and open export of U.S. agricultural commodities that deny American farmers access to important export markets. In particular, Cuba was a very large and dependable market for U.S. rice prior to the imposition of sanctions. However, we do not believe that the failure of the bill to address the sanctions issue should be viewed as a reason to defeat this very important bill.

As such, we urge you and your colleagues to vote for final passage of the conference report on H.R. 1906.

Sincerely,

DENNIS R. DELAUGHTER,  
Chairman.

AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION,  
October 8, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural  
Development, and Related Agencies, Com-  
mittee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the American Soybean Association (ASA), I would like to express our strong support for immediate passage of the Conference Report on agricultural appropriations for FY-2000. Favorable consideration of this important legislation is even more urgent since it will provide emergency relief for producers of soybeans and other commodities who are suffering from historic low prices and from severe crop losses.

U.S. soybean farmers have seen prices fall 32% in the past three years, to a season average level of \$5.00 per bushel for the 1999 crop, according to USDA. This represents a decline of \$4.4 billion in the value of this year's harvest, compared to 1996.

While sluggish foreign demand is partly responsible for lower prices, another factor is the increase in U.S. soybean production under "Freedom to Farm." Since 1996, soybean plantings rose eight million acres, or 12%, from 66 to 74 million acres. This increase has disadvantaged traditional soybean producers, and particularly those who do not receive large payments under the AMTA formula.

With Congress prepared to again provide supplemental AMTA assistance to offset low prices received by producers of former program crops, ASA is pleased that the farm relief package includes \$475 million to partially compensate producers of soybeans and other oilseeds. This amount will add an estimated 15 cents per bushel to farmers' income from the sale of this year's soybean crop and from marketing loan gains or Loan Deficiency Payments. ASA would like to express appreciation to you for your leadership in including and retaining this provision in the final Conference Report.

Sincerely yours,

MARC CURTIS,  
President.

INTERNATIONAL DAIRY  
FOODS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, October 8, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR: Next Tuesday, you will be asked to vote on cloture to stop a filibuster of the final agriculture appropriations conference report as some members seek to force inclusion of controversial dairy compacts in the bill. Without question, dairy compacts artificially inflate milk prices, under the guise of helping dairy farmers.

Now is not the time to hold up this agriculture appropriations bill—which includes important farm relief measures. And it certainly isn't the time to unnecessarily increase milk prices to consumers.

Attached are numerous editorials from across the nation that strongly urge Congress to reject higher milk prices, and let

modest free market reforms stabilize the industry. We urge you to vote for cloture and let the agriculture appropriations process move forward.

Sincerely,

CONSTANCE E. TIPTON,  
Senior Vice President.

NATIONAL BARLEY  
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,

Alexandria, VA, October 12, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN: On behalf of barley producers from across the United States, I am writing to urge Congress to expedite approval of the conference report for FY2000 agricultural appropriations (H.R. 1906). While the conference process was clearly imperfect and barley growers are frustrated by the refusal of the congressional leadership to allow conferees to consider provisions to enact much-needed reforms to US sanctions policy, this package contains several provisions of critical importance to barley producers and to the entire agricultural community. It is important that this package be approved immediately.

As such, barley growers urge you and your colleagues to vote for final passage of the conference report on H.R. 1906.

Sincerely,

JACK Q. PETTUS,  
Washington DC Representative.

LOUISIANA COTTON  
PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,  
Monroe, LA, October 11, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: The Louisiana Cotton Producers Association strongly supports passage of the FY 2000 Ag Appropriations Bill. The financial aid provided for in this bill will to a large degree be the only means by which many are able to hold onto the family farm. Your leadership and support for agriculture is well documented and greatly appreciated.

I look forward to our continued partnership in 2000 as we attempt to improve upon a farm bill that is in dire need of reform.

Sincerely,

JON W. "JAY" HARDWICK.

NATIONAL GRAIN SORGHUM PRODUCERS,  
Abernathy, TX, October 8, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN: On behalf of the National Grain Sorghum Producers we urge you to support the Agriculture Appropriations Bill as presented by the Conference and approved by the House.

Farmers across the United States need these funds now.

Sincerely,

DAN SHAW,  
Washington Representative.

AMERICAN SUGAR ALLIANCE,  
Washington, DC, October 8, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: The associations listed below, representing U.S. sugarbeet and sugarcane farmers, processors, and refiners, unanimously support the Agricultural Appropriations Bill Conference Report.

We thank you for your unfailingly support for American production agriculture and we look forward to continuing to work with you in the future.

Sincerely,

American Sugarbeet Growers Association;  
American Sugar Cane League;  
Florida Sugar Cane League; Gay & Robinson, Hawaii; Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers; Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida; United States Beet Sugar Association.

AMERICAN TEXTILE  
MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE,  
Washington, DC, October 12, 1999.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12 CLOTURE VOTE ON AG APPROPRIATIONS: VOTE YES ON INVOKING CLOTURE—VOTE YES ON FINAL PASSAGE

DEAR SENATOR: The FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations Bill provides needed assistance to U.S. agriculture, including restoration of funds for the cotton competitiveness program, and we urge you to support the conference report. Specifically, we urge you to vote YES on Tuesday, October 12 on the motion to invoke cloture on consideration of this bill, and to vote YES on final passage of the conference agreement.

Funding for "Step 2" of the cotton competitiveness program was capped in the 1996 farm bill and the program ran out of funds in December of 1998, resulting in an immediate and sharp decline in already low raw cotton prices. As we have indicated to you previously, the surge over the last few years in cheap imports from China and other nations of the Far East, in large part because of Asia's economic difficulties, has had a severe impact on the American textile industry. Restoration of funding for Step 2 will help offset some of this damage by making the U.S. cotton and U.S. textile industries more competitive with foreign manufacturers.

As a final point, we understand and sympathize with the concerns of Senators from dairy producing states. However, we strongly urge that these issues be dealt with in an expeditious manner without holding up this badly needed agriculture spending bill. Please do everything you can to achieve such an outcome which will address the needs of dairy producers without holding American textile manufacturers and cotton producers hostage. We need this conference report to be signed into law as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

CARLOS MOORE,  
Executive Vice President.

CALCOT, LTD.,  
Bakersfield, CA, October 11, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: First, I want to thank you for all of your efforts to get the agricultural assistance package to where it is today. Calcot's membership, which totals over 2000 members who grow almost 50 percent of the cotton in Arizona and California, fully support the conference bill.

Growers are distressed at the delay in getting the conference passed by the Senate. Hopefully, the cloture vote tomorrow afternoon will be successful and this bill can be forwarded to the President shortly after that. Growers desperately need the benefits provided in the assistance package, and we really need Step 2 to prevent the loss of further sales of cotton.

Again, we appreciate your efforts to provide this package, but we need it passed by the Senate and signed by the President at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

T.W. SMITH.

USA RICE FEDERATION,  
Arlington, VA, October 8, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the USA Rice Federation, we want to express our support for the FY 2000 Agricultural Appropriations Conference Report. The programs funded by this legislation, and especially the economic assistance package, are urgently needed by America's farmers who are suffering a crisis due to low prices and weather-related disasters.

We urge you and other members of the Senate to support the Report and its quick implementation.

Sincerely,

A. ELLEN TERPSTRA,  
President and Chief Executive Officer.

[News From Independent Community Bankers of America]

ICBA WELCOMES HOUSE PASSAGE OF FARM RELIEF PACKAGE

Washington, DC. (Oct. 1, 1999)—The Independent Community Bankers of America today welcomed the House of Representatives passage of H.R. 1906, the Fiscal Year 2000 Ag Appropriations bill on a 246-183 vote.

"The \$8.7 billion bill will provide much needed economic assistance to struggling farmers who are trying to generate positive cash flows and repay their operating credit as well as plan for new loans. Congress will need to also consider providing additional funds to provide payments for disaster losses and additional money to ensure adequate guaranteed loan funding is available," said ICBA President Bob Barsness.

"While we realize the bill has generated considerable controversy lately, we are hopeful Congress will provide this much needed financial assistance to our farmers as soon as possible," ICBA added.

NATIONAL PEANUT GROWERS GROUP,  
Gorman, TX, October 12, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, Senate Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Peanut Growers Group is a coalition representing peanut growers across the United States. We appreciate very much your hard work in developing the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies appropriations bill. You have always supported our industry.

The bill contains several key provisions that assist peanut growers. In addition to important peanut research projects, the bill provides approximately \$45 million in direct disaster payments to peanut growers based on the 1999 peanut crop.

Language was also added during the Conference that requests the Secretary of Agriculture use peanut growers marketing assessment monies to offset potential program losses in the 1999 peanut crop.

We support the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill and urge its immediate passage.

Sincerely,

WILBUR GAMBLE,  
Chairman.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, October 12, 1999.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COCHRAN: On behalf of the American Bankers Association (ABA), I am writing to express our support for the FY

2000 Agricultural Appropriations Conference Report (HR 1906). The ABA represents all categories of banking institutions which includes community, regional and money center banks and holding companies as well as savings associations, trust companies and savings banks. Our members are deeply concerned about the future of our agricultural and rural borrowers.

At the end of 1998, our members had over \$70 billion in outstanding loans to farm and ranch customers. We provide American agriculture with the credit needed to produce our nation's safe and abundant food and fiber.

We join you in supporting the Conference Report because it will address the emergency needs of this vital national industry. Our nation's farmers and ranchers have been battered by low prices and, in some areas, by severe weather conditions. Many of our farmers and ranchers are losing hope and are deciding to leave agriculture.

For many of these farmers and ranchers the FY 2000 Agricultural Appropriations Conference Report can make the critical difference between staying on the farm or leaving it forever. We thank you for supporting the legislation, and we urge you to impress on your colleagues the urgent need to pass the legislation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

FLOYD E. STONER.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the cloture vote this afternoon. I acknowledge the work of our colleague, Senator COCHRAN, and our colleague, Senator KOHL, who are the chairman and ranking member of this committee. I have found in my time in the Senate that Senator COCHRAN is a very fair man. He is somebody who keeps his word. He always has time to listen. I appreciate that very much. I also appreciate the difficulty he has, along with Senator KOHL, in bringing this bill to the floor. This is not easy to do. It is a very difficult thing year after year, to deal with all of our colleagues on these very contentious issues. I thank my colleague, Senator COCHRAN, for his patience more than anything else because he has certainly demonstrated that. I also thank Senator KOHL because he has also listened carefully to the needs of our colleagues from around the country.

I represent one of the most agricultural States in the Nation. My producers there have been hit by a triple whammy of bad prices, bad weather, and bad policy. The prices are the lowest they have been in real terms in over 50 years. There is a price collapse occurring that is putting enormous financial pressure on our producers.

Bad weather. I guess the simple fact that we had 3 million acres in the State of North Dakota not even planted this year tells a story, not because it was too dry but because it was too wet. What an extraordinary circumstance. Back in 1988 and 1989, we had the worst drought since the 1930s. Now we have the wettest conditions in

100 years. Everywhere you go in North Dakota, at least in a big chunk of our State, there is nothing but water. Who could have believed this dramatic change? And we are hurt by bad trade policy and bad agriculture policy that has further burdened producers.

There are several parts of this package that I think are critically important. The 100-percent AMTA supplemental payment is going to mean that a North Dakota wheat farmer, instead of getting a transition payment of 64 cents a bushel on wheat, is going to get \$1.28. It may not sound like much to many of my colleagues, and it isn't much in the great scheme of things. That is going to make the difference between literally thousands of farm families having to be forced off the land and being able to survive for another year. That is critically important.

Second, there is a 30-percent crop insurance discount. That is very important because we have not devised a crop insurance system that can work for the farmers of this country.

So those are two important provisions. They deserve our support.

As soon as I am positive about this bill, I also want to point out those parts of the bill that are deficient because there is inadequate disaster assistance in this bill. There is not enough money for those who are victims of Hurricane Floyd; there is not enough money for those who are the victims of the drought in the eastern part of the United States; there is not enough money for those farmers in my State who have been flooded out. These are farmers who didn't take a 30-percent loss or a 40-percent loss; they took a 100-percent loss because their land is under water.

Mr. President, we have to do better. We will have a further opportunity to do so in the legislative process later this year. I hope very much we will do that. But right now, the right vote is to vote for cloture.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I must respectfully disagree with my colleague from North Dakota. This bill is a disaster for the farmers in the Northeast. We have been hit, in this bill, by a triple whammy. No. 1, the dairy compact hangs by a thread. No. 2, the pricing support system for dairy 1-A is replaced by 1-B. And then, to add insult to double injury, what has happened is that there is so little disaster relief—given the hurricane in North Carolina, flooding in North Dakota, and the worst drought in a generation in the Northeast—it is hard to see how the money allocated here covers the needs of hard-pressed farmers.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It just does not do the job for us. I have spoken to many on

my side, including our minority leader, who shares our heartfelt concerns; and we are going to make an effort to do whatever we can to get extra disaster relief in other supplemental bills. But it is faint concern, little concern, to the people and farmers in the Northeast.

We have 220,000 farmers in the Northeast, according to the Secretary of Agriculture. We have a program, a dairy program, and fruits and vegetables as well, that are different from the majority of farming here in this country. It is not a row crop, and they are not large farms; they are family farms.

I will leave my colleagues with a plea: We need help. We need real help, particularly this year when low prices and the drought have severely affected us. We are not getting the help we need in this bill, and we hope we can come back another day and get it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I yield the time that he may consume to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, because of the lowest commodity prices in a quarter century in the Midwest and probably every place else in the United States, I support the conference report we are considering this afternoon. While there are elements of the legislation that I might not support, or would rather not have in the bill, I think the greater good is served by passing this legislation as quickly as possible. The sooner we pass this legislation, the sooner we can assist the family farmer. That was our intention when we began this process the first week of August, and I am glad to see it will be accomplished in the near future.

As everyone is aware, there is a crisis in rural America due to these low commodity prices. I made a promise 3 years ago to guarantee a smooth transition from big government command and control to a market-driven agricultural economy. We predicted 3 years ago, in the 1996 farm bill, that that smooth transition would require about \$5.5 billion for the year 1999. We didn't anticipate the lowest prices in 25 years and, obviously, that transition turned out to be more difficult than we anticipated. To remedy the situation we have added economic assistance in this bill that we did not predict was necessary three years ago.

A number of factors have contributed to the downturn in the agriculture economy that we have experienced over the last 18 months. I would like to tell you that the answer to our problem is as easy as changing the 1996 farm bill. But, in fact, the economics involved are complex and international. For example, we saw soybean prices take a nosedive a while back, not because of anything we did in this country, but because the Brazilian currency lost one-quarter of its value overnight.

Brazil happens to be a major soybean producer and also an exporter. That action also shaved roughly a dollar a bushel off of U.S. soybean prices.

Another example is that Asia has been one of our fastest growing and strongest export markets. But when the Asian economy crashed, they could no longer buy American pork and our grain. The financial crisis Asia experienced hurt all our farmers in America, even my friends and neighbors back at New Hartford, Iowa.

Global trade manifested by exports has become a mainstay of our Nation's family farmers. Roughly one-fourth of farm receipts today come from overseas sales. Iowa is a significant supplier to the world, being the Nation's No. 2 exporter of agricultural commodities, after California. The solution is to increase our access to world markets by passing fast track and opening doors through the World Trade Organization and other trade agreements, not by limiting our ability to compete in the world market by choking our own production.

There are 100 million new mouths to feed every year, almost a billion in the next decade. Farmers someplace in the world are going to feed those new mouths. I would rather it be Iowa or United States products than Brazilian and Argentine products. We can do it and compete. In the short-term though, the most effective means of helping our family farmers in need is providing economic assistance as quickly as possible.

The fastest means to provide emergency relief to our farmers is through the AMTA mechanism. I would like to mention that some of my colleagues have criticized our plan to distribute income assistance through the AMTA payment mechanism. I have heard and witnessed statements that would lead some to believe that landowners who do not share in production risk or management are benefiting from this assistance. The 1996 farm bill states that payments are only available to those who "assume all or part of the risk of producing a crop."

Recently, 53 Senators signed a bipartisan letter asking Secretary Glickman whether there are payments being made to those who do not share risk in agriculture—risk in a specific farming operation. If that is occurring we have requested in the letter to Secretary Glickman that the proper disciplinary action for any official approving payments in this manner be administered. But if this is not happening, I apologize for my colleagues who have delayed the process by making baseless claims due to their own ignorance.

So the action we take today guarantees the future stability of the family farmer and the agricultural economy. It is with this in mind that I support this cloture motion and hope this bill passes, because within 10 days after getting this bill signed by the President, this money can be distributed to the farmers of America.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are close to running out of time. I will use my leader time to make a few comments on the pending conference report.

I come to the same conclusion as the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and I would like to elaborate, if I could, briefly on why I have come to that conclusion.

I believe we ought to be supportive of this conference report, but I must say I am deeply disappointed that we have to be in this position in the first place. This is a badly flawed bill from many perspectives. I strongly disagree with using the AMTA mechanism as the only mechanism by which we provide resources to those in need. As a result of our reliance on AMTA, there will be thousands of people no longer directly involved in agriculture who are going to get payments of over five and a half billion dollars. Our view is that that is a tragedy, given the limited resources we have available to us and the extraordinary need to ensure that resources are spent in the most prudent fashion. They will not be, in large measure, because of the formula incorporated in this language.

I also am very deeply concerned about the fact that there is no loan availability in this bill. There are going to be farmers who are going to be turned away from banks throughout the country. When they are turned away, as is happening on many occasions, farmers go to the Farm Service Agency to ensure they can get the resources they need.

Let us be clear. There is no recourse as a result of this legislation. Farmers have no opportunity to get alternative loan availability because there is no money in this bill for loans. For that reason, too, I am very concerned about the deficiencies in this legislation.

As most of us know, we have lost a substantial number of our pork producers. The number of pork producers in South Dakota has diminished substantially in recent years. In fact, we have lost a large portion of the percentage of our hog producers in the last year in large measure because of the disastrous crisis they are now facing. There is not \$1 in here for livestock producers involved in pork production. As a result, our pork producers have no hope of obtaining any kind of assistance as a result of this legislation.

I must say we also are deeply concerned about the impact this legislation could have, if this is the last word on the circumstances those in the Northeast currently are facing. They have experienced serious drought. Other parts of the country have faced other serious farm disasters. The disaster assistance in this package is absolutely unacceptable. The \$1.2 billion is a fraction of what will be required if

we are going to meet all of the obligations this country should and must meet to address disaster needs, especially in the Northeast, in the coming 12 months. We have an extraordinary deficiency with regard to disaster assistance.

As a result of that as well, I am deeply troubled that we are faced with a very untenable choice: vote for this, and get some assistance out to those who will receive it, in time for it to do some good, or do nothing and hope that somehow in some way at some time we can resolve this matter before the end of the session.

I sadly come to the conclusion that what we have to do is take what we can get now, to take what we have been able to put in the bank now, and keep fighting to address all of these deficiencies before the end of this session. I have said just now to my colleagues in the Northeast that we will not rest, we will not be satisfied until we have adequately addressed their needs in disaster assistance before the end of this session. We will make that point with whatever vehicles we have available to us, appropriations or otherwise. It is absolutely essential that we provide that assistance before the end of this year and send a clear message that we understand the gravity of their circumstances and are prepared to address it.

I might also say that we have to look also at an array of policy considerations. My view is that we are in this box in large measure because we created it ourselves. Those who voted for Freedom to Farm are coming to the realization that clearly this is a situation that has to be resolved through public policy, in new farm policy, with the creation of a safety net, with the creation of market incentives to create more of a balance between supply and demand than what we have right now.

That is a debate for another day. We are left with a choice about whether or not we provide \$8.7 billion in aid now, as poor as the vehicle may be, to people who need it so badly. I will vote yes, and I encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee strongly endorsing the method of payment used for the disaster assistance portion of this bill from the American Soybean Association and other groups be printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. TED STEVENS,  
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STEVENS: We are well aware that some have encouraged conferees on the FY00 agricultural appropriations bill to use alternative forms of funding emergency farm income disaster assistance rather

than supplemental Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA) payments.

In Secretary Glickman's September 15 testimony before the House Agricultural Committee, he says "To be sure, there is an immediate need to provide cash assistance to mitigate low prices, falling incomes, and in some areas, falling land values. Congress should enact a new program to target assistance to farmers of 1999 crops suffering from low prices. The Administration believes the income assistance component must address the shortcomings of the farm bill by providing counter-cyclical assistance." He goes on to say, "The income assistance should compensate for today's low prices and therefore they should be paid according to this year's actual production of the major field crops, including oilseeds, not a formula based on an artificial calculation done a decade ago."

Mr. Chairman, we strongly disagree with that philosophy. The current economic distress is partly a result of the unfulfilled promises of expanded export markets, reduced regulations, and tax reform that were part of the promises made during deliberation of the 1996 farm bill. The costs of these unfulfilled promises fall upon those people who were participating in farm programs at that time.

The AMTA payment process is in place and can deliver payments quickly. The administrative costs of developing an alternative method of payments would be very high and eat into funds that should go to farmers. Given the 7½ months it took the Department to issue weather disaster aid last year, we are unwilling to risk that producers might have to wait that long for development and implementation of a new farm economy disaster aid formula. Time is also critical for suppliers of goods and services to producers. They need payments for supplies now to stay in business, not just promises that something will happen in the future.

Supplemental AMTA payments provide income to producers of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, barley, and grain sorghum. Soybean producers will receive separate payments under the Senate Agricultural Appropriations language. Crop cash receipts for these producers in 1999 will be down over 20 percent from the 1995-97 yearly average. Producers who have smaller than normal crops due to weather problems will receive normal payment levels. This is better than using the loan deficiency payment program (LDPs) which are directly tied to this year's production.

We urge you to retain the \$5.5 billion in supplemental AMTA payments as the method of distribution for farm economy aid in the agricultural appropriations conference agreement. Any alternative would certainly take additional time to provide assistance to producers—time which we cannot afford.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation;  
American Soybean Association; National Association of Wheat Growers;  
National Corn Growers Association;  
National Cotton Council; National Grain Sorghum Producers; National Sunflower Association; U.S. Canola Association; USA Rice Federation.

FREEMAN LAKE DAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies which is currently before the Senate contains language under the Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations account of the Natural Re-

sources Conservation Service, NRCS, to utilize Emergency Watershed Protection Program monies to perform rehabilitation of designated dams constructed under the agency's watershed program. Is this correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee if the conference report directs NRCS to provide financial assistance for the Freeman Lake Dam located in Elizabethtown, Kentucky?

Mr. COCHRAN. I assure the gentleman from Kentucky that the Conference Report does contain the language as he has described.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Chairman for including this project in the conference report. The Freeman Lake Dam is in dire need of rehabilitation, and the safety of the community rests upon the integrity of this dam. Finally, I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi, is it the conference's intent that funding to rehabilitate this dam comes from existing Emergency Watershed Protection program funds, since this structure represents a serious threat to life and property.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the chairman.

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about certain aspects of the FY 2000 funding level for the Food and Drug Administration. My greatest concern is that while the FY 2000 conference report provides about \$70 million over FDA's 1999 funding level of \$982,217 million, this is about \$90 million below the agency's FY 1999 request of \$1.142 billion.

While the conference report for FY 2000 does fund important new initiatives within the FDA such as food safety programs, other key priorities are not accommodated such as \$20.4 million for phase I funding for construction of the agency's Los Angeles laboratory facility and \$15.3 million for improvements to FDA's adverse event reporting system.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to bring these vital issues to his attention. If Congress can find resources to fund these important priorities, the American public will reap great benefits. Finally, I commend him for your demonstrated leadership and expertise in financing the operations FDA and I look forward to continuing to work with you on funding this key public health agency.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator from Utah for his comments regarding funding for the Food and Drug Administration. As the Senator knows, the Congress is required to comply with fiscal year 2000 budget caps on discretionary spending. Unlike the President's budget, we do not have the luxury of being able to offset appropriations' increases with savings from

questionable scoring tactics, or from new user fee and other proposed legislation which has not won the support of the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress.

I understand the Senator's concern that this conference agreement does not provide the full fiscal year 2000 level requested for the FDA. However, it does provide the FDA with a substantial increase in funding from the fiscal year 1999 level to provide the amount requested for two of FDA's highest priority activities—food safety and premarket review. I can assure my colleague from Utah that we will continue to review the funding needs of this critical public health agency and consider future requests of the agency to enhance funding for its essential activities, including those which he has brought to our attention here today.

#### WIC PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we have before the Senate the conference report on H.R. 1906, the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies. Included in this Act is more than \$4 billion for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children commonly known as the WIC program. This is one of the most successful programs provided by the federal government, and I am glad to see that an increase above last year's level is provided in this Act.

However, I have concerns about language in the statement of managers to accompany this conference report about the WIC program. This language relates to the so-called "sugar cap" and I would like to ask my friend from Wisconsin, the ranking member of the appropriations subcommittee, about this specific provision.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and he is correct, there is language in the statement of managers that instructs the Department of agriculture not to make any exceptions to the WIC sugar cap.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask the Senator, did this or any similar language appear in either the House or Senate measures before the conference committee convened?

Mr. KOHL. This particular language was offered in the conference committee, and it does not appear in either the House or Senate versions of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bills or reports.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator. I was surprised to learn that language relating to specific nutritional policy of the USDA—policy that has been the subject of significant study and debate within the agency for years—that language which appears to reach a conclusion on the outcome of years of study has been slipped into the fiscal year 2000 appropriations report. This language appeared, *deus ex machina*, at the very last minute and without discussion by all the conferees. Thankfully, the language is not binding on USDA, so the agency can continue with their

decision making process, without being bound by the language in the conference report.

Substantively, the report language conflicts with the USDA's own recommendations on children's diets. When the National Association of WIC Directors and the USDA's Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion both urge people to add fruit to their cereal, it is irrational and incoherent to deny people the opportunity to obtain fruit in their cereal. But that is what the report language would accomplish.

USDA should make a determination on how the sugar cap on breakfast cereals in the WIC package of foods should be calculated and how best to incorporate fruit into WIC participants' diets. The agency should bring nutritional science and common sense to the task, and it should ensure that the rule is consistent with the nutritional recommendations that it makes regarding children's diets.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I agree with my colleague that the USDA, which has the expertise to make an informed decision about the value of fruit and other foods in children's diets should be left alone to design the composition of the WIC food packages. Over the past several years, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies appropriations bill has become a vehicle for the debate surrounding the content of sugar in certain foods eligible for inclusion in the WIC program. More recently, the fiscal year 1999 Statement of Managers instructed the Department to provide \$300,000 for a study by the National Academy of Sciences on this issue, which was not conducted. Now, the fiscal year 2000 Statement of Managers includes language directing that no exception to the sugar cap be made. I assume that this pattern of direction is as frustrating to all of us as it is to WIC program administrators, participants, and suppliers.

Our goal, quite simply, should be to promote a healthy diet for all Americans. USDA nutrition policy should consider the totality of U.S. eating habits and aim for consumer education and program implementation that deals with a person's overall diet rather than one burdened by requirements attached in a piecemeal fashion.

It is unfortunate that the grip of political consideration has taken hold of a matter best left to nutritionists and those trained in the science of public health. It is also unfortunate that the result has been inconsistent policy development where certain nutritional limitations have been imposed on some components of USDA nutrition programs, but not on others. This issue should be resolved by experts who can best determine dietary guidelines properly suited for all Americans. My intent also does not suggest that USDA nutrition programs should be made more complicated than they are, but that a simple injection of common sense should prove refreshing and,

hopefully, a basis for sound public policy.

Mr. KOHL. I appreciate the view of the Senators from Michigan and California regarding this issue. For many years, I too have grown concerned by the trend away from healthy food choices and toward eating patterns that may lead to tremendous health care costs in the future. To the extent that human health is a result of human choices, there is probably no better example than in what we choose to eat.

In my opinion, American consumers receive too much persuasion regarding diet from our popular culture and far too little from those best qualified to provide good counsel. In the instance of the matter raised by the Senator from Michigan, I am not sure what benefits to public policy are achieved by an never ending discussion within political circles where expertise in human nutrition is probably lacking. Does this send a good strong message to the American consumer regarding the right choices to make regarding nutrition? I hardly think so.

It is time, it is long time, for politicians to step back and let the experts decide what is best for the American consumer. The Senator from Michigan makes some valid points regarding the need for a common sense approach to nutrition and public health. I hope the Department of agriculture recognizes that their responsibly transcends the political winds where some matters, such as sound nutritional advice, have no place. I would not expect doctors at the Mayo Clinic to take my advice on how to proceed with a delicate operation. Further, I would not expect nutrition experts at USDA to take my advice on what details best constitute a totally balance diet for a certain population beyond my suggestion that they use their best judgement base don their knowledge and experience. If they don't follow those standards it is unclear why they are there in the first place.

#### TOBACCO PROVISIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the tobacco provisions of this bill, will provide an additional \$328,000,000 in funds for farmers who produce the major cigarette tobaccos—burley and flue-cured tobacco. It is those farmers who have been the most affected by recent developments with respect to the manufacture and use of cigarettes. It is those farmers also who are the subject of the recent "Phase II Settlement" in which moneys are being made available to burley and flue-cured tobacco growers through the use of State trusts. It is also my understanding that the bill's reference to those farms who receive "quotas" under the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, is intentional, and does limit the relief, to burley and flue-cured tobacco. The reference to "quotas" is to poundage quotas and burley and flue-cured tobacco are the only tobaccos under the current regulatory scheme that receive poundage

"quotas" as opposed to acreage allotments. This limitation to burley and flue-cured tobaccos is intentional and reflects recent developments.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2000.

The conference report provides \$68.6 billion in new budget authority (BA) and \$48.5 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. Within this amount, \$8.7 billion in BA, and \$8.3 billion in outlays is designated as emergency spending for farmers who have experienced weather-related disasters, and for additional market transition payments to compensate farmers for depressed commodity prices. All of the discretionary funding in this bill is nondefense spending. When outlays from prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the conference report totals \$73.0 billion in BA and \$55.7 billion in outlays for FY 2000.

The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee 302(b) conference allocation totals \$73.0 billion in BA and \$55.7 billion in outlays. Within this amount, \$22.7 billion in BA and \$22.6 billion in outlays is for nondefense discretionary spending, of which \$8.7 billion in BA, and \$8.3 billion in outlays are designated as emergency spending. For discretionary spending in the bill, and counting (scoring) all the mandatory savings in the bill, the conference report is at the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation in BA and outlays. It is \$8.7 billion in BA and \$8.5 billion in outlays above the 1999 level for discretionary spending, \$1.1 billion in BA and \$1.0 billion in outlays above the Senate-passed bill, and \$8.2 billion in BA and \$7.7 billion in outlays above the President's request for these programs.

I recognize the difficulty of bringing this bill to the floor at its 302(b) allocation. I appreciate the committee's support for a number of ongoing projects and programs important to my home State of New Mexico as it has worked to keep this bill within its budget allocation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000, SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

(Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General Purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Conference Report:				
Budget authority .....	22,687	.....	50,295	72,982
Outlays .....	22,578	.....	33,088	55,666



## H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000, SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

(Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General Purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority .....	22,687	.....	50,295	72,982
Outlays .....	22,578	.....	33,088	55,666
1999 level:				
Budget authority .....	14,005	.....	41,460	55,465
Outlays .....	14,093	.....	33,429	47,522
President's request:				
Budget authority .....	14,520	.....	50,295	64,815
Outlays .....	14,831	.....	33,088	47,919
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority .....	13,882	.....	50,295	64,177
Outlays .....	14,508	.....	33,088	47,596
Senate-passed bill:				
Budget authority .....	21,619	.....	50,295	71,914
Outlays .....	21,532	.....	33,088	54,620
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Outlays .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1999 level:				
Budget authority .....	8,682	.....	8,835	17,517
Outlays .....	8,485	.....	- 341	8,144
President's request:				
Budget authority .....	8,167	.....	.....	8,167
Outlays .....	7,747	.....	.....	7,747
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority .....	8,805	.....	.....	8,805
Outlays .....	8,070	.....	.....	8,070
Senate-passed bill:				
Budget authority .....	1,068	.....	.....	1,068
Outlays .....	1,046	.....	.....	1,046

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my disappointment that the agriculture appropriations conference report that Congress is sending to the President does not ratify a Southern Dairy Compact that 14 state legislatures have approved.

I recently met with several dairy farmers from Tennessee who stressed to me the importance of the Southern Dairy Compact to their farms' survival. Dramatic fluctuations in the price of milk continue, and it is increasingly difficult for these family farms, many of which have been passed down from one generation to the next, to hang on during the hard times. Let me illustrate how dire the situation is: in the last two years, 400 dairy farms in Tennessee have been forced out of business, reducing the total number of farms producing Grade-A milk in the state to under 1,000 for first time since anyone started counting.

Today I will vote to cut off a filibuster on the agriculture appropriations conference report because America's farmers are in urgent need of the disaster assistance the bill provides and cannot afford any delay in its delivery, but I am no less committed to the establishment of a Southern Dairy Compact. I believe it would provide the stability in milk prices that dairy farmers need to survive and would protect the region's local supply of milk. Fourteen southern states, including Tennessee, have voted to participate in the Southern Dairy Compact, and it's now up to Congress to ratify it. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the Senate to get that done.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank Chairman COCHRAN and his staff for putting together a bill that encompasses the needs of agriculture. I also thank Chairman STEVENS for his co-

operation during the agricultural appropriations process. I am pleased with the funding that went to my home State of Montana as well as to important national programs for agriculture.

During this economic crisis in agriculture, immediate funding needs of farmers and ranchers must be addressed. I believe this bill does that. The \$8.7 billion package contains important funding for Agricultural Marketing Transition Act, AMTA payments for wheat and barley producers in Montana, as well as \$322 million for livestock producers and \$650 million in crop insurance.

Additionally, I am thrilled that price reporting was included in the final bill at my request. I have been trying to secure price reporting for our livestock producers for quite some time now. This legislation will provide producers with the information they need to make prudent marketing decisions, and take the control out of the hands of the meat packers.

Four major packers control 79% of the meat-packing industry. It is necessary to have this price reporting information accessible to producers so that they may take advantage of the best possible market opportunities available. Additionally, they must have the assurance that they are receiving accurate data.

The majority of livestock producers in Montana sell their feeder calves to feeder markets, which are highly concentrated. Increased concentration within the agricultural industry provides them fewer and fewer options open for marketing. Price reporting will increase market transparency and present producers an accurate view of the market.

The National Cattlemen's Beef Association, the American Sheep Industry, and the National Pork Producers Council worked extensively with State producer organizations and the packers to craft a bill that will work for everyone and directly benefit producers. The end result of this work is the legislation included in agricultural appropriations as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture on July 29, 1999. I join all of these interested parties in directing the Department of Agriculture and the administration generally to this document for use in the correct interpretation and administration of this important law.

I am disappointed that policy issues such as dairy and food-related sanctions were eventually stripped from this bill. I believe these concerns must be addressed as soon as possible. I will support Option 1—A legislation in H.R. 1402, in order to ensure my dairy farmers are taken care of. Additionally, I will support Senator ASHCROFT in his efforts to exempt food and medicine from sanctioned countries. American farmers and ranchers stand much to lose by not having all viable markets open to them.

Again, I thank the fine chairman, Mr. COCHRAN, for all his good work on

this bill. I will continue to work for Montana farmers and ranchers to make sure they make not only a decent living but one that is profitable and fulfilling.

I thank the Chair.

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, the Agriculture appropriations bill:

Trent Lott, Thad Cochran, Tim Hutchinson, Conrad Burns, Christopher S. Bond, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Robert F. Bennett, Craig Thomas, Pat Roberts, Paul Coverdell, Larry E. Craig, Michael B. Enzi, Mike Crapo, Frank H. Murkowski, Don Nickles, and Pete Domenici.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, the Agriculture appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, is absent because of illness in the family.

The yeas and nay resulted—yeas 79, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 322 Leg.]

## YEAS—79

Abraham	Durbin	Landrieu
Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Allard	Enzi	Lincoln
Ashcroft	Feingold	Lott
Baucus	Feinstein	Lugar
Bayh	Fitzgerald	Mack
Bennett	Frist	McCain
Bingaman	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Murray
Breaux	Grams	Reid
Brownback	Grassley	Robb
Bryan	Hagel	Roberts
Bunning	Harkin	Rockefeller
Burns	Hatch	Sessions
Byrd	Helms	Shelby
Campbell	Hollings	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Hutchinson	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Thomas
Conrad	Inhofe	Thompson
Coverdell	Inouye	Thurmond
Craig	Johnson	Voinovich
Crapo	Kennedy	Warner
Daschle	Kerrey	Wellstone
DeWine	Kerry	Wyden
Domenici	Kohl	
Dorgan	Kyl	

## NAYS—20

Biden	Lieberman	Sarbanes
Chafee	Mikulski	Schumer
Collins	Moynihan	Smith (NH)
Gregg	Nickles	Snowe
Jeffords	Reed	Specter
Lautenberg	Roth	Torricelli
Leahy	Santorum	

## NOT VOTING—1

Dodd

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 79, the nays are 20.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I will propound the following unanimous consent request which has been cleared, I am told, on both sides of the aisle. It relates to the further handling of the Agriculture conference report.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday there be up to 5 hours equally divided for debate between Senator COCHRAN and the minority manager or his designee, with an additional hour under the control of Senator WELLSTONE, on the Agriculture appropriations conference report, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have been authorized, on behalf of the leader, to announce, for the information of all Senators, there will be no more votes tonight.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 8, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,660,032,556,386.77 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty billion, thirty-two million, five hundred fifty-six thousand, three hundred eighty-six dollars and seventy-seven cents).

One year ago, October 8, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,534,496,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-four billion, four hundred ninety-six million).

Fifteen years ago, October 8, 1984, the Federal debt stood at \$1,572,268,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred seventy-two billion, two hundred sixty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 8, 1974, the Federal debt stood at \$477,151,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-seven billion, one hundred fifty-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,182,881,556,386.77 (Five trillion, one hundred eighty-two billion, eight hundred eighty-one million, five hundred fifty-six thousand, three hundred eighty-six dollars and seventy-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

#### TITLE XX SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANTS

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise to speak about some grave concerns I have regarding the dramatic and unprecedented cuts to Title XX, the Social Services Block Grant, in S. 1650, the Labor-Health and Human Services Appropriations bill.

As I am sure many of my colleagues are aware, the Social Services Block Grant is currently authorized at \$2.38 billion, but the Senate bill provides for only \$1.05 billion, a reduction of more than 50%, for Fiscal Year 2000. In addition, it appears that the bill would also accelerate the reduction in transferability of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—or TANF—from 10% to 4.25%. In other words, not only has the appropriation been slashed in half, the ability of the states and counties to transfer other dollars into SSBG is also sharply reduced.

My immediate reaction when I learned about these cuts to SSBG was enormous disappointment. When I travel through each of Wisconsin's 72 counties each year holding town-meeting style listening sessions, many of my constituents have discussed with me the value and importance of SSBG funds in enabling the provision of vitally-needed services for some of our most vulnerable citizens. I have the benefit of a very engaged and active Counties Association to keep me informed about the importance of assuring SSBG funding.

But perhaps not all of my colleagues share my good fortune in this respect, perhaps some of our colleagues are not aware of the value of SSBG funds in their own states and communities—that is the only reason I can think of why these cuts are included in the bill. In the event that that is the case, please allow me a few moments to elaborate on the important services that SSBG dollars fund in my home state of Wisconsin:

Wisconsin counties received more than \$42 million in SSBG dollars in FY 1997, the most recent year for which data is available. Those dollars provided services to Wisconsin's Seniors such as home meal delivery programs like meals-on-wheels, day programs for seniors, and supportive home care. SSBG dollars also help to provide crucial services to protect children, such as investigating potential child abuse cases and providing protective services for children who ARE being abused,

and providing for after school programs so that children have a safe place to go in the afternoon. Throughout Wisconsin, SSBG dollars have enabled Wisconsin's counties to provide these services to 283,964 Wisconsinites—many of whom will lose access to these services if SSBG is further cut.

Lastly, let me illustrate what the impact of SSBG cuts means for some communities in Wisconsin: the Rainbow Center for Prevention of Child Abuse in Dane County, Wisconsin, will have to cut services for 130 families. In Milwaukee County, 428 patients will not receive outpatient mental health care, and 550 adults seeking drug and alcohol abuse treatment will be turned away. Milwaukee County will also lose funding for more than 2,000 shelter nights for the homeless and victims of domestic violence.

Mr. President, I hope that this short description of the many ways SSBG supports and strengthens counties and local communities helps to illustrate why a 50% reduction in funds will be so devastating. I hope that House and Senate conferees will restore SSBG to its authorized amount for Fiscal Year 2000 so that the counties who so rely on these funds will be able to provide the services our constituents need, services that are vital to supporting and strengthening our communities.

I thank the Chair.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

##### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE CARIBBEAN BASIN ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT—MES- SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— PM 63

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 214 of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Expansion Act of 1990 (19 U.S.C. 2702(f)), I transmit herewith to the Congress the Third Report on the Operation of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 12, 1999.