

Mr. INHOFE. There was a time when that was true. During the cold war that was a valid argument. It is no longer true. Virtually every country has weapons of mass destruction. Now it is a matter of which countries have missiles that could deliver them, of which now we know of North Korea and Russia and China—and whoever else we don't know because they have been trading technology with countries like Iraq and Iran, and other countries.

Mr. DORGAN. I did not say that the United States and Russia are the only countries that have nuclear weapons. I said we have 30,000 between the two countries. Other countries have nuclear weapons as well, and many other countries aspire to have nuclear weapons.

The Senator from Oklahoma said something that is not the case. He said virtually every other country has weapons of mass destruction. That is not the case. The nuclear club, those countries that possess nuclear weapons, is still rather small, but the aspiration to get a hold of nuclear weapons is pretty large. A lot of countries—more than just countries, terrorist groups—want to lay their hands on nuclear weapons. What happens when they do? Then we will see significant threats to the rest of this world.

It is in our interest as a country to do everything we can possibly do to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Do we want Bin Laden to have a nuclear weapon? Do we want Qadhafi to have a nuclear weapon? Do we want Saddam Hussein to acquire a nuclear weapon? I don't think so. Arms control agreements and the opportunities to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons are critical.

How do we best do that? Many of us believe one of the best ways to do that is to pass this treaty, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

We are going to have this treaty back on the floor, I think, for 3 hours today. I will make it a point to come and I will spend the entire 3 hours with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator will yield for a response.

Mr. DORGAN. I have not yielded, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. This treaty was brought to the floor for 14 hours of debate. Name another arms control treaty that came to the floor with only 14 hours of debate. The Senator asks: Why didn't someone object? The burden is on us. Because the majority leader treated a serious matter lightly, the burden is on someone else.

The Senator from Oklahoma knows we objected the first time the Senator from Mississippi proposed it. He knows an objection was raised. The second time the Senator from Mississippi proposed it, he linked it to a time. If that is the only basis on which we had the opportunity to consider this treaty, so be it. But it is not treating a serious

matter seriously, in my judgment. Name another treaty that has come to the floor of the Senate dealing with arms control, the arms control issues embodied in this treaty, trying to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, that has had this little debate and comes to the floor, despite what my colleague says, without having had 1 day of comprehensive hearings devoted to this treaty in the committee to which it was assigned? Those are the facts.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator will yield on that point.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to speak about the Agriculture appropriations bill. The only reason I made these comments is, the Senator from Oklahoma was, once again, making statements. He is good at it. He feels passionately about these things. But I think, with all due respect, he is wrong on this issue.

This country has a responsibility to treat these issues seriously. This country has a responsibility to lead in the area of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. We don't lead in that regard by turning down or rejecting this treaty. There was a coup in Pakistan yesterday; we are told. We don't know the dimensions or consequences of it. Pakistan is a nuclear power. Pakistan and India are two countries that don't like each other. They exploded nuclear weapons, literally under each other's chin, within the last year. Is that a serious concern to the rest of the world? It is.

Mr. INHOFE. Absolutely, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. DORGAN. Are we going to lead and try to stop nuclear testing? Are we going to lead in trying to stop the spread of nuclear weapons? I hope so. I cast my vote to ratify this treaty, believing it is the best hope we have as a country to weigh in and be a leader, to say we want to stop the spread of nuclear weapons around the rest of the country.

Mr. President, I see my friend from Arizona has also joined us. I came to speak about this Agriculture bill. I know my colleague from Illinois is waiting to address these issues as well.

Mr. KYL. I wonder if I might prevail on the courtesy of the Senator for 30 seconds.

Mr. DORGAN. Thirty seconds.

Mr. KYL. The Senator asked a question which I think deserves an answer: Name one other treaty that had less time or more time than this. Here are the treaties: The Chemical Weapons Convention had 18 hours allotted for it.

Mr. DORGAN. Is that less than 14?

Mr. KYL. That includes amendments.

Mr. DORGAN. How many comprehensive hearings did that treaty have?

Mr. KYL. If I could complete my answer to the Senator, which is that this treaty, pursuant to a request by the minority, had 14 hours associated with it, plus 4 hours per amendment, if there were amendments offered. There was an amendment offered on the Demo-

cratic side. The Democratic side used 2 hours allotted to them for that. The Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty had 6 hours, compared to 14 for the CTBT. The START Treaty had 9½ hours, about 6 hours less. The START II Treaty had 6 hours, and the CFE Flank Agreement, 2 hours. So every one of these treaties ended up having less time than the CTBT allotted for debate on the floor.

All of last week was consumed by hearings in the Intelligence Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senate Armed Services Committee; I don't know how many hours total. Prior to that time, the Government Operations Committee had three separate hearings. That is the specific answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. DORGAN. One thing I hate in politics is losing an argument I am not having. The Senator from Arizona cites the number of hours this treaty or that treaty was considered on the floor of the Senate. I will bring to the floor this afternoon the compendium of action by the Senate on the range of arms control treaties, START I, START II, ABM, so on. What I will show is that in the committee of jurisdiction, there were days and days and days of comprehensive hearings and the length of time those treaties were considered, in terms of number of days on the floor of the Senate, were extensive. It allows the American people to be involved in this discussion and this debate. This approach, which treats a very serious issue, in my judgment, too lightly, says, let us not hold comprehensive hearings. I remind the Senator that the request from the minority was of the majority leader to hold comprehensive hearings, allow consideration, and allow a vote on this treaty. That is not the course the majority leader chose.

Having said all that, I am happy to come back this afternoon. I feel passionately about this issue. We should talk about all the things the Senator from Oklahoma is raising. We haven't tested for 7 years, and we think this country is weaker because of it. I don't know how some people can sleep at night. North Korea is going to attack the Aleutian Islands with some missile. Our nuclear stockpile is unsafe, one Senator said the other day. The bombs in storage are unsafe. We have been storing nuclear weapons for over 40 years in this country. All of a sudden they are unsafe, on the eve of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

---

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

Mr. DORGAN. Having said all that, let me turn to the question of the Agriculture Appropriations bill. Let me ask how much time I have remaining? I had sought 20 minutes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The minority has 136 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORGAN. I will take 5 minutes. My friend, the Senator from Illinois, is waiting and the Senator from Mississippi, who manages the bill, has the patience of Job. I will not spend a lot of additional time.

I want to run through a couple charts, if I might. I want people to think through if this were their income, what their situation would be. Every one of you have a job; you have an income. If you have a business, you have some profit or an expected profit. Ask yourself what your situation would be personally if your job was to raise corn. This is what has happened to the price of corn; it has dropped dramatically. Think of what that would mean if that happened to your income.

What about if you are a producer out there, a family farmer raising some children and trying to operate a farm? You are raising wheat. Here is what has happened to your income. It has plummeted?

What if you are raising some kids and trying to operate a family farm and doing well and you are producing soybeans? This is what happened to your income. Again, a drastic reduction.

Do you know of any other business in which prices have fallen as much as for wheat, corn, soybeans?

Likewise, what if somebody said that the product you raise, a bushel of wheat, for example, as a percentage of the cereal grain dollar, was going to shrink by over half?

Take another example. Say you were raising hogs and not too long ago you sold a 200-pound hog and got \$20 for it. Then that hog was slaughtered and the meat from that hog went to the grocery store and was sold for \$350. There is something wrong with that picture.

Is there something wrong with the stream of income that goes to the person who actually raised that hog versus the amount of income that goes to the middle people who process it? Absolutely.

We could go through chart after chart, those of us who represent farm States. All of us know what the story is. The story is, our family farmers are in crisis. We have a farm bill that has an inadequate safety net. We have the collapse of grain prices in this country in an almost unprecedented way. We have the weakening Asian economy, which means fewer exports. We have concentration and monopolies in every direction, which cuts the farmer's share of the food dollar.

When Continental and Cargill are allowed to get married, as they just did, two big companies gathering together under one umbrella, it demonstrates that our antitrust laws don't work. Every direction the farmer looks, he finds a monopoly. Want to raise some grain and ship it on a railroad? You are held up for prices that are outrageous in order to haul it by the railroad. The same is true with virtually every other

commodity such as selling wheat into a grain trade that is highly concentrated. In every set of circumstances, farmers have been injured. And the result of all of these adverse circumstances coming together, especially the twin calamities of the collapse of commodity prices and weather-related crop disasters, means we have a full-scale emergency on our family farms.

This piece of legislation is not particularly good. I am going to vote for it, but with no great enthusiasm. I was one of the conferees. The conference met for a brief period of time. Senator DURBIN was a conferee, as well, and he will recall we met for a period of time, and one of the things we pushed for was to stop using food as a weapon. No more food embargoes. Guess what. That was our strong Senate position, but it is not in this report.

This report doesn't end the embargoes on food or end using food as a weapon. This report doesn't do that because the conference dumped it. We didn't do it because we were part of the conference, but the conference didn't meet. It adjourned in a pique and never got back together. We are told the Senate majority leader and the Speaker of the House cobbled together this bill, with some technical help. When we saw it again, it said we want to continue to use food as a weapon and keep embargoes on various countries around the world.

I am not happy with this bill. Let's provide income support to farmers, it says, after we pushed for that. But it says do it with something called AMTA payments. We are going to have people getting emergency payments who didn't lose any money because of collapsed prices; they weren't even farming. In fact, the payment limits have gone up. So it is conceivable that some landowners are going to get \$460,000 without putting a hand to the plow. That is the new payment limit. Can you imagine telling a taxpayer in a city someplace that we want to help farmers in trouble, and they ask which farmers? Well, somebody is going to get a \$460,000 payment whether or not they are actually farming. That is not helping America's family farmers. So there is a lot wrong with the payments provided by this bill.

Similarly, the disaster aid is only \$1.2 billion and contains no specific line item for flooded lands. We know that amount shortchanges all the known needs. We know that is not going to cover the drought of the Northeast, the flooding from Hurricane Floyd and the prevented planting in the Upper Midwest—all of the disasters that need to be addressed across this country. But the combination of things in this legislation has put us in a position of asking if we are going to provide some help or no help.

We are in a situation where we have to say yes, we will vote for this package, but without great enthusiasm. This was done the wrong way. Most of

us know that. We should have helped farmers who lost income because of collapsed prices and weather disasters, the people who really produce a crop. We ought not to have a \$460,000 upper payment limit, and we ought not to have dropped the provision that says we are going to end embargoes on food and medicine forever. It was wrong to drop that. We know that.

I will have to vote for this conference report, without enthusiasm, because there is an emergency and a crisis, and some farmers will not be around if we don't extend a helping hand now. Never again should we do it this way. This is the wrong way to do it. It is not the right way to respond to the emergency that exists in farm country.

My friend, the Senator from Illinois, wants to speak. I thank him for his patience. I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS).** The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

#### THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are several issues that have been debated on the floor this morning, and it is typical of the Senate, which considers myriad issues, to consider some that are quite contrasting. To move from nuclear proliferation to help for soybean growers is about as much a contrast as you could ask for. But it reflects the workload that we face in the Senate, and it reflects the diversity of issues with which we have to deal.

I will speak very briefly to the issue of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. This nuclear test ban treaty, which may be considered for a vote this afternoon, could be one of the most significant votes ever cast by many Members of the Senate. It appears the vote will be overwhelmingly in favor of the treaty on the Democratic side of the aisle, with a handful of Republican Senators joining us—not enough to enact this treaty into law and to ratify it so that it becomes virtually a law governing the United States. If that occurs, if we defeat this treaty this afternoon—as it appears we are headed to do—it could be one of the single most irresponsible acts ever by the Senate.

Let me give specifics. It was only a few hours ago, in Pakistan, that a military coup took place and replaced the administration of Mr. Sharif. Mr. Sharif had been elected. He was a man with whom we had dealt. He was a person who at least came out of the democratic process. But he was toppled. We have not had that experience in the United States, and I pray we never will. But the military leaders decided they had had enough of Mr. Sharif. They weren't going to wait for an election. They decided to take over. It appears from the press reports that the source of their anger was the fact that Mr. Sharif had not aggressively pursued the war against India, nor had he escalated the nuclear testing that took place just a few months ago.