

You may remember, on the Fourth of July, the President of the United States of America stayed in the White House for a special meeting—a rare meeting on a very important national holiday with Mr. Sharif of Pakistan, where he laid down the rule to him that we didn't want to see the Pakistani army engaged in the militia tactics against the Indians in an escalated fight over their territory in Kashmir. He produced, I am told, satellite imagery that verified that the Pakistanis were involved, and he told Mr. Sharif to stop right then and there. If this escalated, two nascent nuclear powers could see this develop into a conflagration that could consume greater parts of Asia. The President was persuasive. Sharif went home and the tension seemed to decline—until yesterday when the military took over.

Why does that have any significance with our vote on a nuclear test ban treaty? How on God's Earth can the United States of America argue to India and Pakistan to stop this madness of testing nuclear weapons and escalating the struggle when we reject a treaty that would end nuclear testing once and for all? It is really talking out of both sides of your mouth.

This nuclear test ban treaty had been supported originally by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Democratic and Republican Presidents, over the years. It was President George Bush who unilaterally said we will stop nuclear testing in the United States. He did not believe that it compromised our national defense, and he certainly was a Republican.

If you listen to the arguments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you would think this is just a cut and dried partisan issue, with Republicans on one side and Democrats on the other. The polling tells us that 82 percent of the American people want us to pass this test ban treaty. They understand full well that if more and more nations around the world acquire nuclear weapons, it doesn't make the United States any safer; it makes the world more dangerous. Leaders in some of these countries, who should not be entrusted with a cap gun, will end up with a nuclear weapon, and we will have to worry whether they have the delivery capability.

Why is a nuclear test an important part of it? You can't take this nuclear concept from a tiny little model on a bench and move it up to a bomb that can destroy millions of people without testing it. If you stop the testing, you stop the progress of these countries. Some say there will be rogue nations that will ignore that, that they don't care if you sign a treaty in the United States; they are going to go ahead and build their weapons.

I don't think any of us would suggest that we can guarantee a nuclear-free world or a nuclear-controlled world by a treaty. But ask yourself a basic question: Are we a safer world if we have a nuclear test ban treaty that puts sens-

ing devices in 350 different locations so we can detect these tests that occur? Are we a safer world if we have a regime in place where one nation can challenge another and say, "I think you have just engaged in the development of a nuclear weapon you are about to test, and under the terms of the treaty I have a right to send in an international inspection team to answer the question once and for all."

Why, of course, we are a safer world if those two things occur. They will not occur if the Republicans beat down this treaty today, as they have promised they will. An old friend of mine—now passed away—from the city of Chicago, said, "When it comes to politics, there is always a good reason and a real reason."

The so-called good reason for opposing the treaty has to do with this belief that it doesn't cover every nation and every possible test.

The real reason, frankly, that a lot of them are nervous about going against this treaty is the fear that in a week or a month or a few months we will have another member of the nuclear club; in a week or a month or a few months we will have more testing between India and Pakistan; in a few weeks we may see what is happening in Pakistan disintegrating further and then having to worry about whether there will be nuclear weapons used in the process of their confrontation with India.

Those who vote to defeat the treaty will wear that collar, and they will know full well that they missed the signal opportunity for the United States to have the moral leadership to say our policy of no nuclear testing should be the world policy; it makes us safer. It makes the world safer.

Sadly, we have spent virtually no time in having committee hearings necessary for a treaty of this complexity, and a very limited time for floor debate. It is a rush to judgment. I am afraid the judgment has already been made. But ultimately the judgment will be made in November of the year 2000 when the American voters have their voice in this process. Our debates on the floor will be long forgotten. But the voters will have the final voice as to which was the moral, responsible course of action to enact a treaty supported by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, and the Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a treaty that really gives us an opportunity for a safer world, or to turn our backs on it.

I sincerely hope that enough Republicans on that side of the aisle will muster the political courage to join us. The right thing to do is to pass this treaty.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to address the second issue before us, and one which is of grave concern in my home State of Illinois. It is the Agriculture appropriations bill.

It has been my high honor to serve on the agriculture appropriations subcommittee in both the House and the Senate. I have been party to some 13 different conferences. That is where the House and Senate come together and try to work out their differences.

I want to say of my chairman of the subcommittee, Senator COCHRAN, that I respect him very much. When I served in the House and he was a conferee, I believe that we always had a constructive dialog. There are important issues involving American agriculture. I was honored to be appointed to the same committee in the Senate, and I have respected him again for the contribution he has made as chairman of the committee.

But what happened to Senator COCHRAN in this conference shouldn't happen to anyone in the Senate. He was moving along at a good pace, a constructive pace, to resolve differences between the House and the Senate. Unfortunately, the House leadership turned out the lights, ended the conference committee, and said we will meet no more. What was usually a bipartisan and open and fair process disintegrated before our eyes. That is no reflection on the Senator from Mississippi. I have no idea what led to that. It occurred. It was clear that the problem was on the House side. We were making progress. We were making bipartisan decisions. The process broke down.

But with that said, I will vote for this bill, and reluctantly. I believe it will provide some relief for struggling farmers in our fragile farm economy.

The Illinois Department of Agriculture estimates that \$450 million from the \$8.7 billion agricultural relief package will directly benefit Illinois producers through receipt of 100 percent of the 1999 AMTA payments. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota. Using an AMTA payment is fraught with danger. I think it is an open invitation for every one of these investigative television shows to have fun at the expense of this bill and this decision process. When they find people who haven't seen a tractor in decades but have ownership of a farm receiving payments upward of \$.5 million, they are going to say: I thought you were trying to help struggling farmers, not somebody with a trust account who has never been near a farm.

That may occur because we have chosen these AMTA payments. We should have done this differently. I think we are going to rue the day these payments are made and the investigations

take place. But these AMTA payments will be in addition to the more than \$450 million already received by Illinois farmers this year to help them through this crisis.

I voted for the Freedom to Farm Act. I have said repeatedly that I did not believe when I voted for that farm bill that I was voting for the Ten Commandments. I believed that we were dealing with an unpredictable process. Farming is unpredictable. Farm policy has to be flexible. We don't know what happens to weather or prices. We have to be able to respond.

You have to say in all candor as we complete this fiscal year and spend more in Federal farm payments than ever in our history that the Freedom to Farm Act, as we know, has failed. It is time for us, on a bipartisan basis, to revisit it, otherwise we will see year after weary and expensive year these emergency payments.

Look at the Illinois farm economy. My State is a lucky one. We usually aren't the first to feel the pain. God blessed us with great soil and talented farmers and a good climate. But we are in trouble.

Farm income in Illinois dropped 78 percent last year to just over \$11,000 a year. That is barely a minimum wage that farmers will receive. That is the lowest net income on farms in two decades.

Incidentally, if you are going to gauge it by a minimum wage, as the Presiding Officer can tell you, farmers don't work 40-hour workweeks. When they are out in the fields late at night and early in the morning, they put in the hours that are necessary. Yet they end up receiving the minimum wage in my State of Illinois. That is down from \$51,000 in 1997. That was the net farm income per family in that year. Lower commodity prices and record low hog prices in particular are primarily to blame for this net farm income free fall in my home State.

The Illinois Farm Development Authority recently noted that the financial stress faced by Illinois farmers today is higher than it has been for 10 years. Activity in the authority's Debt Restructuring Guarantee Program is four or five times higher than last year. They have approved 7 to 10 loans per month in 1998. In 1999, the authority has been approving 30 to 40 debt restructuring loans per month—a 300-percent increase. This is a record level unmatched since the 1986–1987 farm crisis.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has predicted that prices for corn, soybeans, and wheat will remain well below normal, and that farm income may drop again next year. Nationally, farm income has declined 16 percent since 1996.

On Saturday night in Springfield, IL, I went to a wedding reception and sat next to a friend of mine. I said: What is a bushel of corn going for now? He said \$1.51. If you follow this, as they do every day in farm country, that is a disaster—\$1.51 a bushel.

I said: How is your yield this year?

He said: It is up a little, but I can't make up for that decline in price.

That is what is coming together. That is the disaster in Illinois and in many places around the Nation.

The USDA is facing the largest farm assistance expenditure in its history. The Department of Agriculture processed 2,181 loan deficiency payments in 1997, about 2.1 million in 1998—1,000 times more—and they will work through a projected 3 million this year. Unfortunately, it appears that this crisis is going to drag on in the foreseeable future further draining USDA's resources and reserves.

I am going to address separately the whole question of the Ashcroft-Dodd amendment because I think it is one that deserves special attention. But I want to say that though I did not sign this conference report because of the procedures that were followed, I hope that we don't repeat this process in the future. It really undermines the credibility of Congress and of the good Members such as the Senator from Mississippi and others who really do their best to produce a good bill when they turn out the lights and send us home, and then circulate a conference report that has never been seen until they put it before you for signature.

Once the Senate acts on the conference report, sends it to the President, our role in helping improve conditions in rural America does not end. We should explore other ways to help our farmers.

Let me say a word about the Ashcroft-Dodd amendment.

You may recall during the Carter administration when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. President Carter announced an embargo on the Soviet Union—an embargo that became one of the single most unpopular things that he did. President Carter and the Democratic Party wore the collar for a decade or more that we were the party of food embargoes, of agricultural embargoes. Our opponents and critics beat it like a tin drum to remind us that it was our party that did that.

I think it should be a matter of record that a strong bipartisan suggestion from Republican Senator JOHN ASHCROFT of Missouri, and Senator CHRIS DODD, a Democrat of Connecticut, that we stop food embargoes once and for all passed the Senate with 70 votes and then was defeated in that very same conference committee to which I referred. The bill we now have before us continues food embargoes. The sticking point apparently was that of the countries exempted from embargoes on food and medicine, specifically Cuba was to be excluded.

There are some Americans, many Cuban-Americans, who hate Castro with a passion for what he did to their country, their family, and their business, and believe we should punish him. He has been in power for over 40 years, and we imposed embargoes on his nation for food and medicine.

I have said on the floor and I will repeat again, in the 40 years I have seen photographs of Mr. Castro since we have embargoed exports of food to Cuba, I have never seen a photo of Mr. Castro where he appeared malnourished or hungry. The bottom line is, somehow he is pretty well fed. I bet he has access to good medicine. The people who are suffering are the poor people in Cuba and a lot of other countries. The people are suffering because we don't have the trade for American farmers. It is a policy that has not worked.

How did we open up eastern Europe? We opened it up by exposing the people who were living under communism to the real world of the West—free markets and democracy. They fled Moscow and that Soviet control as fast as they could. We have always thought we could isolate Cuba. I think exactly the opposite would end Castro's totalitarian rule—when the people in Cuba get an appetite for what is only 90 miles away in the United States, through trade, through expanded opportunities.

The Governor of the State of Illinois, George Ryan, a Republican Governor, has said he will take a trade mission to Cuba. I support him. I think the idea of opening up that kind of trade is the best way to quickly bring down any control which Castro still holds in that country.

When that amendment to end the embargo on food and medicine in six countries went to conference, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives stopped it in its tracks. After we had voted on a bipartisan basis on the Senate side to move it forward, they stopped it in its tracks.

That is a sad outcome not just for the poor people living in the countries affected but for the United States to still be using food as a weapon with these unilateral embargoes on food and medicine. Yes, in the case of Cuba and many other countries, it is a policy which does harm a lot of innocent people. In Cuba, it is very difficult to get the most basic medicines. Are we really bringing Castro down by not providing the medicines that an infant needs to survive? Is that what the U.S. foreign policy is all about? I hope not.

Senator ASHCROFT is right. Senator DODD is right. We have to revisit this. I am sorry this bill does not include that provision. It is one that I think is in the best interests of our foreign policy and our future.

I hope the President will sign this conference report quickly and work with Congress to submit a supplemental request, taking into account the devastating financial crisis that continues in rural America. To delay further action on this would be a great disservice to the men and women who have dedicated their lives to production agriculture, a sector of the economy in which I take great pride in my home State of Illinois, and I am sure we all do across the United States.

I am extremely disappointed that this conference agreement removed the Ashcroft amendment that would have allowed food and medicine to be exported to countries against which we have sanctions. This amendment passed the Senate overwhelmingly after language was worked out carefully and on a bipartisan basis. I am especially disturbed that, after the conference stalled on this issue, just a few decided to withdraw this provision behind closed doors.

The sticking point was the idea of selling food and medicine to the people of Cuba—not to Iran, Iraq, or Libya. Cuba remains a Communist country whose leaders repress their people and commit serious abuses of human and political rights. We all agree on the goal of peaceful change toward democracy and a free market economy in Cuba. But continuing the restrictions on sending food and medicine to Cuba is the wrong way to accomplish this goal.

The report issued 2 years ago by the American Association for World Health, Denial of Food and Medicine: The Impact of the U.S. Embargo on Health & Nutrition in Cuba concluded that “the U.S. embargo of Cuba has dramatically harmed the health and nutrition of large numbers of ordinary Cubans.” The report went on to say:

The declining availability of foodstuffs, medicines and such basic medical supplies as replacement parts for 30-year-old X-ray machines is taking a tragic toll. . . . The embargo has closed so many windows that in some instances Cuban physicians have found it impossible to obtain lifesaving machines from any source, under any circumstances. Patients have died.

I would like to read part of a letter I got from Bishop William D. Persell from the Diocese of Chicago who relates his experiences in visiting villages outside of Havana. He says:

I was especially struck by the impact of the American embargo on people's health. We saw huge boxes of expired pill samples in a hospital. Other than those, the shelves of the pharmacy were almost bare. We talked with patients waiting for surgeries who could not be operated upon because the X-ray machine from Germany had broken down. A woman at the Cathedral was choking from asthma for lack of an inhaler. At an AIDS center, plastic gloves had been washed and hung on a line to dry for re-use. The examples of people directly suffering from the impact of our government's policy after all these years was sad and embarrassing to see.

Many religious groups in the United States have called for the end of these restrictions, which the U.S. Catholic Conference, for example, has termed “morally unacceptable.” During Pope John Paul II's visit to Cuba last year, he noted that it is the poorest and most vulnerable that bear the brunt of these policies.

Hurting everyday people is not what this country is about. Such suffering attributed to our great nation is unconscionable. Even in Iraq, where stringent international sanctions have been imposed, there is an international

“oil for food” program, which aims to be sure the Iraqi people have adequate nutrition. That program has not always been as successful as I had hoped, but we have not even tried similar relief for the Cuban people.

The burdensome and complex licensing procedures that Americans have to go through to get food and medicine to Cuba essentially constitute a ban on such products because of the long delays and increased costs. I applaud and welcome the changes the Clinton administration made following Pope John Paul II's visit to streamline the licensing procedures for getting these products to Cuba, but I'm afraid these changes are not enough. Although agricultural and medical products eventually have been licensed to go to Cuba through this lengthy and cumbersome process, much of it has not been sent. The licensing procedure itself discourages many from even trying to use it.

I believe that the suffering of the Cuban people because of these restrictions on food and medicine is counterproductive to our shared goal of democratization in Cuba. Castro gets to blame the United States, and not his own failed Communist policies, for the suffering and hardships of the Cuban people. The policy encourages a “rally ‘round the flag’” mentality, where people who otherwise might oppose Castro's regime hunker down and support the government in such trying economic circumstances portrayed as the fault of the United States.

There seems to be a consensus developing that food and medicine should not be used as a weapon against governments with which we disagree. Congress has supported lifting such sanctions against India, Pakistan, and even Iran. The people of Cuba should be treated no differently.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi who has managed this Agriculture appropriations bill through the high winds and difficult seas over the last few weeks. Some of that was acknowledged this morning. We started out dealing with agriculture, and we have now been dealing with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and other important things. I am grateful for his patience, leadership, and diligence to get to this point.

This is a very important conference report we take up today. I rise to support the Agriculture appropriations conference report.

As has been noted on the floor of the Senate this morning that American agriculture is in trouble. Our American agricultural producers are struggling. I think it is worthy that we examine briefly what has caused this difficulty.

Good weather over the last 3 years has led to worldwide record grain yields, which has created a large oversupply and significantly reduced grain prices. Other important causes for

these difficult times facing our agricultural producers are: The 2-year Asian economic crisis which has spread throughout the world; the high value of the American dollar versus other currencies; export subsidies and unfair trade practices by our foreign competitors; the lack of meaningful trade and sanctions reform; the lack of real tax and regulatory reform; and, for the last 5 years, the lack of fast-track trade authority for the President. All of these and more are directly responsible for the current situation in American agriculture.

I might add, they have nothing to do with our current farm policy, which is known as Freedom to Farm. What I have just registered, what I have just cited—those unpredictables, those uncontrollables—would be here regardless of America's farm policy. It is important to point that out because I have heard some suggest it is America's Freedom to Farm policy that this Congress enacted and this President signed in 1996 that is at the root of this disastrous agricultural situation in which we find ourselves. In fact, it is not.

This \$69.3 billion bill will assist agricultural producers by providing, among other things, short-term assistance. It includes an \$8.7 billion emergency package, and it is important we work our way through this so the American people understand what is included in this package:

There is \$5.5 billion in agricultural market transition assistance payments that are paid directly to our agricultural producers, to the farmers and the ranchers. This equates to a 100-percent increase from the producers' 1999 payment and puts the money directly in the hands of our producers and certainly does it much faster than supplemental loan deficiency payments.

There is \$1.2 billion for disaster relief; \$475 million in direct payments to soybean and minor oilseed producers; \$325 million in livestock feeder assistance; \$325 million for livestock producers; \$200 million is in the form of assistance to producers due to drought or other natural disasters; \$400 million to assist producers in purchasing additional insurance for crops coming up that they will plant early next year for fiscal year 2000; and mandatory price reporting to assist livestock producers in their marketing decisions.

While the Agriculture appropriations conference report and emergency assistance package are important and they are very helpful in the short term, we need to look at the long-term solutions: How do we fix this for the long term so we don't keep coming back to Congress year after year after year for more supplemental appropriations? That is what we must stay focused on. We find those long-term solutions in opening up more opportunities for our farmers and our ranchers to sell the products.

Our producers need more open markets. While we need to adjust parts of

Freedom to Farm and we need to do that to make it work better, the basic underlying principle of Freedom to Farm should be preserved. And the basic underlying principle of Freedom to Farm is plant to the market, let the market decide.

In order to become more efficient and to produce for a growing market, we must give the producers the flexibility to grow what they want when they want: Grow for the market, not what the Government dictates or what the Government manipulates.

We need to adjust transition payments to make them more useful in times when cash flows are tight, when they are needed, not just arbitrary: Another supplemental appropriation. Payment levels may need to be adjusted annually, that is the way it is, to take into account such things as the value of the U.S. dollar, export opportunities, natural disasters, actual production levels, and other factors.

Loan deficiency payments have proven a useful tool for farmers, but we need to build into that more flexibility so producers can quickly respond to changes in the market.

The Crop Insurance Program is critical to the future of our ag producers. The Crop Insurance Program needs to be expanded and reformed so producers can be more self-reliant during economic downturns. We need to focus on private-sector solutions rather than public-sector solutions.

The United States needs a relevant and a vital trade policy that addresses the challenges of the 21st century. We need WTO accession for China, trade and sanctions reform, and more international food assistance programs. WTO negotiations also need to address unfair manipulation and other trade barriers that hurt America's farmers and ranchers. We are currently working our way through the beef hormone issue. The WTO has consistently come down in favor of the American producer, yet we still find the Europeans throw up artificial trade barriers. These are big issues, important issues. Trade must be a constant. It must be elevated to a priority in the next administration. The next President must put trade on the agenda, and he must lead toward accomplishment of that agenda.

As my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois, noted earlier, I, too, am disappointed this conference report does not contain the Ashcroft-Hagel-Dodd sanctions reform language, which passed this body, as noted by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, 70 to 28—70 votes in favor of lifting unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. I am confident we can move forward on this legislation. We will come back to it when it soon comes, again, to the Senate floor for consideration. The Ashcroft-Hagel-Dodd bill would exempt food and medicine from unilateral sanctions and embargoes. It is supported by the American Farm Bureau and the entire American agricultural community.

This reform also strengthens the ties among peoples and nations and demonstrates the goodness and the humanitarianism of the American people. It sends a very strong, clear message to our customers and our competitors around the world that our agricultural producers will be consistent and reliable suppliers of quality products. The American agricultural producer can compete with anyone in the world. Passing sanctions reform legislation will open up new markets, and it will allow our agricultural producers to compete in markets around the globe. I am hopeful we will move forward on comprehensive sanctions and trade reform legislation early next year. This must be a priority. It should be a priority. It is a priority, and it is a bipartisan priority.

As Senator DURBIN mentioned earlier, if you look at those 70 Senators who voted in favor of lifting sanctions on food and medicine, they represented the majority of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties in this body. That is a very clear message that this is a bipartisan issue. We should capture the essence of that bipartisan ship and let that lead us next year as we should, and we will, make considerable progress in trade and sanctions reform.

Regulations continue to add to the cost of production to farmers and ranchers. Regulatory reform is critical. We need to look at all the regulations currently on the books and make sure they are based on sound science and, lo and behold, common sense.

We need to look at tax reform. In 1996 when the Congress passed and the President signed Freedom to Farm, two promises were made by Congress to our agricultural producers: We would comprehensively deal with the important dynamics of tax reform and regulatory reform. We have failed to do so. We have failed to address comprehensive tax reform and regulatory reform, aside from what we have discussed, not dealing with sanctions and trade reform either. We need to look at tax reform. For example, farm and ranch risk management accounts, FARRM accounts, reduction in capital gains rates, elimination of estate taxes, income averaging, and other constructive actions are all measures that take us, move us, get us to where we want to be.

This conference report includes an important new provision we have not seen in past Agriculture appropriations bills, the mandatory price reporting provision. This is important for livestock producers. It allows for market transparency, it levels the playing field, and ensures fairness. We also need to look hard at other issues like industry concentration and meat labeling to ensure that markets remain free, fair, and competitive.

While we deal with short-term crises, we also need to work consistently, diligently on the long-term improvements focused on trade, and sanctions, and taxes, and regulatory reform, and agricultural policy.

This is important legislation we debate today and will vote on this afternoon. It provides much needed assistance at a very critical time in the agricultural community. I hope we will pass this conference report today and the President will sign it, so we can get our farmers and ranchers the assistance they need. Then this body can move on to do the important business of our Nation and the important business of our agricultural community, connected to the total of who we are, as a nation and as a global leader, and that is paying attention to the issues of trade and foreign policy, sanctions reform, and all that is connected to the future for our country and the world as we enter this next millennium.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I compliment and thank my good friend from Nebraska for his statement on this Agriculture conference report.

Nebraska is an agricultural State. As my colleague from Montana, the Presiding Officer, knows, Montana is also an agricultural State. I see on the floor the chairman, my good friend from Mississippi. Mississippi is also an agricultural State. Every State is an agricultural State—some more than others, of course.

But I must say about the statement the Senator made—in most respects I agree with him—it was a good one.

Essentially it comes down to this. A lot of farmers and ranchers are suffering very dire economic consequences because of low prices in the main but also because of bad weather, because of disaster, droughts, or in many cases floods. The hurricane, for example, that came up the east coast not too long ago has devastated a lot of eastern American farmers. Those States are not part of the farm program but, nevertheless, have heavy agricultural segments in their economy and have been damaged significantly. We have a conference report in front of us which provides about \$8.7 billion in emergency aid. Most of that goes to Midwest farmers, western farmers, and not enough goes to the northeastern farmers. That is regrettable.

There is not enough in this conference report that takes care of Eastern and Northeastern agriculture. There should be. I hope we can figure out a way to provide for those in agriculture in the Eastern and Northeastern parts of the United States because they are not sufficiently provided for in this bill.

Nevertheless, for most of America, this bill does help. It just helps. It does not do much more, but it helps relieve a lot of the pain that farmers—when I say farmers, I mean grain producers and livestock producers—are facing.

It is an old story. It has not changed. Agriculture is in a special situation; namely, it suffers the vagaries of weather; it suffers the vagaries of the market price. Most businesses today do

not have that to worry about. Most businesses today can control the prices they pay for their products. To some degree, they can control the prices for which they sell their products. There is a lot more stability in most other industries compared to agriculture.

Because of the instability in agriculture, again because farmers and ranchers have virtually no control over the price they get for their products and because the costs they pay for all of their supplies and implements keep rising—and they have virtually no say about that—agriculture is getting squeezed more and more each year. That is the problem, particularly when there is a natural disaster on top of it.

This Senate has not done a very good job in addressing this problem. There are a lot of fancy speeches about we have to do this and we have to do that. I have made some of them. All Senators in this Chamber at the present time have made some of them. I am not blaming us all, but I am giving us all a little bit of a reminder that we have not followed up our speeches enough with action. It is hard. It is very hard to know what the solutions should be, but we still have not found the solutions. We are elected to find the solutions. That is why we run for these jobs, and that is theoretically why people elect us. They think we are going to do something about some of the problems our people face.

Why haven't we done more? I submit in large part because this place is so partisan. It has become very partisan in the last several years. I am not going to stand here and blame one side or the other. I am going to say it is a fact. Because it is so partisan, there is very little trust, and because there is very little trust not much gets accomplished. There is not much trust between the majority party and the White House. When that happens, not much gets accomplished.

Our Founding Fathers set up a form of government of divided powers. We are not a parliamentary form of government. We are a divided government. We have the executive branch and the legislative branch, the two Houses of Congress, and people have to get along if we are to get something accomplished; people have to work together if we are going to get something accomplished.

Too often, people in the House and the Senate, and probably the executive branch as well, run to the newspapers, they run to the press back home and they make all these high-sounding statements to make themselves look good and the other side to look bad. They are trying to claim credit for doing the good things and basically saying the other guys are doing the bad things.

That is where we are. There is not a person listening to my remarks who does not disagree with that. That is exactly where we are.

The question is, How do we get out of this? How do we start to regain some

lost trust? How do we begin to regain, in some sense—some are going to dispute a little of this—those times in the older days when there was a little more cooperation? How are we going to do that?

Basically, it takes leadership. It takes leadership by Senators; it takes leadership by the leadership. It means standing above matters a little bit, standing back and getting a perspective, remembering why we are here, remembering what really counts. And what really counts is serving our people without a lot of fanfare rather than trying to make a lot of big fancy statements.

I am reminded of a former Senator from Montana, Mike Mansfield. Mike Mansfield, who was majority leader for 17 years—he was leader longer than any other Senator has ever been leader in this body—was the kind of person—and that is probably why he was leader for so long—who basically worked to get things done but did not crow about it and did not try to take a lot of credit for it. He was a guy who wanted to get things done to serve the people and to serve the right way, not play politics, not play partisan politics. In fact, there is a new book coming out about Mike Mansfield. If you page through it, you can get a sense of what he was about, and we can take a lesson from it.

I am going to list a couple of things I know we have to do in the hope that—knowing that most agree we have to do these things—we somehow get together and start doing something about them.

One is to get this conference report adopted. It is going to help. It is not going to solve all the problems, but it is going to help. As I mentioned, it does not do enough for the Northeastern United States or Eastern United States. I very much hope we can find the time and way to do that.

In addition, we do need to address the longer term; that is, some kind of a safety net. There has been a lot of debate—most of it has been ideological—over Freedom to Farm. It is basically an ideological debate. Most farmers and ranchers do not give two hoots about ideology. Most farmers and ranchers just want some basic program, structure, or something that addresses the bottom so there is some kind of a safety net.

We are not talking about a handout. Nobody is talking about a handout. We are not talking about some solution where farmers are given an absolute guarantee they are going to make money or absolute guarantee they are going to make a profit. But we know because of weather conditions—sometimes it rains too much, sometimes not enough, sometimes there are floods, sometimes droughts, sometimes the market falls to the bottom—we need a floor to basically prevent people from going out of business—not to make a profit but prevent them from going out of business because we know how important agriculture is to our country.

Let's get over the ideology of Freedom to Farm, the "freedom to fail." Those are nice sounding words. All of us have heard them hundreds of times. I say let's forget the words and figure out a way to design a safety net. It is not going to happen this year because there is not enough time. I ask us all, when we are home during the recess, to be thinking about this and thinking about a way to get a square peg in a square hole or a round peg in a round hole and find a solution. I guarantee, the best politics is really the best policy; that is, if we enact something that makes sense, then all the Republicans and all the Democrats can say: Yes, we did something good. And the people at home are going to be very happy for that. They care much more about that than who is blaming whom for not getting the job done.

I do not know why I have to say that. It is so obvious. I guess I say it because it is still not done.

We, obviously, have to address crop insurance. We want a Crop Insurance Program essentially so farmers and ranchers can make their own decisions and know how much they should be insured. We want a program that works and covers a lot more than the current program does.

As you well know, Mr. President, because you and I have spent a lot of time on these issues, we have to have a much better international trade regime. American farmers and ranchers are being taken to the cleaners. They are being taken to the cleaners compared with farmers and ranchers worldwide.

One example is this beef hormone matter. The Europeans for 12 years have said they are not going to take a single ounce of American beef. Why? Because they say our feed lots with growth hormones cause disease and people who eat American beef—Americans eat it all the time and other people do, too—has an adverse health effect on European consumers. It is a totally bogus issue, totally. Europeans know it; we know it. But for 12 years, they still have not taken any beef.

What do we do? We bring an action before the World Trade Organization. What happens? The World Trade Organization agrees. They sent it to an international scientific panel which concluded the Americans are right and the Europeans are wrong. They sent it to a second scientific panel. It came to the same conclusion. All the scientific panels came to the same conclusion. Europe still says no.

The WTO says that we have a right, as Americans, to impose tariffs on European products, on the value of the beef that is not going into Europe, so we do. Europeans say: Fine, we will just pay; we still won't import any beef. That is one of many examples where we are getting stiffed because there is not a way, there is not leverage, there is not a regime for us to stand up for what is right for American farmers.

And take the state trading enterprises, the Canadian Wheat Board, the Australian Wheat Board. We still have not solved that problem.

We will face a huge problem, too, in the coming years with respect to Europe. Europeans are getting on their high horse about genetically modified organisms. It is going to be a huge problem with Europe. To make matters even worse, Europe is starting to feel its oats. I think it is kind of upset with the United States because they see the United States as this big country. I think the war in Yugoslavia has exacerbated things a little bit because the European defense establishment did not provide the sophisticated materiel that was needed there. So now they want to build up their defense establishment. It is wrapped up in an awful lot of issues.

And it is OK for Americans to criticize the Europeans for their failure to be straight and have a level agricultural playing field. I might add, for example, their export subsidies are out of this world. European export subsidies are about 60 times American export subsidies for agriculture—60 times. Our EEP is about \$300 million, \$200 million—I do not think it is ever used—whereas their export subsidies are gargantuan.

Do you think Europeans, out of the goodness of their heart, are going to lower their export subsidies? No way. No way. We know that no country altruistically, out of the goodness of its heart, is going to lower their trade barriers. The only way to lower trade barriers is when there is a little leverage. So we have to find leverage in the usual way.

What I am saying is we have a huge challenge ahead of us; that is, to try to figure out—hopefully, in a noncombative way—how to deal with Europe. There are many issues with Europe, and they are just getting more and more complicated—whether it is Airbus or whether it is air pollution rules. They will not take our planes now because they say our airplanes pollute Europe. They are just huge issues. Basically, they are economic issues. And the economic issues are also very heavily agricultural.

We have to figure out a way. It takes leadership from the President. It takes some cool-mindedness in the House and the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, to try to figure out some way to crack this nut. It is going to be a very difficult nut to crack, but it has to be if it is going to help our farmers because right now our farmers are being taken advantage of by the Europeans—pure and simple. Nobody disputes that.

It is up to us to try to figure out a way to solve that one. I know that the more we criticize Europe, the more it makes us feel good, but it probably causes Europeans to dig their heels in a little more, and I do not know how much it will get the problem solved. We have to find leverage and some commonsense way to go about it and deal with this issue.

The leverage I suggest is the WTO “trigger,” as I call it, the export subsidy trigger. This legislation I have introduced essentially provides that if the Europeans do not reduce their agricultural subsidies by 50 percent in a couple years, then the United States is directed to spend EEP dollars in a like amount. If they do not eliminate them in another year, then the United States is directed to spend several billion dollars in EEP directed and targeted exactly at European producers, the European countries. So that is one bit of leverage.

I am also going to introduce legislation soon. It is agricultural surge legislation, to prevent farmers from suffering so much from import surges from other countries to the United States. We need action such as that and then to sit down calmly and coolly to talk with the Europeans, talk with the Chinese and the Japanese and the Canadians, to find a solution.

There are a lot of other things we need to do to help our farmers. Many have talked about the concentration of the beef packing industry, and they are right; there is way too much concentration of the beef packing industry, which is hurting our producers. There is labeling in this bill that helps.

There is one big omission. Seventy Senators voted to end the unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. The conferees disregarded the views of 70 Senators. They took that out. I do not know why. It does not make any sense why the conferees took that out of this conference report, particularly when 70 Senators, on a bipartisan basis, said, hey, we should not have unilateral sanctions on medicine and food; it should not be there. I wish they had not done that. Clearly, we have to find a way to get that passed.

I will stop here, Mr. President, because I see a lot of other Senators on the floor who wish to speak. But I strongly urge a heavy vote for this conference report and in a deeper sense—because obviously it is going to pass—calling upon us to back off from the partisanship. Let's start to think as men and women, as people. We are supposed to be educated. We are supposed to be smart. We are supposed to be leaders in a certain sense. Let's do it. Let's act as grownups, adults, problem solvers. That is all I am asking. It is not a lot. Over the recess, I hope we think a little bit about that, so when we come back next year, we can start to solve some problems.

#### COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on one other matter, although I told the Senator from Mississippi I would not address this subject, I am going to do so very briefly. That is the other matter before the Senate today, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.

This is a no-brainer. It is an absolute no-brainer. It makes no sense, no sense

whatsoever, for the Senate to disregard the views of the President of the United States to bring up the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty knowing it is going to fail. It makes no sense. It is irresponsible. It is tragic. I cannot believe the Senate will let that happen. I cannot believe it because of the obvious signal it is going to send around the world.

What is that signal? The signal is: The United States is abrogating its leadership. The United States is sticking its tail between its legs and running away. It is leaving the scene. It is not being a leader. I cannot believe the Senate will allow that treaty to come up knowing it is going to be a negative vote.

I do not know what planet I am on—Mars, Pluto, Jupiter—to think of what the Senate could possibly do today. It is outrageous.

While I am on that point, let me speak toward bipartisanship just briefly. It used to be when the President of the United States had a major foreign policy request of the Congress, politics would stop at the water's edge. Politics would stop because it would be such an important national issue, and the Congress—Republicans and Democrats—would work together on major foreign policy issues.

There is plenty of opportunity for politics in the United States. There is plenty of opportunity—too much. It is highly irresponsible for the Senate to stick its thumb in the eye of the President of the United States when the President of the United States requests that there not be a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, whatever his reasons might be, and say: We don't care what you think, Mr. President; we're going to vote anyway because we want to knock this thing down.

I just cannot believe it. It is just beyond belief.

I very much hope that later on today and in future days, Senators will think more calmly about this, exercise a little prudence, and do what Senators are elected to do; that is, be responsible and do what is right, not what is political.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture appropriations bill. I regret very much having to do this because I appreciate the fact that all across our country, farmers are in need of assistance. I recognize that it is important to try to get some of these programs out to them. But I am very frank to tell the Senate that I think the conference