

is a superstar, the Michael Jordan of women's athletics, led the attack. While she failed to score, she kept pressure on the Chinese for most all of the game. Michelle Akers, at 33 the oldest team member, a woman who suffers from Epstein-Barr, or chronic fatigue syndrome, played as if she would never be fatigued until the last minute of regulation play. She literally was carried off the field, succumbing to dehydration and exhaustion. She was certainly a stalwart of this team effort.

This team has captured America's heart. A crowd of over 90,000 people watched that game. Cumulative attendance for the U.S. team's 6 victories was 412,486, an average of almost 70,000 a game. The 90,000-plus that watched this game was the largest crowd to watch an athletic contest among women. This team, that averaged 70,000 people watching each of its contests, was a constant reminder that this event was seen as a bellwether for women's athletics in America. Could women's teams fill stadiums? Could they draw advertising and television viewers in a nonolympic event? The answer to each of those questions was a resounding yes.

While most of their success is a result of the hard work and dedication of each team member to the sport of soccer, their brilliant play on the field, and their personalities off the field, they were aided even more in the fact this came about as a result of title IX.

There are many heroes in bringing about title IX. We could name Molly Yard, who more than four decades ago started talking about why women deserve to be treated equally in athletics. We could talk about Senators Birch Bayh from Indiana and George McGovern of South Dakota who led the way in the Senate against sex discrimination in higher education programs.

But there is no need to talk about any one individual. The fact is that title IX makes a great case for American women.

I indicated that my youngest son is a good athlete. He really is a great athlete. But the fact of the matter is, he inherited his athleticism from his mother, not from his father. The fact is, his mother and I went to high school together.

The only thing that his mother, my wife, could do in high school was be a cheerleader. As athletic as she was, she could not do anything else because there was nothing else for her to do. She was not entitled to play any other athletics. Title IX says that is not the way it is to be.

Title IX has been an outstanding program. It has allowed women to build their character and athleticism just as men did for many decades. They are building their character, as seen in this team, this women's athletic team—the World Cup champions.

Women are now seen as sports stars in their own right, not through their sons but through themselves, from Mia Hamm in soccer to Sheryl Swoopes in

basketball, and as shown by the inspiring story of Dr. Dot Richardson, the captain of the American Olympic softball team, who left her triumph in Atlanta to go to medical school. That is what title IX is all about. And Dot Richardson exemplifies what has been accomplished on and off the field because of women's athletics.

Before the passage of title IX, athletic scholarships for college women were rare, no matter how great their talent. After winning two gold medals in the 1964 Olympics, swimmer Donna de Varona could not find a college anywhere in the United States that offered a swimming scholarship. She was one of the finest, if not the finest swimmer in the world at that time. She could not find one because it did not exist.

It took time and effort to improve the opportunities for young women. Two years after title IX was voted into law, an estimated 50,000 men were attending U.S. colleges and universities on athletic scholarships but only about 50 women.

In 1973, the University of Miami in Florida awarded the first athletic scholarships to women—a total of 15 in swimming, diving, tennis, and golf. Today, college women receive about a third of all the athletic scholarships that are given. That is good. It should be half. But a third is certainly a step in the right direction.

It is important to recognize that there is no mandate under title IX that requires a college to eliminate men's teams to achieve compliance.

The critical values learned, though, are that women are entitled to equality. Those things learned from sports participation—including teamwork, standards, leadership, discipline, self-sacrifice, and pride in accomplishment—are equally important for young women as they are for young men.

These women who have captured America's attention over the last 3 weeks are all children of title IX. They came to age athletically at a time when high schools and colleges were required by law—a law that we passed—to treat them fairly.

These women have set an excellent example for the thousands and thousands of young girls who have followed their World Cup play over the last 3 weeks.

I was listening to something on public radio this morning where they interviewed young girls who attended their celebrations yesterday. They were saying they wanted to be just like them. That is important.

So I congratulate all them and wish them continued success in the future.

I have a resolution that I would like to introduce later in the day. I certainly invite everyone to join with me. I would certainly be willing to take a back seat to the women of the Senate, as we do a lot of times around here, to allow them to be first in line to sponsor this resolution. So at a later time today, I would like to introduce this resolution and hope that it would clear

both sides of the aisle to give these women the recognition they deserve today, to congratulate the U.S. women's soccer team on winning the 1999 Women's World Cup championship.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator will yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I have come to the floor to speak on another issue, but I watched the entire soccer game on Saturday. It was exciting and wonderful. I also thought about the fact that it is an example of a regulation that works. Title IX says: Equal opportunity; you must provide equal opportunity in academics and athletics.

Before title IX, of course, there was not equal opportunity. I think Saturday's game was such a testament to the regulations and requirements from title IX that have improved athletics and academics in this country.

Mr. REID. I appreciate very much my friend from North Dakota commenting. I say to my friend from North Dakota, it is extremely interesting that young girls recognize that they do now have equal opportunity.

I was at a small school in rural Nevada and getting ready to speak to a group of students who were assembling. I was in a holding room waiting to speak, and there were two girls in the room with me. They were wearing their letter sweaters. One of them was a sprinter and one played softball.

I said: Do you know why you can participate in athletics?

They said: No. Why?

Because we passed a law saying if boys have a program in athletics, girls have to have something that is equal to the program the boys have.

They did not know that. They just thought girls had always participated in athletics. One of the girls said: I would just die without my athletics.

Title IX is a program that of which we should all be proud. It has really done a great deal to equalize athletics for boys and girls in America. That is the way it should be.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tony Blaylock, a fellow on my staff, be given floor privileges today.

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

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are now turning to a 4-week period here in the Senate in which we will work, prior to the August recess, on a range of issues—today beginning with the Patients' Bill of Rights, and then turning to appropriations bills and other matters.

I want to call to everyone's attention two issues that are of vital concern that I think ought to be and must be part of the Senate agenda. The first is an issue dealing with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is something that has been before the Senate now for some long while. Efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban treaty originated with President Eisenhower. It has been around a long time. This President, after long negotiations through many administrations, finally signed the treaty. It has now been sent to the Senate for ratification. But it has languished in the Senate for 658 days, during which time there has not been even a hearing on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I will put up a couple of charts to describe the circumstances with this treaty.

The rule in the Senate requires that the Senate should consider treaties as soon as possible after their submission.

In fact, the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 was considered by the Senate in 3 weeks; SALT I, 3 months; the ABM Treaty, 10 weeks; ABM Treaty Protocols, 14 months; START I, 11 months.

We have had the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before the Senate for 658 days with not even a hearing. I think that is a shame. This treaty ought to be part of this Senate's agenda. If we do not have a hearing and do not ratify this treaty by the end of September, we will have only a limited role when a conference is formed in October of the countries that have ratified this treaty to discuss its entry into force. It does not make any sense to me.

This country ought to lead on issues concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. One way to lead on those issues is to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It does not make any sense for the treaty to have been signed, negotiated and sent to this Senate, and then to have it languish for all of these days.

I would like to put up a chart which shows a concern that some of the critics have. They say: Well, gosh, with all this Chinese espionage, the last thing we want, is to do something with respect to a treaty on banning nuclear tests.

The Cox report on the Chinese espionage makes references to the CTBT. The report says it will be more difficult for the Chinese to develop advanced nuclear weapons if we have this treaty in place. If the People's Republic of China violated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by testing surreptitiously to further accelerate its nuclear development, we could detect it given the monitoring system imposed by the treaty. If the Chinese are signatories to the treaty and the Russians are signatories to the treaty—and they are waiting for us—and we can stop testing, the only conceivable way they could validate any kind of nuclear stockpile is through the use of ad-

vanced computers. The restrictions imposed by the CTBT make it extremely difficult or impossible to improve nuclear weapons designs except by high performance computers.

The Cox report appears to make the point that it is more important for us to restrict the shipment of advanced computers to the Chinese. The point is this—we deserve an opportunity to debate the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We should have done so long ago. I don't mean to argue the merits of it on the floor today.

My hope is, we will not go through July as if this treaty doesn't exist. It was negotiated, signed, and has been before the Senate over 600 days. There hasn't been one hearing. There ought to be a hearing. It ought to be brought to the floor so the American people can, through this Senate, debate that treaty.

Finally, support for the nuclear test ban: 75 percent, 74 percent, 85 percent, 80 percent, these are national polls over time, always consistently high support for this kind of a treaty. This Congress has a responsibility. I say to my colleagues who really don't want to do this: You have a responsibility to the country to do this. I hope that in the month of July we can make progress in passing this Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

MR. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a resolution to the desk.

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

THE FARM CRISIS

MR. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me turn to an additional issue I believe Congress and the President must consider in the month of July. It deals with the urgent farm crisis that exists in farm country across America.

If there was a massive earthquake, a series of tornadoes, fires, or floods across the Midwest, we would see Congress, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, virtually everyone involved through the Federal agencies responding immediately. The President would likely fly out and view it. Congress would send emergency help. Federal agents would be there en masse setting up offices to help.

Yet in farm country we have a crisis that is just as real, not as dangerous to human health or human life as a tornado or a flood, perhaps, but just as real and just as dramatic as natural disasters.

The chart here shows what has happened to the price of wheat since 1996. You can see what has happened to the price of wheat. We have mostly wheat farmers up in our part of the country. The price of wheat has collapsed like a lead weight. Ask yourself: If your income collapsed, if a Senator's income collapsed like that, do you think there would be howls of protest? Do you think that would be an emergency? How about the minimum wage, if it

went down like this? How about if the stock market looked like this? Do you think there would be a problem in this country? Of course, there would.

This is a huge problem in the farm belt. Family farmers are finding themselves on the precipice of going broke in record numbers. I had a call this morning from a family farmer who nearly choked up on the phone saying: I don't think my son and I can continue. We can't continue when prices have collapsed. We don't have the income to continue family farming.

For them it is a dream, a lifestyle, a way of life. It is not just a business.

This Congress, while prices have collapsed, largely is content to sort of meander around and talk as if it were theory. It is not theory. It is a crisis.

This chart shows what is happening across the farm belt. The red indicates the counties that have lost more than 10 percent of their population, 1980-1998. Take a look at the red. What does that show? The middle part of America is being depopulated, especially now with prices collapsing, people moving out and not in.

The question is, "What are we going to do about that?" Congress has a responsibility to do something about it and so does this President. This Congress passed the Freedom to Farm bill. The presumption of Freedom to Farm is, we will reduce support prices and you rely on the marketplace. If the marketplace has collapsed prices, there has to be a safety net. If you don't have a safety net, you won't have family farmers left.

Freedom to Farm hasn't worked, and this Congress needs to understand that and do something about it. The President also has a responsibility. He signed the Freedom to Farm bill. He complained a little about it when he signed it, but he signed it and said: We will make some improvements.

The Freedom to Farm bill hasn't worked. Our trade policies are bankrupt and not working. Concentration of agricultural industries means that farmers face monopolies in every direction. All of these combined together are conspiring to leave this country without family farmers in its future, and that will be, in my judgment, a massive failure for America.

In the month of July, in the coming 4 weeks, the President has a responsibility, in my judgment, to come to Congress with a bold approach in dealing with this issue. Congress has a responsibility to deal with it, as well, in a bold manner.

I know some in Congress say: We don't intend to do anything until the President sends us something. They didn't have that reticence about adding \$6 billion to the defense bill. When the emergency bill came up for defense, they said: We don't care what the President said. We think he should have \$6 billion more.

This is a joint responsibility. The Congress needs to act and the President needs to act. We need to do it together, and it needs to be done now.