

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

#### NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in a while—though it is not clear when—it is my understanding that Congressman OBEY from Wisconsin—and I see Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin on the floor right now—is in the House with any number of different motions to adjourn before this conference report is acted upon.

We will eventually get this huge omnibus conference report. Those of us from the midwest dairy States are indignant about what has been done. It goes beyond dairy. Later on, believe me, we are going to have plenty of time to talk about dairy farmers. We are going to talk about what it means to dairy farmers, what it means to our States, and what it means to the country when, in a conference committee, provisions that extend the Northeast Dairy Compact and also block what Secretary Glickman was trying to do with the milk marketing order reform are put into the overall bill.

What I want to focus on is the process. To focus on the process, one might say, is a little bit too inside Washington politics, but I do not think so because actually, I say to my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, this is, in a way, what makes people most distrustful of what we do.

By the way, I am not going to argue that everything we do should be looked upon with suspicion by citizens. I am not going to engage in an across-the-board indiscriminate bashing of the whole political process. But I will say, if people do not believe in the process, they do not believe in the product.

Again, what has happened, in all due respect to the negotiators, is by not getting the work done on these appropriations bills and by putting all of this into an omnibus bill, we have had a few people negotiating. If the majority party in a conference committee wants to roll the minority party, they can do so. That is what they have done in the House by basically putting in this provision that extends the Northeast Dairy Compact and blocks the milk marketing order reform.

We had a vote on this in the Senate. We voted against extending the dairy compact. It was a square and fair debate and vote. Then, in a conference committee, completely unrelated to the appropriations bills, completely unrelated to what the scope of the conference committee was supposed to be, these provisions were put back in the bill in the dark of night. House Majority Leader ARMEY announced they had done it, and Senate Majority Leader LOTT announced the provision was in. There was never debate and discussion. They tucked into the conference report this huge monstrosity of a bill that hardly any of us have had a chance to read yet, which will be coming over here sometime.

I come to the floor to say to Congressman OBEY in the House: I applaud your efforts. What we have is raw politics—just get this through. That is what they have done with this Northeast Dairy Compact. They could not do it on the floor of the Senate. They stuck it in a conference report. They did it in the dead of night. They did it outside any public scrutiny. And now they present it to us in a conference report as a fait accompli. They set up a continuing resolution that goes into next week.

They figure out ways of jamming people, and it is unclear as to what leverage we have left. But, as Congressman OBEY is doing in the House, I am sure those of us who are from Wisconsin and Minnesota in the Senate intend to speak out. We intend to be very clear about what has happened, and we will do all we can as Senators. We will go from there.

I say to my colleagues that almost as much as the final product, I came to the floor of the Senate to strongly dissent from the way it was done.

I understand the rules. I understand what it is all about when people have figured out a way to roll Senators. I think that is what the majority leader, the Senate majority leader, and House Majority Leader ARMEY have done. I think that is what the Republicans have done in this conference committee. There is no question about it.

But I want people in Minnesota to know that we will continue to speak out about this, even as we see less and less opportunities for our leverage. We will fight in whatever way we can. We will certainly not be silent about this.

When this bill comes over, I would think, I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, we can probably expect a considerable amount of discussion about not only the impact on dairy farmers and what it is going to mean for a lot of people who are going to go under who are already struggling enough, but I think also, I say to Senator FEINGOLD, who has been such a reformer, the way it has been done, the whole process, which I think is profoundly antidemocratic, with a small "d"—not up-or-down votes, late at night, tucked into a report; by whom, when, how, not at all clear, and then design rules in such a way you can just roll it through—we will certainly be speaking out loudly and clearly about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### A PRODUCTIVE SESSION AND ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while presiding and listening to some of my distinguished colleagues talking about the lack of productivity of this session of the legislature, there are a few things that were very productive and that we can be very proud of when we go home and say we were able to get certain things done.

Before doing that, though, and to ensure I get one point out before using up the time that is allotted, the distinguished Senator from Illinois named a number of issues that he thought were somewhat disgraceful—for example, the fact that we do not have more gun control legislation.

Maybe because of my roots back in Oklahoma, I find it very difficult to understand this mentality, that somehow guns are the culprit as opposed to the people, and somehow that honest, law-abiding Americans should have to be disarmed, should have to give up their guns, while the criminal element would not be giving up their guns.

Time and time again, every survey that has been done, every study that has taken place, has come to the conclusion that the problems that we have are of a criminal element. There are people out there who are not getting adequately punished, and they will continue to have firearms.

I will just make one statement. It seems incredibly naive to me anyone could believe that if we pass a law that makes it illegal for all citizens to own guns, somehow the criminal element, who by their very definition and nature, are criminals, will comply with the law.

Also, it seems very frustrating to me that we have a President of the United States who wants to have all kinds of legislation to take away guns from law-abiding citizens and at the same time turns 16 terrorists loose on the streets of America; that we have a President of the United States who will make speeches—as this President made some 133 times, including in two State of the Union Messages—that now, for the first time in contemporary history, the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not one—I repeat, not one—missile aimed at American children tonight. When he made that statement, he knew full well that in at least one country, China, there were a minimum of at least 13 American cities that were targeted at that very moment. So we are living in a very dangerous world.

I listened to the concerns that we have on the nuclear test ban treaty. As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I would like to kind of lead into that to at least explain to thinking people that we did the right thing by not unilaterally disarming with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which is not verifiable.

First of all, I can say—and I do not think anyone can challenge this statement—we are now in the most threatened position that we have been in, in the history of America. By that, I mean for things that have happened in the last 7 years in three broad categories.

First of all, we have a President of the United States who, through his veto messages, starting in 1993 in vetoing the defense authorization bills, and then succeeding bills since that

time, has done so, so that we would have to cut down the size of our military, so that we now have ended up having a force strength of one-half of what we had in 1991 and 1992 during the Persian Gulf war.

It is not a matter of the President vetoing defense authorization bills and taking money out of our defense system to put into his favorite domestic social programs, but at the same time he has deployed our troops to places all over the Earth where we have no national security interests. So now we have troops in Bosnia.

I remember in December of 1995, when we were on the floor trying to pass a resolution of disapproval, to stop the President from sending our rare military assets to places such as Bosnia. We lost it by three votes. The President said: Let me do this. If we defeat this resolution, and if we get to send troops into Bosnia, I promise they will be home for Christmas 1996. Here we are. We are getting close to Christmas 1999 and the troops are still not home. There is no end in sight.

We have the same thing in Kosovo. We have had serious problems. I have gone over to Kosovo, I am sure, more than any other Member has, only to find out this is a war that has been going on for 600 years, a war where the two sides alternate in who is the good guy and who is the bad guy. Ethnic cleansing has taken place historically for 600 years on both sides; both on the Serbian side and the Albanian side.

So it was a horrible awakening I had when I was over there, right after we went in there with cruise missiles, where we had refugees in different places such as Tirana, Albania. I can remember walking through the refugee camp. The people were well cared for. They were doing quite well. But then they looked at me and said: When are you and America going to do something about our problem?

I said: What is your problem?

They said: Well, we're refugees.

I said: Why should we in the United States be as concerned about that as other countries?

They said: Because it is because of you that we are refugees. It is because the ethnic cleansing was not accelerated until the time that the bombs started being dropped on that town.

So we now have a weakened defense system because we have starved it into a degree of weakness. Yet we are living in a time when virtually every country has weapons of mass destruction.

And now we find out that in conventional warfare we are not superior anymore. Wake up America. We are not superior anymore. We found out the other day that two of our Army divisions are ranked as C-4, which means they are not capable of combat. And what are these divisions? These divisions are the 10th Army Mountain Division in Bosnia and the 1st Infantry Division in Kosovo.

It is not the fault of our troops. They are put in places and they no longer

have combat training, so they are not capable of combat without coming out of there and training for at least 6 months.

So if we are down to 10 Army divisions because of this President, and 2 of them are rendered incapable of combat, that is 8 Army divisions. We had 19 during the Persian Gulf war. So that is what has happened to our military.

Just the other day I was very proud of Gen. John Jumper, who had the courage to stand up and say publicly that we are no longer superior in air-to-air and air-to-ground combat. Our strategic fighters are not superior to those others on the market. He stated the SU-35, as made by the Russians, is on the market right now, the open market. It is for sale. Anyone can buy it—Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, anybody else—and it is better than anything we have, including the F-15 and the F-16.

We have to face up to this. It is a threat from the conventional side as well as from missiles.

I will make one comment about the missiles. Again, we hang this on President Clinton. In that same veto message in 1993, President Clinton said: I'm vetoing this bill. And I'm vetoing it because it has money in it for a national missile defense system, which we do not need because there is no threat out there. Yet we knew from our intelligence that the threat would be there and imminent by fiscal year 1998. And sure enough, it was.

So here we are with the combination of all these countries out there that have every kind of weapon of mass destruction: Biological, chemical, or nuclear. Yet we have countries such as China and Russia and now North Korea that have the capability of delivering those warheads to anywhere in America right now, when we are in Washington, DC. They could fire one from North Korea that would take 35 minutes to get here. There is not one thing in our arsenal to knock it down because this President vetoed our national missile defense effort.

Now the American people have awakened to this, and we have enough Democrats who are supporting Republicans to rebuild our system and to try to get a national missile defense system deployed. Unfortunately, it couldn't happen for another 2 years, maybe 2½ to 3 years.

That gets around to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty about which my distinguished colleague from Illinois was talking. I think probably the best thing that could have happened to us for our national security was to defeat that. If we don't have a national missile defense system, then what do we have to deter other countries from launching missiles at the United States?

What we have is a nuclear stockpile. We have nine weapons in the nuclear stockpile. Because of the President's moratorium, they haven't been tested for 7 years. We don't know whether or not they work. I suggest it might be

better not even to have nuclear weapons than to have weapons but not know whether they work. That is exactly what we have right now. If we had passed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, there would be no verification, there would be no way in the world we would have known whether or not our stockpile was working because they hadn't been tested.

I can remember quote after quote after quote by the people who were so much involved in this from our energy labs. They all said—I had the quotes; I don't have them in front of me right now—that if we can't test these nuclear weapons, there is no way we can determine whether or not they work. It is a very unsafe thing for America. These were the directors of the labs responsible for this nuclear arsenal.

So of the nine weapons we have, which I have listed here, we only have one we have adequately tested enough to know whether or not it would work. That is the W-84 warhead that we know would work.

This would have been a real disaster for America. People kept saying President Eisenhower was for a comprehensive test ban treaty, that President Bush was, that President Reagan was. That isn't true at all. This flawed treaty was a zero-yield treaty. We would only have had the word of our adversaries that they would not test their nuclear arsenals.

We keep our word in America; we don't test our arsenal. But we don't have any idea whether or not they are going to test theirs. In fact, during the course of the debate, both China and Russia said they would not comply with the zero yield. There is no way in the world we can detect that, that we would know what our adversaries were doing. That would, for all practical purposes, be unilateral disarmament.

I am asked back in Oklahoma by people who have good street sense, why is it the liberals in Congress are so committed to disarming our country, to taking our money that we are supposed to have to defend America and putting it into these various discretionary social programs? I have to explain to them that the people in Washington, and some of the Senators in this Chamber, are not like the people of Oklahoma. I think President Clinton honestly believes that if we all stand in a circle and hold hands and we unilaterally disarm, everyone will love each other and it won't be necessary to have a defense system.

That is what we are up against. In a very respectful way, I have to disagree with many of the things my distinguished colleague from Illinois stated.

I think we have had a very successful session. We have ensured a sound Social Security retirement system. We have improved educational opportunities for our children. Along this line, the major disagreement we had was that the Democrats thought the decisions should be made here in Washington; Republicans want to use the

same amount of money but not make the decisions in Washington but send that money to the school districts. The school board in Tulsa, OK, is much better equipped to know what their education needs are in Oklahoma than we are in this August body of the Senate. The Democrats say the answer is not school buses, not computers, not the physical facilities that are available; it is 100,000 teachers. I think the more we can send these decisions back to the local level, the better the people of America will be served.

I believe we have had a good session. I am not pleased with the way it is turning out right now. The old saying we have heard so many times in the past that there are two things you never want to watch while they are being made—one is sausage and the other is laws—becomes very true during the last few days of legislative sessions.

I think we have done a very good job. I think we did the right thing in defeating the unverifiable test ban treaty. I think we have passed legislation of which America will be very proud. I am anxious to end all this fun we are having and go home and tell the people in Oklahoma about it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended to the hour of 2 p.m. and that the time be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the next quorum call the time be divided for each side equally.

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

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions recently to talk about the issue of prescription drugs for the elderly.

I think there is a particularly relevant point to make this afternoon given the very extensive press coverage we have seen on this issue in recent days.

Over the weekend, David Rosenbaum in the New York Times had an excellent article on the issue. In the last couple of days, Time magazine had another very lengthy piece on the question of prescription drugs for seniors. And both of these articles ultimately make the point that Congress probably is not going to be able to agree on legislation during this session. The authors offer considerable skepticism about the ability of Congress to come together on a very difficult issue. Both of them, to some extent, go off into what I think are secondary questions—the questions of the role of the Internet, and the question of patents on drugs. Those are important matters.

But what is central and what the Congress needs to do on a bipartisan basis is pass legislation that would make it possible for frail and vulnerable older people to get insurance coverage that would provide for their medicine.

For example, if you are an elderly widow who is 78, maybe having early signs of Alzheimer's, and you spend more than half of your combined monthly income of Social Security and pension on prescription medicine—those are the kinds of letters that seniors are sending to me—it is not going to help you a whole lot to get a 10- or 15-percent discount because you shop over the Internet. Certainly, the role of the Internet in prescription drugs is going to be important. There will be a lot of issues. But to provide relief for the Nation's older people, what Congress needs to do on a bipartisan basis is pass legislation that provides insurance coverage making it possible for older people to pay these big bills. Patent issues and the question of the Internet are matters that are important, but what is needed is legislation that provides real relief.

Part of the effort to win bipartisan support for prescription drug legislation is coming to this floor and, as the poster says, urging seniors to send in copies of their prescription drug bills. Send them to each of us here in the Senate in Washington, DC.

I intend to keep coming to the floor of the Senate and actually reading from these letters. I have three today that I think tell an important story.

One is from a senior citizen in Medford, OR, in my home State. Another is from a senior citizen from Grants Pass, OR, and a third is from a senior citizen in O'Brien, OR, all of which reflect the kind of concerns I know are out there. Hopefully, as seniors learn about our campaign and see that we are urging them to send us copies of their prescription drug bills, it can help bring about bipartisan support for legislation in the Senate.

I am very proud that I have been able to team up in recent months with Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE on bipartisan legislation. I have been of the view that nothing more can happen in Washington, DC, unless it is bipartisan. The Snowe-Wyden legislation is a bill that uses marketplace forces and unleashes the forces of the private sector in an effort to make medicine more affordable for the Nation's older people.

What is sad is that our elderly are in effect hit by a double whammy. Millions of them can't afford their prescriptions. Medicare doesn't cover medicine. It hasn't since the program began in 1965.

On top of the fact that seniors don't have Medicare coverage, when they walk into a pharmacy—I see our friend from New Hampshire, our colleague who has a great interest in health care. As he knows, when a senior walks into a drugstore in New Hampshire, Oregon, or Kentucky, and can't pay for their prescription medicine, in addition they are subsidizing the big buyers of prescription drugs. The HMOs and the health care plans are in a position to negotiate a discount. They get a break on their prices. The seniors, people who are spending half their monthly income on prescriptions, are, in effect, subsidizing those big buyers.

The bipartisan Snowe-Wyden legislation, fortunately, has been able to generate a lot of interest in the Senate. Senator SNOWE and I are proud to have the support.

For example, more than 54 Members of the Senate—more than half the Senate—are now on record saying they would support a tobacco tax to pay for prescription drug benefits for older people. That strikes me as appropriate.

Medicare spent more than \$12 billion last year picking up the costs of tobacco-related illnesses, and more than 50 Members of the Senate are now on record as saying they would be willing to support additional funding to help the vulnerable seniors from whom we are hearing.

Let me read a little bit from some of these letters because I think they sum it up. One I received in the last couple of days from Grants Pass says:

No way can I afford to pay for my medicine. I did get a refill on Pepcid.

That is an important medication this elderly woman is taking now in Grants Pass, OR.