

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Although opponents of the treaty argue support is limited to just Democrats or liberals, opinion polls point to a different conclusion. CTBT support spans the entire political spectrum. For example, among those who identify themselves as Republicans, 80 percent support the treaty and 79 percent of those who characterize themselves as "conservative Republicans" believe the Senate should ratify the CTBT. As far as geographic limitations, the polls show CTBT support knows no boundaries. From coast to coast and all points in between, the vast majority of Americans support this treaty. Let me provide the Senate with a few examples that back up this statement. In Tennessee, 78 percent support the treaty. In Kansas, 79 percent. In Washington, 82 percent. In Oregon, 83 percent. The story is similar in every other state in the Union.

With these facts as a backdrop, I think it is easy to understand why I and many others are confused that, in the two years since the President submitted the CTBT treaty, the Republicans have chosen to do nothing. CTBT is vigorously endorsed by our most senior military leaders, past and present. Senate Republicans are unmoved. Republican and Democratic Presidents since Eisenhower have strongly backed the CTBT. Yet, Senate Republicans choose to do nothing. Finally, over 80 percent of our constituents, from all parts of the political spectrum and all regions of the country, have asked us to ratify the CTBT. And the response of Senate Republicans? Not a hearing, not a vote. Nothing but silence and inaction.

I mentioned at the outset that I am also disappointed by the course Senate Republicans have pursued. The reason for my disappointment is that Senate Republicans have permitted a small number of members from within their ranks to manipulate Senate rules and procedures to prevent the Senate from acting on the CTBT. I recognize these few members are well within their rights as Senators to use the rules in this manner. Under Senate rules, a small group can thwart or delay action on even the most vital pieces of legislation. This has been proven time and again since the Senate's founding. In more recent times, we have seen the same handful of Senators on the far right of the political spectrum repeatedly resort to these tactics to prevent the Senate from acting expeditiously on arms control treaties.

However, in many of these previous instances, a number of Republicans eventually decided to call an end to the political gamesmanship of their more conservative colleagues. They decided that this nation's national interests superseded the political interests of a few Senators at the far end of the political spectrum. They decided that the

full Senate should be allowed to work its will on matters of national security. In short, they decided that politics stopped at the water's edge. I am disappointed that in this particular instance, two years have elapsed and I see no such movement within the Republican caucus. Two years is too long. I would hope we would soon see some leadership on the Republican side of the aisle to break the current impasse and allow the full Senate to act on the CTBT.

Finally, I also indicated I deeply regret the Senate's failure to act. While waiting for the United States Senate to ratify the CTBT, we have seen nearly 40 other nations do so. We have witnessed two additional countries test nuclear weapons while the intelligence community tells us several others continue developing such weapons. And in a few short weeks, we will observe the nations that have ratified the treaty convene a conference to discuss how to facilitate the treaty's entry into force—a conference that limits participation only to those nations that have ratified the treaty. If the United States is to play a leadership role on nuclear testing, convince others to forgo nuclear testing, and actively participate in efforts to implement the treaty, the United States Senate must exercise some leadership itself and give the CTBT a fair hearing and a vote. That effort must begin today.

RISK MANAGEMENT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we have all spent considerable time during the past few years analyzing the problems in agriculture and making predictions about the future. Some of these problems can be traced back to various sources such as an intrusive Federal Government, drought and instability in foreign markets. As markets closed due to the financial instability, the Asian economic crisis spread, supply increased and farmers had no place to sell overseas. As a result, commodity prices across the board have been well under costs of production. We have all heard from producers in our states, and the message we hear is that our farmers are needing help.

Before the August recess, the Senate passed a \$7.2 billion emergency spending package designed to help offset some of the losses in recent years. Those in the Senate who represent Ag states realize we cannot pass emergency spending bills every time the Ag economy takes a nose dive. This is not fiscally responsible and is not sound public policy. Our farmers deserve better and the representatives in the Congress must look for ways to ensure the people in rural America reap the benefits of the economic prosperity we are experiencing.

Over the August recess, I held many town hall meetings across the state of

Oklahoma. In one meeting in the small farming community of Boise City, I had an audience of six farmers. For over an hour, I was able to talk to the folks who had seen the face of agriculture go through substantial changes over the past 10 years. I was able to hear these farmers voice their concerns about what was working, what wasn't and what could be improved.

What really impressed me Mr. President, was the fact that these producers believed Freedom to Farm was the right thing to do for agriculture. They liked having the freedom to plant what they wanted, the freedom to experiment and try something new without government interference. One of the farmers, Mr. Ron Overstreet, decided to try a couple of new things. In an area we would not normally think of as dairy country or an area for growing grapes, Ron and some of his partners have opened a dairy operation, as well as starting a vineyard. As I heard during the meeting, "If I am not willing to experiment and try something new, I am in the wrong business." I was pleased these farmers did not want to turn their backs on Freedom to Farm but rather work to improve and refine some of the provisions of the program.

At the end of August, Congressman FRANK LUCAS, who represents all of Western Oklahoma, and I held an Agriculture Summit in which we invited individuals representing different commodity groups, Ag lending companies, farm & ranch organizations, as well as Ag economists to discuss solutions to the sustained downturn in the agriculture economy. Many saw several positive changes which could be made to Freedom to Farm, with very few advocating getting rid of the existing farm program. As several of the representatives at the Ag summit suggested, the Federal Government must be more aggressive in opening and competing in foreign markets. We must make opening and penetrating foreign markets a top priority of our Nation's Ag policy. Nearly 1/2 of all U.S. crops are grown for the export market. In 1996, farm exports reached nearly \$61 billion, with nearly 46% of that total going to Asian markets. Due to the economic turmoil, exports to Asia are now less than 39%. While economies in Asia are recovering, relief for our farmers cannot come soon enough. This Administration has been lax in its fundamental duty to aggressively pursue foreign markets for American farmers. To do this, we must change attitudes. When the U.S. uses food as a diplomatic weapon with presidential embargoes, it deprives farmers of the freedom to sell their products. These unilateral sanctions hurt only a small percentage of America's populations. Unfortunately, that group is our farmers. But a simple reform introduced by Senator ASHCROFT, myself and others would work to change this.

As part of the Agricultural appropriations for FY 2000, the Senate adopted the Food and Medicine for the World Act. Under this amendment, all current food and medicine embargoes would be re-evaluated by the Administration and Congress and future embargoes could be imposed only if Congress agrees in advance. It would also lift restrictions on farmers using U.S. Department of Agriculture credit guarantees to get their goods to foreign buyers, as well as requiring the President to obtain Congressional approval before the U.S. implements any trade sanctions on food and medicine. I think this is a positive step towards reforming our policies on sanctions.

With all that said Mr. President, I would like to address the reason I came down here today, which is to announce my support for and original cosponsorship of Senator ROBERTS' bill, The Risk Management for the 21st Century Act.

At the Ag Summit I held, one item many people thought could be improved was crop insurance. Witness after witness testified the current crop insurance program is inadequate and suffers from lack of affordability, inadequacy in multiple years of disaster, inequality in rating structure, and lack of sufficient specialty crop policies. I believe Joe Mayer, Vice-President of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, stated it best when he noted, "... the cost of insurance balanced against the guaranteed revenues do not make the purchase of crop insurance a sound business practice in many parts of the country." In the Ag summit, producers also had several suggestions of how to improve the current system. These reforms are very simple. First and foremost, there must be greater levels of coverage at affordable prices to all producers. Second, there must be expanded availability of revenue-based insurance products. Third, the program must address the needs of producers suffering multiple crop failures. Given the present state of agriculture, many within the Ag community believe reforming the crop insurance program is the best ways to provide immediate relief for farmers across the country.

Since the introduction of this bill, I have heard from producers and insurance agents across the state of Oklahoma who have been extremely pleased with the provisions of Senator ROBERTS' bill. I believe first and foremost one of the best provisions of this bill is the premium write-downs. Under this legislation, the current subsidy structure is inverted. By doing this we encourage participation at higher levels of coverage. By encouraging participation in the crop insurance program, we strengthen the safety net for America's farmers. While this is a very simple provision, I think this is one of the best provisions in the bill and one of the easiest ways to improve the current state of agriculture.

The Risk management for the 21st Century Act contains provisions which establishes an Average Production history credit program. This addresses the needs of those farmers who lack production histories because they are just beginning or have recently added land. A related provision which helps many of the farmers in Oklahoma is the multi-year disaster Average Production History adjustment for producers who have suffered a disaster during at least three of the preceding five years. This is especially important to our producers in the Southwest who have suffered through several years of drought conditions.

I am also pleased by the Noninsured Assistance program. Under this program, producers are allowed to plant different varieties of a crop and still be considered a single crop. As I heard from the farmers in Boise City, as well as the Ag summit, this is what they wanted—greater freedom and the opportunity to try new things. I am also pleased by the provisions dealing with restructuring the Board of Directors for the Federal Crop Insurance Commission. It is my hope we can fill this Board with producers who are farming on a daily basis and know the crop insurance system.

Mr. President, Danny Geis, President of the Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association, noted at the Ag summit, "Policy set forth from now to the end of the current farm bill must culminate in the development of a program that will provide a realistically solid financial floor that will insure stability, and will encourage the opportunistic free enterprise system that makes U.S. agriculture strong." I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Risk Management for the 21st Century Act as I believe it helps achieve this important goal. It helps producers obtain better coverage at a lower cost, creates a flexible policy that better meets their needs, and it encourages development of policies that ensure against market losses. This plan strengthens the farm safety net by improving farm and risk management by providing a good step for long-term policy improvements for producers. By making the permanent improvements to crop insurance, we will ensure that farmers and ranchers will have powerful management tools for years to come. Once again, Senator ROBERTS is providing a tremendous voice for farmers across the country and I look forward to working with him to ensure passage of this important legislation.

THE CLOSURE OF NSWC-ANNAPOLIS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I want to speak about the end of an era for the David Taylor Research Center, and the beginning of a promising future for this facility and many

of its workers. On September 25, 1999, the Navy will formally close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division's Annapolis Site, more commonly known as the David Taylor Research Center (DTRC). While the Navy marks the occasion of its departure from this successful and accomplished lab, we must not dwell solely on its past. On this occasion we should also recognize the help and cooperation of Anne Arundel County, the Navy, and relevant businesses in developing a reuse strategy that will enable the lab to continue conducting important maritime research into the 21st century.

The Navy has a right to be very proud of the legacy of this lab. I want to touch on a few of its most important contributions throughout our maritime history. From its inception in 1903 by Rear Admiral George Melville, it has served a crucial role in the development of our modern Navy.

First established as the US Naval Engineering Experiment Station (EES), it served to fill the need for the testing of Naval equipment and the development of Fleet standards for Naval machinery. During WWI, the EES assisted the Navy with the procurement of naval machinery, crafting guidelines for optimum fuel usage, developing metal corrosion deterrents, and pioneering the first use of sonar. Before its expansion during WWII, the lab's research on sound led to the development of the first sonic depth and range finders.

In 1941, Dr. Robert Goddard established a Bureau of Aeronautics at the facility which led to the expansion of five additional Naval Laboratories on the site during WWII. The newly expanded Annapolis lab served to make many critical contributions to WWII Naval Fleet development, ranging from high capacity water stills for submarine use to improvements in Marine Corps landing craft.

By 1963, the facility had evolved into one of the Navy's premiere research and development centers, and was renamed the U.S. Marine Engineering Laboratory. During the Vietnam war, the lab provided support to our forces from 1966 until the end of the war. During that time, its projects included boat quieting systems, engine cooling, bunker busting, aluminum boat corrosion abatement, and the development of ferro-cement boats.

During the late 1970s, the work of the Annapolis lab was concentrated into two technical departments, Propulsion and Auxiliary Systems, and Materials Engineering. The lab's contributions to today's Navy range from cutting edge superconducting electrical machinery to patented approaches to isolating and silencing machinery on every submarine class.

In addition to these and other truly remarkable accomplishments, the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division's Annapolis Site