going under and yet the packers are in hog heaven. Everywhere the farmers look, they have a few large firms, whether it be dairy, whether it be livestock producers, whether it be grain farmers, a few large firms that dominate well over 50 percent of the market. What the farmers were calling for was strong antitrust action.

Joel Klein was honest. He said: I wouldn't be here if I didn't take this seriously, and you will have to judge me by my deeds. I so appreciated his coming out. There was a lot of pressure on Mike Dunn and USDA and Secretary Glickman to do more by way of antitrust action.

It was much appreciated. But I say, Mr. President, that the farmers, with considerable justification, want to put some free enterprise back into the food industry. Farmers, with considerable justification, see a direct correlation between monopoly power and a few large, giant firms that are making record profits while they go under. They want to see antitrust action. All they are asking for is a competitive market. By golly, government ought to be on their side. We ought to be seeing stronger antitrust action.

The other thing I have to say—we have one bill, S. 19, on which Senator DASCHLE is taking the lead, which talks about full public disclosure of pricing, which is so important to livestock producers—we ought to know what these packers are paying our livestock producers; we ought to have public disclosure on pricing. In addition, we ought to deal with the monopoly power and have some antitrust action taken so farmers have a chance to compete.

I have to say to colleagues, yes, it is crop insurance reform that we are talking about. But the other thing we are going to have to do is revisit this Freedom to Farm, which I have always called the ''freedom to fail'' bill. I don't even want to point the finger. We can talk about what works with Freedom to Farm, but it seems to me that here the evidence is crystal clear that one thing has happened for sure—there is absolutely no stability anymore when it comes to farm income. And while the large conglomerates with huge amounts of capital can weather these mad fluctuations in price, our family farmers can't. They aren't getting anywhere near the cost of production. We have to focus on how we can get the price up and have some farm income for family farmers, and how we can take on some of these conglomerates so family farmers have a fair shake by way of getting a decent price.

As a Senator from the Midwest where we still have a family farm structure in agriculture that we are trying to hold on to, it is so important for our rural communities, so important for family farmers, so important for safe, affordable food for consumers, so important for the environment. This is a historic struggle.

I hope Senators from the farm states will be coming to the floor every day to speak out about this until we have some strong action that will be on behalf of family farmers. They need the support. They deserve the support. And the Senate and the Congress ought to be taking action.

I yield the floor. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

THE FISHERMEN'S BANKRUPTCY PROTECTION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, recently I introduced S. 684, the Fishermen's Bankruptcy Protection Act, a bill to provide family fishermen with the same protections and terms as those granted family farmers under Chapter 12 of our bankruptcy laws. I would like to take this opportunity to explain this legislation to my colleagues in anticipation of the Senate's upcoming debate on bankruptcy legislation.

Like many Americans, I'm appalled by those who live beyond their means, and use the bankruptcy code as a tool to cure their self-induced financial ills. I have supported and will continue to support reasonable reforms to the bankruptcy code that ensure the responsible use of its provisions. All consumers bear the burden of irresponsible debtors who abuse the system. Therefore, I believe bankruptcy should remain a tool of last resort for those in severe financial distress.

As those familiar with the bankruptcy code know, however, business reorganization in bankruptcy is a different creature than the forgiveness of debt traditionally associated with bankruptcy. Reorganization embodies the hope that by providing a business some relief, and allowing debt to be adjusted, the business will have an opportunity to get back on sound financial footing and thrive. In that vein, Chapter 12 was added to the bankruptcy code in 1986 by the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, to provide for bankruptcy reorganization of the family farm and to give family farmers a fighting chance to reorganize their debts and keep their land.

To provide the fighting chance envisioned by the authors of Chapter 12, Congress provided a distinctive set of rules to govern effective reorganization of the family farm. In essence, Chapter 12 was a recognition of the unique situation of family-owned businesses and the enormous value of the family farmer to the American economy and to our cultural heritage.

Chapter 12 was modeled on bankruptcy Chapter 13 which governs the reorganization of individual debt. However, to address the unique problems encountered by farmers, Chapter 12 provided for significant advantages over the standard Chapter 13 filer. These advantages include a longer period of time to file a plan for relief, greater flexibility for the debtor to modify the debts secured by their assets, and the alteration of the statutory time limit to repay secured debts. The Chapter 12 debtor is also given the freedom to sell off parts of his or her property as part of a reorganization plan.

Unlike Chapter 13 which applies solely to individuals, Chapter 12 can apply to individuals, partnerships or corporations which fall under a $1.5 million debt threshold—a recognition of the common use of incorporation even among small family-held farms.

Chapter 12 has been an enormous success in the farm community. According to a recent University of Iowa study, 74 percent of family farmers who filed Chapter 12 bankruptcy are still farming, and 61 percent of farmers who went through Chapter 12 believe the law was helpful in getting them back on their feet.

Recognizing its effectiveness, my bill proposes that Chapter 12 should be made a permanent part of the bankruptcy code, and equally important, my legislation would extend Chapter 12's protections to family fishermen.

In my own state of Maine, fishing is a vital part of our economy and our way of life. The commercial fishing industry is made up of proud and fiercely independent individuals whose goal is simply to preserve their business, family income, and community. My legislation would afford fishermen the same protection of business reorganization as is provided to family farmers.

There are many similarities between the family farmer and the family fisherman. Like the family farmer, the fisherman should not only be valued as a businessman, but also for his or her contributions to our way of life and our economy. Like farmers, fishermen face perennial threats from nature and the elements, as well as laws and regulations which unfortunately threaten their existence. Like family farmers, fishermen are not seeking special treatment or a hand-out from the federal government, they seek only the fighting chance to remain afloat so that they can continue in their way of life.

Although fishermen do not seek any special treatment from the government, they play a special role in seafaring communities on our coasts, and they deserve protections granted others who face similar, often unavoidable, problems. Fishermen should not

be denied the bankruptcy protections accorded to farmers solely because they harvest the sea and not the land.

I have proposed not only to make Chapter 12 a permanent part of the bankruptcy code, but also to apply its provisions to the family fisherman. The bill I have proposed mirrors Chapter 12 with very few exceptions. Its protections are restricted to those fishermen with regular income who have total debt less than $1.5 million, the bulk of which, eighty percent, must stem from commercial fishing. Moreover, families must rely on fishing income for these provisions to apply.

These same protections and flexibility we grant to farmers should also be granted to the family fisherman. By making this modest but important change to the bankruptcy laws, we will express our respect for the business of fishing, and our shared wish that this unique way of life—that embodies the state of Maine—should continue.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, acting as a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

KOSOVO POLICY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to speak to a resolution that has been introduced this morning regarding Congress taking an action about our troops in Kosovo and the whole escalation of the operation in Kosovo. The text of the resolution is that we would give the President all of the authority to use whatever force, take whatever steps he sees as necessary.

I certainly think we should have a debate on this whole issue of Kosovo. I think it is certainly something that Congress is going to need to weigh in on. But I think it would be vastly premature to take an action before the President has laid out a plan. The President has not asked us for ''all force.'' The President has not asked us, actually, for anything except funding on an emergency basis to make sure we have the ability to fund the operation that is going on in Yugoslavia without taking away from other national security interests. I am going to support the President in that request. The last thing I want to do is have our troops in harm's way, along with our allies', and run out of money or run out of equipment or have any of our national defense personnel anywhere else in the world be shortchanged. We are not going to let that happen.

When the President gives us the specificity that is required for the appropriation, I think there will be a resounding vote in Congress to give our troops and our military the leeway they need to spend the money to have the equipment they need to do this job. But I cannot imagine having a carte blanche given to an operation that clearly is escalating a mission and we have not seen a plan. We have not seen a plan. We have not seen a timetable. We have not seen a cost estimate for the long term. So I hope we will take a step back here, and rather than voting on the resolution that was put forward today we would be talking among ourselves, that we will be debating at whatever point is the right one, and that we would be having op-eds in newspapers, which I think certainly have added to the body of opinion on this issue. But Congress should not micromanage this war. The President should come to us and say what he needs, what he is going to do with the money, what kind of plan we have, what kind of troop commitment are we talking about, what is it going to do to the rest of our national defense operation. We need to have a full plan.

One of the things that has concerned so many of us is that perhaps we started an operation before we had a contingency plan. Perhaps we started the operation before we knew what we would need for the long term, before we knew the goal. I think the mission has actually changed several times.

We obviously have had a different result from this operation than we had hoped. There is no question about that. Whether this is a success is yet to be determined, and I do not think we should be jumping in, saying it has not been a success. But I think it is time for us to let the President take the lead, to let him come to us with his requests. He is the one who is supposed to be executing this operation. I do think it would be a mistake for Congress to put the cart before the horse. I do not think we should micromanage. I do not think we should tell the President what to do. I do not think we should put our opinions on top of his. And most certainly, when I hear our NATO allies saying they would not consider ground troops, the last thing I think we should do is encourage ground troops. I think the case has not been made, the base has not been laid, and our allies are not in support.

So I think we need to take a step back. We need to be getting the administration to give us briefings at every point, asking our opinions. Let's debate this, let's talk about what kind of commitment we want to make. But I will not vote for troops on the ground in this operation as a carte blanche, a blank check, before I know what we are going to do. What will our responsibility be? What will our allies' contribution be? What is the timetable? What is the mission? Is it achievable, and what is it going to cost? And what is it going to do to the rest of our national defense?

These are questions that must be asked. We must get answers. We must have a full briefing. For Congress to have a vote before we have all of that would be irresponsible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

KOSOVO

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I will address what is obviously the issue most pressing on us as a nation and certainly on the Western World. That is, of course, the issue of Kosovo and the war that is being pursued there.

First, I think it is important to understand that we as a nation are obviously the sole major superpower in the world and that we have, as a nation, a significant obligation to use our strength in order to promote the betterment of the world and to promote interests around the world which assist our national policy. We should not disengage from the world, we should not