

the reluctance to take it in 1998, the reluctance to support previous legislation that would put that waste in a temporary repository at Yucca Mountain until Yucca Mountain was determined to be licensed. So now the fear is that these States are going to be stuck with that waste because the Federal Government is going to take control of it in their State, and it will sit there.

Let me cite the specific reasons for the opposition of these Governors. Again, they are Jeb Bush, Republican from Florida; Howard Dean, Democrat from Vermont; Angus King, Independent from Maine; John Kitzhaber, Democrat from Oregon; Jeanne Shaheen, Democrat from New Hampshire; Jesse Ventura, the Reform Governor from Minnesota; Tom Vilsack, Democrat from Iowa. That is a pretty broad bipartisan group. In the letter, it says:

Specific reasons for our opposition are:

The plan proposes to use our electric consumer monies which were paid to the Federal Government for creating a final disposal repository for used nuclear fuel. Such funds cannot [in their opinion] legally be used for any other purpose than a Federal repository.

Well, if that is correct, then that is correct, they can't be used to store the fuel in those States next to the reactors.

Further, it states:

This plan abridges States' rights. . . .

I think we need to hear a little bit more about States' rights around here.

[I]t constitutes Federal takings and establishes new nuclear waste facilities outside of State authority and control.

Yet within their very States.

These new Federal nuclear waste facilities would be on river fronts, lakes and seashores [where the plants are] which would never be chosen for permanent disposal of used nuclear fuel and in a site selection process.

The plan constitutes a major Federal action—

I think it does—

which has not gone through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process.

So the administration is circumventing NEPA.

Further:

The new waste facilities would likely become de facto permanent [waste] disposal sites.

This is the crux of it, Mr. President. They say:

Federal action over the last 50 years has not been able to solve the political problems associated with developing disposal for used nuclear fuel. Establishing these Federal sites will remove the political motivation to complete a final disposal site.

The letter to the President concludes with:

We urge you to retract Secretary Richardson's proposed plan and instead support establishing centralized interim storage at an appropriate site. This concept has strong, bipartisan support and results in the environmentally preferable, least-cost solution to the used nuclear fuel dilemma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used all his time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. On behalf of the leader, I ask consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### THE LATE SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we begin the new session of the 106th Congress on a sad note, marking the passing of a good friend and former colleague, Senator Carl T. Curtis of Nebraska, who died recently at the age of 94.

For those of you who are new to the Senate, Carl was a great man who rendered a valuable service to his state and our nation throughout his career. First elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1938 and the United States Senate in 1954, Carl holds the record for being the Nebraskan to serve the longest in the United States Congress. In total, he spent almost forty-one years on Capitol Hill before retiring from the Senate in 1979.

During his tenure as a Federal legislator, he earned a well deserved reputation for fiscal conservatism, limited government, and was known as a champion of farmers and agricultural issues. He was party loyalist and a true conservative who never sacrificed personal convictions for the sake of public opinion. Among other issues, he was steadfast in his backing of President Nixon and our fight against communism in Southeast Asia even though these were highly unpopular positions at that time. An indication of his commitment to the conservative cause was the close alliance between he and Barry Goldwater, as a matter of fact, Carl managed the floor during the 1964 Republican Presidential Convention in San Francisco when Senator Goldwater was seeking the nomination of the party. Perhaps most importantly, Carl was known for his commitment to his constituents, nothing was more important to him than helping the people of Nebraska. Such dedication to helping others is truly the hallmark of an individual devoted to public service.

During the course of our time in the Senate together, I came to know Carl

quite well as we had much in common, as a matter of fact, he and I both entered the Senate in 1954 and that was not the least of our similarities. Beyond being like-minded on so many issues, we were essentially contemporaries, having grown-up on farms, read for the law instead of going to law school, and preferring to be out meeting with our constituents. It was always a pleasure to work with Carl on any number of issues and I valued his alliance as a Senator and his friendship as an individual. It was a high honor to be asked to serve as an honorary pall bearer by the Curtis family, though I hate to say "goodbye" to my old friend.

Carl Curtis was the embodiment of a public-minded citizen who dedicated his life to making a difference. From his stint as Kearney County Attorney to his role as an elder statesman, Carl Curtis always sought to build a community, state, and nation that were better for all its citizens. He set an exemplary example for integrity, diligence, and conviction, and others would do well to follow the high standards to which he held himself. My sympathies go out to his widow, Mildred, his son Carl T. Curtis, Jr., his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. All can be proud of this fine man who we are all better for having known.

#### "DON'T BE DOWN ON THE FARM"

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last week I joined several of my Democratic colleagues at a hearing on the agriculture crisis that is forcing many family farmers out of operation. We heard a number of witnesses tell compelling stories about how the 1996 "Freedom to Farm" Act has failed them and their communities.

Lori Hintz, a registered nurse and farm wife, talked about the impact of the '96 farm bill on her community in Beadle County, South Dakota. She emphasized that farmers are not the only ones in her area that are struggling.

When farm prices are depressed in a rural community—like they are in Lori's—small businesses, health clinics and schools also feel the pinch. Lori spoke eloquently about the urgent need to invest in rural communities and promote a healthy farm economy, thereby reducing out-migration and preserving the way of life that built and still defines the Midwest.

I believe I speak for all Democratic Senators who participated in last week's hearing when I say that the testimony presented by each witness was both powerful and thought-provoking. That testimony only strengthened our determination to address the agriculture crisis facing this country.

Few people have a better appreciation for the problems confronting our family farmers, and for what we in the

Senate need to do to fix those problems, than my close friend and colleague, Senator BYRON DORGAN. Senator DORGAN has stood throughout his public career as an effective and tireless advocate for America's family farmers and ranchers, and his perspective on the economic difficulties felt by many rural residents merits the undivided attention of policymakers in Congress and the Administration.

Today, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to Senator DORGAN for an article published in a recent edition of the *Washington Monthly* that presents a poignant and persuasive argument for the family farm. I commend this article, entitled "Don't Be Down on the Farm," to my colleagues' attention.

Senator DORGAN knows this topic as well as anyone. We have all learned from Senator DORGAN's entreaties, many of which have been delivered in this chamber, about the economic challenges facing the people to whom we entrust the safe and abundant production of our nation's food and fiber supply. We have listened to Senator DORGAN's impassioned oratory about conditions in rural North Dakota, and how the economic survival of many communities in his state depends on successful family farms. His words resonate deeply in me, because they often evoke similar scenarios in my state.

In his article, Senator DORGAN makes a number of important observations—things we know to be true, but that too often are recklessly discounted in the crafting of farm policy. He reminds us of the proven efficiency of family farms, and how viable family farms translate into robust, successful communities. He also asks a question to which we still have not received a persuasive answer. What does society gain by replacing family farms with corporate farming operations?

Senator DORGAN also reminds us of the social costs that we may all have to bear for the emergence of corporate agriculture, including the challenge of waste disposal, the threat of related environmental degradation and the loss of a valued way of life.

Finally, Senator DORGAN asks whether we will take steps necessary to ensure the survival of family farms and ranches for the future. That is a question of interest to many members in this chamber, and one to which we simply must find the right answer.

The eloquence and urgency of Senator DORGAN's message reinforces the views of the many Senators who want to secure a strong future for our country's family farms. I appreciate both the effort and conviction evident in the article, and thank Senator DORGAN for his commitment to this vital issue.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DORGAN's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Washington Monthly*, Sept. 1999]

DON'T BE DOWN ON THE FARM

WHAT WE CAN DO TO PRESERVE A NATIONAL TREASURE

(By Senator Byron Dorgan)

A Traveler through Western Europe these days observes something unusual to American eyes. Family-based agriculture is thriving there. The countryside is dotted with small, prosperous farms, and the communities these support are generally prosperous as well. The reason, of course, is that Europe encourages its family-scale agriculture, while America basically doesn't care. The difference was apparent at the World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle. The European representatives were talking about families and communities, while the Americans talked about markets. You listen to the speeches, as I did, and a question looms up in your mind. If American trade representatives think these European values represent the problem, just what do they think represents the solution? If prosperous rural economies are not a worthy goal then what is?

The question is of great urgency among U.S. farmers these days. Out beyond the prosperity of Wall Street and Silicon Valley, the producers in America's food economy are struggling for survival. The weather has been miserable. Prices for some commodities are at Depression-era levels. Imports are soaring, and giant agribusiness firms are squeezing out farmers for a bigger share of the food dollar. In this setting, farm auctions have become a grim daily counterpoint to the Wall Street boom.

The stories are wrenching beyond description. I received a letter from a woman whose son refused to get out of bed the day the family farm was auctioned off. His dream was to become a farmer like his dad, and he couldn't bear to watch that dream get sold off by a bank. Suicides among farmers are now three times the rate of the nation as a whole. One Iowa farmer left a note that said, "Everything is gone, wore out or shot, just like me."

Many in the opinion class offer an obligatory regret and then wonder why we should care. Family farmers are just poignant footnotes to the bright new economy, they say, like the little diners that got left behind on Route 1 when the interstates came in. "The U.S. no longer needs agriculture and is rapidly outgrowing it," said Steven Blank, an economist at the University of California at Davis. In his view, farms, like steel mills and television factories can move to low-cost climes abroad, and should. "It is the improvement in the efficiency of the American economy."

Most express themselves in more diplomatic terms. But that's basically the expert view. An economy is just a mathematical equation and efficiency, narrowly defined, is the ultimate value. If family-based agriculture disappears, so be it. This view isn't just distasteful. It is shortsighted and wrong.

The fact is, family-based agriculture is not unproductive or inefficient, even by the narrow calculus of the economics profession. (I'll go into that a little later.) First off, if we care about food, we will not welcome an economy in which control of the food chain lies in a few corporate hands. Monsanto-in-the-Fields is not everyone's idea of the food economy they want. But the basic issue here goes far beyond food. It speaks to us as citi-

zens rather than just as shoppers; ultimately it concerns the kind of country we are going to be. The family farm today is a sort of canary in the mine shaft of the global economy. It shows in stark terms what happens to our lives, our communities, and our values when we prostrate ourselves before the narrow and myopic calculus of international finance. So doing, it raises what is probably the single most important economic question American faces: What is an economy for?

For decades the nation has listened to a policy establishment that views the economy as a kind of "Stuff Olympics." The gold medal goes to the nation that accumulates the most stuff and racks up the biggest GDP. Enterprise is valued only to the extent it serves this end. But what happens when we produce more stuff than we need but less of other things, such as community, that we need just as much? Do we continue our efforts to produce more of what we already have a glut of? Or do we ask a different question? If Americans say we need stronger families and better communities, then we need to question whether our economic arrangements are contributing to those ends. If we really believe in traditionally family values, then should we not support the form of agriculture—and business generally—based upon those values?

There's a way to save our family-based agriculture. Harry Truman had the answer more than fifty years ago. Put simply, Truman wanted to confine the agricultural support system to the family-sized unit. This would promote a modern and productive farm economy and healthy rural communities too. It would begin to align our economic policies with our traditional family values and social ideals. But in order to see the value of this approach, we have to put off the mythologies and ideological blinders that dominate the debate today.

OVER THE EDGE

These mythologies start with the assumption that the struggles of family farmers are Darwinian proof of their own unfitness to survive. The fact is, family farmers are in a bind today because of deliberate actions and inactions here in Washington. An impartial market didn't decree their difficulties. Policy makers did. Yes, there has been lousy weather, an expensive dollar, and the collapse of crucial markets in Asia. These come with the territory. Since the New Deal, the federal government has sought to help farmers get through such tough times.

What's different now is that government has tried instead to push family-based producers over the edge. The push started with the trade agreements that opened the U.S. wide to foreign production. Advocates of NAFTA and GATT promised American producers vast new markets, yet today America's trade deficit has reached record levels, and the balance of agricultural trade is heading in the same direction. You need that right. The coal is pouring into Newcastle. By the sublime logic of the global economy, a nation that has depressed prices of durum wheat is importing durum wheat, fruit, poultry, and meat as well.

This did not happen because American farmers are backward or inefficient. It happened because of a high dollar, which works against exports; and because American trade negotiators have been more attentive to the needs of corporate food processors than to the farmers who grow the food. The U.S. trade agreement with Canada is a prime example. Before that agreement the U.S. imported virtually no durum wheat from Canada. (Durum is the kind used in pasta.) The

U.S. trade representative at the time, Clayton Yeutter, assured Congress in writing that the agreement would have no effect on grain. Yet durum was pouring across the northern border almost from the moment the agreement took effect. Today, Canadian imports comprise nearly 25 percent of U.S. processed durum. These imports nearly doubled in the first five months of 1999 alone.

Some call this the Invisible Hand. But it has a lot more to do with something called the Canadian Wheat Board, a government agency that handles every bushel of wheat produced in Canada. The Wheat Board publishes no price information, so the workings of the Canadian market are inscrutable to U.S. farmers. There are subsidies for grain handling and transportation that give Canadian producers a further edge. Canada is not an exception. Most nations try to protect their own food production, and understandably so. They have long memories of wars that made food a precious commodity; and as true conservatives they value their rural traditions and cultures.

So tough luck you say: The consumer is king, and cheap imports mean low prices at the supermarket. This degradation of the producer was not what Jefferson and others had in mind when they founded our republic. But that aside, if you think the farmer's travail has been the consumer's gain, you might check your local supermarket. Somehow, those Depression-level prices on the farm haven't shown up on the bar codes. Prices of hamburger and bread have inched up, even as farm prices have plummeted.

Someone is getting the spread, and that someone is the food processing and packing industry, which has scored big off the misery of U.S. farmers. The big four cereal manufacturers have returns on equity of upwards of 29 percent even as farmers go bankrupt. From a loaf of bread that costs \$1.59 at the store, the wheat farmer gets about five to six cents. In 1981 the wheat farmer got about double that. The processors can reap where the farmer sows, in large part because the industry has become so concentrated in recent years. When Ronald Reagan became president, the top four beef processors controlled about 36 percent of the market. Today the figure is over 80 percent. A wheat farmer today is dealing with a grain industry in which the top four firms control 62 percent of the business. This means a marketplace with the power to say, "take it or leave it."

The antitrust laws are supposed to prevent this kind of bullying. But decades of erosion at the hands of ideologically-disposed economists and judges have reduced these laws to mere "husks of what they were intended to be," as the late Justice Douglas put it. Moreover, budget cuts during the Reagan-Bush years crippled antitrust enforcement just as the current merger wave was gaining momentum. Even after modest increases under Clinton, the antitrust budget has fallen in real terms since the late 1970s. The Microsoft trial has gotten a lot of headlines. But when Cargill, the nation's number one grain exporter and the largest privately-held company, can buy the grain operations of Continental, which is number two, with barely a peep from Washington, then the cops aren't exactly walking tall on the antitrust beat.

There is a pattern here. The U.S. government has undertaken to remake the world in the image of the multinational corporation—an image in which all economic problems get reduced to mathematics. Family-based production has stubborn loyalties to locality and place. It provides a buffer against the ruthless—and often misleading—mathe-

matics of the market. Therefore the government seeks to engineer it out of existence and to replace it with the corporation that has no such inconvenient human tendencies. This was the implicit logic of the Farm Bill of 1996.

#### FAILING THE FARMS

The Farm Bill of 1996 was touted as a radical break from the past. Proponents said that it would "free" farmers from the stifling bureaucracy of the federal government and enable them to make their fortunes in the global marketplace. They called the bill—with mordant irony—the Freedom to Farm Act. It seemed plausible in the flush times of the mid-'90s. But the agricultural marketplace soon cratered, and farmers found out quickly what the bill really left them free to do—Get Out of Farming Fast.

Put simply, the bill phases out the federal-price support program over a period of seven years. During that time, it doles out between \$5 billion and \$6 billion a year in transition payments, supposedly to wean farmers off the federal supports. These go to all agricultural entities, regardless of size and regardless of need. The bigger you are, the more you get—no matter how much money you have sitting in the bank.

It sounds like a parody of a government program. Yet that's how the bill works—or, more accurately, doesn't work. A year after the bill took effect, Congress was enacting "emergency" relief to help undo the damage it had just done. Congress just enacted another emergency measure this year. There is no end in sight. Congress buys a little quiet while the nation's family-based producers twist slowly in the wind.

#### COMMUNITY MATTERS TOO

From the time Franklin Roosevelt established the first farm-support programs during the Depression, a central question has gone unresolved: What is the farm program really for? People in Washington have always wrung their hands over hard-pressed family farmers. But the programs they've enacted have favored the biggest farmers and hastened the demise of the smaller ones. In its many permutations, the farm program has proceeded on the assumption that the mode and scale of production don't matter, and all that counts is a given quantity of beef or grain. This view dominates the policy and media establishments and the result is a facile cynicism regarding efforts to help the family-based producer. We need to reexamine this assumption. The embrace of text-book orthodoxy tends to blind reporters to economic reality, and to the social dimension of economic enterprise.

In reality, a family-based enterprise such as a farm produces much more than corn or wheat. It also produces a community. One might say it has a social product as well as a material product. This social product is invisible to economists and policy experts because they see only what they can count in money. But it is crucial in a nation that has more stuff than it knows what to do with but less community and stability than it needs.

This is not rural romanticism. I'm talking about the opposite—the ways that family-based enterprise provides a matrix for community life. A small town café, for example, contributes much more to the life of a rural community than its financial balance sheet would suggest. It is a hub of social interaction, a crossroads where people meet in person rather than just as blips on a computer screen. It serves to reinforce the formal organizations in the town, from the volunteer fire department to the PTA. Cafés are

so important to small-town life that in Havana, North Dakota, (pop. 124) folks actually volunteer at the local café to keep it open.

Family-based agriculture is a prolific source of social product. Study after study has documented this effect. The most famous was that of Walter Goldschmidt of the University of California, comparing two California farm communities in the 1940s. One was comprised of small and medium sized family farms; the other of large scale producers. The localities were similar in other significant respects. Goldschmidt found that the family farms produced a measurably stronger social unit. People showed "a strong economic and social interest in their community. Differences in wealth among them are not great, and the people generally associate in those organizations which serve the community." The locality with larger farms, by contrast, had a more pronounced class structure, less stability, and less civic participation.

This will come as no surprise to people who grew up in such settings. The family and community values that people give speeches about in Washington are a fact of daily life. I remember a farmer in my home town of Regent, North Dakota, a fellow named Ernest, who had a heart attack around harvest time. His neighbors took their combines and harvested his grain. The economics textbooks call these farmers "competitors," and if they were corporations they would behave that way. But because they are real people they acted like neighbors and friends.

The social dimension of enterprise is crucial even in conventional economic terms. Francis Fukuyama, the respected writer on social dynamics, developed this subject in his book *Trust*. "Virtually all serious observers understand," he wrote, "that liberal political and economic institutions depend on a healthy and dynamic civil society for their vitality." Society needs enterprise but enterprise also needs a society.

Jefferson was right. The kind of agriculture we choose affects the kind of communities we have and the kind of nation we are going to be. A nation that tries to divorce the processes of production from larger social concerns—as policy experts do—eats its own seed corn. Neglect the social product of private enterprise, and we create the conditions for our own decline.

#### SMALL FARMS ARE EFFICIENT

Against this, we have to ask what's to gain by displacing family-based farming with corporate agribusiness firms. The answer is, very little.

The supposed efficiency of corporate-scale operations has a large dose of hype. Farms can reach peak efficiency at well within the range of a family operation. Michael Duffy, an agricultural economist at Iowa State University, has found that corn and soybean producers in that state reach the low point on the production cost curve at between 300 and 500 acres. The top 10 percent of pig producers, based on cost of production, averaged 164 sows.

Wheat farmers reach lowest costs at a somewhat larger scale, but still well within a family-sized operation. The belief that bigger corporate operations mean more productive agriculture is just a "bunch of crapolla," Duffy says.

The claims of efficiency, moreover, ignore the costs that sprawling agribusiness operations impose upon the rest of us. Partly these costs are social. When there are no neighbors to drive Aunt Ella a hundred miles to the clinic, she has to use a taxpayer-funded van instead. But the biggest costs may be

environmental. Corporate pig factories, for example, have become a nightmare for their neighbors. They foul local water supplies and emit a colossal stink into the air.

A county in Illinois actually had to reduce property assessments by 30 percent in the vicinity of such a plant. In North Carolina, which has emerged as a pig factory haven in recent years, Hurricane Floyd caused massive flooding of the huge lagoons that hold the wastes. The sludge spread over the countryside and leached into the groundwater. Residents were advised to drink bottled water and even to have their wells redrilled. That might be efficiency for the corporation. But it's not for the neighbors, nor for the society as a whole.

I see an economist scowling in the back row. If people want social product, he mutters, then they would demand it in the market.

But that's precisely the problem. Americans can't speak through the market unless the market gives them an effective choice, and under current arrangements they don't have one. When we buy pasta or pork chops at the supermarket there's nothing on the label to tell us the kind of farm it came from.

Markets are the best means we have for allocating resources, when people have both information and choices and when all costs are accounted for. But they don't work so well when information and choice are lacking—the costs get shifted into others, and that's what happens with agricultural production today. Farmers aren't getting full compensation for their production, including social product. They should. The question is how.

#### THE BRANNAN PLAN

After his improbable reelection in 1948 President Harry Truman introduced a farm bill that had a truly far-sighted provision to limit federal farm supports to the family-sized unit. Farmers could become bigger if they wished. They could produce as much as they thought they could sell. But they couldn't expect the federal government to support all their ambitions.

The Brannan Plan as it was called—after then Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan—would have made it the policy of the United States that scale and social impact matter, in agriculture at least. Not surprisingly, the larger farm interests opposed the Brannan Plan (though mostly on other grounds) and it died a quick legislative death.

In the 50 years since, the farm program has gone from one extreme to the other—from supporting everything in sight to hitching the nation's farmers to a market ideology in a world that doesn't always buy it. We've shed crocodile tears over family farmers while promoting their demise. Now the congressional majority is in a quandary. Republicans know they have to do something. But many on that side can't bring themselves to face the implications. So they heap more blame on government, rail at the Federal Reserve Board and the government's failure to open more foreign markets, and hope the problem will just go away.

To be sure, the Federal Reserve Board is a deserving target. When you hand the management of the economy over to money center bankers, then farmers, who rely heavily on credit, are going to get shortchanged. But it's not enough to rail at the Fed. We need to put someone on the Fed who understands the value of family-based farms and who can provide some balance to the economists and bankers who run the place now.

It is good too that Republicans want to open up foreign markets, but we've also got to develop new domestic markets. Since people can eat only so much, that means new uses for farm products. Ethanol barely scratches the surface. There are many materials, from plastics and building materials to paper and inks, that are being made from crops. In Minnesota, farmers are getting from \$20 to \$50 an acre for selling the right to capture the wind energy from their land. David Morris of the Institute for Local Self Reliance has sketched out the possibilities in a report called, suggestively, "The Carbohydrate Economy."

Farmers need more bargaining power in the market too, not just more points of access to it. Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota and I have proposed a moratorium on mergers in agriculture-related industries, and a complete review of the antitrust laws as they affect this part of the economy. The measure failed to pass this fall, but we will introduce it again.

But by far the most important issue is the economic safety net. No matter what else you do, farmers are going to confront bad years. There has to be a support structure of some kind, and it should advance the social values of this country rather than undermine them. Harry Truman had the right idea. There should be a support price for an amount of production that is within the range of a family-scale operation. (This would vary by crop and region of the country, of course.)

Beyond that, producers would be on their own. If they wanted to exceed the support range and take their chances in the world market, then more power to them. But we wouldn't ask the taxpayers to support a scale of operation from which there is no social benefit and for which there is no economic need.

This approach would not encourage overproduction, since there would be built-in limits on the amount of production that was supported. The caps would be enough to sustain a family-sized operation in bad years, but they would not make anyone rich. This approach would begin to compensate farmers for their contribution to rural communities—a form of production for which the global market provides no monetary return. It would recognize that the efficient destruction of community in America is not the kind of efficiency the government should encourage.

If this country can subsidize a public-housing program for millionaire athletes and billionaire owners called pro-sports stadiums, then surely it can provide a safety net for the family-scale agriculture that contributes so much to this nation. Anyone who thinks big corporations are less likely than small enterprises to ask for government help hasn't been paying much attention. Big companies, not little ones, get bailed out in America. Already, the corporate pig factories in North Carolina have asked for millions of dollars from Congress to help upgrade their waste lagoons.

An economy is supposed to provide for human need. At a time of material abundance but social scarcity, shouldn't we encourage forms of enterprise that meet the needs of our dwindling communities? If we truly believe in traditional family values, shouldn't we support the forms of enterprise that embody those values, including the family farm?

The crisis in the Farm Belt is one problem America knows how to solve. We have both the means and the resources; the question is whether we will use them.

#### THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS COVENANT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I rise to express my whole-hearted support for S. 1052, the Northern Mariana Islands Covenant Implementation Act, which the Senate considered and passed on Monday, and to recognize Senator AKAKA, Energy Committee Chairman MURKOWSKI, and Ranking Senator BINGAMAN for their determined efforts to shepard this bill through the Senate. During the recent recess, I had the opportunity to travel with Senator AKAKA to South Asia. Once again, I was reminded why Senator AKAKA is one of the most respected members of the Senate. As we met with leaders from India and Pakistan, Senator AKAKA's humanitarian focus was evident time and again. Yesterday, Senator AKAKA's concern for those without wealth and privilege was on display once more. I wish I could have been here, yesterday, to celebrate his legislative victory.

Senator AKAKA's special interest in the welfare of the residents of the Northern Mariana Islands dates back to WW II when he served with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and spent time on both Saipan and Tinian. In 1996, he and Senator MURKOWSKI traveled to the Commonwealth to investigate reports of the horrible working conditions first hand. Senator AKAKA returned with confirmation of those reports and worked quickly to introduce legislation, with Chairman MURKOWSKI, to improve the often horrific conditions faced by alien workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Since then, Senator AKAKA has come to the floor repeatedly to draw attention to this problem and he has worked tirelessly behind the scenes to build effective bipartisan support for this measure. Senator AKAKA's dedication to this issue reminds us that our work here is not confined to the headline grabbing issues of the day but extends to the quiet pursuit of humane working conditions everywhere.

S. 1052 is a bill to amend the legislation enacted by Congress in 1976 through which the Northern Mariana Islands became a Commonwealth of the United States. This bill provides for a transition period during which the Commonwealth will be incorporated into our federal system of immigration laws. The 1976 covenant enacted by Congress extended U.S. citizenship to CNMI residents, but it exempted the Commonwealth from the Immigration and Nationality Act. Over the years it has become clear what a mistake that was.

Today the immigration situation in the Commonwealth contributes to some very grave social problems. Over the past twenty years, the number of citizens of the Commonwealth has doubled, while over that same period of time the number of alien workers has