

U.S. foreign policy apparatus, and reform the United Nations. This bill passed the Senate by an overwhelming 90 to 5 vote stipulating the abolishment of two antiquated temporary Federal agencies—the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and brings another—the Agency for International Development—under the authority of the Secretary of State.

And, just as importantly, it strikes a grand bargain regarding the United Nations, paying \$819 million in so-called U.S. arrears in exchange for deep-seated and meaningful U.N. reforms.

In addition, since the August recess, the full committee, and its various subcommittees, have convened literally dozens of hearings on a wide range of foreign policy matters. During the fall months, the committee began hearings on what will surely be next year's most important foreign policy debate: the expansion of the NATO alliance.

The committee has already held six hearings—beginning with testimony from Secretary of State Albright—hearings which I believe will have a real impact in ensuring not only that NATO expansion is approved by the Senate next spring, but that the plan presented to the Senate for its advice and consent is done the right way, taking into account the legitimate concerns various Senators have presented.

It is difficult for me to express in any adequate way my gratitude to the members of this committee for all their efforts this past year. The chairmen and ranking members of the various subcommittees have done splendid work in the consideration of all the nominations, the bilateral tax treaties that are so important to American industry, and to hold oversight hearings on so many important matters.

It is because of their work—not Senator BIDEN's nor mine—that this committee has been restored to the world stage as an important player in American foreign policy. I am proud of them and, it has been a privilege to serve with them on the Foreign Relations Committee.

JUDGE IN MINNESOTA BLOCKS CLASS I DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this week Senator LEAHY and I addressed the Senate about our concerns and disappointment with the recent order by the U.S. District Court of Minnesota which enjoined the Secretary of Agriculture from enforcing class I differentials in 28 of the current 33 Federal milk marketing orders. If the November 3, 1997, ruling stands, it will throw the entire milk pricing system into chaos threatening the continued existence of thousands of dairy farms nationwide.

Mr. President, it is imperative that Secretary Glickman move immediately to seek a stay and file an appeal to the court's decision. I am joining several of my colleagues in a letter to Secretary

Glickman to formally request that the U.S. Department of Agriculture appeal the decision. I urge others to contact Secretary Glickman to recommend that he act swiftly in this request as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter being sent to Secretary Glickman appear in the RECORD.

This ruling should not impact the current reforms of the Federal milk marketing orders with respect to the basic formula price and class I differentials. It is important that the Department of Agriculture continue to use sound public policy in determining a pricing structure that is in the best interest of dairy farmers and consumers alike. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have expressed in overwhelming fashion to the Secretary of Agriculture the support and importance of maintaining our class I differentials. Recently, 48 Senators wrote to Secretary Glickman supporting class I differentials and endorsing the Department's option 1-A proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of October 10, 1997, regarding overwhelming support for option 1-A appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, those of us who value dairying in our States should recognize the dangerous precedent of this ruling. The success of an appeal to overturn in this case is of vital importance to the survival of dairy farmers across this Nation.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 10, 1997.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: Considering the recent district court decision out of Minnesota, we want to reconfirm our views on milk marketing orders and strongly recommend that the USDA seek a stay and appeal the decision.

In reviewing the various options for the pricing of Class 1 fluid milk, it is still our view that Option 1-A is the most viable and economically sound approach to the future pricing of fluid milk.

Last month forty-eight Senators and one hundred and thirteen Members of the House of Representatives indicated to you that Option 1-A reflects good public policy necessary for effective milk marketing order reform. Our support for Option 1-A is based upon a number of important factors:

It recognizes the transportation costs involved in moving fluid milk from the farm to the consumer.

It takes into account the importance of balancing the supply and demand for milk, ensuring adequate production to meet all fluid milk needs.

It recognizes the costs of producing and marketing milk and, therefore, does not inflict economic hardship on dairy producers in any one region to benefit others.

It is sensitive to the need for attracting supplemental milk supplies to regions of the country that occasionally face production deficits.

These are some of the reasons that most of the dairy producing regions of the country

support Option 1-A for the regional pricing differentials for fluid milk.

Under the November 3, 1997, court decision in *Minnesota Milk Producers, et al. v. Dan Glickman*, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to end the Class I differentials in the milk marketing order system. If this decision stands, it will throw the entire milk system into chaos threatening the continued existence of thousands of dairy farms nationwide.

Appealing the court's ruling is in the best interest of milk producers and consumers across the country.

We look forward to your comments and to working closely with you on the federal order reform process.

Sincerely,

JIM M. JEFFORDS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, October 10, 1997.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN: In reviewing the various options for the pricing of Class 1 fluid milk, it is clear that Option 1-A is the most viable and economically sound approach to the future pricing of fluid milk.

Option 1-A reflects good public policy necessary for effective milk marketing order reform. Our support for Option 1-A is based upon a number of important factors: It recognizes the transportation costs involved in moving fluid milk from the farm to the consumer; it takes into account the importance of balancing the supply and demand for milk, ensuring adequate production to meet all fluid milk needs; it recognizes the costs of producing and marketing milk and, therefore, does not inflict economic hardship on dairy producers in any one region to benefit others; and it is sensitive to the need for attracting supplemental milk supplies to regions of the country that occasionally face production deficits.

These are some of the reasons that most of the dairy producing regions of the country support Option 1-A for the regional pricing differentials for fluid milk.

As part of the reforms to the Basic Formula Price (BFP), we urge the Department to seriously consider partially "decoupling" fluid milk prices from the volatile cheese-based pricing system that has resulted in wide fluctuations in milk prices.

This pricing system has dramatically reduced farm milk prices and has left permanently high consumer prices. In our view, maintaining price stability is an extremely important order reform goal for both dairy farmers and consumers.

We look forward to your comments and in working closely with you on the federal order reform process.

Sincerely,

James M. Jeffords; Patrick Leahy; Susan Collins; Lauch Faircloth; Chris Dodd; Bob Graham; Alfonse D'Amato; Joe Biden; Mary L. Landrieu; Bill Roth; John Breaux; Jesse Helms; Jeff Bingaman; John F. Kerry; Tim Hutchinson; Max Cleland.

Connie Mack; Daniel P. Moynihan; John H. Chafee; Patty Murray; Joe Lieberman; Edward Kennedy; Larry E. Craig; Charles Robb; Paul Coverdell; Barbara A. Mikulski; Ron Wyden; Richard Shelby; Pete V. Domenici; Mitch McConnell; Jack Reed; Jeff Sessions.

Ernest Hollings; Olympia Snowe; Strom Thurmond; John W. Warner; Dale Bumpers; Bob Smith; Slade Gorton; Christopher Bond; Thad Cochran; Rick Santorum; Arlen Specter; John Glenn; Dirk Kempthorne; Mike DeWine; Judd Gregg; Paul S. Sarbanes.