

the cities but in the towns and suburbs alike.

Look at the efforts to help family farmers. We finally came through with that on a bipartisan basis. It is one of the things we achieved this year. But it begs the question, to leave it at that, because next year if we do not change the basic Federal farm policy, the so-called Freedom to Farm Act, we are going to see a rerun, unfortunately, of what we saw this year—farmers literally struggling to survive. As prices across the world have plummeted, they cannot make a decent income.

In my home State of Illinois, a State that has a very strong farm sector, just a few years ago the average net farm income for a farmer was about \$48,000 a year. This year it will be about \$25,000. That is about half. But \$13,000 of the \$25,000 will come from Federal payments. The other about \$12,000 will come in farm operations. We cannot sustain a farm economy where half the income of farmers in Illinois and Minnesota or Nebraska comes from the Federal Treasury. The law has to be changed, and this year we did not take up a change in the law as we should have.

The last point I would like to make before I yield to my colleague from Minnesota is this. The Patients' Bill of Rights is an issue we have to return to as the highest priority in the next Congress. When you consider the lives of people who are dependent on this action, you understand the severity of it. I will tell one quick story.

Take a look at this little girl here. She is Theresa. She lives in Yorkville, IL. Her dad is a police officer and her mom stays at home to look after her. She suffers from a rare disease known as spinal muscular atrophy. It is a very debilitating disease. As you can see, she is on a ventilator, and I met a couple of kids just like this. This is what her mother says:

She was hospitalized from September 2nd last year until February 15 of this year due to fighting the insurance company for certain provisions we could not do without in our home.

We had to fight and fight with the insurance company for things the doctors had said were needed [for Theresa.] So we fought for 2½ months. We eventually did get everything that we needed, except it was a very long battle.

Can you imagine having your family separated that long because the insurance company did not want to help?

Theresa caught RSV in the hospital while we were waiting for the appeal to go through. That is why she now has [a ventilator and tracheotomy.]

That is a real life family. Theresa's dad is a policeman. Theresa and her family would not be protected by the Republican version of the Patients' Bill of Rights. They would not have the benefit of an appeals process in a timely fashion so they could get a good answer, a sensible medical answer for this little girl. Instead, they are embroiled in month after month of weary debate with the insurance company. That is

health care in America for too many American families. This Congress has failed, utterly failed to address this critical issue.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized. We are going from side to side.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I wonder if I can ask unanimous consent to follow the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object, I inquire of the Chair, it is my understanding we had until the hour of 1 o'clock equally divided. I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Republican side, there are 22 minutes 37 seconds. On the Democratic side, there are 9 minutes 33 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota will be recognized following the Senator from Kentucky.

#### THE TICKET TO WORK AND WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the work incentives and ticket to work legislation. This is a day I have looked forward to for a long time.

It is a great day for the disabled in America. By passing this legislation, we are going to make it easier for them to return to work and become self-sufficient. We are going to give those who want to try to return to work the tools they need to support themselves and to escape from the dependency on a monthly Government check.

For years, the Social Security disability program has provided a vital safety net to assist those who fall on hard times and need help when they become sick or injured and cannot support themselves. It has done this job well. But for the many disabled people who have wanted to return to work and could be able to work, the disability program has not worked as well. It has not properly equipped them to return to the workforce. It has not given them the tools they need to move off the disability rolls. In fact, fewer than 1 percent of those who go on the disability rolls—that is currently 4.5 million people—never return to work because the program does not provide an adequate support network or resources for these Americans to move back into the workforce.

For these disabled people, the disability program has become a black hole. Once they fall in, they cannot escape. The bill we hope to pass today or tomorrow finally gives these Americans new hope, the ladder they need to climb out of that hole. The Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act modernizes the disability program and moves it into the modern age and provides more options for the

disabled who want to work. It provides them with a ticket that can be used to help acquire skills to reenter the workforce.

Under the old system, these workers had only one option if they wanted to return to work; they had to work through their State vocational rehabilitation programs. This option will still be open to them, but now they will also be able to use their "ticket" to go to other provider networks and employers to obtain skills and jobs. In short, the "ticket" expands opportunity for training and choices for rehabilitation for the disabled, and gives them the ability to tap into the power of the free market.

This legislation also addresses the most pressing need for most of those who want to leave the disability rolls and return to work—the availability of adequate health care. Many of these potential workers continue to require a high degree of medical care even after they return to work. Obtaining this care—and paying for it—is often a high hurdle to cross, especially for those who move back to the workplace in entry and lower-level positions. Under the bill we are dealing with today, we expand continued Medicare coverage for the disabled and also increase Medicaid funding to the States to help them address the problems.

All in all, this bill is win-win. It is a winner for the disabled community and a winner for the American taxpayers and all of us who pay Social Security taxes. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that for every 1 percent of disability recipients who return to work, the Social Security disability trust fund saves \$3 billion. That is serious money. If this legislation only works partly as well as we expect, it will make a tremendous difference for the future of the trust fund and our ability to look after the neediest Americans.

It's been almost 5 years since Congress began looking into problems with the disability program. In 1995, when I was the chairman of the House Social Security Subcommittee, we began holding hearings on possible changes we could make to Social Security to help the disabled. After those hearings, former Congresswoman Barbara Kenelley and myself wrote reform legislation that passed in the House in 1998 by a vote of 410-1. While my bill died in the Senate last year because Senator KENNEDY put a hold on my bill and some shenanigans by the White House, it is at the core of the legislation we are passing today and I am very proud of that. We have worked very hard to make sure the ticket-to-work portion of this reflects the bill that passed the House last year 410-1.

This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. It will truly make a difference for many Americans who need it the most, and I think it will stand as one of the most significant pieces of legislation to pass during this Congress.

I yield the floor.

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