Iowa. And 43 percent of the sorghum crop is planted in Texas and 18 percent in Arkansas. Rice: Texas, 85 percent planted; Louisiana, 69 percent; 10 percent in Arkansas.

Our producers and our bankers, lenders, must make planting and lending decisions. We cannot continue this game of Charlie Brown, Lucy, and the football. This will not work in farm country.

Our producers have been told that the bill could be completed prior to Christmas, the bill could be completed right after the first of the year, the bill would be completed by Easter, and the bill would be completed by April 15.

Quite frankly, we have people who crawl out of train wrecks faster than the farm bill conference is proceeding in regard to the tough amendments they must reconcile. My producers do not believe any predictions they hear at this point. They now need to make decisions forced by their lenders.

I want to make it clear to colleagues that if we pass a new bill for this year's crops, we are setting ourselves up for another disaster or supplemental bill this fall—even after spending $73.5 billion in new funding for agriculture. Unfortunately—and this is the one I want all farmers, ranchers, and agribusiness to pay attention to—you are going to discover that in both House and Senate farm bill proposals, there will be no supplemental AMTA statement, no market loss payment in September, as producers have grown accustomed to.

Instead, under the countercyclical proposals in the two bills, producers and farmers could receive a portion of their countercyclical payment for wheat in December, while other crops would receive no assistance until next spring.

To put it another way, none of this countercyclical assistance, after all the talk we have heard in the last years as to the current farm bill—about the lack of a safety net and the need for countercyclical assistance—none of this assistance for the 2002 crop will even go out until the spring of 2003. When farmers discover this, there is going to be an outcry. That is why, in a recent poll, 70 percent of the farmers said about the supplemental in this crop bill: Put the new farm bill under 2003.

We are receiving indications that any agreement on the farm bill will include much higher loan rates—most likely at the expense of direct payments or the countercyclical payment.

It was 97 degrees in Dodge City 2 days ago. That is pretty hot for Dodge. Nearly 50 percent of our Kansas wheat crop has been rated at below favorable conditions and getting worse. My producers who may have no crop to harvest—and that is the condition in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska, moving north—will gain nothing from higher loan rates. Loan rates don't help if you don't have a crop.

This is a blueprint for disaster. We cannot continue down this path. It appears the farm bill will not be completed this week. We still have 8 or 10 contentious amendments. They probably should not be part of the commodity title.

I am putting colleagues on notice that as soon as the procedural situation allows, I will either ask unanimous consent that S. 2040—the supplemental bill I just referred to, which I previously introduced—be pulled up and, hopefully, passed by the Senate or I will offer it as an amendment to any bill under consideration by the Senate.

Madam President, it didn't have to go down this road. I hope my Senate colleagues serving on the conference—good men and women all—can reach some accommodation by the end of this week and break this logjam or we are going to have to go this route because we will be in a world of trouble in farm country. We already are.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

SECRETARY POWELL'S MIDEAST TRIP

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to comment briefly on the trip to the Mideast by Secretary of State Colin Powell.

At the outset, I compliment President Bush for his initiative in sending Secretary Powell to the region, and I compliment Secretary Powell for his strenuous efforts, even though they have not achieved a cease-fire. As I listened to Secretary Powell on his live newscast this morning at about 7 a.m. eastern standard time, it seemed to me that his trip was worthwhile and progress had been made, although it is difficult to quantify progress in the Mideast because of the difficult and complex problems that are faced there.

I believe Israel has acted in self-defense in moving into Palestinian territories. It is the fundamental duty of a nation to protect its citizens. When Israel has been faced by almost daily suicide bombings, that action is necessary, as viewed by the Israeli authorities.

The President did call upon Israel to withdraw several days ago—almost 2 weeks ago—and Israel has to make its judgments and decisions as a sovereign nation. I do not think it should be viewed as a rebuke to President Bush that Prime Minister Sharon and the Israeli Cabinet saw it differently. President Bush made the judgment call he did as he saw the interests of the United States and the interests of the world community. I am sure he was considering Israel's interests in that mix. However, the judgment is up to Israel as a sovereign nation. It is understandable that when they have virtually daily suicide bombings, they see it differently so as to protect their citizens.

This morning, Secretary Powell referred to an international conference, and it is my hope that such a conference would be convened at an early time. It is my view that the so-called moderate Arab States have to become involved, representing Palestinian interests, because of the difficulties of relying upon anything Chairman Yasser Arafat has to say.

On March 26, 2002, I visited Israel and talked to General Zinni, Prime Minister Sharon, and Chairman Arafat. On that day, the three were in agreement that they were very close to coming to terms on the so-called Tenet plan on security arrangements. The very next day there was a suicide bombing in Netanya at the Passover seder killing 27 Jews at prayer and wounding approximately 200 others. The whole situation has deteriorated.

In the intervening three weeks, evidence has come to light, purportedly bearing the handwriting of Chairman Arafat, that he personally was involved in paying terrorists. I have asked the State Department for an analysis and the verification that, in fact, it was Arafat's handwriting, but on this state of the record, it appears that was the case.

It is no surprise that Yasser Arafat is a terrorist. He was involved in the murder of the United States charge d'affaires in the Sudan in 1974. He was involved with the murders of Israeli athletes. He was involved with the murder of Leon Klinghoffer who was pushed off the *Achille Lauro*. It was hoped that a new page had been turned with the Oslo agreements.

I was present on the White House lawn on September 13, 1993, when Arafat was honored at the White House. I had grave reservations about seeing this known terrorist honored at that time, but I watched as President Clinton put his left arm around Arafat and his right arm around Prime Minister Rabin, and the two shook hands. Then, Foreign Minister Peres shook hands with Arafat. It seemed to me that if the Israeli leaders were prepared to shake Arafat's hand, where Israel had been the principal victim of the terrorism, that was something we might move ahead with and try to deal with Arafat.

I have had occasion to talk to Chairman Arafat on a number of occasions over the years. Again, when I met with him on Tuesday, March 26, I urged him to make a clear-cut, definitive statement denouncing terrorism and denouncing suicide bombings. Chairman Arafat said he would, but of course he has never done so.

It is a very difficult call to have U.S. negotiators or the Secretary of State or anyone meet with Arafat because of the outstanding evidence that he is still involved in terrorism, but that is a call the Secretary of State had to make, and I respect that. It seems to me that if the peace process is to go forward, it is very difficult for Arafat to be a major player or a major participant because he is, simply stated, untrustworthy.

When Prime Minister Rabin made the famous statement that we have to negotiate with our enemies, we have to make peace with our enemies because we do not need to make peace with our friends, that set a parameter in a statesmanlike way for the necessity for Prime Minister Rabin to deal with Chairman Arafat and for us and others to have had talks with him. However, on this state of the record, where it appears that Arafat has been paying terrorists recently, it seems to me very hard to conduct negotiations with Arafat on the expectation that his commitments will be observed.

We do have moderate Arab leaders. We have King Abdullah of Jordan, a man in his late thirties, heir to King Hussein's good work. We have King Mohamed of Morocco, another able young man in his late thirties who has the potential for leadership. We have President Mubarak of Egypt. It seems to me that those are the leaders who ought to be convened.

It would be my hope that Saudi Arabia would play a constructive role in a peace conference. The Saudis came forward with a proposal which had merit because it was the first time the Saudis have said they would normalize relations with Israel if Israel would recede to the pre-1967 borders. I do not think it is possible to recede to those borders, but there had been negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians on borders, and I think an accommodation would be worked out. However, when the Saudis agreed to normalize and the Syrians agreed with that, that was a significant step forward.

Candidly, it was a major disappointment to see Saudi Arabia have a telethon for the Palestinians and raise, according to press reports, some $92 million. Where was their telethon for the American victims from September 11th? We know that of the 19 terrorists involved, 15 were from Saudi Arabia, and then Osama bin Laden is a Saudi. It would be my hope that we could expect something more from Saudi Arabia.

As we look forward, I was pleased to see Secretary of State Powell say today that Assistant Secretary Burns will remain in the region, that General Zinni will be there to carry on his role, and that CIA Director George Tenet may be going in the near future to work out security arrangements so that there is an active role by the United States.

I urge the administration to move forward on a conference which would be at the ministerial level, in a sense making the move for Foreign Minister Peres to be the negotiator for Israel; a conference which hopefully would omit Arafat; a conference which hopefully would have Jordan, Egypt, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia as principal participants to be guarantors representing the Palestinian efforts and making arrangements which could be relied upon and could be carried out.

It is very important, in conclusion, that the process be continued. When Secretary Powell went to the Mideast, he undertook very substantial risks. Everyone cannot hit a home run every time they go to bat, but I think the Secretary did a good job and made a constructive step. Now it should be carried forward with a peace conference attended by other Arab leaders.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 517, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Bingaman further modified amendment No. 2917, in the nature of a substitute.

Kerry/McCain amendment No. 2999 (to amendment No. 2917), to provide for increased average fuel economy standards for passenger automobiles and light trucks.

Dayton/Grassley amendment No. 3008 (to amendment No. 2917), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

Lott amendment No. 3028 (to amendment No. 2917), to provide for the fair treatment of Presidential judicial nominees.

Landrieu/Kyl amendment No. 3050 (to amendment No. 2917), to increase the transfer capability of electric energy transmission systems through participant-funded investment.

Graham amendment No. 3070 (to amendment No. 2917), to clarify the provisions relating to the Renewable Portfolio Standard.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 3093 (to amendment No. 2917), to prohibit oil and gas drilling activity in Finger Lakes National Forest, New York.

Dayton amendment No. 3097 (to amendment No. 2917), to require additional findings for FERC approval of an electric utility merger.

Schumer amendment No. 3030 (to amendment No. 2917), to strike the section establishing a renewable fuel content requirement for motor vehicle fuel.

Feinstein/Boxer amendment No. 3115 (to amendment No. 2917), to modify the provision relating to the renewable content of motor vehicle fuel to eliminate the required volume of renewable fuel for calendar year 2004.

Murkowski/Breaux/Stevens amendment No. 3132 (to amendment No. 2917), to create jobs for Americans, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, to strengthen the economic self-determination of the Inupiat Eskimos, and to promote national security.

Stevens amendment No. 3133 (to amendment No. 3132), to create jobs for Americans, to strengthen the United States steel industry, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, and to promote national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3132 AND 3133

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I welcome a chance to speak about the pending amendments. There are two amendments that have been proposed related to ANWR:

A first-degree amendment by my friend Senator MURKOWSKI relates to the proposal to open ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge area, to drilling, and the second-degree amendment by Senator STEVENS proposes to do that but also proposes a major relief program related to the U.S. steel industry primarily. I will try to talk about the ANWR-related provisions of the bill, and particularly the energy aspects of those today.

I oppose opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development, and there are many reasons why. Some of those reasons relate to the energy security issues with which we are trying to deal. Some relate to environmental concerns. I am strongly committed, as I believe most Members of this body are, to our Nation's energy security, and the energy bill we have put forward tries to emphasize domestic energy supply and the importance of energy in national security.

However, developing the oil and gas resources in this Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge, this area known as the 1002 area, is simply not a necessary component of a progressive energy policy for this country. The development of the Coastal Plain has been debated in this country and in this Congress for nearly 40 years. Experts still disagree about the actual reserve potential.

In May of 1998, the Geological Survey released new estimates of oil in the refuge. In that analysis, the USGS's mean estimate of economically recoverable oil on Federal lands within the 1002 area was from 3.2 to 5.2 billion barrels, and that was assuming a price of $20 to $24 per barrel using 1996 dollars. Today the United States consumes about 19 million barrels of oil each day, almost 7 billion barrels of oil each year.

We have a chart I will put up which I think begins to make that point. As this chart indicates, production from the Arctic Refuge would not contribute significantly to solving this problem. I will make the point by reference to this chart.

Domestic oil production, as shown on this chart, has been declining since 1970 and continues to decline today. That is this green line toward the bottom of the chart. Total oil demand, on the other hand, in the United States has been going up and is expected to continue going up. This chart goes from the year 1950 to the year 2020. We can see demand continuing to go up.

This middle line is transportation demand, and one of the points this chart makes is that total oil demand is driven directly by transportation demand. I think people can see that pretty readily. This little red line down in the right-hand side is domestic oil production with ANWR. So we can see that domestic oil production, although it