

## IRAQ

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition to discuss the present grave concern in the United States, and for that matter, around the world, about the menace posed by Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

I am pleased to note that the President has announced his intention to come to Congress to seek authorization before there is any military action taken by the United States as to Iraq. Senator HARKIN and I had introduced a resolution back in July asking that congressional authority be obtained before any military action. The President, as Commander in Chief, under the Constitution certainly has the authority to act in times of emergency. When there is time for discussion, deliberation, debate, and decision, then under the Constitution, it is the authority of the Congress to act.

The events are moving very fast. There have been briefings of Members of the Congress by the Administration and there is a great concern, which I have personally noted in my State, Pennsylvania, on a series of town meetings across the State. Everywhere I traveled there was concern as to what action would be taken as to Iraq.

There was no doubt that the United States has learned a very bitter lesson from 9/11; we should have taken preemptive action against Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida. We had evidence against civilians in Mogadishu in 1993, and embassy bombings in 1993. In all of those events, bin Laden was under indictment. We knew about his involvement in the USS *Cole* and his proclamation for a worldwide jihad; preemptive action should have been taken.

Taking preemptive action against a nation-state would be a change in policy for the United States. It is my view that we ought to exhaust every alternative—economic sanctions, inspections, diplomacy.

We have seen a number of people very close to President Bush and to the first President Bush, come out and caution against action. We have seen General Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to President George Herbert Walker Bush, come out and raise a great many concerns about taking action without support from our allies. We have seen former Secretary of State James Baker raise an issue about going to the United Nations for inspections, which I think is a very sound point.

It is my hope that President Bush will go to the United Nations and will press to have inspections of Iraq proceed. The obligation for Iraq to submit to those inspections is an obligation which runs to the United Nations. Iraq's commitments to the UN have been flouted.

Former Secretary of State Baker makes the cogent suggestion that the United Nations ought to be called upon to take military action to enforce those inspection rights, if Saddam Hus-

sein does not acquiesce. Certainly, if Saddam Hussein continues to stiff the UN, to thumb his nose at the UN, and thumb his nose at the international community, then there will be a stronger basis for the United States to act, if we decide that our national interests compel us to do so.

There is an obvious difficulty in communicating to the American people all that President Bush and the intelligence agencies know about the threat posed by Iraq and posed by Saddam Hussein. There is a problem, as we have seen from our experience, in telling the Congress, even in closed session, even in top secret briefings, where that information, regrettably, is disclosed to the press. Leaks in Washington are epidemic. However, if the Congress is to discharge its duty to pass on the question of what is tantamount to a declaration of war, a resolution authorizing the use of force, we have to know the basis on which we are acting.

There have been strong suggestions that there is very substantial evidence pointing to a clear and present danger now. We do know Saddam has chemical weapons. We do know he has used them on his own people, the Kurds. We do know he has used them in the Iran-Iraq war. There is substantial evidence about weapons of mass destruction and biological weapons. As best we know, Saddam Hussein does not yet have nuclear weapons, but how long it would take him to develop them is a question.

For the Congress to act, we really have to have this information, and the President has intimated, really suggested, that more information will be coming to the Congress. So far, I do not think we have seen the indicators of a clear and present danger, but that is something which will have to be taken up.

This is an issue which is now, obviously, on the front burner. There are indications that the President will seek a vote by the Congress before we adjourn. So it is a matter which will require very intensive consideration and analysis. However, it is my hope that when the President makes his speech at the United Nations next week, he will call on the UN to enforce the UN's inspection rights.

Recently, Senator SHELBY and I made a trip to Africa. Included in that trip was a visit to the Sudan. I had attempted to go there in the past and was advised against it because of the civil war, which has been raging in that country. We talked to U.S. intelligence personnel in the Sudan and found that they have worked out an arrangement with the Government of Sudan to make surprise inspections of weapons manufacturing locations and also on laboratories—going in with no notice, breaking locks, and taking photographs. They have concluded that, as to the installations they had identified and inspected, they were satisfied that there were no weapons of mass destruction being pursued by the Government of Sudan.

That could be a model to go after as to inspections in Iraq. Of course, it still leaves open the possibility that there are some locations about which we do not know. It leaves open the possibility that some of the weapons of mass destruction could be transported, could be moved around. However, I think it would be a very significant step. Then, if Saddam and Iraq refused to honor their commitments, it would put us on the high ground to take action in our own national interest.

I yield the floor. In the absence of any other Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the Interior appropriations be extended for 10 minutes.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003—Continued

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are attempting to work out a time to vote on the Harkin amendment which he will shortly offer. We are very close to having that done. I suggest that Senator HARKIN go ahead and give his speech. If we can work out a unanimous consent agreement, he can offer the amendment, and then we can vote on it. He would give the speech now, and we would move to the amendment, if we could get the approval of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa be recognized for 5 minutes to speak on the amendment which he will offer at a subsequent time.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, over 40 million Americans rely on Medicare for their health care security. For these Americans and their loved ones Medicare is a lifeline. And because of this Medicare must be protected and secured for today and tomorrow.

Medicare, however, is not without its problems. Clearly, its benefits package needs to be updated to include prescription drugs. Seniors shouldn't have to make the choice between the drugs they need to stay healthy and food or heat. The Senate should once again try to craft a prescription drug plan to fill this great need.

But there is also another problem with Medicare. And that is the principal subject of my sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Americans, no matter where they live, whether it is rural Iowa or urban Florida, are taxed at the same rate to help pay for Medicare—1.45 percent of payroll for both workers and their employers. And Medicare beneficiaries—whether in Brooklyn, IA or Brooklyn, NY—pay the same monthly Medicare premium.

But while they pay the same taxes and premiums, the level of Medicare payments received by Americans often varies greatly from State to State.

For example, my home State of Iowa receives an average \$3,053 per beneficiary, which is 45 percent less than the national average. Some States are much higher than that. But there is a disparity between, say, \$3,053 and the top State, which is over \$7,000. It is quite substantial.

And while some of the variation may legitimately be due to cost differences, costs alone clearly do not explain the degree of differences among the states.

Much of this unfair variation is caused by outdated and nonsensical reimbursement policies that penalize efficiency and conservative medical practices. Medicare assumes that it costs much less to provide health care in rural areas, and assumes that we still compete locally and regionally for health care professionals. Those of us in under-reimbursed states know that neither of these is true. Rural areas don't enjoy the economies of scale enjoyed by their urban counterparts, and we are competing in a national and often global market for health care professionals.

The impact is real. For example, if the same hospital in Des Moines providing the same services to the same seniors in Cincinnati, OH, it would receive \$5.3 million more per year. If we put it in Ann Arbor, MI, it would receive \$14.6 million more per year.

What is the result of this unfair variation? Well, in Iowa, one substantial result is that we have a shortage of virtually all types of health care professionals.

Low reimbursement equals low wages, equals health professional shortages. Iowa ranks 50th in Medicare reimbursement and we rank 50th in nursing pay. So it is no surprise that we have 3,000 unfilled registered nurse positions, another 728 vacancies for licensed practical nurses, and 2,700 openings for nonlicensed personnel. Add this to the fact that our nurses are getting older, not enough new nurses are entering the field, and Iowa has the largest population of any State over age 85, and what you have is a real recipe for disaster.

It gets worse. Medicare payments influence Medicaid reimbursement and private payer reimbursement. Because of this, Iowa ranks 49th in the ratio of general pediatricians per 100,000 children, and 50th in the ratio of OB/GYNs to 1,000 live births.

So it is no wonder we can't recruit and keep health care professionals. A physician performing a hip replace-

ment in New York receives \$1,807.25, while one in Iowa receives \$1,304.09, and one in South Dakota only receives \$1,286.46. The same amount of work, time, and skill goes into the same procedure. Yet there is a vast difference in the reimbursement to each provider.

It takes the same amount of education, skill, and time in Iowa as it does in other States, and these professionals should be reimbursed accordingly. So there are changes that must be made to bring greater fairness and improve the health care systems across the States.

There are many different proposals in the Senate that attempt to tackle this issue. I think people on both sides of the aisle can come together, as we have in the past, on this issue. I know we are very busy with many important pieces of legislation, including the homeland security bill and appropriations bills. But the resolution I am offering is very simple. Its resolve clause simply reads:

Congress (acting through the appropriate authorization process) and the President should act promptly to address the disparity among the States in the amount of payments made under the Medicare program; and

Legislation should be passed [promptly] that reduces unfair geographic disparity in Medicare payment rates and restores scheduled inappropriate reductions in Medicare payment rates.

So, Madam President, it is a very simple, straightforward resolution. It just says we in the Congress and the White House, the President, ought to do something very promptly to address this huge disparity among the States.

As I said, maybe you can have some disparity based upon rental rates and things like that. I understand that. But to say one State would get \$3,000 and another State \$7,000, this is just nonsensical. So the States that fall below the average are the ones that are getting hurt the most.

All my resolution says is that we ought to act promptly, in a bipartisan fashion, to address this issue and to make Medicare more even, more fair across the States. So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I see my colleague in the Chamber. I did not see him on the floor. He is my colleague in this endeavor, Senator CRAIG from Idaho. He and I have worked together on this for a long time. He knows exactly what I am talking about because of the great disparity in his State.

I thank the Senator from Idaho for working in a great bipartisan fashion to try to get something done to resolve this issue.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I will speak only briefly to the resolution. The Senator from Iowa and I share, as I think all Senators who represent rural countrysides must share, a very real frustration in the disparity between urban and rural Medicare payment schedules and the reality that we are dealing with a 20- or 30-year-old

concept that does not make sense anymore.

We have a phenomenal nursing shortage in our country today. So if a nurse lives on one side of a boundary line created by this law, she or he can well commute to the other side and we cannot afford them.

The Presiding Officer represents a city not far from one of my major cities: Spokane, WA, versus Coeur d'Alene, ID. Spokane, WA, has a different payment schedule than Coeur d'Alene, ID, and they are 20 miles of interstate apart. Many people say that living in Coeur d'Alene, ID, because of its beauty, is more desirable than living in Spokane, but they work in Spokane because of the wage scale and/or this particular problem.

As a result, the Kootenai Medical Center and, as a result, the rural medical communities of northern Idaho cannot, in effect, compete.

It is time that we address this issue evenhandedly across all jurisdictions so that Medicare payments are reflective of current health care needs; not a 30-year-old model that is just flat obsolete and does not make sense anymore, but because we build up these political barriers or frustrations we do not want to address them. I think we must. I think we should.

The resolution speaks to trying to move the Senate, the President, and the Congress as a whole in that direction.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, time on this bill is about to expire. I am going to ask to extend the time for a few more minutes. Let me just say to everyone, the reason for this is, in good faith we thought this matter had been cleared by everybody. The fact is, we had not received a signoff from Senator GRASSLEY and his staff. He is on his way over here, or staff is on their way over. I am sure, when they look at it, they will approve it, but it will take a few more minutes, so I ask unanimous consent that the time on the bill be extended until 25 minutes to the hour.

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

What is the will of the Senate?

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senator from Kansas wishes to speak on the underlying amendment. We have had a number of speeches today. Certainly we want him to do that. The problem is, within a minute or two we are off the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the Interior bill be extended until the hour of 12:45, and that the Senator from Kansas be recognized for 5 minutes to speak on the bill.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I have no objection if by unanimous consent the morning business session, which was to go from 12:30 to 1, could be extended from 12:45 to 1:15 so that I might have an opportunity to deliver remarks for which I have been waiting.

Mr. REID. I think, in fairness, we should allot the Senators who want to speak in morning business the full hour. The Republicans are entitled to half an hour and the Democrats are entitled to a half an hour. As soon as we get this little dust-off taken care of, I will ask unanimous consent at that time that morning business be for 1 hour.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I come before the Senate today to address the majority leader's amendment which is intended to direct immediate financial assistance to farmers around the country who are facing an historic drought. Our Kansas State motto is *Ad Astra Per Aspera*—a beautiful saying that means "To the Stars Through Difficulties." I have always thought that it captured beautifully the spirit of our State. It is part of our character to tackle calamity and to smile at threats that have consumed lesser men. During the August recess I spent several weeks touring our State and meeting with farmers about the drought. Its impact on our crops and our rural communities is staggering.

The drought in Kansas is one of the worst in a century. It is compared, by folks who know, to the dust bowl of the 1930's. Crops are withering and dying in the fields right under the watchful and woeful eyes of our farmers—farmers who are helpless to stop the conditions and helpless to prevent the circle of crisis from beginning. For what we all must remember is that blackened crops across the States are not just "their" problem or "someone else's" problem—it is our problem. The devastation brought on by persistent drought is in evidence all over Kansas. As I toured several affected counties, the widening economic impacts of this drought on our state were mostly overwhelmed by the urgency of the emergency. But by the end of my tour, I was reminded again and again that the true impact of

this drought is not the plight of just farm families. The impact that many Kansans have yet to fully comprehend, is the toll this drought is having on our economy.

With more than 2 years of lower than average rainfall, it has become clear that our towns are feeling the effects of evaporating capital. As fewer farmers and ranchers collect on their investments, this means fewer dollars for local coffers and diminished investment in new jobs, our schools and economic activity.

Leading economists in our State have estimated that just the crop losses alone have cost Kansans almost a billion dollars. This does not include any other ancillary or downstream economic costs that are sure to mount as this crisis deepens. It is for this reason that I will vote for this amendment, brought by the Senator from South Dakota. While I was disappointed that we were unable to work out a more bipartisan compromise, one that would have encouraged more farmers to purchase crop insurance and would have been balanced by offsets from other places in the budget, I will support this initiative and urge my colleagues to do likewise. This serious drought is a major threat to our Nation's economy, and we should act quickly to get relief to our farmers.

This is an issue of key importance to my State. As I said, over the August break I traveled extensively across Kansas and witnessed the drought we are experiencing. We have parts of the State that have had less rainfall than at any time since 1895, including all the Dust Bowl years when we had the terrible experience of the wind blowing soil in dark clouds. During the day you couldn't even see the Sun because there was so much dirt in the air. That was due to both agricultural practices and lack of rainfall. Now we have better agricultural practices, but we have a lot less rainfall. It has been a disaster in a number of areas.

There are whole counties that haven't had any rainfall at all. I looked at a lake near Jetmore, KS, that has a normal surface area of about 100 acres and is now down to less than 10 acres. It is because of a lack of rainfall. I saw whole fields where nothing has come up because of lack of rainfall.

Fortunately, some areas of the State are getting some moisture now, but it is not enough. The crops have already died for the year. It will help, hopefully, on winter wheat planting that will now begin in some places.

What compounds the problem we are having today and why we need the drought assistance is that the new farm bill doesn't work particularly well in a situation such as this. Some agree with the increased impact and use of loan payments. I happen to disagree with the farm bill. The problem is, with the loan payment, you need a crop to be able to borrow against to then use it and to default on it and get paid. That way, if you don't have a

crop, you can't use the loan payments. So you are caught that way as well.

There is a problem with countercyclical payments. You get in a drought situation, your crop reduces. The supply reduces, and generally where supply goes down, demand stays steady, the price goes up, and the price has gone up for some crops. Not enough; it should be up more. But your countercyclical payment doesn't help because when your price is going down, you get more payment. But when the price is going up, you get less payment.

The farmers in Kansas, in particular, are caught in a double vice. They have problems with the new farm bill and its impact because of the drought and the lack of a crop, and then we are getting caught in the loan payment scenario situation we have in the countercyclical payments not being helpful to them.

Overall, we need the help. It would be a much better situation if we were this fall getting the double AMTA payment that normally had been coming through this body. That would help more people. It wouldn't be dependent upon crop production. They are not going to have that. That is not going to be the situation. That is why we need this drought assistance.

I think it would be better if we had an offset to it. That would be a wiser way, given the budgetary situation we are in today. We could find that in other places. Although some of my other colleagues are saying they don't want to go with an offset. Reaching \$157 billion in deficits this year points to the way we should be looking for offsets to be prudent in future years and for future generations so that we don't overspend what we have.

To sum up, we need this help. We need it because of the drought. We also need it because of the new farm bill. This will help our farmers at a time and a situation and a place that they need it. It should be offset. I don't know that we will have that vote to be able to move that side of the issue forward.

In my State we are looking at a \$1 billion loss because of the drought. That is going to impact our farmers and farm families. It will also impact our communities and our entire State. This will be an important measure to get passed. I am hopeful we can make it happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it appears we will not be able to work this out so we can have a vote on the Harkin amendment. Therefore, I think what we will do is try to have a vote next week on the Harkin amendment.

If we can't do it on Monday, we will do it on Tuesday, Wednesday. Sometime before we finish this bill, the Senator from Iowa is going to offer his amendment.

That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period for

morning business, under the previous order—

Mr. HARKIN. If I may ask the leader to yield, I have been here all morning. I thought there was no controversy on the sense-of-the-Senate resolution that the Senate and the Congress and the President act promptly to address these inequities on the Medicare repayment, of which the Senator from Idaho has been a very strong proponent for a long time. I thought we were going to have a vote on it. I don't understand why we are not voting on this today.

Mr. REID. As I indicated, we had a sign-off from Senator BAUCUS, chairman of the Finance Committee. I thought we had a sign-off from the ranking member, but that didn't happen. It is my understanding that the Senator from Iowa and his staff are looking into the amendment now. They have had the opportunity for a long time now, and they haven't given us a sign-off. Therefore, because of the ranking member of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, not giving consent to move forward, Senator BURNS has not allowed us to go forward.

Mr. HARKIN. It is my understanding that the Finance Committee people had this for some time and look at it.

Mr. REID. I don't know about that.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the assistant majority leader. I hope we can vote on this next week sometime.

• Mr. GRASSLEY. The Assistant Democratic leader and my colleague Senator HARKIN of Iowa have claimed that I withheld my consent to moving to a vote on a Sense of the Senate Resolution directing Congress to promptly address inequities in Medicare payments across states.

The author of the Sense of the Senate resolution, Senator HARKIN, has said "it was my understanding the Finance Committee people had [his amendment] for some time and had looked at it."

This was not the case, because I was not given the courtesy of knowing about or even seeing the resolution in advance. No one talked to me about it at all. In fact, my staff and I did not learn of the resolution until we saw it raised on the Senate floor. By the time my staff had the resolution in their hands, the Senate had moved on to other business, claiming that I was withholding my consent.

I believe the resolution, and all legislation to improve Medicare fairness in rural areas, deserves our attention and support. And I intend to support the resolution when we vote on it next week. •

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I offer for the record the Budget Committee's official scoring of S. 2708, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003.

The committee-reported bill provides \$81.936 billion in nonemergency discretionary budget authority including an advance appropriation into 2003 of \$36 million, which will result in new outlays in 2003 of \$11.901 billion. When out-

lays from prior-year budget authority are taken into account, discretionary outlays for the Senate bill total \$18.330 billion in 2003. Of that total, \$1.442 billion in budget authority and \$1.075 billion in outlays are classified as conservation category spending.

In addition, the committee-reported bill provides new emergency spending authority of \$400 million for wildland fire management, which will result in outlays of \$400 million. In accordance with standard budget practice, the emergency spending is not counted against the appropriations committee's allocation until after conference.

Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee voted 29-0 on June 27 to adopt a set of non-binding sub-allocations for its 13 subcommittees totaling \$768.1 billion in budget authority and \$793.1 billion in outlays. While the committee's subcommittee allocations are consistent with both the amendment supported by 59 Senators on June 20 and with the President's request for total discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 2003, they are not enforceable under either Senate budget rules or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. While I applaud the committee for adopting its own set of sub-allocations, I once again urge the Senate to take up and pass the bipartisan resolution, which would make the committee's sub-allocations enforceable under Senate rules and provide for other important budgetary disciplines. With the new fiscal year starting in 26 days, it is important that we act now.

For the Interior Subcommittee, the full committee allocated \$18.926 billion in budget authority and \$18.804 billion in total outlays for 2003. The bill reported by the full committee on June 27 is above its sub-allocation for budget authority by \$10 million and is below its sub-allocation for outlays by \$280 million. An amendment by Chairman BYRD, however, at the outset of the bill's consideration lowered the bill's total budget authority by \$10 million, making it consistent with its sub-allocation. In any event, the appropriations committee's sub-allocations are not enforceable under Senate rules; thus, a point of order did not lie against the bill for exceeding its sub-allocation as reported. However, by including emergency funding for wildland fire management, the committee-reported bill does violate section 205 of H. Con. Res. 290, the concurrent resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, by designating non-defense spending as an emergency.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 2708, INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, 2003  
[Spending comparisons—Senate Reported Bill (in millions of dollars)]

|   | General purpose | Conservation | Mandatory | Total  |
|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------|
| <b>Senate-reported bill:</b>                    |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | 17,494          | 1,442        | 64        | 19,000 |
| Outlays .....                                   | 17,255          | 1,075        | 77        | 18,407 |
| <b>Senate committee allocation:<sup>1</sup></b> |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | 18,926          | 0            | 64        | 18,990 |
| Outlays .....                                   | 18,610          | 0            | 77        | 18,687 |
| <b>House-passed:</b>                            |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | 18,292          | 1,438        | 64        | 19,794 |
| Outlays .....                                   | 17,800          | 1,052        | 77        | 18,929 |
| <b>President's request:<sup>2</sup></b>         |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | 17,632          | 1,321        | 64        | 19,017 |
| Outlays .....                                   | 17,524          | 971          | 77        | 18,572 |
| <b>SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:</b>        |                 |              |           |        |
| <b>Senate committee allocation:<sup>3</sup></b> |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | 10              | 0            | 0         | 10     |
| Outlays .....                                   | -280            | 0            | 0         | -280   |
| <b>House-passed:</b>                            |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | -798            | 4            | 0         | -794   |
| Outlays .....                                   | -545            | 23           | 0         | -522   |
| <b>President's request:</b>                     |                 |              |           |        |
| Budget Authority .....                          | -138            | 121          | 0         | -17    |
| Outlays .....                                   | -269            | 104          | 0         | -165   |

<sup>1</sup> The Senate has not adopted a 302(a) allocation for the Appropriations Committee. The committee has set non-enforceable sub-allocations for its 13 subcommittees. This table compares the committee-reported bill with the committee's sub-allocation to the Interior Subcommittee for informational purposes only.

<sup>2</sup> The President requested total discretionary budget authority for 2003 of \$768.1 billion, including a proposal to change how the budget records the accrual cost of future pension and health retiree benefits earned by current federal employees. Because the Congress has not acted on that proposal, for comparability, the numbers in this table exclude the effects of the President's accrual proposal.

<sup>3</sup> The Appropriations Committee did not provide a separate allocation for general purpose and conservation category spending. This table combines the general purpose and conservation category together for purposes of comparing them to the Interior Subcommittee's sub-allocation.

Notes: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions, including removal of emergency funding (\$400 million in budget authority and \$400 million in outlays) and inclusion of 2003 advance appropriation of \$36 million (budget authority and outlays). By tradition, emergency spending is not counted against the Appropriations Committee's allocation until after conference.

Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, 9-5-02.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to support an important program funded in the fiscal year 2003 Interior Appropriation measure. The Advanced Microturbine Program is a Department of Energy effort to support and develop clean and efficient power technologies for the 21st century. The program's goals are to improve energy efficiency, reduce environmental emissions and expand fuel choices for the next generation of microturbines.

As I mentioned in the past, we must produce more energy, but we also must conserve more energy. Conservation of energy is simply another way of producing energy. Energy efficiency is also integral to any energy plan. Electrical systems can and should be made more efficient. Finally, we must utilize renewable energies. Employing fuels such as ethanol and using them to extend our energy supply makes good sense.

The Advanced Microturbine Program goes a long ways towards those ends. The ultimate aim of the program is to produce ultra clean, highly efficient microturbine product designs by 2006 that are ready for commercialization. The machines will utilize several fuel options, including landfill gas, industrial off-gases, ethanol, and other biobased liquids and gases.

The Advanced Microturbine Program is a good example of how partnerships with industry, including one from my home State, and government can deliver advanced technologies and practices to assist in meeting challenging

goals in the areas of renewable resource development and environmental protection. For this efficient technology to reach its full potential, I am told that the Advanced Microturbine Program should be funded at \$14 million for fiscal year 2003. At the minimum, I encourage my colleagues to recede to the higher House level of \$12 million as we move this bill to conference.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to express my support for an amendment that has been introduced by our distinguished majority leader. This amendment, which has taken a variety of forms in the past several months, was originally proposed as a bill by Senator BAUCUS. I cosponsored this bill previously and support it now as it provides much needed assistance to our Nation's farmers who have suffered significant crop losses during the past 2 crop years. Farmers throughout the Nation have suffered great losses, and farmers in my home State of Michigan have been among those who have suffered most.

Two years of statewide crop failure have threatened the viability of Michigan's farmers, and this amendment strives to address the losses suffered by growers in the 2001 and 2002 growing years. Over the past 2 years, some farmers faced early warm temperatures followed by freezing conditions. For others, torrential rains came early in the growing season and were followed by long droughts for some farmers. Still other farmers faced drought conditions at the start of the crop year and heavy rains at harvest time.

This year, USDA Secretary Ann Veneman recognized the atypical weather conditions that greatly diminished crop production in Michigan by designating 50 Michigan counties as disaster areas. If that was not bad enough, Secretary Veneman designated that 82 of Michigan's 83 counties as official disaster areas last year.

Michigan is one of the Nation's most diverse states in terms of the sheer breadth and number of crops grown in it, and growers of many crops have been affected by adverse weather conditions.

This year, cherry farmers in Michigan lost upwards of 95 percent of their crops—a level that threatens to devastate Michigan and the Nation's cherry industry, given that Michigan produces over 70 percent of the tart cherries in the nation. Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit with cherry growers in Michigan and listen to them as they told me how this year's crop losses were the worst that the industry had ever suffered since crop records have been kept. Additionally, all apple growers in Michigan have had at least 20 percent of their crops damaged this, and 80 percent of all Michigan apple farmers have lost upwards of 40 percent of their crop this year.

Last year, farmers in just one area of Michigan, which is one of the leading dry bean producing regions in the Na-

tion, lost 85 percent of their bean crop. Across the state, in the southwest corner of Michigan, labrusca grape growers lost 80 percent of their crop, and they suffered similar losses this year. While the losses suffered by bean and grape growers are particularly severe, they are not the only crops to have suffered drastic losses.

Approximately 25 percent of apple growers in Michigan and across the Nation are in danger of going out of business in the next 2 years, and in Michigan that means that our cherry, peach and asparagus crops, which are often grown on the same orchards as apples, will be greatly decreased. Orchard communities around the country have been devastated. As farmers have left the business, small businesses and cooperatives that have been around for generations have also gone out of business, and local governments have lost significant tax revenue. This assistance will allow many growers to reduce debt and get private bank or USDA loans for the next growing season. This assistance for will give farmers the shot in the arm they need to recover from several years of low prices.

Our Nation's farmers have not shared in the prosperity which many Americans have experienced over the past decade. No one, least of all America's farmers, likes the fact that annual emergency agriculture supplementals have seemingly become routine.

Yet we must provide this assistance if we are to address the problems facing farmers throughout the Nation. Several growers have told me that the crops losses they suffered this year were so severe that without emergency assistance they will most likely lose their farms. This assistance is not the answer to the problems facing our farmers and rural America, but it is an important part of an effort to keep families on their farms. I thank the Senator for South Dakota and the Senator from Montana for their efforts in drafting, supporting and offering this amendment.

#### HAY AND FESCUE CROPS

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, I wish to enter a short colloquy with my good friend, the Senator from Montana, one of the chief authors of this amendment, and ask him if losses to hay and fescue crops due to armyworm infestation qualify for assistance under amendment 4481 to the Interior Appropriations Act.

As the distinguished Senator might know, farmers of forage crops in southern Missouri, and across the country, were devastated by a recent armyworm infestation. The Secretary of Agriculture declared sixty-two Missouri counties as natural disaster areas due to damage caused by severe armyworm infestation. Last year Senator LEAHY and I introduced legislation, S. 1354, to provide emergency relief for these farmers.

Mr. BAUCUS. In response to my distinguished colleague, we have consulted with the Department of Agri-

culture and these crop losses would indeed qualify for assistance under this amendment.

I know that the armyworm infestations have caused massive damage to crops throughout the Midwest and Northeast and I am pleased that this legislation will provide some assistance to these farmers.

Mrs. CARNAHAN. I thank the Chairman of the Finance Committee for his assurances that this important legislation will provide much needed relief to so many farmers and farm communities in Missouri.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, under the order that was to be in effect following the termination of the debate on the Interior bill, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business begin now and go for an hour. I ask that, rather than be controlled by any particular party, those wishing to speak be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each and that the Senator from California be first recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. How long does the Senator from California wish to speak?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I was hoping 20 minutes.

Mr. REID. I ask that the first person to be recognized be the Senator from California for up to 20 minutes and that in the time thereafter, whoever wishes to speak may come to speak. We are not trying to cut out the minority from exercising their ability to speak in morning business. I am not sure anybody wishes to speak now because it is lunchtime, but everybody will have the opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California is recognized.

#### MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS ON IRAQ

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to express my growing concern that we may shortly be faced with a decision to unilaterally invade another nation-state, and that is the State of Iraq. This concern has been heightened by the news of today's assassination attempt of Afghan President Hamid Karzai in Kandahar. Earlier on, a car bomb exploded in central Kabul, killing at least 22 people.

This event, in my view, underscores the point that our primary focus must remain on our immediate war on terrorism being waged in troubled Afghanistan, where our soldiers are on the front line. As a matter of fact, preliminary reports indicate it was Americans who took down the attempted assassins.

While I welcome President Bush's recent statement indicating he will seek congressional approval of such a use of