

Resolved, That suitable copies of this Memorial, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, each member of the United States Congress who sits as chair on the United States House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture or the United States Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the United States Secretary of Agriculture and each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. I also ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized: Senator HARKIN for 20 minutes; Senator CLINTON for 10 minutes, Senator SCHUMER for 10 minutes, Senator LINCOLN for 5 minutes, Senator DORGAN for 15 minutes, and Senator DAYTON for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President—and I do not intend to object—I think the Senators who wish to be heard on this issue should have an opportunity. I did want to see if the ranking member on this side might have some request at this time with regard to the timing of the speeches or indications of how votes might occur. I withdraw my reservation and yield the floor to Senator LUGAR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator cannot yield the floor.

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to reflect that Senators SESSIONS, COLLINS, GORDON SMITH, and TIM HUTCHINSON voted "yes" on the unanimous consent request as granted by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I inquire if Members on our side wish time. There are requests: From Senator ROBERTS for 10 minutes, 5 minutes for Senator CRAIG, and I reserve 15 minutes for myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senators alternate, Republican and Democrat, as we acknowledge those who have requested time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There is no objection.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, before the distinguished majority leader leaves the floor, I inquire, then, about any plans for further votes to occur today or this afternoon.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I failed to add to the list Senator LEAHY. I ask 5 minutes for Senator LEAHY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, with this unanimous consent request, there will be no more rollcall votes today. I thank all Senators for their cooperation.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand under the unanimous consent request I am recognized for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 20 minutes.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, here is the situation, just for the benefit of all who are watching and wondering what happened. Basically what has happened is that the Senate just took up the House-passed Agriculture emergency bill and passed it, and therefore it will be sent to the President for his signature. I also point out we still have pending in the Senate the bill that was passed by our committee and there has been entered a motion to reconsider that has been placed by our leader, by Senator DASCHLE of South Dakota. So at some point when we come back it is entirely within the realm of feasibility or possibility that this Senate might want to revisit that Senate bill because it is clear that the House bill is totally inadequate to meet the needs of our farmers across the country.

I am proud of our committee and the work it did. Keep in mind that our committee was not reconstituted or able to do business until June 29, because the Senate organizing resolution was held up until then. And we did not have our full membership until July 10. But our committee worked diligently to look at the entire spectrum of farm families across America to try to determine what was needed to keep these farm families in business, keep their heads above water for yet another year until we can get a farm bill passed. The bill we reported out met the needs of farmers across America. Yet the White House said no.

I again point out that our committee voted the Senate bill out on a bipartisan vote. The Senate voted, again on a bipartisan vote, in favor of our bill and the provisions we had in our bill. But the White House said no.

Now we are at the point, because the House has left, they went home, and because we need to get this money out, that a gun is held at our heads by the White House and by OMB. They are saying if we do not pass the House bill, or if we pass something more adequate to the need in rural America we may lose even the \$5.5 billion the House provided. So the gun was held at our heads and the White House refused to compromise.

Yesterday I spoke several times with the head of the Office of Management

and Budget, Mr. Daniels, I spoke with the President's chief of staff, and I spoke with the Secretary of Agriculture to see if they would at least meet with us to see if there could be some compromise worked out. I said to the President's chief of staff last night: I respectfully request a meeting with the President at least to lay out our case on why the House bill was inadequate. That meeting was denied. So the President decided he would accept only \$5.5 billion, which is only about three-fourths of what Congress passed in a similar bill last year.

I had a long visit with the head of OMB on the phone last night to try to determine why they picked that number. He said: Well, it looked as if farm income was a little bit better this year.

I said: Compared to what? We have had extremely low commodity prices, in some cases at about 30-year lows. Now, because livestock receipts were up a little bit the ag picture looks a little bit better than it did last year, but we are still in the basement. However, the money in this bill mainly goes to crop farmers, and they are the ones who are hurting the most. They are not only as bad off as last year, but they are probably worse off than last year because the prices are still low and all of their production costs have gone up—fertilizer, fuel, everything. Yet somehow the bean counters down at OMB have said no, the House bill is sufficient.

I will resubmit for the RECORD at this time letters or statements from just about all of the main farm organizations: The American Farm Bureau, National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Corn Growers Association, the American Soybean Association, the National Barley Growers Association and others—all saying that the House bill is inadequate. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Voice of Agriculture, Monday
July 30, 2001]

FARM BUREAU DISAPPOINTED IN HOUSE FUNDING FOR FARMERS

WASHINGTON, DC., June 21, 2001—The House Agriculture Committee's decision to provide only \$5.5 billion in a farm relief package "is disheartening and will not provide sufficient assistance needed by many farm and ranch families," said American Farm Bureau Federation President Bob Stallman.

"We believe needs exceed \$7 billion," Stallman said. "The fact is agricultural commodity prices have not strengthened since last year when Congress saw fit to provide significantly more aid."

Stallman said securing additional funding will be a high priority for Farm Bureau. He said the organization will now turn its attention to the Senate and then the House-Senate conference committee that will decide the fate of much-needed farm relief.

"Four years of low prices has put a lot of pressure on farmers. We need assistance to keep this sector viable," the farm leader said.

"We've been told net farm income is rising but a closer examination shows that is largely due to higher livestock prices, not most of American agriculture," Stallman said.

"And, costs are rising for all farmers and ranchers due to problems in the energy industry that are reflected in increased costs

for fuel and fertilizer. Farmers and ranchers who produce grain, oilseeds, cotton, fruits and vegetables need help and that assistance is needed soon."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WHEAT GROWERS,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2001.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Rus-
sell Senate Officer Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN: As President of the National Association of Wheat (NAWG), and on behalf of wheat producers across the nation, I urge the Committee to draft a 2001 agriculture economic assistance package that provides wheat producers with a market loss payment equal to the 1999 Production Flexibility Contract (AMTA) payment rate.

NAWG understands Congress is facing difficult budget decisions. We too are experiencing tight budgets in wheat country. While wheat prices hover around the loan rate, PFC payments this year have declined from \$0.59 to \$0.47. At the same time, input costs have escalated. Fuel and oil expenses are up 53 percent from 1999, and fertilizer costs have risen 33 percent this year alone.

Given these circumstances, NAWG's first priority for the 2001 crop year is securing a market loss payment at the 1999 PFC rate. We believe a supplemental payment at \$0.64 for wheat—the same level provided in both 1999 and 2000—is warranted and necessary to provide sufficient income support to the wheat industry.

NAWG has a history of supporting fiscal discipline and respects efforts to preserve the integrity of the \$73.5 billion in FY02-FY11 farm program dollars. However, given current financial conditions, growers cannot afford the reduced level of support provided by the House in H.R. 2213. Wheat farmers across the nation are counting on a market loss payment at the 1999 PFC rate.

Thank you for your leadership and support.
Sincerely,

DUSTY TALLMAN,
President, National Association
of Wheat Growers.

NATIONAL CORN GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2001.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HARKIN: We write to urge you to take immediate action on the \$5.5 billion in funding for agricultural economic assistance authorized in the FY01 budget resolution.

The fiscal year 2001 budget resolution authorized \$5.5 billion in economic assistance for those suffering through low commodity prices in agriculture. However, these funds must be dispersed by the US Department of Agriculture by September 30, 2001. We are very concerned that any further delay by Congress concerning these funds will severely hamper USDA's efforts to release funds and will, in turn, be detrimental to producers anxiously awaiting this relief.

We feel strongly that the Committee should disperse these limited funds in a similar manner to the FY00 economic assistance package—addressing the needs of the eight major crops—corn, wheat, barley, oats, oilseeds, sorghum, rice and cotton. It is these growers who have suffered greatly from the last two years of escalating fuel and other input costs. The expectation of these program crop farmers is certainly for a continuation of the supplemental, AMTA at the 1999 level.

Again, we urge the Committee to allocate the market loss assistance payments at the

FY99 production flexibility contract payment level for program crops. We feel strongly that Congress should support the growers getting hit hardest by increasing input costs.
Sincerely,

LEE KLEIN,
President, National Corn
Growers Association.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Aurora, CO, July 25, 2001.

FARMERS UNION COMMENDS SENATE ON
EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PACKAGE

WASHINGTON, D.C. (July 25, 2001).—The National Farmers Union (NFU) today applauded the Senate Agriculture Committee on its approval of \$7.4 billion in emergency assistance for U.S. agriculture producers. The bill provides supplemental income assistance to feed grains, wheat, rice and cotton producers as well as specialty crop producers. The Senate measure provides the needed assistance at the same levels as last year and is \$2 billion more than what is provided in a House version of the measure. NFU urges expeditious passage by the full Senate and resolution in the House/Senate conference committee that adopts the much needed funding at the Senate level.

"We commend Chairman Tom Harkin for his leadership in crafting this assistance package," said Leland Swenson, president of NFU. "We are pleased that members of the committee have chosen to provide funding that is comparable to what many farmers requested at the start of this process. This level of funding recognizes the needs that exist in rural America at a time when farmers face continued low commodity prices for row and specialty crops while input costs for fuel, fertilizer and energy have risen rapidly over the past year."

The Senate Agriculture Committee approved the Emergency Agriculture Assistance Act of 2001 that provides \$7.4 billion in emergency assistance to a broad range of agriculture producers and funds conservation programs. It also provides loans and grants to encourage value-added products, compensation for damage to flooded lands and support for bio-energy-based initiatives. The funding level is the same as what was provided last year and is comparable to what NFU had requested in order to meet today's needs for farmers and ranchers. The House proposal provides \$5.5 billion.

"We now urge the full Senate to quickly pass this much-needed assistance package," Swenson added. "It is vital that the House/Senate conference committee fund this measure at the Senate level. As we meet the challenge of crafting a new agriculture policy for the future, today's needs for assistance are still great. We hope for swift action to help America's farmers and ranchers."

NATIONAL BARLEY GROWERS ASSOCIATION
(NBGA)—POSITION STATEMENT
INCOME AND MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE FOR THE
2001 CROP

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2002 budget resolution provides \$5.5 billion in additional agricultural assistance for crop year 2001 and an increase of \$73.5 billion in the agriculture budget baseline through 2011. The budget resolution also provided flexibility in the use of a total of \$79 billion. Because agricultural prices are not improving and production costs continue to escalate, NBGA believes it will be difficult to fully address the chronically ailing agriculture economy if Congress provides no more than \$5.5 billion in assistance.

Although projections show a rise in farm income, this is largely due to the fact that analysis project livestock cash receipts to rise from \$98.8 billion in 2000 to \$106.6 billion

in 2001. At the same time, cash receipts from crop sales are up less than \$1 billion.

Further, producers continue to face historic low prices and income as well as increased input costs. In 2000, farm expenditures for fuel and oil, electricity, fertilizer and crop protection chemicals are estimated to increase farmers' cost \$2.9 billion. This year, USDA estimates those expenses will rise an additional \$2 billion to \$3 billion while farm income continues to decrease. These issues affect every sector of agriculture.

We urge Congress to mandate that the Secretary of Agriculture make emergency economic assistance for the 2001 crops in the form of a market loss assistance payment at the 1999 Production Flexibility Contract (PFC, or AMTA) payment rate as soon as practicable prior to the end of FY01.

We believe this additional assistance will help address the serious economic conditions in the farm sector and does not jeopardize the House and Senate Agriculture Committees' ability to develop effective new long-term farm policy in the near future.

AMERICAN FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION,
Park Ridge, IL, July 31, 2001.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry
Committee, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Of-
fice Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: The American Farm Bureau Federation supports at least \$5.5 billion in supplemental Agricultural Market Transition Act payments and \$500 million in market loss assistance payments for oilseeds as part of the emergency spending package for crop year 2001. We also believe it is imperative to offer assistance to peanut, fruit and vegetable producers. In addition, it is crucial to extend the dairy price support in this bill since the current program will expire in less than two months.

All over this country agriculture has been facing historic low prices and increasing production costs. These challenges have had a significant effect on the incomes of U.S. producers. At the same time, projections of improvement for the near future are not very optimistic. We appreciate your leadership in providing assistance to address the low-income situation that U.S. producers are currently facing.

We thank you for your leadership and look forward to working with you to provide assistance for agricultural producers.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

JULY 31, 2001.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and For-
estry, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The undersigned oilseed producer organizations strongly support the Committee's efforts to complete consideration of legislation to provide Economic Loss Assistance to producers of 2001 crops prior to the August Congressional work period. As you know, funds available for this purpose in FY-2001 must be expended before the end of the Fiscal Year on September 30, 2001. This deadline requires that Congress complete action this week, so that the Farm Service Agency can process payments after enactment.

As part of the Economic Loss Assistance package, we support continuing the level of support for oilseeds provided in last year's plan of \$500 million. Prices for oilseeds are at or below levels experienced for the 2000 crop. Farmers and their lenders expect Congress to maintain oilseed payments at last year's levels.

For this reason, we support making funds available for oilseed payments from the \$7.35 billion provided in the Budget Resolution for FY-2002. This is the same approach used for 2000 crop oilseeds, when \$500 million in FY-2001 funds were made available. We only ask that oilseed producers receive the same support, and in the same manner, provided last year.

Thank you very much for your efforts to provide fair and equitable treatment for oilseed producers in this time of severe economic hardship.

Sincerely yours,

BART RUTH,
President, American
Soybean Assn.

LLOYD KLEIN,
President, National
Sunflower Assn.

STEVE DAHL,
President, U.S. Canola
Assn.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Reston, VA, July 27, 2001.

Senator TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senate, Chairman, Senate Agriculture
Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and its more than 4 million members and supporters nationwide, I would like to thank for your strong leadership in providing significant funding for conservation programs within the Emergency Agricultural Aid Package passed by the Senate Agriculture Committee earlier this week.

For too many years, conservation programs have been overlooked as viable and sustainable solutions to the emergency needs of agricultural producers suffering from the results of flooding and drought. As you are aware, programs such as the Wetlands Reserve Program and Floodplain Easement Program put needed funds into the hands of farmers at the same time that they take disaster-prone land out of production, reducing the need for future disaster assistance. Thanks to your efforts, such programs will be considered as components of agricultural disaster assistance this year. We look forward to working with you to ensure that this funding is retained during floor consideration of the bill and in conference with the House.

Once again, we thank you for your work in support of conservation programs.

Sincerely,

MARK VAN PUTTEN,
President & CEO.

THE AMERICAN DIETETIC ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, July 31, 2001.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and For-
estry, U.S. Senate, Russell Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

Attn: Karil Bialostosky.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: ADA is writing to go on record in support of several nutrition provisions proposed in the Emergency Agricultural Assistance Act of 2001 (S. 1246). These provisions move programs in the right direction by increasing consumer access to healthful foods. The American Dietetic Association promotes optimal nutrition and well being for all people by advocating for its members—70,000 nutrition professionals who are the leading providers of food and nutrition services in the United States.

All consumers in the United States should have access to a wide variety of safe, affordable and nutritious foods. ADA urges Congress to support agriculture policy and fund programs that help Americans follow a diet consistent with the U.S. Dietary Guidelines

for Americans. The Commodity Purchases provision (Title I, Section 108) and Sections 301, 302, 303 and 304 of the Nutrition Title (Title III) move toward that goal.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE J. GORTON,
Director,
National Nutrition Policy.

Mr. HARKIN. I ask again, Mr. President, who knows better what the farmers of America need, OMB and the bean counters or the National Corn Growers Association? Who knows better what our farmers need, the people down at the White House running around those corridors down there or the American Soybean Association and our soybean farmers? Who knows better about what our farmers need, the people down at OMB who say we only need three-fourths of what we had last year or the farmers of America, through their representatives here, who have said time and time again the House bill is inadequate?

To show you how bad it really is, here is a letter dated today to me from the American Soybean Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, and the National Cotton Council, sent to me in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

It says:

The undersigned organizations are concerned that despite your best efforts to develop an emergency assistance package, the Senate's efforts to respond to the severe economic crisis facing agriculture will be unsuccessful unless emergency agricultural legislation is enacted prior to the August recess. With the House of Representatives already in recess, the only course available to the Senate to ensure that farmers receive \$5.5 billion of funds earmarked for 2001 is to pass H.R. 2213 as passed by the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

AUGUST 3, 2001.

Re Emergency Assistance for Agriculture.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The undersigned organizations are concerned that despite your best efforts to develop an emergency assistance package, the Senate's efforts to respond to the severe economic crisis facing agriculture will be unsuccessful unless emergency agricultural legislation is enacted prior to the August recess. With the House of Representatives already in recess, the only course available to the Senate to ensure that farmers receive \$5.5 billion of funds earmarked for 2001 is to pass H.R. 2213 as passed by the House.

In order to avoid the very real possibility these budgeted funds will be lost, we urge the Senate to take the necessary action and pass H.R. 2213 without amendment and send the bill to the President. Without timely action, we face the prospect of missing the budget-imposed September 30 deadline and forfeiting this crucial financial aid.

With prices of many commodities even lower than 2000, with increased costs for fuel and other inputs, and with severe weather in some regions, U.S. farmers need this assist-

ance package more than ever. It is imperative that Congress complete its work right away.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,
American Soybean Association.
National Corn Growers Association.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Cotton Council.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, again, I want you to know how proud I am to have stood side by side with the American Soybean Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, and the National Cotton Council. We have fought side by side to respond to the dire needs of our farmers in America.

But, as this letter shows, we have a gun held to our heads. If we don't pass that House bill today, we risk losing even that amount of money.

We have this confrontation. I had hoped that the President would be willing to meet with us to seek some reasonable compromise. After all, this President came to town saying he wanted to be a conciliator. He wanted to work together in a bipartisan fashion to seek compromise. We want to seek compromise. The House passed \$5.5 billion. We passed \$7.5 billion. We were willing to meet and discuss and work out some compromise. The White House was unwilling to meet and unwilling to compromise.

I have heard time after time speeches on the other side of the Senate. I have heard from my Republican friends saying how bad it is in agriculture and how much we need this assistance. But, obviously, the President has said no.

In my conversations with the head of OMB last night, I kept saying: Why? For what reason is it \$5.5 billion or nothing? He said that is our number—5.5. It was almost like a mantra. He said: It is 5.5, and we are not going to budge from it.

It is one thing to have a strong position, but it is another thing to have a position in which you have taken a strong stand that does not correlate with the facts. The facts are that farmers and rural America need a lot more help than what this House bill provides.

Again, I point out what the difference between the House-passed bill and the Senate bill means for our farmers around America. These are the payments that would go out to farmers in a number of States in this country.

In this column, we see what the Senate bill would provide. We see in this column the House bill. The comparisons are just on the commodity title, but do not include the specialty crop purchases or House bill specialty crop payments to states. This is how much each State will lose because the President refused to compromise.

Washington State will lose \$103 million for their farmers. That is the difference between what the Senate bill had and what the House bill had. Washington State farmers will get \$75 million from the House bill. We had \$178

million in our bill for Washington State farmers. Washington farmers are going to be hurt and hurt badly. So will their community banks; so will the auto dealers; so will the hardware stores; the feed stores; and, everyone else in those small towns all over the State of Washington.

In Iowa, in my home State, farmers will lose \$91.47 million because the President said no, again just on the commodity title and not counting conservation, for example.

In Minnesota, they will lose \$82.7 million; Texas, \$82.4 million. In the President's home State, farmers are going to lose \$82.42 million.

In Illinois, they will lose \$81.6 million. In Nebraska, they will lose \$65.2 million; Kansas will lose \$61.7 million for their farmers; North Dakota, \$60.7 million; California, \$52.5 million; Arkansas will lose \$43.9 million for their farmers; Indiana will lose \$40.12 million; Louisiana, \$32 million; South Dakota, \$32 million; Missouri, \$31 million; Michigan, \$31 million; Ohio, \$29 million; Montana, \$24 million; Wisconsin, \$24 million; Idaho, \$23.9 million; Oklahoma, \$22.8 million; Mississippi, \$22 million.

That is what the House bill is going to cost the farmers in those States because the President said no. The President is determined that the House bill was sufficient to take care of the farmers in those States.

Time and time again I see the President visiting farms. How many farms is he going to have to visit before he gets the picture and before he understands what is happening in rural America?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of March 13 sent to the Honorable PETE DOMENICI, chairman—at that time—of the Budget Committee. It was signed by 21 Members of the Senate asking that the 2001 Agriculture Market Transition Act payment be the same as it was last year. The letter went on to say how bad things are in rural America with high production costs, fuel, fertilizer, and interest rates with projections that farm income will not improve in the near future. It says:

We believe it is vitally important to provide at least as much total economic assistance for 2001 and 2002 as was provided for the 2000 crop.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter and the accompanying signatures be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2001.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE: We are writing to request your assistance in including appropriate language in the FY02 budget resolution so that emergency economic loss assistance can be made available for 2001 and 2002 or until a replacement for the 1996 Farm Bill can be enacted. Specifically, since conditions are not appreciably improved for 2001, we support making market loss assistance available so that the total amount of assistance available through the 2001 Agricultural Market Transition Act payment and the Market Loss Assistance payments will be the same as was available for the 2000 crop. We understand it is unusual to ask that funds to be made available in the current fiscal year be provided in a budget resolution covering the next fiscal year, but the financial stress in U.S. agriculture is extraordinary.

According to USDA and other prominent agriculture economists, the U.S. agricultural economy continues to face persistent low prices and depressed farm income. According to testimony presented by USDA on February 14, 2001, "a strong rebound in farm prices and income from the market place for major crops appears unlikely . . . assuming no supplemental assistance, net cash farm income in 2001 is projected to be the lowest level since 1994 and about \$4 billion below the average of the 1990's." The USDA statement also said . . . "(a) national farm financial crisis has not occurred in large part due to record government payments and greater off-farm income."

In addition to sluggish demand and chronically low prices, U.S. farmers and ranchers are experiencing rapidly increasing input costs including fuel, fertilizer and interest rates. According to USDA, "increases in petroleum prices and interest rates along with higher prices for other inputs, including hired labor increased farmers' production expenses by 4 percent or \$7.6 billion in 2000, and for 2001 cash production expenses are forecast to increase further. At the same time, major crop prices for the 2000-01 season are expected to register only modest improvement from last year's 15-25 year lows, reflecting another year of large global production of major crops and ample stocks."

During the last 3 years, Congress has provided significant levels of emergency economic assistance through so-called Market Loss Assistance payments and disaster assistance for weather related losses. During the last three years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has provided about \$72 billion in economic and weather related loss assistance and conservation payments. The Congressional Budget Office and USDA project that expenditures for 2001 will be \$14-17 billion without additional market or weather loss assistance. With projections that farm income will not improve in the near future, we believe it is vitally important to provide at least as much total economic assistance for 2001 and 2002 as was provided for the 2000 crop.

Congress has begun to evaluate replacement farm policy. In order to provide effective, predictable financial support which also allows farmers and ranchers to be competitive, sufficient funding will be needed to allow the Agriculture Committee to ultimately develop a comprehensive package covering major commodities in addition to livestock and specialty crops, rural development, trade, and conservation initiatives. Until new legislation can be enacted, it is essential that Congress provide emergency economic assistance necessary to alleviate the current financial crisis.

We realize these recommendations add significantly to projected outlays for farm programs. Our farmers and ranchers clearly prefer receiving their income from the market. However, while they strive to further reduce costs and expand markets, federal assistance will be necessary until conditions improve. We appreciate your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,
Thad Conchran, John Breaux, Tim Hutchinson, Mary Landrieu, Kit Bond,

Blanche Lincoln, Jim Bunning, Mitch McConnell, Max Cleland, Jeff Sessions, Richard Shelby, Jesse Helms, Larry Craig, James Inhofe, Strom Thurmond, Zell Miller, Craig Thomas, Chuck Hagel, Peter Fitzgerald, Bill Frist, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, nothing has changed. I can only assume my friends on the other side of the aisle would like to have had more money for our farmers. They would like to have had the Senate-passed bill to provide 100 percent of AMTA because this is what they asked for. That is what we put in the Senate bill. But, obviously, the President said no. The President said no; farmers had enough.

I also point out what else was in our bill in terms of conservation. Our bill provided funding for a number of USDA conservation programs. The Wetlands Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, and Farmland Protection Program are all in jeopardy because the House bill has zero dollars for conservation.

Let me show you what it is in terms of all of the funding for these programs.

Here is the Wetlands Reserve Program. Right now the total backlog is about \$568 million. In our bill, we had \$200 million for the Wetlands Reserve Program to cut that in half. Here are the top 10 States that need funding for the Wetlands Reserve Program.

I see my friend and colleague from Arkansas, a distinguished member of our committee, here in the Chamber. Arkansas has \$89 million in backlog for the Wetlands Reserve Program. These are all eligible enrollments. But we don't have the money for it. At least our bill would have cut that almost in half.

Iowa, my State, \$81.9 million; California, \$78.9 million; Louisiana, \$69 million; Mississippi, \$18 million. All of these States have backlogs for the Wetlands Reserve Program. The House provides zero dollars. That puts the Wetlands Reserve Program in jeopardy.

We have the Farmland Protection Program to help buy easements to keep our farmland in farmland rather than in urban sprawl. The total U.S. backlog is \$255 million. We had \$40 million in our bill, which coupled with money from the States, local governments and non-profit organizations would have helped a lot to save farmland. The House bill had zero dollars for that.

Under the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, the backlog is \$14 million. We had \$7 million in our bill, again to cut that backlog in half.

Here are all the States with all of the backlogs that we could have helped in the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program.

Lastly, Environmental Quality Incentives Program, with a backlog of \$1.3 billion. We had \$250 million in our bill to reduce that down.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four charts showing the backlogs in USDA conservation programs for a number of States.

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

Wetlands Reserve Program

[Total U.S. Backlog = \$568,772,170]

TOP 10 STATES

Arkansas	\$89,102,486
Iowa	81,965,541
California	78,988,416
Louisiana	69,656,427
Missouri	41,111,255
Florida	27,539,000
Minnesota	25,017,968
Illinois	24,986,434
Michigan	20,500,000
Mississippi	18,173,136

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Farmland Protection Program

[Total U.S. Backlog = \$255,677,581]

TOP 10 STATES

California	\$47,692,183
New York	33,760,639
Maryland	29,531,511
Florida	18,799,852
Pennsylvania	15,908,572
Delaware	12,926,040
Kentucky	12,290,000
Michigan	11,579,235
New Jersey	10,692,132
Massachusetts	10,465,820

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program

[Total U.S. Backlog = \$14,447,989]

TOP 10 STATES

Oregon	\$1,129,115
Texas	1,100,000
Florida	1,040,000
West Virginia	1,030,472
Arkansas	920,000
Colorado	770,000
Maine	650,000
Michigan	613,434
Alabama	548,000
South Dakota	529,395

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Environmental Quality Incentives Program

[Total U.S. Backlog = \$1,378,348,711]

TOP 10 STATES

Texas	\$175,615,986
Oklahoma	60,684,644
Georgia	55,908,744
Arkansas	53,263,407
Kansas	49,142,061
Montana	46,421,056
Kentucky	44,107,218
Nebraska	42,912,850
Tennessee	40,772,836
Virginia	39,795,591

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Mr. HARKIN. These States have tremendous backlogs and needs in the Environmental Quality Incentives Program to help clean up the water and conserve resources in these States. We had about \$½ billion in our bill to help all of the States meet the environmental standards and needs in States.

Many of the farmers in these States have to meet environmental standards, and even without requirements, farmers and ranchers strive to take care of the land. They want to do their best to be good stewards. In many cases farmers are doing this out of their own pockets with their own machinery and their own time.

I believe we need to help them. We need to help these farmers meet these

environmental standards. Yet the House bill provides nothing.

It is too bad that the President would not even meet with us and would not try to work out some decent compromise. We were willing. The President said, no. They made their point they were only going to have \$5.5 billion for our farmers; they were not going to have any conservation.

We also wanted to broaden this bill out to address the needs of our specialty crop producers in America, the people who raise peas and lentils and apples and all the other fruits and vegetables that are part of our great bounty that we have in this country. These farmers are hurting, too. We tried to help them. The House bill does a little bit, but hardly anything at all, to help these beleaguered farmers.

Lastly, I want to say—and I want to make this point one more time, as I made it to OMB and to the White House—the \$7.5 billion that we had in our bill fully complied with the budget. No budget point of order would lay against our bill. We had \$5.5 billion in fiscal year 2001. We used \$2 billion of the \$7.35 billion that was allowed us in 2002. We did not bust any budgets. We stayed within the budget. We met our obligations, and we met our obligations both to fiscal responsibility and also our responsibility to the farmers of this country.

So I will close by saying that the fight goes on. This Senator, and I am sure many other Senators in this body, are not going to give up. The President got his way because he has the veto.

I am hopeful that we can work with the White House in August and in September, and going into this fall, on two things. One is to shape and fashion a new farm bill that will get us off the failed policies of the past. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the Freedom to Farm bill has failed, and failed miserably. We need a new farm bill. We need a new vision of agriculture in America. We need a farm bill that will move us into the 21st century. I look forward to working with the administration and with the Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, to fashion that new farm bill.

I also hope that as we go into the fall, we should come back and see what we might need to fill the gap between the end of September and whenever the farm bill is passed. The House bill we passed shorted farmers in Iowa and across the nation. The market loss and oilseed payments were cut back. The specialty crops were left out. Conservation was left out. Some assistance to our dairy farmers was left out. I hope we can come back in September—maybe early October—and revisit this and, hopefully, have the help and the support of the White House at that time to at least fill in that gap. That is what we tried to do in this bill, to fill in the gap from the end of September until such time as the farm bill is passed and enacted to make sure that

our programs for conservation were not interrupted, and to make sure that farmers were taken care of.

The fiscal year may end on September 30, but the crop-year does not. Farmers need help in October and November.

So hope springs eternal. The fight goes on. We will never give up the fight to provide the kind of assistance and support that our farmers and our farm families need—and not just those in the Midwest, but those in Michigan and New York and Washington State and all over this country, to make sure that those farm families are able to continue and to provide the agricultural products that we need for our country.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRAPO be added to the list of speakers who have been granted 5 minutes to speak.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Excuse me just one second. I am supposed to add someone else.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DODD be added to the list of speakers who have been granted 10 minutes to speak.

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

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I join the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee in saying the fight always goes on for American farmers. In the Agriculture Committee we have that commitment. And it is one we take with a great deal of pride and, likewise, with a high energy level. But today, Madam President, let me just say American farmers rejoice because a remarkable thing has occurred in this Senate Chamber this morning. We have come together with our colleagues in the House to pass a bill, which now, through some effort, will go to the House, to the President for signature, and to American farmers.

Let me just say the benefits to American farmers are very substantial. We began this quest because American farmers, according to the best estimate of the USDA, would receive—without our action—\$3 billion less in aggregate cash income this year. We have, by our actions this morning, sent to American farmers \$5.5 billion. We have, in fact, exceeded the gap and, as a matter of fact, made certain that agricultural income in America for this year will be \$2.5 billion more than last year.

That has not escaped the attention of a good number of agricultural organizations that have beneficiaries. The