

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

force, I believe any action in Iraq at this time, without allied support, without United Nations support, and without a compelling case for just cause, would be both morally wrong and politically mistaken.

I just returned from a trip to Europe. As part of my role as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, I toured U.S. military bases and met with a variety of individuals. They included members of the intelligence community, the military, and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

I was shocked at how dramatically perceptions in Europe have shifted since September 11 toward our country. All of the sympathy and concern we received in the wake of the terrorist attacks has apparently vanished, replaced by the sense that the United States is becoming an arrogant and aggressive power, a nation that simply gives orders, a nation that neither listens nor hears.

When I was in Europe, much attention was given to the absence of Presidential participation at the Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. And this, on top of our rejection of the Kyoto treaty, our casting of aspersions on international accords such as the International Criminal Court, the Anti-Ballistic Missile and Landmine treaties, has led to a growing belief, right or wrong, that the United States is using its power in an increasingly unilateral and somewhat arrogant manner.

Above all, there is our approach to Iraq and our perceived readiness to invade that nation unilaterally.

I believe we have to ask many critical questions, most of which are unanswered.

Questions about the ongoing war on terrorism. How do we stay the course, root out terrorism and, at the same time, initiate war with a nation-state which, to this day, remains unconnected to 9/11.

Questions about the extent of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction and about who will get to them first.

Questions about going it alone in Iraq.

Questions about casualties and cost.

Questions about collateral human damage—civilians killed in the short term and in the long run.

Questions about the future of Iraq, about whether we can honestly expect a democracy to be created out of a nation consumed by tribal factionalism.

And questions about what the long-term impact might be on the Arab world, on the Middle East. What if Iraq attacks Israel? What will we do, and what will the world do?

Present United States policy toward Iraq stands in stark contrast to how we conducted Operation Desert Storm just over a decade ago. Then, the first Bush administration spent several months building a broad-based coalition that included 30 nations, including many in

the Islamic world. It sought and received resolutions supporting the use of force against Iraq from the United States Congress and the United Nations Security Council, and American and international public opinion stood firmly behind such action. Today, no nation is firmly allied with the United States on this issue.

At the very least, I believe we should launch a major diplomatic effort with the United Nations, our allies, and our Arab friends, with the goal of delivering an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein: Either open up or go down.

If he does not comply with this demand, it will give the United States added moral and diplomatic strength to any future effort. It will help unite the world community behind us.

Additionally, I am very concerned that the United States stay the course on our war against terrorism. To date, there is no direct connection between Saddam Hussein's Iraq and the 9/11 attacks that has been substantiated.

This means staying the course in our war against terrorism, part of which exists in Afghanistan. The government of Hamid Karzai is fragile at best. Today should show that. During its first 6 months in power, two Cabinet officials have been assassinated. Today, President Karzai himself barely escaped an assassination attempt, and a major act of terrorism has killed many in central Kabul. The Karzai government must have security and stability, or it will perish and so will democracy.

Additionally, we know the Taliban and al-Qaida lurk in the remote mountains, waiting for an opportune moment to come back. If Afghanistan cannot be stabilized, if its streets and homes cannot be made secure, and if its first democratic government cannot survive, this will be a very serious setback.

Afghanistan is our beachhead in the war on terror. We cannot lose it, or we lose the war on terror. We must put al-Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, and a host of other terrorist groups out of business before they can strike out again at America and our interests.

That is why concentrating on this war—the critical war against terrorism—is so important.

An attack on Iraq at this time would only deflect from this war, by diverting attention and forces away from bringing to justice the perpetrators of 9/11. Can we afford to do this?

If there is an imminent threat to the United States or to our interests, then we must act. At this moment, however, I do not believe such a threat exists. No one doubts that Iraq has chemical or biological weapons and the means to deliver them. They have used them on at least three occasions, but they have not used them in the last 10 years, and I believe they know what will happen if they do use them.

What is less clear, however, is the status of Iraq's nuclear weapons capability. In 1981, Israel destroyed the

Osiraq reactor provided by France. While Iraq continues to seek to develop nuclear capability, there is no evidence I have found that Iraq is nuclear capable today. So there is no imminent threat.

Secretary Rumsfeld has claimed that if we wait for Iraq to develop nuclear weapons, then it will be too late. He is right. The key is to find a way to stop Iraqi nuclear ambition, and stop it now, which is why opening Iraq's borders to a search and destroy mission for weapons of mass destruction, conducted by our allies, our friends in the Arab world, and the United Nations, is critical.

I believe this requires renewed diplomatic efforts on our part, with the United Nations, with our allies, and with friendly Arab nations. We must stop Iraq from becoming nuclear capable. And the world in turn must respond. Otherwise, an attack becomes the only alternative.

As Gen. Wesley Clark recently stated:

In the war on terrorism, alliances are not an obstacle to victory. They're the key to it.

By acting unilaterally, the United States not only runs the risk of isolating these long-standing allies, but also of solidifying the entire Arab world sharply against us. This may not result in any direct or traditional military response against the United States, but what about a personal jihad throughout this country—a jihad of bombs and other terrorist acts carried out throughout the world?

There are people out there eminently capable and able to finance doing just that.

With the Israeli-Palestinian conflict not yet under control, a United States attack on Iraq would certainly fuel the fire of Islamic fanaticism, uniting the Arab world against the West and Israel. The consequences could be unprecedented and beyond our present comprehension.

The Israeli-Palestinian situation should be our highest priority. This conflict must be resolved. The United States must use its influence and leadership here, with the Israelis, the Palestinians, and the surrounding Arab world. Here, too, we must stay the course.

At the same time, there is some troubling evidence today of the preparation of a second front in southern Lebanon to attack Israel in the event we attack Iraq. Ambassador Dennis Ross recently told me of thousands—he mentioned 10,000—extended-range Katyusha rockets that have been moved through Syria from Iran and into southern Lebanon, for an attack on Israel. He said they had been extended so that they could hit at the major Israeli industrial zone north of Haifa. I believe this has been confirmed.

In the face of all of this, assume we do attack Iraq. Consider that we mobilize 250,000 to 300,000 soldiers, our aircraft carriers, our B-52s, our 117s. This will not be another Desert Storm

where exposed Iraqi troops are routed in the open desert, overwhelmed by American airpower.

This war will be waged in Baghdad, in Tikrit, and in other cities. It will be waged from house to house and palace to palace, from street to street and school to school and hospital to hospital.

We will certainly kill many Iraqis, and how many of our own will be killed? And will we stay the course once the body bags start coming back to Dover? Will Americans stand up and say, "More"? I think not.

Then there are the thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians already brutalized by the last 12 years—who will become casualties in this war.

America has never been an aggressor nation unless attacked, as we were at Pearl Harbor and on September 11, or our interests and our allies were attacked. We have never initiated a major invasion against another nation-state, which leads to the question of whether a preemptive war is the morally right, legally right, or the politically right way for the United States to proceed.

Lastly, there is the immensely complicated question of the Iraqi nation Saddam Hussein now has and what will happen if he is overthrown. Have we really thought out our options here? Have we taken into account the deep tribal factionalism and divisions, the bitter and often bloody rivalries among the Shia majority, the ruling Sunni minority, and the Kurds, that lie at the very root of Iraq? Will we protect the Kurds from possible genocide? How long will we stay to secure a new government? And who would replace Saddam Hussein?

Let's be realistic. A democracy is not likely to emerge. One must look closely at the history of Iraq to draw such a conclusion, and I have.

Madam President, I would like to quote from the recently published book, "The Reckoning: Iraq and the Legacy of Saddam Hussein" by Sandra Mackey. She writes:

When [Saddam Hussein] finally loses his grip on power either politically or physically, he will leave Iraq much as it was when the British created it—torn by tribalism and uncertain in its identity. It is this Iraq that threatens to inflict its communal grievances, its decades of non-cooperation, and its festering suspicions and entrenched hatreds on the Persian Gulf, the life-line of our global economy.

In light of such conditions, is the United States ready to be an occupational force? It could take many years for the seeds of a stable pluralist society to flourish in Iraq. Are we really ready to spend a generation there?

Given what is at stake here—American lives, American prestige, and America's respect for the rule of law—we find ourselves at a critical crossroad.

Again, according to Sandra Mackey:

. . . the time is fast approaching when the United States, for a series of perilous rea-

sons, will be forced to look beyond Hussein to Iraq itself. That is when all Americans will pay the price for what has been a long night of ignorance about the land between the rivers.

In closing, I am very happy to see that President Bush will now seek congressional approval regarding military action. So this debate has just begun.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Congress to ensure we not only ask the questions but see that the answers are moral, see that they are legal, see that they are befitting the greatest democracy on Earth, and see whether they are worth, for the first time, the United States of America making a unilateral attack on another nation-state.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, the attacks of September 11 changed us as individuals and as a nation. They changed the way we think about our personal security, and they challenged our assumptions about the threats posed by groups and organizations hostile to our values and our way of life.

The events of the past year have also bolstered our resolve. We have come a long way since that terrible day, but much more needs to be done. We have toppled the Taliban and severely disrupted the al-Qaida network, but our military is still working around the clock to destroy al-Qaida elements around the world.

We have dramatically improved security at our airports, but we have much to do to protect our aviation system, our ports, and our borders. We have spent billions to recover from the attacks, but unfortunately we must spend more to protect our homeland from threats ranging from bioterrorism to dirty bombs.

Today, we are focused on reorganizing our Federal Government to meet these new security challenges. I believe creating a new Federal Department of Homeland Security is the right thing to do. We need one agency whose exclusive focus is controlling our borders and protecting our homeland. That is why I support the bill before the Senate.

I commend Senator LIEBERMAN for the leadership and tenacity he has shown in getting us to this point. We began hearings last year on this proposal, and now we have brought the Senate a well-designed, comprehensive bill, approved on a bipartisan basis by the Governmental Affairs Committee. I was proud to vote for that bill.

I also commend President Bush for his decision to support the creation of a Homeland Security Department.

I believe now is the time for Congress and the President to work together to create a strong, effective, and well-equipped department—a robust department. The American people rightly demand that the first duty of the Federal Government is to provide security. So we need to make sure we give the new Department the structure and the tools it needs to do the job.

The committee-approved homeland security bill creates an agency that will improve coordination, cooperation, and communication among all the Government organizations that will work at this new effort. It will bring together information and expertise from Federal, State, and local government and the private sector. Such efforts are key to preventing and containing further attacks.

Our States are on the front line of this battle. Missouri recognized this and was the first State to hire a homeland security director. In recognition of the strong bonds needed between Federal, State, and local government, the committee bill includes an office of State and local government Coordination. This office will assure that the Federal Government reaches out to the State and local levels with training, tools, and a coordinated strategy.

It will take more than this bill to prepare communities to respond to an attack, however. There must be the resources to do the job. I am already concerned because Federal funding for homeland security still has not made its way to the local level in Missouri. In the aftermath of 9/11, the staffing needs of many fire departments have increased dramatically across our Nation. Two-thirds of all fire departments, large and small, operate with inadequate staff. The International Association of Fire Chiefs estimates that 75,000 additional firefighters are needed to meet minimal acceptable levels for safety and effective response.

I offered an amendment with Senator COLLINS that will begin to address this. It will establish a program to enable local fire departments in Missouri and across the country to hire 10,000 new firefighters. I am pleased the amendment passed unanimously in committee. This amendment is an effort to strengthen the ranks of those who protect us and did so on September 11, and who risk their lives daily to keep our communities safe.

I urge my colleagues to support this provision when the Senate bill is conferenced with the House bill. We not only need to make sure our first responders have sufficient resources, but we will need to make sure they have adequate training. I sponsored an amendment in committee that requires the new Department to coordinate with the Secretary of Defense for training on how to respond to chemical and biological attacks. This is a logical step because the Defense Department is the