

were quite different than they are today. The Sergeant at Arms was given the responsibility for keeping a majority of members together long enough to organize and begin the business of government.

Today, the job has grown, and so has the office. The Sergeant at Arms is now the chief protocol and law enforcement officer of the Senate, as well as the administrative manager for many Senate support services. The Sergeant at Arms oversees the largest staff and budget in the U.S. Senate.

That expanded role demands expanded skills—in both law-enforcement and management.

In every position he has held, Al Lenhardt has demonstrated those skills as well as a solemn commitment to public service.

Al retired from the United States Army in 1997 as a Major General after over 31 years of domestic and international experience in national security and law enforcement programs. As Commanding General at the U.S. Army Recruiting Command in Ft. Knox, KY, he managed and directed over 13,000 people in over 1,800 separate locations.

Before the recruiting command, Al served as the senior military police officer in the Army, overseeing all Army police operations and security matters worldwide and managing a budget of over \$300 million.

For the past four years, he has served as Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the Council on Foundations, a non-profit membership association of foundations and corporate philanthropic organizations.

Al Lenhardt is a versatile senior executive with the stature, the management experience and the law enforcement portfolio to make an outstanding Senate Sergeant at Arms. While Al Lenhardt may not be readily known to you because he has no prior connection to me or to the Senate, I think my colleagues will be impressed with the experience, the ability and the character of the man.

In the 212 year history of the Senate, Al Lenhardt will become the 35th person to serve as Sergeant at Arms, and the first African American to hold this position.

But more importantly, Al is clearly of the highest caliber and qualifications. The Senate will benefit greatly from his service and leadership. We all look forward to working with him in the months and years ahead.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without intervening action for debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 149) was agreed to.

(The text of S. Res. 149 is printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1246

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the closure vote on the Agriculture supplemental authorization bill occur at 9:30 on Friday, August 3, with the mandatory quorum waived; further, that Senators have until 10 a.m. to file second-degree amendments.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS and Mr. BYRD pertaining to the introduction of S. 1347 are located in today's RECORD under "Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Arkansas.

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURE ASSISTANCE

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I am here on the floor out of a sense of frustration and I suppose a very deep sense of dedication, maybe because I am from a seventh-generation Arkansas farm family, maybe because I am a daughter of a farmer who I watched for many years toiling to ensure that he could provide a good upbringing, a good heritage to his family, working on that family farm.

Maybe it is because I have watched neighbors and family members who have had to give up a way of life and a profession, a piece of their heritage, because they were unsure of where their Government was going to be for them as family farmers. Or perhaps it is because they were inundated by so many things that were unpredictable, things they could not predict or control such as the weather or the economy or the fact that their Government could not make a decision as to whether the family farmer was important enough to support and to keep in business.

I am really here because, in the 11th hour, I still take my job very seriously. That job is to be here to fight hard, to do everything I can to support that American farmer and that farmer in Arkansas who has spent this entire year trying to put out a crop and wondering whether or not his or her Government was going to come through in the end with an emergency supplemental appropriation as we promised.

I am here to talk about agriculture and to talk about the rural economic crisis that we are on the verge of making even worse. Six years ago, Congress and the White House, the Republicans and the Democrats, stood toe to toe and dared each other to blink. Of course no one did, and all that happened is that the Federal Government shut down. FSA offices and other important Government offices around the country closed. Farmers could not get access to the services they needed. Sen-

iors could not access the services they needed. People all around the country were knocking on Government doors that would not open. But up here in Washington, instead of sitting down and figuring out how to get those doors open, politicians only pointed fingers at each other. They were more concerned about laying blame on each other than finding a solution.

Here we are again. Now we find ourselves at another impasse, this time on an emergency assistance package for farmers that is profoundly crucial to the economic well-being of our farmers and our rural economies, an emergency assistance package we have been talking about since February. In February we started talking about the dire situation our farmers were in, that rural America was in dire straits because we had not addressed their needs, whether it was in trade or whether it was in how Government was going to provide them what they needed in order to be competitive and maintain themselves in a competitive way in the global marketplace.

Whether we are talking about the delta region of Arkansas and Mississippi or the prairies of the Dakotas or anywhere else for that matter, our rural economies are in deep trouble.

I don't think there is a single person in this body who would dispute that. Our farmers are hurting, and they are hurting badly. But, of course, they are not the only ones who are hurting. All of the small town institutions, businesses, and local banks were up here to talk to us back in February about what we do in extending these loans to these critical people in our communities. Do we give them a loan knowing their cost of production is going to be enormous because of energy and because of fertilizer input? Do we extend that loan knowing the prices are in the tank on commodities and have remained there and probably will remain there?

It is also hurting the suppliers, the corner grocery stores on Main Street, and the car dealers. They are all hurting because their viability depends on the health of the farm economy.

Colleagues, this crisis is real, and we are on the verge of making it much, much worse. If we don't get an emergency assistance package passed this week, these farmers and these small towns—very real people, many of whom happen to be related to me and to you—and these rural economies will have run out of time.

I am frustrated. I am outraged that we have been sitting in this Chamber all week without being able to come to agreement on an emergency package that we all agree our farmers need. The House passed a \$5.5 billion emergency package, and they are saying, oh, just do what we did, and we can all go home. But that doesn't even meet the needs of the AMTA assistance payments that our farmers need to survive. The fact is, it doesn't even give them what they had prior to 1999.

Because of the Freedom to Farm Act, we have ratcheted down the payments

every year that the Government is willing to provide to help them compete in that global marketplace. What happened? We are coming now and asking them to take even less in that emergency assistance.

I don't blame Republicans and I don't blame Democrats. I blame all of us because we are all responsible if we are unable to come together because we are ready to go home or because we are tired and we don't want to do our job by coming together and getting a package approved and sending it out to rural America.

I plead with the President. He visited with Young Farmers of America the other day and talked about how agriculture and farmers are the soul of America. Let me tell you, they need us right now. They need us a lot.

It is our duty at this point not to be tired, not to go home, but to sit down with one another and talk about how we can come together to provide them what they need. It is no wonder that the citizens of this country are cynical about what goes on in Washington. Farmers have been out there toiling all year and for centuries—many centuries ago—to provide us with the safest, most abundant and affordable food supply in this world.

I think it certainly behooves us to stay a few extra hours to come up with something that is going to be the best possible job and the best possible package for our American farmers. They look for farm support and all they see is another showdown at the OK Corral. Only it isn't Congress. It is our farmers, and our rural economy, and the people who live in these communities who are in the line of fire. We need to put our guns back in our holsters, and we need to find some resolution to this impasse.

I, for one, am ready to stay here and do the job that the people of Arkansas sent me here to do; that is, to work out an agreement and come up with the solutions on behalf of those people who ensure that I and my children, and you and your children, have a safe, abundant, and affordable food supply day in and day out.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague and friend from Arkansas for the very poignant speech she just gave about the plight of agriculture in America. Senator LINCOLN has said it succinctly and with meaning and I think with a passion that she rightly has to fight for the people who live in our small towns and communities—our farmers. She is right. They are hurting. We have to pay attention.

We are operating under the failed Freedom to Farm bill that was passed back in 1996. Year after year we have had to come in and patch it up, fix it up, and put in supplemental payments to keep our farmers alive, to keep their heads above water.

It is another reason why in the new farm bill we have to make the changes necessary to get off of the old failed Freedom to Farm bill and to have a farm bill where we don't have to rely on a yearly basis on a fickle Congress or a President who says no.

We have come up with a bill out of our Agriculture Committee that would at least provide for our farmers the same payment they received last year to help keep them going. But, even with those payments, it won't make them whole because of the increased fuel prices and fertilizer prices and everything else.

I have heard from the administration that the reason they don't want the bill we reported out of the Committee is because they have seen net farm income go up this year. I am sorry. I don't know what figures they are looking at. I think what they are saying is last year our farm prices were at a 15-year low. Farm income is a little better than last year, but really the increase comes almost entirely from increased livestock prices—not grain prices. Prices are still in the basement. But the bill before us provides money to the crop farmers. They are the ones who are hurting. But the President said no, that he is going to veto the bill because he said farmers don't need that much money. Keep in mind that the bill is within our budget guidelines. We are doing exactly what the budget allows us to do, but the President says no, it is too much.

This is the difference. I have to point this out. In the fall of 1998, Congress passed emergency relief for farmers. It went to the White House. President Clinton vetoed it because it wasn't enough to help our farmers. We came back and added more money to keep our farmers alive and well.

This year the Senate passed a bill to provide sufficient support for our farmers. This President says no, he will veto it because it is too much. What a difference.

What do we have here that is costing extra money? We have the full level of market loss and oilseed payments that were in a similar package last year. We also have nutrition, rural economic development and conservation money. We have money for several conservation programs, including the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, the Farmland Protection Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program.

Right now for the Wetlands Reserve Program we have a backlog of \$568 million nationwide. Here are the top 10 States with the backlog: Arkansas, Iowa, California, Louisiana, Missouri, Florida, Minnesota, Illinois, Michigan, and Mississippi.

Our bill provides \$200 million to cut that backlog down by over a third. It would enroll 150,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program. The President says no. That is too much.

For the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, the backlog is \$14 million. We

have put in \$7 million to cut it down by half. Again, the top 10 States are Oregon, Texas, Florida, West Virginia, Arkansas, Colorado, Maine, Michigan, Arkansas, and South Dakota. We had \$7 million, and the President says no. That is too much.

The Farmland Protection Program is a program that provides some money for the state and local governments and non-profit groups so they can buy development easements from farmers to stop the urban sprawl. There is a \$255 million backlog for FPP. The top 10 States are: California, New York, Maryland, Florida, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

In that program, we put \$40 million to help leverage money supplied by state and local governments, as well as non-profit groups—they are already doing it—to help buy easements to keep the land from being developed for non-agricultural purposes. The President says: No, that is too much money.

Finally, we have the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. The backlog is over \$1.3 billion. We have \$250 million in the bill, plus \$200 million already in the law, which would help cut that down by about a third. Again, the top 10 States are: Texas, Oklahoma, Georgia, Arkansas, Kansas, Montana, Kentucky, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Virginia. We put \$250 million in the bill. The President says: No, it is too much money.

It is not too much, in any case, to help save our soil and our water, to provide conservation money to farmers and ranchers in America who need the help and who need the support.

The Lugar substitute, that I guess we will be voting on, takes out all this conservation money. It provides zero dollars for conservation. It is rather sad that we are in this situation. We are trying to help farmers be good stewards and the President stands in the way.

As Senator LINCOLN said: Our farmers are good stewards of their land. They try to take good care of it. In many cases, these farmers are spending their own money, using their own equipment, spending their time—and all we are trying to do is give them some help and support. And the President has said: No, that is too much.

We will debate this more tomorrow. But tonight I wanted to just point out what we have in the bill, to try to help our farmers with conservation. Three of these programs will be put into jeopardy, and all will be underfunded. The Wetlands Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program and the Farmland Protection Program will all be put in jeopardy because we will not fund them if the Lugar amendment is adopted.

Finally, I have had a lot of conversations with people at the White House and OMB today. They want to spend only \$5.5 billion. When I asked why, I got the answer: Because they want \$5.5 billion.

I don't see any real reason for it because the budget does allow us to spend not only \$5.5 billion in fiscal 2001, but \$7.35 billion for fiscal 2002.

So what we are trying to do is what the budget allows us to do right now: get the money out to help our farmers now, get the conservation program funding out, and get money out to help some of our specialty crop producers around the country. And basically the President is saying, no.

I hope the Senate will persevere. I hope we will tell the President we have to fight for our farmers and our farm families; that we cannot, for no good reason fail to send the help they need. I have not heard one good reason from the White House why we should not put this money out to help save our farmers. I believe we have to, that we must, and I hope we do tomorrow.

Madam President, I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MR. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes after I speak.

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

TRIBUTE TO KANSAS GOVERNOR JOAN FINNEY

MR. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Kansan the Presiding Officer knew. She died as a result of complications associated with her fight with liver cancer—a lady who was the first female Governor of the State of Kansas, Joan Finney. She was a lady I had the privilege of serving with in State government.

I was Secretary of Agriculture under her for a brief period of time. She was a remarkable lady.

One of the tributes that was given to her yesterday, when the State paid their final respects to Governor Finney, was by Rev. Francis Krische, pastor of the Most Pure Heart of Mary Catholic Church, who stated to the mourners something about Governor Finney that probably captures the essence of Governor Finney, a beautiful woman. He said this about her: "She knew how to be with people. This was one of the keys to her success."

She really did know how to be with people. She had been elected treasurer in the State of Kansas for 4 terms. She was elected as the first female Governor in the State of Kansas from 1991 to 1995. She started out her career in politics serving a Member of this body, Senator Frank Carlson, whose seat I now occupy.

She worked for him for several years doing constituent work, which fit Governor Finney beautifully because she so loved to help people. She was beautiful about it. She was beautiful about working with people. I would be around her at different events, and it was always so amazing to me the depth of her

knowledge of the people she would see whom she knew. She knew the family members. She knew something about what was happening in their families. I sometimes thought she knew all of the people of Kansas.

She was really a beautiful lady. I think the depth of her caring was such a key characteristic of hers. To learn and know about an individual is how much she cared about the people she was working for and serving, whether it was as a caseworker for Senator Carlson or whether it was as State treasurer or whether it was as Governor of the State of Kansas.

The Democrat Party, in its annual meeting this year in Topeka, adopted a resolution regarding Governor Finney and stated this about her: "She was truly one of Kansas' most adored native daughters. And she was." She was adored by the people.

She felt that the people's view was the correct one, even though she might disagree with it. She would go ahead and proceed forward with that view, whatever it might be. She was, in that sense, a populist in the best sense of the word: It was to represent the people. And the people's will was paramount in politics.

She had a deep heart. She really cared for the people who she served. And you could see, this was not something that was a practiced skill of hers, where she would work, for example, at learning people's names. It was written in her heart. She knew these people in her heart. She cared for them. While many people would have had disagreements on different policy issues, they would never disagree with the heart of Joan Finney because it was one of those pure hearts.

She played the harp for a number of people. She played it professionally. It was a gift that she used frequently when asked. It was something I think that also helped to express just the inside of who this beautiful woman was. She was somebody who really played beautifully and played purely in the game of life.

So as people say their prayers tonight, I hope they remember Joan Finney, as well as her husband Spencer, who is still alive, although mourning, obviously, the death of his spouse. I hope they will remember her. And I can guarantee she would remember them.

I yield the floor.

MR. ROBERTS. Madam President, on Wednesday, Kansans paid their final respects to Governor Finney and I join with my colleague Senator BROWNBACK in expressing our state's condolences to the Finney family.

While Senate business kept me from attending her funeral in Topeka, I want to share with my colleagues her success in Kansas government and politics. Although Joan and I belonged to different political parties, she put those differences aside when it came to work together for the State of Kansas.

Governor Finney was a straight shooter, never ducking behind guarded

words. Some believe that her direct nature hurt her politically in the State Capitol, but Kansans appreciated this quality. In an interview with the Topeka Capital Journal she said, "I believe the people should be supreme in all things . . . Even if you don't agree and the majority want a certain issue and believe in a certain issue, I accept that and I will stand by the people."

Governor Finney is a key figure in Kansas' strong tradition of electing women to various offices. She served as State Treasurer for four consecutive terms and then was elected as the first female governor serving from 1991 to 1995. She will be remembered for her dedication and hardwork for all Kansans throughout her life.

During his sermon, Reverend Francis Krische, pastor of the Most Pure Heart of Mary Catholic Church reminded mourners that "She knew how to be with people. This was one of the keys to her success".

Madam President, it is painful when God calls home a friend and colleague, but her memory will continue to remind us of our commitment to our constituents and family.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alabama is recognized for 15 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. SESSIONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1346 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

ORDER AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENTS

MR. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President of the Senate pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by the Senate.

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

ORDER FOR REFERRAL OF NOMINATION

MR. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order I submit to the Senate be considered with respect to referral of the nomination of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works for the 107th Congress.

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

The order reads as follows:

Ordered that, when the nomination for the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works is received by the Senate, it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, provided that when the Committee on Armed Services reports the nomination, it be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works for a period of 20 days of session, provided further that if the Committee