

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 \$1/2 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

American Soybean Association, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Cotton Council, and the U.S. Rice Producers Group have all written this morning to the chairman, with a copy of their letter to me, simply urging the Senate “to take the necessary action and pass H.R. 2213”—the House bill—“without amendment and send the bill to the President.”

Each of these groups wrote to the chairman: “Without timely action, we face the prospect of missing the budget-imposed September 30 deadline and forfeiting this crucial financial aid.” I mention that because I appreciate their commendation of our work and their encouragement that we do precisely what we have done this morning.

I want to mention that it is important that all Members understand what we have done; namely, that through the so-called AMTA payments, \$4.622 billion in supplemental payments will be sent to producers in the next few days; \$424 million in market loss payments to soybean producers and other oilseed producers, who received this assistance last year, will be distributed in the next few days; \$159 million in assistance to producers of specialty crops, such as fruits and vegetables, will receive their money through our block grants to the States.

I make that point because the only way in which money could conceivably have gotten to any specialty group would have been through these block grants to States and a distribution after finding the recipients in each of those States. I make that point because there always was an illusion that somehow money to specialty crops could come in some other way, but there are not good lists, the criteria, and the other aspects that have surrounded the so-called program crops. Therefore, this was an essential point, if the specialty crop recipients were to get their money before September 30. And \$129 million in market loss assistance will go to tobacco farmers, whose names and addresses are well known to USDA; \$54 million, likewise, to peanut growers; \$85 million for cotton seed; \$17 million for wool and mohair producers; and \$10 million of emergency food assistance support.

I make these points because each one of us may have a wish list of those that we would like to receive money. The purpose of this action, the reason that both Houses have taken action—and we have done so unanimously this morning—is that we saw a gap for American agriculture in total. We have tried to fill the gap. In committing compromises and bicameral compromises, we have tried to make certain that assistance came to the normal program recipients since the time of the 1930s, the specialty crops, and to many others who were identified in previous supplemental bills of the last 2 years.

I regret there is difficulty with regard to the stance of the President. I

simply want to support the President very strongly in the action he took.

First of all, he supported the \$5.5 billion of payments. He pointed out, as I have this morning, that if these are to make a difference for farmers, they need to be received now. They need to make their appointments with the country bankers as required and make certain that they stay in business. It is easy enough for us to speculate that if we did not take action now or if we took action in the by and by, somehow more might be obtained.

The fact is, more was not going to be obtained for farmers now. The only way in which money could be obtained was, first of all, following the budget resolution so a point of order was not entered; secondly, recognizing that the money destined for next year in the Senate Agriculture Committee's original bill was very likely to be taken off the table before it was distributed.

I want to make the point again that we suggested earlier in the debate: While we are in recess, OMB and CBO are going to come forward with estimates of our national budget picture. Almost every prediction is that these estimates will downsize the amount of money that is anticipated to be coming into the Federal Government, the amount of the surplus, the amount of money, in fact, for the appropriations bills, eight of which are still to be considered by the Senate.

Already the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the distinguished ranking member, Senators BYRD and STEVENS, are cautioning the subcommittees in appropriations not to exceed the allocations of money they have received. They are cautioning them because they are pointing out the money simply may not be there.

We were in a position that if we did not take action now, it is very conceivable that the money that was destined for American farmers might not have been there either. The number of claimants, whether in defense, in health, in education, in all the various aspects of American life, are very considerable. We have pinned down for American farmers today money that we want to go to American farmers. We have done so in a responsible way. We have done so with the support of the President of the United States and both Houses of the Congress. That is no minor achievement in an agricultural piece of legislation.

Let me point out one further thing about the President of the United States; that is, he is determined, as I hope most of us are, to be responsible with regard to money. We have had years in this body in which Members were more or less responsible—sometimes less. As a consequence, large deficits were the result.

In a bipartisan way, we have determined those days ought to be over. It does require that, finally, we do our very best to conform to the budget, that we respect the rights at least of

all the other claimants to Federal funds, including taxpayers. The President is simply saying: I am going to do my duty. If I see things exceeding the budget, I am going to veto those bills.

He has said that with regard to our Agriculture Committee bill. If it exceeds \$5.5 billion, I am going to veto it. The President said that to me personally at 3:40 yesterday afternoon, face to face. So there was no doubt. He did not hide behind a letter from OMB, did not suggest that unnamed advisers necessarily were speaking for him. He came to the Capitol twice during this week and talked about the trust he has in behalf of the American people, all of the American people, for the integrity of our financial system and the integrity of Social Security and Medicare and all of the educational plans he has worked with the Congress to forward and all the plans for health care for the elderly that he is working with the Congress to forward.

All of these are also our objectives. They fit together only if there is a certain degree of discipline and order.

The President has said: I am going to provide that. You can count on me.

His credibility is at stake when he says that. Sometimes Presidents say, perhaps if this doesn't work out, this and that will occur. This President said: If this exceeds \$5.5 billion, I am going to veto it.

I believed that. This morning, the Senate has believed that. The House believed that. We have a result in conformity with the budget. That is a victory for the American people likewise, as well as for agricultural America.

Now it has, in fact, more money than the year before but some assurance that we are not going to have fiscal irresponsibility again, rampant inflation, the difficulties that come when there is not solid leadership at the top and in this body.

Finally, let me say that it has been a pleasure for me to work on this bill with members of the Agriculture Committee, our chairman, Senator HARKIN, with the present occupant of the chair, Ms. STABENOW, with many Members who had diverse views.

One of the aspects of our committee I have found—my service is now in its 25th year—is that we do have diverse views because we come from constituents who believe very strongly about these issues and who want our advocacy and our support. We try to do that. I think we listen to each other, and we understand that there is not simply one crop in America that is dominant, that we are a very diverse group in terms of our interests. It is amazing how we are able to come together for good results.

I believe we have come together for a good result on this day. I appreciate, even as I say that—I see the faces and hear the words of the Members—that not every aspect of this result is in conformity with what we might have wished would have occurred. I made the admission, as I was offering an

amendment the other day—which failed narrowly by 52-48—that this is not exactly the amendment I would have started with or the one maybe I would have finished with. Nevertheless, it was an amendment that reflected the views of Members of the House and many members of our committee and, in my judgment, was in the realm of the possible. That is the final criteria for agricultural bills. It takes very little skill to paint a picture of all of the money that might go to various States or people or crops or groups in America. Simply to add them up and say, here is the total, believe me, all of these are good folks and all need the money. That is true. They are all good, and they all need the money. Agriculture does not pay well.

The facts of life are that money that goes into agriculture is very important, not only for the recipients but for our country, for the continuity of all of our States and small towns in the rural areas that we try to support.

At the same time, most farmers I know understand that funds are not available for everything. They want people of common sense to make certain that there is something at the end of the rainbow as opposed to blue-sky thinking and more grandiose schemes.

In due course, we are going to have an opportunity, under the leadership of our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, to consider a farm bill this year or next, or whatever the context may be in the scheduling of the distinguished chairman. I will join him enthusiastically, as I suspect the occupant of the chair will, as we take a look at conservation programs that are very important for America, for rural development programs that are important, not just for farmers but often for the second income for farmers and their families and those who are important to agricultural production in America.

We are going to take a look, I hope, at nutrition programs that make a very sizable difference for many Americans beyond production in agriculture. This scope of our committee's activities is broad, as broad as food, nutrition, and forestry might imply, and that is exciting.

I think we are going to have a superb farm bill, and I hope we will be able to work closely with our friends in the House, with the White House, with everybody, so we move along together without misunderstandings and have the best sort of result at the end of the road with the greatest amount of agreement.

I trust in the course of brokering all of these different ideas there will be some disagreement, and ultimately we will have to make hard choices. I am prepared to work on that project with that thought firmly in mind, and I look forward to it. For the moment, I believe we have great news this morning for farmers in America but likewise for the citizens of our country because we have acted in a responsible way. We

will have even better news as we proceed into a new farm bill and take a comprehensive look at all the ways we might affect the lives of Americans in a very constructive way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I know the Senator from New York is next up to speak, and I ask unanimous consent that I speak for about 3 minutes without jeopardizing her right to speak.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington, Ms. CANTWELL, be added to the list of speakers and be allowed to speak for 10 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I take this time to express my deep gratitude to my ranking member, my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Indiana, to thank him for the graciousness he has given to me, first when he was chairman and I was ranking member and now when I am chairman and he is ranking member. I could not ask for a better partner on the Senate Agriculture Committee than Senator LUGAR. We have worked very closely together.

This legislative disagreement we had here this week again reminds me of why this is called the crucible of democracy. We grind these issues out in time and we move ahead, which is what I have always loved about the legislative process. Friends can differ. We can fight these things out and work them out, and we move ahead.

I am quite taken by what the distinguished ranking member said about looking ahead on the farm bill. We have discussed this personally, in private, many times.

Everything the distinguished ranking member just mentioned is something I feel strongly about and feel deeply about. I believe we are going to have many, many opportunities to work together this fall to fashion a new farm bill, as the distinguished ranking member said, that looks at the broad spectrum of agriculture beyond just production but all of the aspects of agriculture.

I am quite heartened by his words and, again, I want the Senator from Indiana to know how much I really appreciate the many kindnesses he and his staff have shown to me and my staff through all of the processes of the changes that have come about this summer, and working on this bill, and I really look forward to working with him on the development of the new farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I also thank the chairman and ranking member for not only the work they have done on this bill but the work

they will do on the farm bill this fall. I know this is a difficult matter.

Both the chairman and the ranking member have outlined the challenges ahead of us, but I know everyone in this Chamber is ready and willing to work together to get a result that will be not only fair to our farmers but will recognize the full extent of both agricultural and conservation needs that go hand in hand with agriculture throughout our country.

I rise today to say a few words about agriculture in New York because I have noticed many of my colleagues are surprised there is agriculture in New York. Many people, perhaps some in the gallery today, think of New York and think of New York City. They may fly into LaGuardia or out of JFK. They do not get a chance to travel throughout the State to see the beauty of the scenery and to know how important agriculture is to the livelihood, the economy, and the future of New York.

In every section of New York, even surprisingly in some of the boroughs of New York City, there are still some agricultural interests. Much of the State, from St. Lawrence to Orleans, to the entire southern tier out into Long Island, agriculture remains a critical part of the fabric of life in New York and is a crucial livelihood for countless New Yorkers.

In fact, agriculture still is the No. 1 economic sector in New York, which would come, I suppose, as a surprise to many people from the Midwest or the South. I have been fortunate, having grown up in the Midwest—actually in Illinois, right between the chairman and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee—to know a little bit about Midwest agriculture. Then I have been honored to have lived in Arkansas, for which good friend Senator LINCOLN, having come from a farming family, is a champion, so I know full well how critical agriculture is in the Midwest, in the South, in the West, but I do not want anyone in this Chamber or anyone in our country to overlook or forget how important agriculture is in the Northeast and particularly in the State of New York.

I received a letter from a farmer in Kent, NY. What he has written could be written from the chairman's State or the ranking member's State. I want to read what he said:

I am writing this letter with great concern on behalf of our family farm. Our family farm was started in early 1900 by my grandfather and grandmother when they came to America from England. I started working on the farm as a young man at the age of 7 by riding with my father and watching how to work and how to make a living, by providing food for the world in which we live. Now at age 46, I sit back and try to evaluate what is wrong with our agriculture picture.

Our cost of production has gone through the roof as fuel, labor and growing mandates are taking our profit out of the picture. Our fresh fruit apples, after being packed out of storage, have a slim chance to exceed the cost of production.

Our vegetable operation, along with our grain crops, are in the same position, due to

commodity prices that are lower than 25 years ago, but yet fuel prices alone have more than doubled in 15 months.

He goes on to write:

Usually, there is always one commodity that excels each year to offset the poorer priced ones, but that has not happened in the past year. Your first response is to get your cost of production down and to establish a higher yield, but we have exhausted all of these options. Every time we have a potential for a commodity price increase, one of our competitors ship across the borders, keep prices low and here we sit in New York just trying to survive.

I have a great deal of pride and want to do my part to keep agriculture the number one industry in our County of Orleans, State of New York. Let us get agriculture out of this situation and back on track immediately.

I could not agree with this gentleman more. What I hope we are going to be able to do, as the chairman, the ranking member, and the committee members craft their farming bill for this fall, is to make sure those of us who may not be on the committee but who represent farmers and a farming State, no matter how difficult that may be for some to believe, will also be at that table because we have to be heard on behalf of our farmers.

I want to point to this chart. In 1964, there were 66,510 family farms. In 1997, we are down to 31,757. Certainly, some of those farms were lost because New York grew. The county I live in became pricey, choice real estate for people who wanted to live near New York City. We are fighting to preserve the farmland we still have left in Westchester County.

We know there were inevitable changes. No one is arguing against the inevitability of change that is going to take farmland out of production, but in many parts of our State we lost population. There was not population pressure forcing people into the country, therefore doing away with available farmland. We lost farmland because our farmers were not given a fair shake, were not given the tools with which to compete.

As we look at the farm bill, I hope we are going to also look at the important essential role farmers play in conservation, preserving our rural countryside, making it possible to have high water quality and wildlife habitat. I know if it were not for farmers all up and down the Midwest and the South, there would not be as many ducks to hunt every year. I know farmers have played a critical role in preserving wildlife habitat for hunters and for the enjoyment of so many other people.

Farmers have a role not only in producing quality, affordable food, but also improving water quality and wildlife habitat, restoring wetlands, and protecting farmland from further development. I hope we are going to get some of that conservation assistance in the farm bill coming this fall. I would have preferred by far the bill that came out of the committee in the Senate. That was not possible because of the President's veto threat. That is what

the ranking member just explained. I deeply regret that.

As the chairman, Senator HARKIN, pointed out, this would not have busted the budget. This was forward funding that would have gone into next year. The dollars then could have been distributed not only to help our farmers but also to do the conservation work that they do for all of us.

I want to mention also that we have some crops in New York that do not produce a lot of money, less than \$10,000, but we are proud of them. We have a lot of orchards in New York, going from 6,931 in 1964 to 2,436 in 1997. We still are proud of our apple growers. We are proud of our speciality crops.

In May, there was an article in the Washington Post about the plight of apple growers in Albany, NY. It told how this past March Susan and Gary Davis auctioned off the machinery they used to tend orchards and vegetables on a farm that had been in their family for a century. They said: You feel like you are letting them down, both past generations and your own children. But they just could not keep up with the costs, and their farm manager finally said he could not do it anymore. The grower gave up and moved to find a livelihood somewhere else.

We know we have to do more to make farming a viable alternative for those who are willing to put in the long hours, are willing to do the work that gives us a safe food supply. I consider food security part of national security. Certainly that is true when it comes to the speciality crops and also when it comes to dairy in New York.

Our dairy farmers are down to 8,732 farms. I bet a lot of people did not know there were 8,700 dairy farms in New York. We are the third largest dairy producing State in America, and we are proud of that fact. But we have to have some help. We have to be able to compete with our neighbors to the north, with our neighbors to the south, and with our neighbors to the west.

Milk is New York's leading agricultural product, creating almost \$2 billion in receipts. We rank third behind California and Wisconsin. Our dairy farmers are probably the hardest working farmers, maybe the hardest working small businesspeople, one will find anywhere. It is a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week job. I was visiting with some of our dairy farmers on the shores of Lake Champlain. They have been there for seven, eight, and nine generations. This is a difficult, tough job. We should not make it any harder. We should be proud of those who are willing to do this work, and we should find ways to support them because it helps all of us.

Finally, I hope my colleague, Senator SCHUMER, and I are able to convey as clearly and, hopefully, persuasively as possible that when agriculture is discussed, New York should be at the table. I thank everyone in this Chamber for giving us the opportunity to have our farmers receive the same help that all of our farmers in America need.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, there is a sigh of relief all throughout farm country in regard to passage of this emergency assistance. We avoided a partisan train wreck, losing the money, taking the money from next year's farm bill, and or next year's emergency assistance. I regret that it came to this. This is a trail we really did not have to take.

When you serve on the Agriculture Committee—and I have done that in the House and Senate—you have the opportunity to serve on one of the most nonpartisan committees in the Congress.

With the events of the past week, I deeply regret what some have referred to as partisan milk that got a little sour and curdled a little bit. But, we have cleaned it up and we have made some progress. We have an old expression in my hometown of Dodge City, KS: If you are riding ahead of the herd, it's a good thing to take a look back now and then to make sure it is still there.

I say to my colleagues, the reverse is also true. We have done that today. It is a good idea for both sides to take a look and tell your leadership when you are about to be driven off an emergency assistance cliff along with our farmers and ranchers. We avoided that today, and that is a positive step.

We had the possibility of endangering emergency funding for our farmers and ranchers. I was worried some would have preferred an issue as opposed to a bill. We were about to saw off the branch that supports our farmers and hang all of us in the process.

Here is the deal. If the majority had prevailed, the bill would have had to be conferred with the House. If we simply check the lights in the House, they are out of town; they are gone. I went over to the House last night during the debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights. I met with both the Agriculture Committee chairman, LARRY COMBEST, and the ranking member, CHARLIE STENHOLM, both good friends, not to mention the members of the House Agriculture Committee. They were adamant, and I mean adamant—put that in bold letters—in support of the statement they released a day or two ago. Their statement—not mine—said:

For the sake of our farmers, the U.S. Senate must put politics aside and realize the critical importance of passing the 2001 crop assistance bill immediately, so that the process can continue and a bill can be sent to the President for signature.

The House statement went on:

The House Ag Committee, anticipating this need, acted early and responsibly, passing a bill out 6 weeks ago.

That is now 7 weeks.

This bill was passed by the House on June 26—

Unanimously on a voice vote—and was immediately sent to the Senate where it languished. If payments are not

made before September 30 of this year then \$5.5 billion that was fought for and budgeted for farmers will disappear. At this critical time, we must all put our agendas aside and concentrate our efforts on providing the needed assistance for farmers. It is unwise to encumber the bill with unnecessary, non-emergency items like increased conservation spending when our farmers' livelihoods hang in the balance. The process must move on.

My friends, those were the words of the Chairman and Ranking Member in the House. We have done that. I think it is a step in the right direction.

I point out that one of the reasons the House was so adamant, why they were so upset, is that the House Agriculture Committee passed a new farm bill out of committee last week, and it uses the \$2 billion extra that was in the Senator from Iowa's approach for their farm bill. I do not know how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have proposed, or we would have proposed, to reconcile the difference.

I am not sure what the farm bill will look like in the Senate, but I do not think we want to propose the House cut their own farm bill in terms of target price, AMTA payments, loan levels. Obviously the farmers of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and soybean in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Arkansas, and Kansas would not have supported that move.

I say it again: We were about to borrow from the future. We did not do that.

I will sum up what I think happened in this situation. I think it could be a good lesson learned.

June 5, my colleagues on the other side take over control of the Senate and the Senate Agriculture Committee. June 20, the House Agriculture Committee passed its bill. This is the emergency assistance bill. June 26, the full House passed the bill on a voice vote. June 28 to July 24, 6 hearings were held in the Senate Agriculture Committee on the farm bill and other issues no hearings or meetings on the assistance package were held during this time. July 25 we went to markup. Late July 27, the bill is brought up for debate; July 30 through today, this moment, debate on the legislation. July 31, the CBO sends a letter to the Senate stating 2001 funds will be scored in 2002 if the bill is not passed before the August recess. July 31, the House Agriculture Committee Chairman COMBEST and Ranking Member STENHOLM asked the Senate to please approve the House-passed bill and get the money to farmers and ranchers. August 1, Mr. COMBEST and Mr. STENHOLM make strong statements that I don't have to go into, again asking the Senate to pass the House bill. August 2, CBO verbally confirmed to me what they stated in their previous letter of July 31: The bill must be passed before the August recess or they will score the money going out in fiscal year 2002. Again this morning, CBO staff again confirm to my staff that the Senate bill, as written, must be passed before the August recess in order for the money to be scored in fiscal year 2001.

I think that lays out the facts.

Again, the point was, delay. In August, there is going to be a new budget estimate. I think we all know about the rhetoric and the legislation that will be flying around in September and October with any emergency or additional spending bumping against the trust funds.

Do we really want to be considering a package like this with amendments, saying we cannot use the money because it will allegedly come from Social Security? Do we want agriculture in that position? Do we want farmers and ranchers being the poster people for raiding Social Security? I don't think that is a very good idea.

Finally, you can't have it both ways. Further delay of trade authority for the President and getting a consistent and aggressive export policy will certainly mean a continued loss of market share and exports. We have to sell our commodities. If we don't, it means there will be calls for another emergency bill next year. I hope we don't have to have that, but we may. And this money and this emergency bill, or at least in the proposal offered by the distinguished chairman, would have taken money from that account.

I was very worried this morning. I thought Senators could, maybe would, take this issue and ride with it, that we would have gone squarely into a boxed canyon and fired off our shotguns of partisan rhetoric, whoop and holler as to who was to blame. Some of that has been said on the Senate floor. Or we could have passed the House version, and we did, of emergency relief and get assistance to hard-pressed farmers and hopefully begin bipartisan work on the next farm bill.

I have been through six farm bills. You can always have an issue or you can always have a bill. It is basically that simple. In this regard, without question, I think the decision reached spared agriculture and that means the assessments will be forthcoming.

There used to be a chairman in the House Agriculture Committee in Texas, Bob Poage, an outstanding chairman, great chairman. People used to ask Bob, when a farm bill came to the floor of the House, Mr. Poage, Mr. Chairman, is this the best possible bill? And he would say, no; but it is the best bill possible.

In a gesture of friendship and bipartisanship with the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the distinguished ranking member, and other members of the Agriculture Committee, the distinguished acting Presiding Officer is a very valued member of the committee. Let's work together on this. Let's not go down this road again. Let's work in a bipartisan matter for farmers. I pledge I will do that. I pledge to the chairman I will do that. This morning was not a pleasant experience for any of us. But we did the right thing as of this morning.

To reiterate:

Mr. President, this is a partisan trail that we did not have to take. When you serve on the Agriculture Committee, you have the opportunity to serve on one of the most nonpartisan committees in the Congress. With this stand-off, I deeply regret the spilled partisan milk, and its gotten pretty sour.

There is an old expression we have in my home town of Dodge City, KS—"If you are riding ahead of the herd it's a good thing to take a look back now and then to make sure its still there."

My colleagues, the reverse is also true. It would be most timely and a good idea this morning for the herd across the aisle to look ahead and tell your leadership that you are about to be driven off an emergency assistance cliff—along with our farmers and ranchers.

Those who are endangering emergency funding for our farmers and ranchers, those who apparently prefer an issue to emergency farmer relief are about to saw off the branch that will support farmers and hang all of us in the process. Here is the deal.

Obviously, should the majority prevail, this bill would have to be conferred with the House. Check the lights over there, the House is gone. I went over to the House last night during the debate on the Patients' Bill of Rights and met with both Agriculture Chairman LARRY COMBEST and Ranking Member CHARLIE STENHOLM, not to mention many members of the House Agriculture Committee.

They are ADAMANT in support of the statement they released just a day or two ago. That statement, theirs—not mine—said this:

The Senate Majority Leader is diverting attention with a fast shell game to quickly switch blame for the Senate not finishing its work on farmer assistance on time. Close of business set for early August has been scheduled since the beginning of the year. Against this well publicized early August deadline, the Senate has had the House-approved bill languishing for over a month now. There has been absolutely nothing keeping the Senate Agriculture Committee from moving on its own package, rather than waiting until the last minute. The Senate's search for an excuse on a past-due bill must mean they fear going home to face the music from constituents.

In another statement on July 31:

For the sake of our farmers, the U.S. Senate must put politics aside and realize the critical importance of passing the 2001 crop assistance bill immediately so, that the process can continue and a bill can be sent to the President for signature. The House Ag committee, anticipating this need, acted early and responsibly, passing a bill out 6 weeks ago. This bill was passed by the House on June 26, and was immediately sent to the Senate where it has languished. If payments are not made before September 30 of this year, then \$5.5 billion that was fought for and budgeted for farmers will disappear. At this critical time, we must all put our agendas aside and concentrate our efforts on providing the needed assistance for farmers. It is unwise to encumber the bill with unnecessary, non-emergency items like increased conservation spending when our farmers' livelihoods hang in the balance. The process must move on, and the Senate must act.

I would also point out that the House Agriculture Committee passed a new farm bill out of committee last week. It uses this \$2 billion for 2002 funding on the new farm bill.

How do my colleagues on the other side propose to reconcile this difference? I'm not sure what the farm bill will look like in the Senate. But would they propose the House cut the target price, AMTA, or loan levels in its proposal? Will the wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and soybean farmers in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Arkansas, and other States support that move?

I will say it again, we are borrowing from the future if we pass this bill as it is currently written.

Mr. President, let me sum up:

June 5: My colleagues on the other side take over control of the Senate and Senate Agriculture Committee.

June 20: House Agriculture Committee passes its bill.

June 26: The full House passes the bill on a voice vote.

June 28 to July 24: Six hearings in the Senate Agriculture Committee on the farm bill and other issues. No hearings or meetings on this assistance package.

July 25: Mark-up.

Late July 27: Bill is brought up for debate.

July 30 through today: debate on this legislation.

July 31: CBO sends letter to the Senate stating 2001 funds will be scored in 2002 if the bill is not passed before the August recess.

July 31: House Agriculture Committee Chairman COMBEST and Ranking Member STENHOLM ask the Senate to approve the House passed bill and get our money to our farmers and ranchers.

August 1: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. STENHOLM accuse the Senate majority leader and chairman of obstructing the passage of this important legislation.

August 2: CBO verbally confirmed to me what they had stated in their previous letter of July 31: the bill must be passed before August recess or they will score the money going out in FY02.

Mr. President, I believe that lays out the facts.

Again, the point is the delay. In August, there will be a new budget estimate. And we all know the rhetoric and legislation that will be flying around here with regard any emergency or additional spending bumping against trust funds. Do we really want to be considering this package with amendments saying we cannot use the money because it allegedly will come from Social Security. Do we want agriculture in that position?

Finally, let me say you cannot have it both ways on the other side of the aisle. Further delay of trade authority for the President will certainly mean continued loss of market share and exports. That means another emergency bill next year. And, this money robs that account.

Now, Senators can take the issue and ride with it, squarely into a box canyon and fire off our partisan pop guns and whoop and holler as to who was to blame. Or we can pass the House version of emergency relief and get the assistance to our hard pressed farmers and hopefully begin bipartisan work on the next farm bill.

We can have an issue or we can enact emergency assistance, it is that simple. In this regard, without question the decision reached this morning will spare agriculture further delay and will provide the assistance needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I came to the floor last night in a great deal of frustration, and now I come to the floor in a great deal of disappointment. This morning, the Senate moved forward on an emergency assistance package for farmers that most in this body know is inadequate. We have done something. We have moved forward, as many people have said, because the House has left or because the President drew a line in the sand.

That is not what our job in the Senate is. Our job in the Senate is to do the best we can possibly do. Is this bill the best we can do? Absolutely not. I don't think there is a Senator in this Chamber who thinks we have done the best job we could do on an Agriculture emergency supplemental bill. That is amazing to me.

We approved a bill that most Members know is not going to provide even the minimum of support that our farmers and our communities, our rural communities, our community banks, and our rural economies really need. Our program crops said from day 1 of this year they needed AMTA payments at 100 percent of the 1999 level.

In February, when we started going to the administration, saying we are going to need an emergency Agriculture supplemental bill, we are going to need 100-percent AMTA at 1999 levels, we are going to have to have it; our bankers are saying they are making loans to our agricultural producers based on the fact they are going to get 100 percent at 1999 levels, the administration and others came back and said: Wait until we get through with this tax bill. Then they said: Well, wait until we finish with the education bill. Then we will deal with it. And then: Let's wait until we get past the Patients' Bill of Rights and we will deal with it. Wait, wait, wait until we get back from the Fourth of July recess.

And guess what. We made the mistake of believing them and we waited in good faith, thinking at the end of the road the administration would have the same consideration for production agriculture as those who have grown up in it. Guess what. We were wrong. We were wrong. We thought they would come in good faith from the administration and work with Members on this.

Have they? No. People have said: I am tired; it is time for vacation. Let's go home.

Our specialty crops needed more money for commodity purchases and other forms of support. All of our production farmers needed assistance. Where were we? The administration says farm income is at an all-time high. Guess what. Do you know why it is at an all-time high? Because the rural economy has been in the tanks for years. Their energy costs are at an all-time high and rising. Their fertilizer input costs are at an all-time high. Their energy costs, diesel—name it—implement costs, the costs of buying machinery, and the costs of meeting environmental regulations, every one of them is at an all-time high, and many of our States have producers whose farmer income, 50 percent of it, is government payment. Why? Because we have not provided for our agricultural producers in terms of good, solid, trade opportunities and global marketplace shares because we have not taken into consideration what it means to those individuals to produce a safe and abundant and affordable food supply for those who enjoy it.

We enjoy the most environmentally sound agricultural products in the world coming out of this country. That is all going away unless we make an obligation to production agriculture, that when it comes time to being there for them, we will be there, instead of just saying all year long: Just wait. Just wait until we get through all of these other things and then we will be there for you.

I look at some of my local spinach growers in Arkansas who are not far from local canneries yet find it impossible sometimes to market their spinach just down the road because they can be outbid by spinach that is coming in from Mexico, grown with chemicals we banned over 10 years ago.

What are we doing for production agriculture, to make sure that you and I will continue to have that environmentally well grown product for our children and for future generations? What is our response? Give them less than they need, close up shop, and fly home for vacation. Why? Because the House is going home, we can't do anything.

Well if the House jumps off the bridge, are we going to jump off the bridge, too? What if the administration says it is just not that important; we are not going to come over to negotiate with you to come to some middle ground that is going to provide our producers the 100 percent of AMTA from 1999 levels that we promised them back in February? I don't know. I reject that. I still believe I am here to do the best job I can possibly do for those American producers. I reject the argument that it is too late. I reject the argument that we cannot give them what they need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. I reject the argument that we cannot stay here and fight for our American producers and our farmers.

Farmers themselves say that government is just waiting until they die away, that the family farmer is gone and we can just depend on corporate America to provide us what we need.

I look around at some of the fights I have been fighting this year on behalf of aquaculture and fish farmers in Arkansas. They are having to compete with misleading labeling from other countries that are claiming they are producing that kind of product which we produce here, a farm-raised, grain-fed product, when we know what is coming in the country from Vietnam is not that. It is raised on the Mekong River under unbelievable environmental conditions. Yet it has been sent to this country in misleading ways and sold to the consumers here.

We are dealing with a crisis in agricultural production. I come to the floor saddened. As I look around at this body, I realize that the Members of the Senate years ago used to travel here from their home farms in faraway States and spend the time that they did to debate the issues of this country, all the while still remembering where they came from, the heartland that they represented, the communities and the agricultural producers. In my home State of Arkansas, when that farmer is out in the field and he is bringing in his crop, he is picking cotton or he is combining beans or he is combining rice and gets to the end of a long hot day, and the Sun is setting and he sees a thunderstorm coming out of the west, do you know what. He doesn't pack it up and go home. He turns the lights on, on his combine, and he keeps going, because he believes in producing for the American people and the world the safest, most abundant and affordable food supply in this world, and he does no less.

I, for one, think the Senate could do better. I think we must.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes, and the following Senators be added to the current list of speakers: Senator KENNEDY for 20 minutes, Senator BYRD, Senator HOLLINGS, Senator CORZINE, and Senator SMITH of Oregon.

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

EMERGENCY AGRICULTURE ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I know for me to speak on the floor

about agriculture raises some eyebrows, let's say. I have found that as I, along with others, have been trying to help my colleague from Vermont who has been fighting a lonely battle, for Northeast agriculture. When I spoke in the Democratic caucus, I heard someone sort of singing "Old McDonald," and other things. So people ask, why am I so interested in agriculture, coming from a State such as New York?

For one thing, people forget how much agriculture there is in the State of New York. We are a large agricultural producer. We rank third in dairy production. We rank second or third, depending on the year, in apple production. We are high up in onions and many kinds of specialty products. In fact—and these are numbers that even surprised me—New York has 38,000 farmers. That is 13,500 more farmers than Idaho; 10,400 more than Montana; 7,700 more than North Dakota; 5,500 more than South Dakota; and 28,800 more than Wyoming. So those States which are regarded as agricultural States have fewer farmers, many fewer, than my State of New York.

We do have a large city—we have several large cities. Thank God, we have lots of other kinds of industries. But agriculture is a vital industry.

The second reason I care about agriculture—and it has been new to me; 18 years in the House serving a district in a corner of Brooklyn and Queens, we didn't have any farmers—is meeting the people who do it. I met one family with a farm in their family in Suffolk County for 12 generations. You look into their eyes and see how hard-working they are and see how productive they are, and you see the land and God's beauty in a wonderful way give forth fruits and vegetables and crops. You see how hard they work and you feel for them.

They are on a frustrating treadmill. It seems they work harder and harder but survival in agriculture is even more difficult for them. You look into their eyes and you realize something else. These farmers are the breeder reactor, the place where American values grow and are nurtured. It has been so since the Republic was founded, and it still is. The values of hard work and teamwork and self-reliance and individuality, for which our country is known and blessed, have started on the farm.

So even if all the food could be produced somewhere else and it could be as good and as high quality, I do not think we would want to lose farmers from America and the American way of life because the two are so inextricably tied. So I care about agriculture. I care a great deal about our farmers in New York.

This farm bill, admittedly, does not do what we want. But I want to tell the farmers that we have gotten a pledge from our majority leader that the part of this bill that was cut out by the House will be debated in September. That includes the relief for the apple

farmers that many of us in the Northeast—my colleague, Senator CLINTON—and Senator LEVIN and Senator STABENOW and the two Senators from Washington worked hard to get in the bill. That will come back and have another chance. The provisions the Senator from Iowa put in the bill to deal with specialty crops and conservation, which affected the Northeast, will come back as well. I am glad about that.

When the farm bill comes up, we will make our fight for the dairy farmers, and it is going to be a royal fight because we really care about them.

What I would like my colleagues to know is, my good friend from Vermont, who has often been alone in this fight, is now being joined by many of us. As I mentioned, my colleagues Senator CLINTON and Senator TORRICELLI are in the fight; Senator JEFFORDS, of course, has always been in the fight, as have our Senators from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania and other States as well. We are going to put Northeast agriculture on the legislative map.

It will not be good enough to have bills any longer that do not do a thing for us. I think we have persuaded our Democratic leadership here in the Senate to do so. We have a bit of work to do in the House. We have a bit of work to do in the White House. But we are going to do it.

In fact, as I look at this as somebody admittedly new to agriculture, I would like to make a point to my colleagues. I have never seen a place where we spend so much money and where there is so much unhappiness among the recipients. Something is dramatically wrong.

Mr. President, 50 percent or 47 percent of farm income is now Government. I do not know one other area in the country where that happens. I am willing to do it because, as I said, I believe in the family farm and the values that they bring. But can't we come up with a better way? Can't we come up with a way that makes the family wheat farmer in North Dakota and the family corn and hog farmers in Illinois happier than they are now? Can't we as we come up with that come up with something that includes the dairy farmer in New York or Vermont or the apple grower in New Jersey or Massachusetts? We have to come up with a better way because the present way isn't working.

More and more money—this is another \$5 billion—doesn't help our area. Our fights will come later in September and in October with the farm bill. But that \$5.5 billion isn't making many people happy, even though they are getting it, because they are still struggling.

Freedom to Farm is a problem. Everyone says it. I tend to agree. But you know that we had problems before Freedom to Farm, too. As long as I have been in the Congress, which is from 1981, we have seen more and more money going to agriculture and our