

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I call for regular order with respect to the amendment numbered 4480, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Senator BYRD's amendment No. 4480.

Joseph Lieberman, Harry Reid, Jean Carnahan, Daniel K. Inouye, Christopher Dodd, Herb Kohl, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Kent Conrad, Paul Wellstone, Patrick Leahy, Jeff Bingaman, Barbara Boxer, Byron L. Dorgan, Mark Dayton, Debbie Stabenow, Jim Jeffords, Robert Torricelli.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the majority leader for yielding. He has just filed cloture on the Byrd amendment. The underlying second degree is the Craig-Domenici amendment to try to deal with forest health. I appreciate the frustration of time here and the reality we have to get a lot of work done in the next several weeks to conclude the appropriations process.

It was never our intent to block the Byrd amendment. This is a critical and necessary amendment that deals with fire itself and replacing some of the moneys or refurbishing, replenishing some of the moneys that have been spent fighting fires, primarily in the West but across the country, in our public forests.

We are continuing to work. We had another meeting this morning. I told all of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican alike, that Monday was drop dead. I meant that only in the sense of the legislation itself. Clearly, we have worked hard. There have been some good faith efforts. There has also been a reality as to where all of the sides are on this issue. Tragically enough, no matter what we accomplish, the forests of our country are going to continue to burn at a high rate because of their diminished health because of public policy over the last good number of decades.

But on Monday, in visiting with Senator REID, I hope we will have something we can vote on—or a clear decision that we cannot arrive at an agreement. I hope at some point, Leader, I can come to you and ask you if you could vitiate the vote on cloture, that we could expedite this ourselves. But there are a good number on my side, and some on yours, who want more debate and at least more discussion on this issue, even if we can have opposing positions on which to vote.

I do believe for the American people, who have seen the western skies full of smoke now since the middle of June, it is important that this Senate express its will on this issue.

The Senator from South Dakota found an expression that fit his State. I do not criticize him for it because the Black Hills of South Dakota are in a state of forest health problems, as are other public forests. Clearly, it is important that we not walk away from this session of Congress without the public knowing where we are on this issue because, as the Senator knows, no matter what we do, even if we can have some aggressive effort on thinning and cleaning, the country must become ready to accept, tragically enough, that we are going to lose 5 million or 6 million acres a year of old growth and watershed and wildlife habitat to wildfires because of the public policy that has brought our forests to this current health environment.

But I hope we can make a step, probably not a big one but at least a small step, in the right direction of showing the public we can manage their land and we can do so in an environmentally sensitive way that will replenish the health of these magnificent forests that have now grown to a state of disrepair.

I understand where the leader is. I did want that expression out there. I hope we can come to the majority leader on Monday and say we have something, we hope you can vitiate, and we hope we can come to this floor and debate this issue and get on with the process.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me respond to the Senator from Idaho. I would be more than happy to entertain a consent agreement to vitiate the cloture vote on Tuesday if we arrive at a consensus about this over the weekend. We laid this bill down on September 4. It is now September 13, and I am told we have not spent this much time on any appropriations bill to date. So I attempted to be as patient as I could be with regard to the ongoing discussions. We have offered procedural arrangements to deal with this. They have not been acceptable to some. We have offered as many different iterations of compromise as I think our imaginations allow. But if there is a productive and successful effort over the weekend, we will certainly revisit the question.

However, we have to move on, this is not only a fire amendment but it is a drought amendment, now, as a result of the overwhelming action taken by the Senate just last week. This is a very important piece of legislation, and we have to move along. There is too much work to be done in too short a time.

So we will look at where we are on Monday and come to some conclusion. But if we are unsuccessful, we will have to move on with the cloture vote on Tuesday.

I yield the floor and I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, before the majority leader leaves the floor, I would like to comment on the discussion that just took place between the majority leader and Senator CRAIG and indicate to him I have been a daily participant in those negotiations. I have tried to act in good faith; many have. But somehow or another, we make one step forward, and literally the next time we meet, it looks as if we have gone one and a half back. It is getting more difficult.

We don't intend to delay this bill once we know the good faith efforts of the Senators—which is about 10 of them—cannot reach an agreement. We will come forward. But we will have to take a little time, as best we can, without delaying things too much, to let everybody know what has happened. It will not take too long for that to occur. There are other Senators who may feel differently. The amendment is a Craig-Domenici amendment. We put it together, gathered the Senators, but I wanted the record to reveal we are not interested in delaying the good faith effort on this bill, but we have a powerful issue, as you well known, that burns at many of our hearts. I am sorry I had to use that terrible word. We are having burns elsewhere in our States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I had wanted to make some comments this morning on the issue of homeland security. I understand we are currently back on the Interior appropriations bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he has other business to transact on that appropriation. If not, I would like to offer some comments on homeland security, which is the second track we have been working on this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, if I may respond to the Senator's question without his losing his right to the floor? He has asked me a question.

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

Mr. BYRD. I assume the Senate will return to homeland security this afternoon. The order is, I believe, 12 or 12:30?

Mr. REID. Yes, at 12 noon, with Senator BYRD having the floor.

Mr. BYRD. At 12 noon, at which time, under the unanimous consent order entered last evening, I will get recognized.

Now, I intend to explain my amendment clearly because my amendment is not adversarial to the Lieberman bill. My amendment improves, in my judgment—and I think people will agree once they really understand my amendment—the Lieberman amendment, the Lieberman bill. Therefore, I

will be explaining my amendment. That is in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator.

At that time, if he wishes me to yield to ask questions about homeland security, that will be fine, but I intend to take some time this afternoon. At that time, the Senator can speak. As far as I am concerned, if Senators are going to speak on the Interior bill at this time, why, the Senator could get unanimous consent to speak out of order. I do not believe the Pastore rule has run its course yet. So the Senator could get consent to speak out of order for 10 minutes, 20 minutes, whatever he wants, and nobody is around here to object.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Nevada for a question.

Mr. REID. We have the two managers of the Interior bill here now. We have approximately an hour until we go to the homeland security bill. I have looked to staff, and we have no amendments to clear at this time. That is my understanding. So it would probably be to everyone's benefit, because the cloture motion has been filed on the pending amendment, that we go off this bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that until 12 noon today, the Senate be in a period of morning business and at 12 noon we go to the homeland security bill and Senators be allowed to speak during morning business time for up to 10 minutes. Is that OK with the two managers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I consume.

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

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, let me thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member. We have a very short amount of time in which to do a great deal of business. I did not wish to interrupt their work on Interior if in fact there was an amendment that was to be acted upon. I appreciate their courtesy.

Let me make some comments about the broad question of homeland security and relate it to the discussion yesterday at the United Nations that was offered by President Bush.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I am pleased to yield for a question from the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I wish I could be on the floor to hear what the Senator has to say. I have an appointment. I have to be down below this floor at 11 o'clock, which is 1 minute or 2 from now. I will read the remarks of the Senator. I know they will be good. If I can come back before he completes his remarks, I will do that.

Is it the understanding of the Senator that he will complete his remarks by 12 noon?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have not been on the floor until now to speak about the homeland security bill and the issues surrounding that bill. I have been thinking a lot about it, as have many of my colleagues. We have had a good number of amendments, and I do not believe anyone here thinks the issue is whether we shall pass a piece of legislation dealing with homeland security. Of course we should enact a piece of legislation dealing with homeland security. We need to respond to the President's request. We will do that. The question isn't whether, the question is how.

There are many ideas about homeland security that come from all corners of this Chamber. We ought to take the best of all of those ideas and incorporate them into this legislation.

Yesterday the President spoke at the United Nations about the threat that comes from Saddam Hussein and Iraq. Because that also relates to the issue of homeland security, I wanted to make some comments of a general nature this morning.

In my desk, I have a couple of pieces of materials taken from weapons that were once targeted at the United States. I ask unanimous consent to be able to show them on the floor. I am doing this for a very important reason.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this piece of material is part of a wing strut from a Backfire bomber that the Soviets used to fly. This Backfire bomber doesn't exist anymore. It wasn't shot down. It wasn't part of combat with the United States. This was sawed off of an airplane. The wings were sawed off of a Backfire bomber that used to carry nuclear weapons—presumably that would threaten our country in the middle of the Cold War. It was dismantled, sawed apart, and destroyed. And in a sense, we purchased it. We paid for it under the Nunn-Lugar program, in which we decided through arms control agreements with the Soviet Union—and then with Russia—to reduce the number of nuclear warheads and reduce the delivery vehicles for nuclear warheads, because we believed that allowed us to step back from the dangers of nuclear war.

I hold in my hand part of a Soviet Backfire bomber that we didn't shoot down. We helped pay to saw the wings off this bomber.

This other material is ground up copper wire that used to be in a Soviet

submarine that carried nuclear missiles with warheads aimed at the United States of America. That submarine doesn't exist any longer. I am able to hold in my hand this ground up copper from that dismantled submarine because of an arms control agreement by which we negotiated with the Soviets to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and reduce the delivery vehicles for those nuclear weapons, and, therefore, have made this a safer world. A bomber and a submarine that used to carry nuclear weapons no longer exists. We have made progress.

But there are, of course, somewhere in the neighborhood of 30,000 nuclear weapons that continue to exist on the face of this Earth. And many in this world aspire to acquire nuclear weapons. Terrorist groups and other countries want to become part of the club that has nuclear weapons. Our children and their children are threatened by the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It doesn't take 100 nuclear weapons or a thousand nuclear weapons to create chaos and hysteria and concern for the future of the world. It just takes one—just one nuclear weapon.

Today, if someone is notified that there is a nuclear weapon missing from the Russian arsenal and that has been stolen by terrorists and is put in the trunk of a rusty Yugo car on the dock at New York City, or in a container on a ship coming into the ports of Los Angeles—if just one nuclear weapon is thought to be entering this country's space, its ports, its docks, its cities—that is enough for the kind of nuclear blackmail that can cause chaos and hysteria and threaten a nuclear war.

The President gave a very forceful speech yesterday to the United Nations. He is—and we are—concerned about Iraq and Saddam Hussein having access to weapons of mass destruction. He is—and we are—concerned about the potential of a Saddam Hussein getting access and acquiring a nuclear weapon.

I don't diminish at all the concern about that. We ought to be concerned about that. We and the President are all concerned about that.

But let us understand that the broader issue of arms control and arms reduction ought to be front and center in this Chamber. This country needs to be a leader in the world to help reduce the number of nuclear weapons and help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries.

Regrettably, in recent years, some Members in this Chamber—and elsewhere in the Government of the United States—have expressed, if not a benign neglect, an open hostility to arms control and arms reductions.

Let me go through a few of the things that have happened. We had a vote in this Chamber on the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. We should have such a treaty. After all, we don't test anymore in this country. The first George Bush Presidency said we will no longer test nuclear weapons. But this Senate voted