

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8½ minutes remaining.

FOREST FIRES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, for a couple of weeks, every time Americans look at their TV screen, they see a huge fire, a piece of America burning. Forests in our Southwest and West are on fire. We have seen huge fires in the State of Arizona, small but significant fires in New Mexico, and very large fires in the State of Colorado.

I do not want to discuss the why of the fires today, but I am very hopeful that another year will not pass in the Congress, at least the Senate, without a thorough analysis and research by a committee of Congress on why our forests are burning. Some say it is natural. Others say it is a terrible management mistake. They claim that we have gone along without pruning, thinning, or taking care of forests and are inviting either manmade fires, lightning, or some kind of natural fire starter.

We have a very serious problem with reference to our national forests and these fires. So far this year, over 3 million acres have burned, and the fire season is not yet over. This is 1 million acres more than the devastating 2000 fire season and twice the 10-year average. So far, twice the 10-year fire average has already occurred in our forests! This fire season has had a detrimental impact on communities throughout the West and Southwest, disrupting thousands of people's lives, hurting the economies in ways we cannot measure, and destroying homes and property. We must act in each instance to put out the fires, to contain them, and, yes, after that, provide whatever help we can to those suffering.

While the fires burn, there are people who need help. There are people in both the BLM and the Agriculture Department who are busy, day by day, using millions and millions of dollars, which we have provided.

I suggest today that the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture indicate they will have to move resources from all kinds of activities that are supposed to occur during the rest of this year over into fire accounts because nobody expected such a huge, onerous, and costly fire season. The Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture are about \$850 million short for 2002.

Those managing the bills, and the White House, should know it is a very difficult situation to let a supplemental catch up with the problem. That is what happened here. We have a supplemental appropriations bill waiting around. Now we have a new problem that did not exist when the supplemental started—reimbursement to the Departments of our Government that have used their money to pay for the forest fires that are burning down America.

We ought to either find a place for that amendment on the supplemental

or in some way accommodate it. We always say if it is an American problem, we will pay for it. If it is an earthquake, we pay for it. If it is a tornado, we pay for it. That is the collective insurance of America that we will pay for those emergencies, either on the supplemental or on the Interior appropriations bill, neither of which at this moment has money for these forest fires—neither bill, neither the supplemental nor the full yearly appropriation bill.

The whole of next year is ready to be appropriated without the fire money in it. So we need to provide the money the way I see it. It has been waiting long enough. I know the President does not want the supplemental over a certain amount. I will accommodate to arrange the additional funding, however he and others in the appropriations process and the Congress desire.

I repeat, the money that has been used to fight the forest fires has come out of various and sundry accounts, including the accounts for rehabilitation and restoration of burned lands. For those in the West who are suffering from these fires, we will get a bill ready.

I close by saying there is also a growing problem in Texas and other States regarding excessive water. The floods have caught up with this supplemental. I have been discussing the issue with the Senator from Texas, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON. I have also talked to Senator GRAMM. We will be asking that they present their water issues, and maybe we can provide funding on one emergency supplemental bill to the extent it is necessary to accommodate the emergencies of our people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent to be placed in the queue to speak?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield.

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that at the appropriate time, which I believe is following Senator MCCONNELL, I be allowed 15 minutes to speak in support of the Leahy amendment.

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

The Senator from Kansas.

COMMISSION ON THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW OF FEDERAL AGENCIES ACT

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to spend a few minutes talking about a growing fiscal and budgetary problem we have in the Senate, something I am not joyous about bringing up, but we have a problem. We are quickly sliding into it, if not falling into it, and we need to get it addressed. We need to address it before we get completely caught up in the fiscal and budgetary track.

Time is growing short. This body has yet to pass a budget resolution. We

have not passed a single 1 of the 13 annual appropriations bills yet. Here we are in the middle of July; no budget resolution, not 1 of the 13 annual appropriations bills. We are quietly moving into position for a fiscal train wreck. Many Members of the body expressed grave concern and doubt in 1998 when we did an omnibus appropriations bill. The course currently being charted by the Senate leadership will make that train wreck look like a fender bender.

We need to first consider the budget resolution created by the Budget Act of 1974. The budget resolution, which the Senate is legally required to pass by April 15—nearly 3 months ago—established caps on total annual discretionary spending. To waive the limits requires a 60-vote point of order. Without the mechanism in place, amendments to increase spending can be passed in the appropriations bills, regardless of their impact on Social Security, by a simple majority. So we are subjecting the Social Security surplus to simple majority movement by this body.

It is astounding, but despite the legal requirements for passage of the budget resolution by April 15, the leadership of the Senate has failed to even bring up the measure for consideration. And in the 27 years since the Budget Act of 1974, the Senate has had a budget.

To further put our current situation in perspective, consider the fact that just a year ago this body was composed of the exact 100 people here today, and we passed a budget resolution offered by Senator DOMENICI with the support of 65 Members.

Regardless of how the votes stack up, at the least, the Senate should pass a budget resolution so we have the fiscal caps in place that would take 60 votes—not just a majority, but 60 votes—to be able to raid the Social Security surplus. That is just prudence on our part that we ought to put the budget mechanisms in place.

I think we are sliding quickly into a situation where we are going to be spending ourselves into a bigger hole and not have any of these restraints or the mechanisms in place to help hold us back.

On the appropriations bills I mentioned at first, when the Senate should have passed 4 or 5 of these at least by this point in time, of the 13, we have passed none. These bills can take weeks to debate and pass. Then there are conference committees to work out the differences between the House and the Senate bills.

When considering these factors, coupled with the finite time remaining on the legislative calendar, it seems evident that a super-omnibus bill, larger than the 1998 omnibus, may very well be necessary to break the inevitable logjam.

Most of us in this Chamber have been privileged enough to serve during the recent period of historic, large federal surpluses. While large surpluses can be