

Given the likelihood of future terrorist actions on American soil, the Guard, with thousands of sites around the country and local expertise, offers a far superior means of deploying this capability for domestic emergencies.

Further—and this is not easy to say—the standing Army, is an institution in profound disarray, trashed by scandal and, in many ways, looking for work that will generate hard cash and renewed respect. Almost inevitably, that points toward more domestic missions, especially counter-terrorism in its various aspects. One need not conjure up lurid thoughts of military coups or images of an alienated, embittered officer corps to understand that this is a bad idea. The less the standing military is involved in domestic affairs, the better. Not because they're evil people, but because their professional methods and loyalties may do more harm than good. The Founders knew it; the Army's domestic intelligence activities during Vietnam proved it. To the extent that military force may have to be used in this country in the decades ahead, it ought to be the Guard, with its complex set of responsibilities to and relationships with country, state, and community.

But the political and cultural justifications for the Guard don't address one practical question: Can they be ready to do the job? Obviously, the answer depends on what the job is and what you mean by ready. Still, one thing is clear. There is no inherent reason the Guard cannot perform adequately across the range of its missions. The Marine Corps and the Air Force have demonstrated what can be accomplished when reserves are treated as assets, not rivals. New tools and methods, from tank and cockpit simulators to computerized command post exercises, offer training possibilities unimaginable even 10 years ago. High-priority units can be filled with people willing to accept high levels of contractual obligation, including extended active duty and early call-up. In short, the Guard's proficiency is limited only by resources and creativity—and by a standing Army that, for reasons of its own, prefers not to acknowledge it.

Again, that standing Army isn't evil. It's simply fighting for its institutional life and soul. The current off-site, and the next one, and the one after that, will no doubt reflect the desperation of the struggle. But the Army should not be permitted to sacrifice the Guard to protect its own turf bowls. The current military situation, and the wisdom of centuries, should preclude it.

#### TRIBUTE TO LORD MICHAEL JOPLING

Mr. STEVENS. I come to the Senate floor today to tell the Senate that a very special and dear friend to many of us who serve in the Senate, the Right Honorable Michael Jopling, has now been honored in his country with a life peerage and will join the House of Lords.

Those of us who know Michael Jopling have known him as a Member of Parliament who has served more than three decades in Britain as a Member of Parliament. He served as a Minister of Agricultural, Fisheries, and Food in the British Government for two 4-year periods between 1979 and 1987. Those of us here in the Senate who know him, know him because of his active participation in the North Atlantic Assembly sessions and par-

ticularly in the British-American Interparliamentary Conference meetings which many of us have participated in from time to time.

He continues to serve, Mr. President, as the Secretary for the Interparliamentary Exchange. Senator BYRD and I will lead a Senate delegation in August to meet with our British counterparts, and for the 10th year in a row it will be Lord Jopling, now, who will meet us. He brings great energy and enthusiasm to the meetings we have held and, really, his participation has been unparalleled.

As a matter of fact, I am sad to report to the Senate that with his youthful exuberance he got the better of himself recently when he suffered an accident in a Go-Kart race. He broke some ribs and had some damage to his lungs, but he is on the mend now. I understand that he will have full recovery.

I further bring greetings to the Senate from our friend Senator Heflin. Senator Heflin has written to me about his real joy to see our friend, Michael Jopling, so honored. I am reminded of a speech that Sir Winston Churchill made in the House of Commons on August 20, 1940. He said:

The British Empire and the United States will have to be somewhat mixed together in some of their affairs for mutual and general advantage. For my own part, looking out upon the future, I do not view the process with any misgivings.

It is, in fact, the British-American interparliamentary process that has given great effect to those words, and Lord Jopling has been a leader of that effort. He has made a lasting contribution to the great relationship between our two countries. He and his wife Gail have always been gracious hosts, and they really are wonderful goodwill ambassadors for Britain.

I come to offer my congratulations to Lord Jopling. I think others who know him will want to congratulate him, also. We particularly thank him for years of dedication to his country and to the cause of world peace and understanding. He is a great personal friend. I am delighted to see a friend honored.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. As they say in England, hear, hear. We are delighted to hear of the elevation of our friend Michael to Lord Jopling. It shows, amongst other things in England, that you do not only have to be young, you can be old and still succeed.

I wish him well, too, in his recovery, and I appreciate the Senator from Alaska pointing out this wonderful happening.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for those remarks, and I know I reflect the sentiments of my great friend Howell Heflin in reporting to the Senate this great news.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I do not know Michael Jopling as well as our good friends from Alaska and South Carolina, but I have met him on numerous occasions, having attended a couple of the sessions of the North Atlantic Assembly with Judge Heflin, our former colleague.

I remember when I left the other body, Mr. President, and came to the U.S. Senate, our former colleague and delightful raconteur, Morris Udall, pulled me aside and said, "I want you to know I do not approve of your moving to the U.S. Senate. All I can say is by this move you have improved the intelligence of both bodies," and one might suggest I suppose here with our good friend Michael Jopling, being elevated to the status of Lord, that he is certainly going to improve the intelligence of that body.

He is a wonderful person, a great individual, and I wish him well.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR OF 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 hours of debate on the subject of the conference report on H.R. 1469.

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use. I state to the Senate that I don't intend to use the whole hour, unless it is necessary to respond to some comments that may come up. It is my hope that we can finish debate on this bill and then turn to the budget resolution.

The conference report on the defense and emergency disaster supplemental bill will soon be before us. It is not before us yet. In the interest of time, we hope that we can get this matter resolved so that we may vote upon the bill as soon as it is received from the House.

Mr. President, the conferees completed their work yesterday afternoon and the conference report was filed in the House last night. The final bill keeps faith with the version that passed the Senate last month. It provides needed relief for the victims of disasters in 35 States. The bill also provides \$1.8 billion for military operations in Bosnia, Southwest Asia, and foreign deployments. Those amounts replace funds already spent by the administration. Without this funding for the Defense Department, we face a severe reduction in training, readiness,

and quality of life for our troops worldwide.

The bill continues to exceed the levels requested by the President for the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the community development block grants, economic development, agriculture, and for the Corps of Engineers. I might say, however, Mr. President, while this bill involves increases of \$8 billion, we have offset \$8.4 billion. There is no net increase in this bill. We actually have a \$400 million net reduction in spending for fiscal year 1997 as a result of this bill.

Each of our subcommittees have carefully reviewed the amounts proposed by these agencies, and working with the Members from the impacted States, we have arrived at these funding levels. The new budget authority is offset by corresponding rescissions, as I have indicated. Those exceed the total spending.

Again, let me say, all defense spending is offset by reductions available to the Department of Defense in terms of prior appropriations. Again, consistent with the Senate version of the bill, additional amounts are provided for needed highway programs. Mr. President, there was a request from the administration for some highway money. We added to that. We have reached a compromise now by virtue of the work that was done by Senator SHELBY and Senator LAUTENBERG. That results in an increase for the so-called donor States, compared to the bill that passed the Senate. But I believe it keeps faith with the commitment that we have made to provide more funding to the donee States. We did not rewrite the highway formula. We reached an honest compromise with the House, where the House is dominated primarily by donor States and this Senate has more votes from the donee States. Now, this is a legitimate compromise on the money without rewriting the highway formula.

The conferees maintained the continuing resolution language; it is unchanged. It was the same version in both the House and Senate bills. It was not before the conference, actually. The levels of the continuing resolution version provide 100 percent of the fiscal year 1997 enacted rate of appropriations in the event a bill is not passed by the end of the fiscal year. This is more generous than most continuing resolutions that have been passed by the Congress in prior years. Typically, past resolutions provided that the money to be available during the period of a continuing resolution was the lower of the two amounts provided by the House or the Senate. This is not that case. This continuing resolution would be 100 percent of the amount that has been available in 1997.

I might say to the Senate that, after considerable debate, the conferees modified the language on the 2000 census; that is, we modified the provision adopted by the Senate. The conference agreement prohibits the use of sam-

pling and mandates a full enumeration of Americans for the apportionment of the House of Representatives. This is nothing more than maintaining current law, Mr. President, the constitutional requirement for a real census. It does not permit a political polling type of census.

I think we should state to the Senate that the Appropriations Committee in the House and the Senate each have recognized that this decision will increase the cost of the census for the year 2000. We are prepared to fund that additional cost within the total available under the bipartisan budget agreement, which we will vote on later today. I regret that no Member of the minority has chosen to sign the conference report, but I do understand and respect Senator BYRD's decision. I knew of his objection from the very beginning to the continuing resolution provision that is in the bill. But I want to assure Senators that, as far as the appropriations aspects of this bill, it is not a partisan bill. The agreements reached on the appropriations for disaster relief and for the recovery from the disasters were adopted with complete consultation with all Members of each body, regardless of party.

I hope the President will closely evaluate the total bill before he reaches the decision on a veto. We know that there is a threatened veto. We hope to work with the President to meet the needs of the victims of these disasters and to maintain our national defense, which is our constitutional duty. Vetoing this bill will simply delay further the aid and support that is needed by the citizens of more than 30 States.

I do want to state, Mr. President, that this is the first bill that I have been privileged to handle as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I offer my thanks to Chairman BOB LIVINGSTON for his courtesy and cooperation in working with Members of the Senate on this bill. It is a very complex bill, Mr. President. At times, this was a very contentious conference. But the House chairman, who was the chairman of the conference, presided over the conference with considerable grace, diligence, and good humor. I do believe that all Members will agree that anyone who wanted to participate in the debate concerning this conference was able to do so. I do urge the adoption of the bill by the Senate today so the bill can reach the President as soon as possible.

It will be a difficult vote, Mr. President, and I expect a very close vote on whether the bill goes to the President at all. Thank you.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members of the Appropriations Committee and various subcommittees be granted floor access during the con-

sideration of the conference report on H.R. 1469:

Christine Ciccone, Becky Davies, Sid Ashworth, Alex Flint, Bruce Evans, Wally Burnett, Jon Kamareck, Jay Kimmitt, Michele Randolph, Jack Conway, Jim Morhard, Mary Beth Nethercutt, Robin Cleveland, Craig Higgins, Pat Raymond, Dona Pate, Susan Hogan, and Kevin Johnson.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield myself some of the time assigned to the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, this bill is critically important because it responds to the disasters in many States. Obviously, of greatest concern and interest to this Senator are the disasters that have occurred in North Dakota. Perhaps I could give a brief review for my colleagues and people who might be watching on the need for this disaster legislation. Before I do that, I want to thank those who helped write this legislation. I specifically want to thank the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS. I also want to thank his staff because they listened to our plea for help and they responded. We deeply appreciate that. There were some heated moments as we discussed this legislation, but much of what is here is very good and critically important to our recovery.

As I say that, I must also register disappointment for the unrelated matters that have been included in this legislation, which the President has indicated will compel him to veto the legislation. We asked for and pleaded for a clean disaster bill, one that did not contain extraneous matters. But that did not happen.

Mr. President, I want to go now to a review of the disasters that occurred and led to the necessity for this kind of legislation. North Dakota has been hit with the most extraordinary set of disasters in our State's history. First, we had, as this chart shows, "Snow Foolin', Fargo-Moorhead Sets Record." Mr. President, that is not an athletic record, it is a record for snowfall. At the time they wrote this article, we had received almost 95 inches of snow. Before we were done, we reached over 10 feet of snow that fell in North Dakota during the winter season.

Next, we were faced with an extraordinary ice and blizzard storm, which was the most powerful winter storm in the last 50 years in North Dakota. That occurred in the first week of April. This picture shows downed power lines. It just snapped power lines all across the northeastern part of the State, and 80,000 people were without power. Many were without power for over a week. Not only were power lines affected by this incredible storm, but, as this picture shows, we had thousands of cattle that were killed by this extraordinary blizzard. This shows a mother who is

licking one of her calves. This calf, by the way, did not survive. You can see another dead animal, another dead cow. We lost over 150,000 head in this incredible blizzard in early April.

This is a circumstance in which some cows froze to death and many died by suffocation because in the blizzard the winds were so powerful that it blew snow up into their nostrils, and it compacted. And then the cows actually suffocated, an especially gruesome death for these animals.

It didn't end there, unfortunately, because not only did we have record snowfall followed by the most powerful winter storm in 50 years but then we had on top of it a 500-year flood; a flood that in Grand Forks was 26 feet above flood stage. And the dikes could not hold. As this headline says, "Broken Dikes, Shattered Hopes," and a picture of just one part of Grand Forks.

Grand Forks is a city of 50,000 people. Ninety-five percent of the people were evacuated. Eighty percent of the homes were badly damaged. Tens of thousands of structures were just devastated. In fact, if you go to Grand Forks now—this is 6 weeks after the flood devastation—on every corner, on every boulevard are stacked the personal belongings and the personal effects of the people of the city of Grand Forks. It is like a giant junkyard because everything has been destroyed. This water was contaminated. All of these things are ruined. The carpets, the drapes, all of the furniture, all of their clothing and personal effects destroyed; all of it. It is amazing to go through town. You can see what everybody's refrigerator looked like; everybody's washer and dryer—because they are out on the curb. They are out on the boulevard waiting to be picked up because they are all destroyed. It is really an incredible experience.

This picture shows the extraordinary extent of the flooding that occurred once those dikes broke. I went on a helicopter and flew north of Grand Forks. This shows from horizon to horizon water. In fact, the water was 40 miles wide. Remember. This river is normally 75 to 100 yards wide. But after the dikes burst, the water spread and was 40 miles wide.

You will remember—I think the President has North Dakota roots—you may recall, Mr. President, that we used to have a lake thousands of years ago, Lake Agassiz, that covered much of eastern North Dakota. A lot of us said it looks like Lake Agassiz is reforming because to be up in a helicopter and as far as the eye can see was water; really a stunning sight.

The disaster didn't end there because in the middle of the 500 year flood we had an incredible fire break out. The headline in the paper was, "Red Overruns Heart of Forks." Of course, they are referring to Grand Forks. The picture shows amidst the flooded streets this fire that broke out. This fire devastated much of three blocks of downtown Grand Forks. Many buildings

were destroyed. This picture shows the headline, which says it well, "A City Scarred."

This shows the National Guard with the firemen fighting that incredible inferno. I mean it was an inferno. This fire was so intense and so powerful that giant support beams for office buildings actually went up and were forced by the convection, by the power of these air currents, they blew up into the air and went across the street to the next block. That is how this fire spread, block to block, and destroyed much of three city blocks.

You can see. This is one of the major commercial buildings in the city of Grand Forks. It looks like it went through the raids of Dresden. It is just a shell. It was block after block that looked just like this. Over 150 business structures were destroyed in the combined flood and fire; 156 business structures in Grand Forks alone, housing about two businesses per structure on average. So about 300 businesses had their property wiped out.

This headline came in the Grand Forks Herald, which says it all: "Come Hell and High Water". It shows the little street sign with the water right up to the top; 6 feet of water standing right in the middle of town. Here is again the burned-out shell of a three-block area where the people have been absolutely devastated.

Mr. President, we have another headline that comes from the Grand Forks Herald: "4 Days Since Congress Let Us Down."

This was after Congress failed to act after the Memorial Day recess, and they gave 11 reasons to pass the disaster bill now.

We have heard a lot of talk that, "There is money in the pipeline. Don't worry about anything. Nothing is being held up because there is money in the pipeline." We just had the mayors of the affected communities in town yesterday. The business leaders of Grand Forks were here. One of them said, "You know. I hear all of this talk about money in the pipeline. All I can say is there must be cement in the pipeline because the money is not getting through."

The fact is there is no money in the Housing Department's pipeline for the buyout and relocation of the thousands of homes that have been destroyed. There is no money in that pipeline. We met yesterday with Secretary Cuomo. We asked him, "Do you have any money anywhere that could be diverted to go to work immediately so these homes can be bought out and relocated so we can start to rebuild this community?"

His answer was, "No, I don't."

We met yesterday with Secretary Daley, the Secretary of Commerce. We asked him, "Do you have EDA funds that are in the pipeline that could be used to help rebuild the business community that has been devastated?"

He said, "No, I do not."

There is no money in the pipeline to reimburse the school districts who

took the kids from the disaster areas. Those school districts stepped forward and said, "Yes. We will take your children. We will put them in our schools. We will transport them. We will feed them. We will give them books. We will provide teaching"—because the schools in Grand Forks are devastated.

There is no money in the pipeline to reimburse the school districts that stepped forward. There is no money in the pipeline for the Department of Agriculture to help the ranchers who lost hundreds of thousands of heads of cattle in this remarkable winter that we have just been through.

So when people say there is money in the pipeline, that no project is being delayed, that is just not accurate. That is just not accurate. We had the direct testimony of the mayors of the affected cities, of the business leaders of these cities, and they are saying to us: "We are stopped cold until and unless this disaster bill passes."

So, Mr. President, I am here today with two messages. No. 1, a message of thanks to those who have supported a disaster package that is meaningful and critically important for recovery. But I am also here today to say that I am also disappointed that we don't have before us a clean disaster bill—one that does not have unrelated provisions so that the President can sign this legislation and we can move forward with the recovery and rebuilding. That is unfortunate, and one that I hope is not repeated any time in the future.

I have been in the U.S. Senate for 10 years. And when others had disasters, we never offered amendments that were controversial, that would hold up the legislation, or that would cause a Presidential veto. We never did that. We never even thought of doing such a thing. I wish others would have extended the same courtesy to us that we have extended to them.

Some said, "Well, you offered amendments." Yes. That is true. I have offered amendments to disaster legislation before—noncontroversial amendments that were supported on both sides of the aisle, that were supported by the administration, that didn't hold up anything. I certainly have done that. But I would never have even thought of offering an amendment that would compel a Presidential veto. I mean I really do not understand why that would be done.

I do not want to lose sight of the important provisions that are in this legislation—provisions that will help rebuild the homes and businesses that have been destroyed; provisions that will help farmers and ranchers in many cases who have lost their foundation herds; provisions that will help them recover; provisions that will allow the Corps of Engineers to rebuild and repair and reconstruct levees and dikes so that we don't go through this again next year.

Believe me. We are acutely aware that in North Dakota we could face another disaster next year if we do not

act and act quickly. Again, remember, we have a very short construction season. We need to go to work now to get these projects completed. The money that is here for the Federal Highway Administration to rebuild roads, highways and bridges—many of the bridges up and down the Red River have been destroyed by this series of disasters—the funds for the school districts that have been impacted, and the funding for Devil's Lake because we have another disaster that is occurring in North Dakota: Devil's Lake. This lake is raising inexorably. It has tripled in volume and doubled in size in the last 3 years. It is like a cancer eating more and more of the countryside, eating up homes, eating buildings, eating up roads and bridges. And we are grateful to the committee for having included \$5 million for the work that needs to be done this year on an outlet from that Devil's Lake; and, for the money to rebuild the rural sewer system; the money to provide floodplain easements for those whose land is flooded and who have now been denied any ability to earn an income necessary for their families.

Mr. President, I want to end on this note, as I started, by saying:

No. 1, we are deeply grateful for the response of so many in this Chamber who came to help out.

The occupant of the Chair wrote me a very gracious note reminding me of his North Dakota roots and offering to help out with this disaster. We appreciate that.

We appreciate again especially the assistance of the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We appreciate the help of his staff. We appreciate the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and his staff for the great assistance they have provided in getting this legislation in shape.

Finally, Mr. President, we also have a disappointment. The disappointment is that we have these unrelated measures that are in this legislation. Hopefully, this will all be resolved as quickly as possible so that the relief can start to flow to those communities that have been so badly hurt.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I had a chance to speak at some length about the need for disaster relief, and the need for emergency assistance for Minnesotans and the Dakotas. I want in less than 3 minutes to just say two things on the floor today.

I would like to thank my colleagues. This started out in the hope that eventually it will end up as a bipartisan effort, and a lot of cooperation to get help to people, our neighbors. This is help that doesn't make everybody whole again, but at least it gives peo-

ple a chance to rebuild their lives. I hope that next week that is where this ends up. It started out on a very positive note, and I hope it will end up there.

My second point is my colleague from North Dakota said he was disappointed. I am actually outraged. I think it is transparent. I think what is going on here is silly.

There are some extraneous amendments on what should be a straight disaster relief bill—the way we collect census data; having to do with a continuing resolution; having to do with a budget resolution; and, if there is any kind of crisis a Government shutdown next fall; having to do with parks; you name it. This shouldn't be on this bill.

I think what people know here—for some reason they think people in the country don't know it—that it is going to go to the President, the President is going to veto it, and it is going to be sent back. If it is an effort to embarrass the President, what is accomplished? Because when it gets sent back here, it is my fervent hope—and I believe this will happen—that these extraneous provisions will be taken off the bill. Then it will go back to the President, and then it will be signed.

What has been accomplished? Is the point to embarrass the President? Is it just a game?

I think we are going to be faced next week with one of two scenarios: Either it goes to the President, the President vetoes it—and everybody here knows it. But so do people back in our home States. They have intelligence. The President will veto it. Then it will come back here. And one of two things will happen: Either the bill will be stripped of these provisions that have nothing to do with the compelling need to get help to people, in which case, great. Thank you. Fine. But what was the point?

Or that will not happen. And if that does not happen, then I will use every measure I know how to use as a Senator to stop this process here. I will do everything I can next week if we do not get a clean bill. Everything I can do to fight for the people in Minnesota I will do. So my hope is that this ends up on the positive note that it started out on because this is really not about a kind of strategy or tactics. It is just about getting help to people, and it is time. It is time to do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], has been waiting. How much time does she wish?

Mrs. BOXER. Up to 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes from the time under my control to the distinguished Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership on all of this, and the chairman of the committee. This is his first time as chairman bringing a bill to the floor. I know that both sides have worked very, very hard.

Mr. President, this is a good news-bad news day for the people in North Dakota and for the people in the 21 other States who are waiting to see this Congress finally pass an emergency bill and send it to the President. It is a good news day because the bill is before us.

As has been said many times, and I repeat it again, for both sides, from the chairman, Senator STEVENS, to the ranking member, Senator BYRD, to their staffs, to all of the members of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a new member, I cannot tell you how grateful we from California are for the patience and understanding and the work that went into this bill, for the things we have in this bill to help our people. We have had devastating floods, and we have many things to do to pick up the pieces for the people who were hit hard, for the people who have to replant orchards, for the people who depend on Yosemite National Park and the tourism that it brings to give them livelihood and sustenance.

Those funds are in this bill, and they do not come from FEMA. I say to my colleagues. And, as my friend, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, said, they are not in the pipeline. These funds must come through the pipeline, and until this bill passes they will not be there because they are from agriculture, they are from the highway fund, they are from the Army Corps of Engineers, and they are from housing.

So the funds that are in the pipeline—and I think it is important we all understand this—are the FEMA funds. By the way, if we have another tragedy in our country—we never know when disaster strikes—even that could be jeopardized. I watched with horror the tornado that hit Texas, and I thought to myself here we are on a break and another natural disaster hits. I hope FEMA does have the wherewithal to meet that disaster.

So, my friends, we are playing with fire. We are playing with flooding. We are playing with earthquakes. We are playing with disaster here. We need to be sure that the funds in this bill which have been put together in such a careful way get to the people who need them the most.

I am glad my colleague from North Dakota showed the photographs again of the devastation because sometimes we have a short attention span and we forget, but when we see those buildings as they looked when they were in flames in the middle of a flood, it really did remind you of World War II pictures, of the worst kind of attack, and this was an attack from nature.

We need to do what we can to make these people whole, to work with their

private insurers, to work with communities, to work with local and State governments to do what we can do. It is a very basic question: What are we here for? Are we here to play political games? Are we here to win a political skirmish? Or are we here to help the people who so need that help? I hope that, after we get through today, because clearly we have these riders attached to this bill that have nothing to do whatsoever with the emergency, I hope when this bill comes back from the President, who has been forthright about the fact he will veto a bill with these riders, we will strip these controversial riders from the bill and move on.

Mr. President, my people in California are waiting. They do not understand it. I went home, and they said, "Well, why, Senator, is this all taking so long?" I explained that there were three controversial riders placed on this bill that have nothing to do with the emergency. And one of them, the most controversial, undermines the budget agreement that we were all so proud to say we support. It is almost as if the majority is protecting the Senate from the majority.

Why do I say that? Because there is no reason why we have to put this Government on automatic pilot. There is no reason why we cannot do our work and pass our appropriations bills. We do not need an automatic pilot budget process in place. If we had that in place, why do we need the Senate? We would not need it; we would just put everything on automatic pilot. The only people who can cause a shutdown are the people right here in this Senate. If we agree we are never going to shut down the Government, let us agree to do our work and pass our bills and compromise and move forward.

I do not blame the President for being outraged on this. Here he holds a press conference; everyone is hugging everyone, Democrats and Republicans; they passed the budget. Everyone gave a little and everyone got a little. Now we have this automatic CR placed on an emergency bill, which, if it passes, will totally undermine that agreement there. There are harsh cuts in education and the environment. This does not belong on this bill.

Here is the point. These riders should stand on their own two feet. They should come here as separate bills. We should debate them and vote them out. They should not be attached to legislation to help people who have been thrown off their feet by disasters. This is wrong. We do not have to do this.

So, yes, it is a good news-bad news day for people in 22 States—good news because we are moving the supplemental, bad news because it has these extraneous matters attached that undermine the budget agreement and do other things and do not belong on this bill. The bill will be vetoed, and we will be back to square one. And people in the country will scratch their heads and wonder what on Earth are we

doing. That is not a proud moment for this Senate.

Mr. President, on an unrelated matter, I want to mention that something historic happened in California yesterday that does deal with another type of emergency, and that is the passage of junk gun laws.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened in California yesterday.

The California State Assembly and the California State Senate passed legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of junk guns in California, Saturday night specials. Those guns that have not one quality of safety standard are now banned from manufacture in the State of California, assuming the Governor signs this bill.

Mr. President, we talk about emergencies; 40,000 people a year are killed by gunshots in this great Nation, almost 300,000 a year are wounded, and the criminal gun of choice is the Saturday night special, the junk gun, the only product in America today that has not one quality of safety standard. In 1968, those guns were outlawed from importation after Robert Kennedy was assassinated. I have to say there was a big loophole that allowed American companies to make these guns. I am proud that the State assembly and the senate passed this bill. It is modeled after my bill that I introduced last year and again this year.

I hope that as we deal with emergencies and we look at the emergency of gun violence, we will recognize we have guns on the market today that are banned from importation because they are so poorly made, and at the minimum people deserve to have safety standards and quality standards on guns that they purchase.

So, Mr. President, it is a great day for Californians. Even with the worst, heaviest type of heavyhanded lobbying, these bills passed, and I am very excited about it. I hope that we will have the courage to do the same in the Senate. I will give the Senate a chance to cast that courageous vote.

I close, Mr. President, by again thanking my colleagues from Alaska and West Virginia for their assistance to the good people of California and the 21 other States, particularly the heart-rending photos we saw today that just reminded us of what happened in North Dakota. I thank them for working in a bipartisan fashion to get a bill to us that is an excellent bill, and I pray and I hope that we can get these extraneous riders stripped off of this bill so that the people in North Dakota and the people in the 21 other States can say this Senate did something to really help the people of America.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 28 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. How much time did the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. She used 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. All right. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will yield myself such time as I may consume from the time under my control.

Mr. President, I regret that I am unable to support the conference agreement on the emergency disaster assistance appropriations bill, H.R. 1469, now before the Senate. I am unable to do so despite my total support for the more than \$5 billion in disaster assistance payments which are included in this measure for the hundreds of thousands of people across the country who are the victims of the many natural disasters that have occurred in recent months.

I also support the nearly \$2 billion contained in the measure for aid to our men and women in uniform around the world, particularly in Bosnia, engaged in peacekeeping operations, as well as the nearly \$1 billion contained in the measure for payment of veterans' compensation and pensions.

These funds are all vitally needed for the purposes for which they are appropriated and should be made available at the earliest possible time. Indeed, it is my view Congress should not have recessed for the recent Memorial Day break without having enacted into law these funds that are contained in this bill.

Unfortunately, as did the bill when reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee and after Senate action, this conference agreement contains a number of controversial, extraneous legislative provisions which have no business being included in an emergency disaster assistance bill. The President has never wavered in his statement that he will veto the measure despite the critical nature of funding it contains for hundreds of thousands of people. He has urged Congress to remove the extraneous provisions and send him a clean disaster assistance bill which he can sign. Regrettably, the leadership in Congress has chosen to use this bill as a vehicle for making political points on such things as keeping the Government operating on automatic pilot for the entirety of fiscal year 1998 at 1997 levels regardless of merit and ignoring the fact that a number of activities throughout the Federal Government should not continue and should be cut or eliminated altogether.

This so-called automatic CR and other extraneous provisions need not be on this bill. They can be raised at any time and debated in their own right as freestanding measures. They can be raised by the leadership at any time. What other reason can there be then to insist on including them in this disaster assistance measure than to make purely political points?

I am disturbed by this decision to proceed in this fashion. I note that no Democratic Member of the conference on H.R. 1469, no Democratic Member signed the conference report. In not signing a conference report, I find no

fault with and intend no disrespect toward the chairmen of the conference. I congratulate Chairman LIVINGSTON on conducting a very fair and evenhanded conference. I congratulate our own chairman of the conference, chairman of the Senate conferees, Senator STEVENS, who also, likewise, is very aware of and always considerate of the needs of the constituencies of the Members of this body. I have always found him, over the long years of friendship that I have enjoyed with him, to be most considerate, charitable and fair. In the conduct of this conference, these two chairmen were courteous to all members and showed great patience and eminent skill in completing the conference as expeditiously as possible. Unfortunately, they had no ability to remove these controversial matters that have caused me to oppose the measure and have caused me not to sign the conference report, and I speak for others on my side of the aisle who, likewise, did not sign this conference report. Only the leadership of the two Houses could have accomplished that result.

To those Senators who have chosen to delay the enactment of the measure in order to make political points which they hope to gain from forcing the President to veto it, I say consider this: Next time it may be your State, it may be your people, it may be your constituents.

For the reasons I have stated, I will not vote for the adoption of the conference report.

We must not continue to play cynical games with people who need help when a disaster has taken lives, taken homes, taken farms, taken livestock, taken livelihoods. I hope that this will be the last time such tactics are employed on an emergency disaster bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to have some time?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, [Mr. DORGAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I spoke earlier today on the floor for about 30 minutes on this subject. I shall not extend much beyond that. But I did want to add my voice to the voice of Senator BYRD and express, as I indicated previously, two things. First, my gratitude for the resources that are in this bill that would be available and helpful to the victims of the flood in my State; and, second and also important, my concern about the unnecessary delay.

I was looking for a copy of the conference report. It is not yet available here in the Senate. The conference report is a conference report to provide emergency appropriations. The emergency appropriations are necessary to respond to natural disasters. But, of course, there are issues in this conference report that determine that it

will not become law. The conference report, if it were on my desk, I would hold it up and say, "This is not going to be law, and everyone in this Chamber knows it."

It is part of the process that is so frustrating from time to time in this Chamber. It is a process that goes on from time to time on a lot of legislation—and the Democrats do it, the Republicans do it: Put extraneous or unrelated amendments on a bill. That is not unusual. The rules of the Senate allow that. What is unusual is that a bill providing for disaster relief to thousands and thousands of people is now being used for that purpose. That's unusual. That's unprecedented. That didn't happen previously. A disaster bill, generally speaking, was a piece of legislation that most understood should not be used for the traditional kinds of political games that are played here in the U.S. Congress. That is what is different this time.

This aid will come. The resources in this bill will be available. Recovery will take place, but after, now, 2 weeks' delay. Two weeks ago today, the Congress left for the Memorial Day recess without having enacted a conference report. Now, today, the conference report is before us and it will be undoubtedly approved. It will not be signed into law, and everyone in this Chamber knows it.

Some say, and they make the case with great forcefulness, "It doesn't matter. Nothing that needs to be done is not now being done. There is money in the pipeline." I have heard it a hundred times this week from people who don't have the foggiest idea about what the facts are.

Will Rogers once said, "It's not what he knows that bothers me so much, it's what he says he knows for sure that just ain't so." There is some money in the FEMA pipeline to deal with emergency immediate relief—food today, housing tonight in a motel. But there is no money in the pipeline from HUD to rehabilitate the housing, to begin the construction that is necessary—in a State, by the way, that has a very short construction season. Losing 3 weeks in North Dakota, in a construction season where we have to replace probably 1,000 to 1,500 homes, is devastating. It is a delay that is devastating to the region.

That is the point that drives us and compels us to say, thanks for this aid. It will get there. We appreciate very much the cooperation of everyone. But we remain enormously disturbed by the fact that this conference report is not going to be law and everybody in this Chamber knows it, and the result will be another week of delay. There will be 1 more week with thousands of people who wake up in the morning not in their own beds, somewhere else—a shelter, a neighboring town, a hotel, a home of a stranger who took them in. There are thousands of them, thousands of them today without a home, waiting for the fundamental decisions

that will be unlocked by this bill. And the strategy today, by some, is to include in this bill something that will certainly gain a veto, because it has no relationship to this bill and the President has said it is something he cannot support. The result will be 1 more week, 7 more nights, 14 more nights, for people who don't have a home. That's the dilemma.

Mr. President, I have consumed my time. I thank the Chair and the ranking member of the committee. I hope, when all of this process is complete and the dust settles, that the quantity of resources involved in this bill finally, even if belatedly, will be there to provide some hope and help to those families who now feel hopeless and helpless. There is help on the way.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I very much agree with the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from West Virginia, my colleague from California, and all who have really very sincerely expressed their dismay on the way this bill has been handled. I would like to just take a few minutes and remind my colleagues that this started with a flood in California in January, and it is now June. According to the California Office of Emergency Services, California sustained \$1.8 billion in damages during last winter's flooding. In California alone, 9 people died and 100,000 people lost their homes. They were forced to flee from their homes. This was the third 100-year flood in the last 10 years. It gives you the idea of the impact on part of the State.

Mr. President, 48 out of 58 counties in California were declared Federal disaster areas. Damage to levees, to roads, and other infrastructure was severe. There were over 60 levee breaks in the delta area of California. Many of those breaks have yet to be repaired. These levees do two things. Because the land behind the levee is below sea level, the levees protect homes and agricultural land from the rivers. Now, when the levees break, the land behind the levee is peat, and the peat comes out into the water. That water is the drinking water for two-thirds of the people of the State; that is 20 million people. And when you treat the water for drinking and it has been infested by peat soil, the chlorine throws off carcinogens. So the longer you leave these levees unattended and the longer you have the intrusion of the peat-infested



water into the drinking water, you increase problems in California.

So far, out of this more than \$1.8 billion, California has only received \$27 million for FEMA, for flood fighting, for debris removal, and for infrastructure repair. Fully repairing the damage to public facilities will take months, if not years.

I spent 3 days in these areas. I have flown over most of the levee breaks. I saw the extent of the damage. In places where I flew in a helicopter, let's say maybe 300, 400 feet above the ground, you could not see anything that was not flood-affected on either side. As far as your vision could go, flat land, from 300 to 500 feet above the ground, it was all water. You only saw rooftops.

I talked with people who lost as many as 14,000 trees in their orchard, who were wiped out of their dairy farms, wiped out of their homes. I went into the homes of people who were not farmers. I saw water halfway up the ceiling, everything ruined. Wiring, everything was ruined in the house. If only everyone could see this, I don't think they would want to play these games with this vital piece of legislation.

Let me remind my colleagues of the emergency relief provision and exactly what is in the bill: \$5.6 million, 22 States. According to OMB, the bill allocates \$3.3 billion out of new money and existing FEMA funds for disaster aid to California. Additionally, the bill provides another \$780 million for disaster-related work in California. This is \$200 million for Federal highway work, \$176 million for repairs at Yosemite, \$300 million for the Army Corps of Engineers, and \$47 million for the Department of Agriculture.

I want, just for a moment, to try to debunk the implication that no family has been denied assistance due to delays in the bill. This might be true for agencies like FEMA, which has the disaster trust fund to draw from. But other Federal agencies responding to the disasters are depending on this funding.

HUD currently has no CDBG funds to dedicate to disaster recovery efforts, and both the House and Senate bills contained a half a billion dollars for CDBG disaster recovery efforts. So without this bill, there is no money for these efforts.

Other Federal programs are also waiting for this funding: the Department of Agriculture's Emergency Conservation Program, which assists farmers in rehabilitating flooded farmland and clearing debris from the fields. Without this bill, farmers in the upper Midwest have to delay planting and will see their costs driven up.

The Watershed and Flood Prevention Program, the Tree Assistance Program—now, this is important. I mentioned losing 14,000 trees. Crops that are permanent, like vines and trees, are eligible for grants through the Tree Assistance Program for replanting. There are no moneys for that without

this bill. So it is necessary, if you are going to get the tree in the ground, to get it done as fast as possible.

Let me talk about one of our Nation's jewels—Yosemite National Park. Delaying this bill closes off parts of this park for millions of visitors, no question. The Park Service is proceeding with the most pressing needs, but funds in this bill are now going to arrive too late to affect this summer. That means that contracts to begin the permanent road widening and the permanent utility repairs need to be let as soon as possible to minimize the impact on the park. If it can't be done soon, we are into winter again and then it is not going to be for another year.

The President has made no secret about the fact that he will veto this bill when it hits his desk. We all know the problems with the automatic CR. I, for one, believe that this killer provision is really not necessary. We have shown that when we want to work together in a bipartisan way and make the necessary compromises that we can do it. All we have to do is pass appropriations bills on time. Two weeks ago we voted for a balanced budget. I think it is somewhat disingenuous to include the automatic CR in this legislation.

Let me spend a few moments on another killer issue, because I have spoken to a few Members on the other side about it, and that is the census sampling. I had hoped the conferees would have been able to accept the Senate compromise. The conference report prohibits the use of statistical sampling. This impacts every high-growth State in the United States. I know there is politics in it, let's face it, because lower-income people, minorities, are the most affected if you don't sample. So, if you don't sample, you cut down your numbers in that category. That might be one thing in elections, but let me tell you it is also another thing in funding formula. So by not accepting the sampling, the high-growth States are essentially deprived of vital formula.

Without sampling, the 2,000 census undercount would reach more than 18 million households, it would miss about 1 million people in California; it would miss 5 to 6 million in other States.

Let me give you one example. California's share of Federal vocational rehabilitation funds total about 8 to 9 percent of the Federal funds in the program. These funds would be 11 percent going to California if based on an accurate census. If we don't do the sampling, the cost to the State is \$70 to \$100 million in just this one program alone. You can multiply that all across the board in title I moneys for schools, for poor children, and so every State that has a growth in these numbers, if you don't use the sampling, for political reasons you are sacrificing formula dollars for your State. I might tell you, I find that very hard to do.

I intend to vote for this bill because the bulk of this bill is money for Cali-

fornia. I recognize that the President will veto it. I will also vote to sustain his veto when this comes back. I am hopeful that the rumors I hear about the House are correct, that there will be another bill and it will be a basic disaster relief emergency supplemental so we can get on with other things.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the Senator from Arizona such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank you, and I thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. As always, they have done a very dedicated and very important job here.

As I always do on these bills, Mr. President, I am compelled to talk about some of the parts of this bill which were added which I find very objectionable and which I find unacceptable. I, again, lament that these really nonessential and sometimes wasteful appropriations are added to a bill that is labeled an "emergency supplemental appropriations bill."

Mr. President, in this bill, some that I have found—I am sure there are others—are that it makes an additional \$35 million available for new grants under the Commerce Department Advanced Technology Program. I am the chairman of the Commerce Committee. The Advanced Technology Program falls under the responsibility of the Commerce Committee. We have been investigating that program. We have had a lot of effort put in to making sure the best methods are used for selecting the recipients of these grants. And now in an emergency bill, we see \$35 million for new grants under the Advanced Technology Program.

It earmarks \$5 million for the study of water allocation issues in Alabama, Florida and Georgia; \$10 million for transportation planning and other purposes at Yosemite National Park; \$15 million for research on environmental factors affecting breast cancer; \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education. Someone has to help me out here. Where is the emergency? Where is the emergency that requires \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education?

It earmarks \$5 million for the development of a legislative information system in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate;

And \$16 million to continue development of an automated targeting system for the Customs Service; a set-aside, Mr. President—a set-aside—of \$12.3 million for discretionary authority to construct a parking garage at a VA medical center in Cleveland, OH. Do you want me to tell you that again? Mr. President, \$12.3 million for the construction of a parking garage at a VA

medical center in Cleveland, OH. I know this bill covers a lot of disaster areas. I don't believe Cleveland, OH, was an area that was afflicted, and certainly I do not suspect that a garage for a VA medical center would be an emergency.

There is an earmark of \$500,000 from previously appropriated funds for a parking garage—another parking garage—in Ashland, KY, to instead restore the Paramount Theater in that city; authorization to make grants under the Center for Ecology Research and Training for Bay City, MI.

There are others, Mr. President. This is really not fair to the American people, it is not fair to the taxpayers, and I wish we would stop these things. I, frankly, grow weary.

I want to talk about an important part of this bill, and that is the provision which has been put in the bill which prevents the President from shutting down the Government. That is what it is all about. It prevents the President from shutting down the Government.

As we know, in the last 2 years, one time he shut down the Government and another time the Congress was forced to add some \$8 to \$9 billion in additional spending which they otherwise wouldn't because of a threat to shut down the Government. Why would I care and why should we care, when we are talking about disasters, about the shutdown of the Government? Because the shutdown of the Government was a manmade disaster, Mr. President.

The shutdown of Government was a manmade disaster that afflicted the lives of millions of Americans and if it happens again because of our failure to do our work, we will, again, inflict pain and punishment on the American people.

I was interested in and I appreciate the comments just made by the Senator from California about Yosemite National Park. There is a report on the "Economic Importance of National Parks: The Effects of the 1995-96 Government Shutdown on Selected Park-Dependent Businesses and Communities." This is a report of the National Parks and Conservation Associations.

On page 8 it says:

Impacts were substantial in and around California's national parks, in spite of the fact that they were not in their peak seasons when the shutdowns occurred.

The report goes on to say:

At Yosemite National Park, an off season hardly exists. Impacts in and around the park, which normally receives more than 120,000 visitors in December, were the worst encountered in our investigation.

And then it goes on to quote Gilbert Ghyselinck, owner of Yosemite Gateway Inn, estimated loss, \$45,000; Jim Houtz, owner of the Cedar Lodge Inn and Parkline Restaurants in El Portal, CA, south of Yosemite, estimated loss, \$40,000 to \$50,000. "We put about 50 people on unemployment. It was pretty rough. The part that hurt us the worst was putting those people on unemploy-

ment when they were trying to put away for the winter."

Mr. President, I want to point out they were not Federal workers. They were people who were never repaid, never repaid for our shutdown of the Government.

A gentleman in Oakhurst, CA:

That Christmas and New Year's shutdown was the toughest on us. We're close to full that time of year—90 percent occupancy. I think we barely made 50 percent. It was only 10 days, but it was the 10 days you want. It's also had some lingering effect.

Cheryl Tyler, of Oasis of Eden Inn, Yucca Valley, CA, estimated loss, \$30,000. Cheryl Tyler said:

It really killed us. They were canceling as fast they could get on the phone. People booked for 5 days. They stayed one night and left. We lost half our business.

It goes on and on. Mr. President, this is what happens when you shut down the Government. I am totally and completely in sympathy with my colleagues who are seeking disaster relief. We, on this side of the aisle, are also seeking disaster relief. We are seeking relief from a disaster to ensure that it will never happen again.

I would like to quote from a study that was made by the Congressional Research Service, a CRS report for Congress entitled "Shutdown of the Federal Government: Effects on the Federal Workforce," James McGrath, analyst, National Government Division, updated June 17, 1996, conducted by the Congressional Research Service. Let me just tell you some things they talk about.

Examples of Federal services adversely affected by the shutdowns include those related to health, welfare, law enforcement, public safety, financial services, parks, museums, monuments, visas, passports, services to American Indians and services to veterans, among many others as listed below.

Health: New patients not accepted into clinical research. Toxic waste cleanup at 609 sites stopped; 2,400 Superfund workers sent home.

Welfare: 10,000 new Medicare applications, 212,000 Social Security card requests, 360,000 individual office visits, 13 million recipients of aid to families with dependent children, 273,000 foster care children, over 100,000 children receiving adoption assistance services, and over 100,000 Head Start children experienced delays.

There were 10,000 home purchase loans and refinancing applications totaling 800 million dollars worth of mortgage loans for moderate- and low-income working families nationwide that were delayed.

Law enforcement and public safety: Well, there is one good piece of news here, Mr. President, the suspension of investigative activities by the IRS. So I guess something good comes out of every disaster. But on a far more serious note, the Department of Justice suspended work on more than 3,500 bankruptcy cases. Delinquent child

support cases were suspended, the deadbeat dads program. Closure of 368 National Park Service sites. Loss of 7 million visitors. Grand Canyon National Park, closed for the first time in its 76-year history.

Local communities near national parks lost an estimated \$14.2 million per day in tourism revenues. I point out, again, Mr. President, the people who lost those tourism revenues never got them back. It was not like the Federal workers, where they were repaid when we started the Government up again.

Closure of national museums and monuments—the loss of some 2 million visitors; 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for visas to come to this country went unprocessed each day; 200,000 U.S. applications for passports went unprocessed; U.S. tourist industries and airlines sustained millions of dollars in losses because of visa and passport curtailment.

The American Indians. I will quote Deborah Maddox, the acting deputy commissioner for the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

We are getting close to an emergency situation. This week, we would be generating our general assistance payments for 53,000 individuals and families. These grants are for very basic needs and are for people who are not eligible for other services.

Mr. President, American veterans sustained a major curtailment in services as a result of the Federal shutdown, ranging from health and welfare to finance and travel. They include cancellation of vocational rehabilitation appointments; nonprocessing of payments for compensation, pension and education claims; delayed payments of GI bill education checks and insurance death claims; and canceled counseling services to avoid foreclosures. It goes on and on.

Mr. President, what we did when we shut down the Government was unconscionable and unacceptable, and it cannot be repeated. And for the life of me—for the life of me—I do not understand why. There is some connection being made between the extension of emergency disaster relief services and this provision in the bill. The only reason, Mr. President, there is a distinction being made is the President of the United States does not want to have to sign the bill with this in it because the President of the United States does not want to see legislation which would prevent his ability to shut down the Government.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post not long ago, a few days ago, there was a letter from Mr. ALBERT R. WYNN, who is a U.S. Representative to Congress representing a district in the State of Maryland, very close to here in the District of Columbia, it is a letter to the editor of the Washington Post.

While I recognize that The Post considers itself a national newspaper, as a U.S. Representative from the Washington region, I find portions of The Post's May 15 editorial



"Fooling Around in the House" very troubling.

I cosponsored the bipartisan "Government Shutdown Prevention Amendment" to the "Disaster Recovery Act of 1997." The amendment guarantees that the federal government will remain open and functioning at current funding levels if Congress and the administration cannot agree on the details of the Federal budget. Basically, this amendment provides a safety net for federal employees and the American taxpaying public, which expects its government to provide uninterrupted service. Given the devastating psychological and economic effect the last government shutdown had on our region, I am concerned that The Post considers such an amendment "fooling around."

The Post's assertion that this amendment "would change the balance of power between the elected branches" and that "the effect would be to lock in place a new norm in which an agency's appropriations would be frozen from year to year unless Congress acted to raise—or lower—it" is just plain wrong. The amendment clearly sunsets in 1998, and thus would affect only the appropriations bills now under consideration. . . .

Let me remind The Post of the effects of the last shutdown: The cost to the federal government was \$1.5 billion; 170,000 veterans did not receive December 1995 Montgomery GI Bill education benefits on time; more than 200,000 passport applications were not processed; pay for more than 750,000 federal employees was delayed; 7 million national parks visits were prevented; 2 million visits to historic museums were prevented; 5,200 small businesses did not receive guaranteed financing; 1,036 contract bid opportunities were lost for small businesses, and 30,000 FHA single-family home loans could not be insured.

For those who apparently think the Republicans are so humbled that they wouldn't shut the government down again, I would remind them that we never thought the government would shut down during the Christmas season 1995.

Thus, in the final analysis, I do not believe federal employees or taxpaying citizens think keeping the government open with a continuing resolution is "Fooling Around in the House."

Mr. President, I cannot say it any better. We have an obligation to provide for the needs of those who have suffered natural disasters. There is no one who sponsors this amendment who disagrees with that. And we want that money there as quickly as possible.

But I would allege, Mr. President, that when we ignore the possibility and fail to address the looming possibility of a manmade disaster which would be caused by the shutdown of the Federal Government, again, Mr. President, I cannot quite comprehend why we would not understand that we also have that obligation as well.

So I hope the President of the United States will change his mind. The Senator from Alaska, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has said, and I have said, we would be willing to negotiate the details of this amendment. We would be more than happy to talk about satisfying some concerns as long as we preserve the basic principle of keeping the Government open.

So, Mr. President, I believe we are going to pass this bill. I believe it is going to the President with it included

in the bill. And I hope that the President of the United States will sign the bill, and then we would prevent again the disasters that we inflicted upon the American people during Christmas of 1995, for which not only did the American people suffer, but I have to tell you, in all candor, the reputation of the legislative branch of Government and the entire Federal Government, the governing body, suffered as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise to oppose the supplemental appropriations bill currently before us.

But first, let me once gain take this opportunity to extend my deepest sympathies to those communities and families in the Upper Midwest who have had to deal with the loss and anguish caused by the terrible flooding several weeks ago.

I know all Marylanders join me in extending our thoughts and prayers to everyone in the Midwest.

Like many of my colleagues, I had hoped for a quick and speedy passage of this critically needed assistance to the disaster victims. I know they are counting on us to help them get back on their feet—to help them rebuild their homes and businesses.

I am therefore deeply troubled by the fact that what should have been a speedy, nonpartisan targeted relief bill has instead turned into yet another nasty partisan battle that is designed to divide us and provoke a veto from the President.

I have several major concerns with the supplemental, the first of which is the census sampling amendment that prohibits the Census Bureau from using funds to conduct statistical sampling in the year 2000 census. While to many this is a dry, academic topic, it impacts all Americans on a daily basis.

In addition to being the manner for determining representation in the Congress, the census has become the basis for which billions of dollars in Federal assistance are allocated. Programs such as low-energy assistance, community block development grants, and other vital programs to Maryland for transportation, housing, and education all rely on accurate census data.

This amendment does not follow the congressionally sought recommendation of this Nation's top statistical experts who advise using statistical sampling to get accurate data. Instead this provision would result in an undercount of many of the Nation's citizens. Especially hard hit would be those in rural areas and the inner city poor. That's wrong.

There is no reason to play games with the census, particularly when so many people's lives are at stake. Everybody counts in America, and everybody should be counted.

Mr. President, I am also very concerned by the continued inclusion in this disaster relief package of what has artfully been called the Shutdown Prevention Act.

Nobody knows the pain of a Government shutdown better than me and the Marylanders I represent. When the last shutdown occurred, numerous people from across my State felt the shock and dislocation of those events.

When I visited the Government agencies that had to remain open, I saw the frustration on the faces of the workers and the financial hardship it caused for all Federal employees.

Let there be no mistake, I do not want another shutdown and will do everything I can to prevent it. But this bill is not the answer.

Instead, this bill which provides for a permanent continuing resolution, is nothing more than a partisan exercise designed to hamstring Congress from exercising its constitutional role in the legislative process.

If we fail to enact our appropriations bills on time, the continuing resolution contained in this bill simply prevents Congress from increasing spending on such crucial items as cancer research, crime fighting, and education. It also hampers Congress in cutting unnecessary spending and eliminating waste.

Lastly, I am disappointed by the method we have chosen to pay for this bill. By taking over \$3 billion in unobligated funds from HUD's section 8 public housing program to pay for FEMA's disaster relief fund, we are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul.

We cannot keep on raiding this program to pay for disaster funding. We must find a new way to pay for emergency supplemental appropriations bills because these disasters are not going to end.

We could be facing even more expensive disasters in the near future. Are we going to continually rob one or two agencies to pay for these bills?

I believe we need a new system or a new arrangement to deal with these types of disasters—a new system that is off-budget.

Mr. President, because of the census sampling amendment, the continuing resolution, and the way in which we have chosen to pay for the bill, I am forced to oppose this bill.

It is my sincere hope that in the future we can avoid these partisan fights over disaster relief bills and find a more equitable way to pay for them.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wanted to take a minute to express my deep satisfaction with the results produced by the conference on the emergency supplemental bill. The negotiations were complicated by how many issues were in play, but the chairman did a masterful job at methodically and successfully working through each and every item. Chairman STEVENS' patience and perseverance are why we are here today.

I want to take note of two sections of particular importance to me. First, the transportation chapter includes language which is essential to Kentucky. This legislation provides for a long overdue funding correction in Federal-aid highway funding. As a result of an

accounting error, Kentucky's highway funding in 1996 resulted in a loss of Federal funds. This bill will provide Kentucky with \$29.8 million to correct this funding shortfall. I am pleased to report that this level exceeds the \$12.6 million requested by the Governor to complete the William H. Natcher Bridge. I know the people of Daviess County and western Kentucky look to the completion of this bridge.

Second the foreign operations chapter in the House bill included language giving the President permission to waive earmarks for Ukraine which the Senate had included in last year's bill. This waiver authority was being offered in response to a deteriorating situation involving corruption and a slow down on crucial economic reforms. Congressman CALLAHAN and I have very different views on the need for earmarks, but we share a concern about the trends in Ukraine. We were able to craft a compromise which made clear we are not content with the pace or scope of reform by allowing the President to waive any earmark as it affects aid to the Government of Ukraine. The compromise exempted important projects such as nuclear safety and all activities carried out by the private sector and nongovernment organizations. Most importantly, we did not permit any reduction in the overall level of the aid we provided—the \$225 million stands intact. Should the administration choose to withhold or suspend funds for the government, they must reallocate the funds to other programs within Ukraine.

We have sent a clear and focused message to the government that reforms are essential if businesses are going to have the confidence to invest. But, we have narrowly crafted that message so that we do not damage our bilateral relationship or the support we provide to organizations committed to advancing both Ukrainian and American interests. Both Congressman CALLAHAN and I will review the progress made on this important issue when we take up the fiscal year 1998 bills in the coming weeks. I want to congratulate him on concentrating our attention on Ukraine's problem and working so effectively with me and my Senate colleagues to produce a compromise which we all hope will generate real results.

#### DIRECT OPERATING LOAN FUNDS FOR LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY FARMERS

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I want to mention another group of Americans who are suffering as Members of Congress continue to hold up the disaster relief supplemental appropriations bill and prevent us from passing a funding measure that the President can sign. That struggling group is our Nation's low-income farmers.

Back in April of this year, a group of farmers came to my office and described to me a crisis as real as the floods faced by Americans in the Upper Midwest. It is planting season and many States, including Virginia, have exhausted their total allocation of di-

rect operating loans. Direct operating loans are the funds made available by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to cover the costs of planting and repaid when crops are harvested. Without operating funds, the livelihoods of many farmers, mostly on small farms, are threatened.

The Operating Loan Program is especially important for minority farmers, many of whom have suffered from the well-documented discrimination within the Department of Agriculture. Discrimination has caused or contributed to the financial ruin of minority farmers nationwide and has resulted in bankruptcies and impoverished retirements. But as the number of black farmers in the United States has dwindled at three times the rate of other farmers nationwide—nearly to the point of extinction—a few farmers have managed to survive and keep their struggling farms afloat. USDA acknowledges that “having direct operating loan funds is critical for low-income minority farmers in their effort to become self-sustaining, successful, contributing members of rural communities.”

After speaking with Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman and with the assistance of Senators COCHRAN, BUMPERS, STEVENS and BYRD, we were able to include an appropriation in the supplemental to provide \$100 million in direct operating loan funds to those low-income farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere. I believe these funds are as critical to serving the needs of small and limited-resource farmers as implementing the recommendations outlined in the Civil Rights Action Team report to remedy many of the long-standing problems plaguing the Department and eradicating, once and for all, the discrimination that has plagued the Department for decades.

Unfortunately for Virginia and the other Southern States, it is now June, and we have reached the tail end of the planting season. As we waste time disputing controversial provisions attached to a disaster relief funding bill, we've denied farmers access to loan assistance and prevented the farmers who have survived decades of discrimination the money needed to get their crops in the ground and to keep their farms afloat.

Mr. President, I find this situation frustrating, but my frustration must pale in comparison to the low-income and minority farmers who have struggled and, thus far, have managed to survive this manmade disaster. Again I want to thank my colleagues who are interested in helping our Nation's farmers and helped add my language to the supplemental. But, I ask my colleagues who are keeping this desperately needed money out of the field and out of the hands of our Nation's farmers to stop playing politics and let us pass a bill that the President is willing to sign.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, let me say, as I did when this legislation originally

came before the Senate a month ago, that I fully support the disaster relief that is being provided here. My heart goes not to the families that have lost their homes, their businesses, and their schools in the recent floods and snows. We have all seen the devastation on the evening news, in the newspapers. It is tragic, and we owe it to the people in the Midwest and elsewhere to put the full resources of the Federal Government behind the relief effort to help them get on their feet as soon as possible and restore some sense of normality to their lives.

Mr. President, the relief in this bill is urgently needed. So are the provisions that would prevent another shutdown of the Federal Government this fall. It seems to me that we are taking the very responsible step of acting now to prevent another shutdown of the Government—something President Clinton says he, too, wants to prevent. Yet the President is threatening to veto the disaster relief, of all things, on account of the antishutdown provisions.

Why would a President who says he opposes Government shutdowns threaten to veto a bill that would prevent Government shutdowns?

I will tell you why. Recognizing how anxious Members of Congress were about being perceived as responsible for another Government shutdown last fall—recognizing that Congress would do just about anything to avoid another shutdown—the President was able to demand and win an additional \$6.5 billion for his favorite programs. Majorities in the House and Senate went along. I did not. The threat of a shutdown proved to be a valuable part of the President's arsenal then, and it will be again unless we put a mechanism in place to keep the Government open while we continue to negotiate acceptable spending levels.

There are other good things in this bill as well, including provisions to extend the expiration date of the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992, and to ratify the agreement between the tribe, Phelps Dodge Corp., and the Secretary of the Interior for long-term water use.

Yet, Mr. President, I find myself in the position of having to vote against this bill for the very same reason I did when it first came before this body last month: it is yet another in a long line of spending bills that merely add to the deficit. It is business as usual, and it comes at a time when we supposedly have reached agreement on a plan to eliminate deficits by the year 2002.

It would be one thing if there were no other way to get aid to the flood victims except to borrow. But it is quite another thing when we ignore other options in order to keep spending on other programs.

The Senator from Texas, Senator GRAMM, offered an amendment that would have reduced spending across the board by a grand total of 1.9 percent. One point nine percent. That is less than 2 cents on the dollar in other programs to pay for this disaster relief

and other spending. That is all it would have taken, yet there were only 38 of us in the Senate who voted for that amendment.

Later today, we will be asked to vote on the so-called balanced budget agreement that our leadership struck with the White House. The ink on the budget agreement is not even dry. Yet the supplemental appropriations bill we are about to vote on would add \$6.6 billion to the deficit over the next few years. It busts the budget agreement before the final vote is even taken.

What does that say about the budget agreement, which does not even begin to reduce the deficit until the year 2001? Consider the deficits that are projected under that plan. The deficit this year is expected to total \$67 billion. We are trying to get to a zero deficit—to balance—by the year 2002. But under the budget agreement, the deficit goes up, not down. It climbs 34 percent—to \$90 billion next year—and then remains in that range for 2 more years. Only in the final 2 years of the 5-year plan—in 2001 and 2002—would the deficit drop dramatically.

If anyone thinks that we are really going to be able to eliminate a \$90 billion deficit in those final 2 years—when we cannot even find a way to pay for less than \$7 billion in disaster relief in the bill before us today—they are mistaken.

Mr. President, we all know that disasters can and will occur on a regular basis. Unfortunately, they will happen—floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and the like. We know it, and we should plan for it.

The Appropriations Committee acknowledged in its own report that the number of major disaster declarations in the 1992–1996 period has increased 54 percent. In other words, we had ample warning that something would occur somewhere.

Had we prepared for the need for disaster assistance last fall, instead of using every extra dollar to meet President Clinton's demands for new spending, we would already have been able to respond to the emergency in the Midwest and elsewhere around the country. But by ignoring the potential for disasters last fall, we merely paved the way for adding to the deficit now when the need for relief takes precedence over budget concerns.

Mr. President, this bill is more expensive than when it left the Senate a month ago. It is still not paid for. It busts the budget agreement that we will vote on this evening. We can and we must do better.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I want to voice my very strong objections to the 2000 census language in this bill. It bans the use of sampling—and any other statistical technique—to count the American population for purposes of apportionment. It's unfair—it will cost the American tax payers about a billion dollars—it's political—it just doesn't make sense.

Let's talk about fairness. Without sampling, the Census bureau tells us

that the 2000 census may be about as accurate as the 1990 census. That's the best case scenario. But in 1990, the census missed 10 million people. It counted 6 million people twice. And it counted another 10 or 20 million people in the wrong place—maybe even in the wrong congressional district. Is that our idea of fairness? Is that our idea of "one man, one vote?"

And many of the people undercounted in the last census are poor. Many of them belong to ethnic and racial minorities. We excluded some of America's most vulnerable people from the democratic process. Is that our idea of fairness? Of course not. But that's the kind of census we will have if this language passes into law.

Let's talk about cost. The Census Bureau tells us that a non-sampling census could cost almost a billion dollars more than a non-sampling census. Much of that additional cost will go toward various efforts that the Bureau knows will have only marginal pay-off. But if the Bureau can't sample, it will have to make every effort—even marginally effective efforts—to count people the traditional way. Without sampling, we're talking about a higher cost census to deliver a less accurate population count. Is that a responsible use of tax payer dollars? Does that make sense at the precise moment in time when both Congress and the American people are committed to the painful process of balancing the budget?

And let's talk about common sense. Statistical sampling is a rigorous, reliable, scientific tool. You can't find a statistician who disagrees with that. That view is supported by GAO, the Commerce inspector general, the National Academy of Sciences, and a host of professional organizations.

The Bureau has been using statistical sampling in the decennial census for decades. The census long form—which goes to only one in six households—is a perfect example of a kind of sampling that is widely accepted. Virtually every arm of Government—Federal, State, and local—uses long-form data for enforcement of laws like the Voting Rights Act and for tailoring programs to the cultural diversity of our population. And we are not plagued with law suits challenging the reliability of this data because it is based on sampling.

Ironically, the language in this bill would allow continued use of sampling for the long-form. In fact, it allows sampling for every purpose except that most important one—counting the American people for purposes of apportionment. On the one hand, it acknowledges that sampling is valid and valuable—a scientific tool. But on the other hand, it denies us the use of that tool just where it would be most valuable. That makes no sense at all.

Finally, despite what I read in the newspapers, I have seen no data whatsoever validating the apparent political assumption that an accurate census means fewer House seats for Repub-

licans. It is true—as I have already stated—that many of the undercounted people are poor or members of minority groups. But other groups are undercounted, too. We undercount people in rural areas—that's a third of the 1990 undercount—and many of those areas are Republican strongholds. We undercount people who are renters rather than homeowners, and statisticians tell us that disadvantages the Sun Belt States—where Republicans are also strong. Just last week the 2000 Census Advisory Committee discussed the politics of the undercount. That committee consists of census and population experts representing the statistical community, every level of Government, and every large minority group. The committee was unable to determine who would be the political winners and losers in an accurate census.

This isn't about Democrats versus Republicans. We undercount people of every race, gender, age, State, and political persuasion. The real winners and losers in the sampling debate are the American people. Our system of Government guarantees equal representation for all Americans—regardless of race, ethnicity or economic circumstances—whether they live in the country or the city—whether they own their homes or rent them. That should be our goal—our only goal—in planning the 2000 census.

In my home State of Ohio, we had a slight overcount in 1990. But I don't fear the political consequences of an accurate census. My commitment is to the fundamental principles of America's system of Government. And I'm confident that the citizens of Ohio feel the same way. Give us a fair, accurate census, and let the political chips fall where they may.

I know full well that the Census Bureau's plan to use sampling is highly controversial. I have some reservations about it myself. Some people say that sampling doesn't meet the constitutional requirement for an "actual enumeration." Some say that sampling is inherently subjective because it is based on statistical assumptions. These are questions that must be resolved.

On the constitutional issue, however, the Governmental Affairs Committee recently heard testimony from a panel of attorneys who are not friends of sampling. The panel included Wisconsin's Attorney General James Doyle. He led the charge against sampling in 1990 because statistical adjustment of that census would have given California an additional House seat at Wisconsin's expense. We also heard from Stuart Gerson, the Assistant Attorney General who advised the Bush administration not to adjust the 1990 census. Both testified that the constitutional requirement for an "actual enumeration" doesn't require a headcount. What it requires—what the Framers intended—is the most accurate census possible. That's what we should be aiming for. And those who tell us that

sampling is inherently unconstitutional are trying to scare us into a census process that doesn't meet the Framers' goal.

What's critical right now is for census to continue its planning process—continue to appear before congressional committees—as it is doing before the Governmental Affairs Committee—and continue to explain its plans. Most importantly, the Bureau must test the proposed census plan in the 1998 dress rehearsal. Only after this process is complete will we know whether sampling will yield a better census—a census that includes every American. The census language in this bill would make that impossible.

My heart goes out to all the Americans who are counting on us for the disaster relief this bill will provide. I want to give them that relief. It is extremely regrettable that in our legislative process this has also become a bill that jeopardizes the most fundamental principle of our Democratic society—every American's right to equal representation. If the census language in this bill passes Congress today, it will add to the other reasons that may persuade the President to veto the bill—and send it right back to us. Then perhaps we can get on with the job of providing relief to the thousands of people who are counting on us, and let the Census Bureau get on with planning the best decennial census in American history.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I reluctantly rise to oppose this conference report. Regrettably, the majority has decided to play politics with the lives of disaster victims. This is a tragedy.

Mr. President, I don't have a particular dog in this fight. My State has been fortunate to be free of disasters recently. But it pains me to look at television footage of homeless people in the Dakotas and Minnesota and know that they are not getting all needed assistance because of two unrelated political riders to this legislation.

Mr. President, I oppose this conference report because it includes the so-called automatic CR. I want to be clear with my colleagues—this provision violates the bipartisan budget agreement. Let me repeat this, the automatic CR violates the bipartisan budget agreement.

It violates the budget agreement for two reasons:

First, it would lower the total amount of discretionary spending available for fiscal year 1998. The budget agreement calls for \$527 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 1998, which is a \$17 billion increase over last year's level. If the automatic CR is enacted, the majority could refuse to pass the 13 appropriations bills and they would succeed in a \$17 billion cut in discretionary spending. This would violate one of the basic Democratic accomplishments in the budget agreement.

Second, the automatic CR would make deep cuts in programs that are

protected in the bipartisan budget agreement. The bipartisan negotiators agreed to provide large increases in 13 major discretionary programs.

Examples of these programs include: Elementary and secondary education improvement, Pell grants, child literacy, Head Start, national parks, job training, the Clean Water Act, Superfund, and the COPS Program.

Mr. President, the automatic CR would freeze these programs at last year's levels. Therefore, these programs would not get the increases promised in the bipartisan budget agreement if Congress did not pass certain appropriations bills.

Mr. President, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I am concerned that the majority is violating the bipartisan budget agreement before the ink is dry.

First, they include this automatic CR that cuts overall discretionary spending and specific programs that were protected by the bipartisan budget agreement. Second, a House Ways and Means Subcommittee has approved welfare provisions that are in direct violation of the terms of the bipartisan budget agreement.

This is a disturbing trend. If we are to maintain bipartisan cooperation in the coming weeks, the majority will need to drop their efforts to move legislation that directly violates the bipartisan budget agreement, like the automatic CR.

Mr. President, I also oppose the census provision in the supplemental bill. This is not a provision based upon statistical science, it is a provision based upon politics. It is the latest attempt by the Republican National Committee to try to increase its political fortunes in the next century.

My Republican colleagues, at the request of the RNC, have proposed to throw hundreds of millions more at the 2000 census. This additional money, we have been told by the National Academy of Sciences, will not make the census any more accurate, just more expensive. The Census Bureau estimates that spending up to \$800 million more than planned would reduce the undercount only marginally.

This provision does not belong in a disaster relief bill and it should be stripped out and sent back to the Governmental Affairs Committee for further consideration.

Mr. President, I hope that the President will immediately veto this bill and that the majority will then pass a clean disaster relief bill so that people suffering all over this country will be able to begin the process of rebuilding their lives and communities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I sincerely regret that the bill before us today is not the one which will get relief to the flood victims of the Upper Midwest. Why, because it is laden with extraneous, highly political provisions which the President has told us for months that he could not and would not sign.

What are those provisions? The first is an automatic continuing resolution

which, if enacted, would put the Government on automatic pilot if Congress is unable to complete its work on appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year. While that may sound like a good idea, it is not. It would serve as a disincentive for Congress to complete their work in a timely fashion, and it would remove any leverage the President would have on appropriations bills not enacted by the end of the fiscal year.

The second extraneous provision prohibits the Bureau of the Census from using statistical sampling in preparing the 2000 census. Never mind that statistical sampling was proposed by the National Academy of Sciences after a lengthy study as the best way to ensure an accurate count. There is no question that this attempt to prohibit such sampling is politically motivated. While I oppose both provisions on their merits, neither, in any case, belongs on an emergency disaster appropriations bill.

The sole purpose of the bill before us today is to try to embarrass the President, not to help disaster victims. This is a sad day in the annals of congressional history. It is political one-upmanship at its worst. It is not about helping the people we were elected to serve. It is not about helping thousands of people in Grand Forks who are trying to rebuild their homes and their lives. It is about raw politics, pure and simple. Never, to my knowledge, has a disaster bill been held up for purely political, partisan advantage. That is what we are doing today, and that is just plain wrong.

A group of business and political leaders from Grand Forks were in Washington yesterday, including Mayor Pat Owens. They were here to meet with officials of the various agencies that will receive emergency funds in this bill. Our officials were discussing how the money contained in this measure could help their devastated community. A couple of them sat in on the appropriations conference. They were appalled at what they saw and heard. They heard about the census, the Ukraine, Uruguay, a continuing resolution, but they heard almost nothing about disaster funds. The people of Grand Forks are in dire straights. Their needs are urgent. Their lives are on hold, yet their problems were barely discussed in the conference.

We North Dakotans are a strong, proud, and resolute people. We will face the challenges ahead with courage and commitment. But with damages expected to be in the billions, we can not fully recover without the Federal help provided in this bill. As I stated earlier today, I am enormously grateful for all the resources provided in this bill to help our disaster stricken region. I am particularly grateful to Senators STEVENS and BYRD who were extremely helpful and supportive throughout

every step of the process. Without their personal intervention and continuous support, many items and millions of dollars would not be in the bill we have before us today.

I want to thank their staffs as well—Steve Cortese and Jim English—who gave me wise advice and counsel on my maiden voyage as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. On behalf of all the people of North Dakota, I want to thank them as well as all the members of the committee for their understanding and their generous assistance. I hope that by next week, we will be able to deliver the resources promised in this bill.

Let me just list a few of the items in the bill that will have a direct bearing on our ability to recover, and for which there is currently no money available in the pipeline:

\$500 million in community development block grants. This is the most flexible funding and the most crucial component to allow for buyouts. While all disaster States are eligible for this assistance, we anticipate that the majority will go to the Dakotas and Minnesota;

\$50 million for a new Livestock Indemnity Program which will help North Dakota farmers and ranchers who have lost close to 125,000 head of livestock;

\$15 million in Department of Agriculture funds to purchase floodplain easements to reduce hazards to life and property due to the floods;

\$5 million for the Interest Assistance Program to provide additional funding for guaranteed, low-interest loans to farmers;

\$20 million to reimburse school districts who have had to educate additional children who were dislocated by the floods;

\$5 million for all preconstruction and design work for an outlet from Devils Lake to the Sheyenne River;

\$27.9 million in Corps of Engineers funding for North Dakota from the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Program;

\$600,000 for Ramsey County to mitigate damages to the sewer system from flooding, if necessary;

Up to \$20 million for the Corps of Engineers to raise the levees at Devils Lake;

\$210,000 for North Dakota's National Parks;

\$3.9 million for the BIA in North Dakota;

\$265,000 for the Indian Health Service in North Dakota;

\$6.1 million for North Dakota to repair damaged freight rail lines;

\$9.3 million to the Fish and Wildlife Service in North Dakota;

\$840,000 for the U.S. Geological Survey in North Dakota;

Department of Education waiver authority language which will permit the Department to help students having difficulty meeting application and other statutory deadlines regarding Federal education funds; and

Language that allows disaster States greater flexibility in using child care and development block grant funds to help families in nonemployment-related activities relating to the cleanup and recovery.

My purpose in providing this list is to illustrate the urgent need to pass a bill the President can sign. Those who argue that there is plenty of money in the pipeline to respond to our needs are just plain wrong, as the list above so aptly demonstrates. None of funds listed above will be available until the President signs a disaster bill.

There are many people beyond the Congress to thank for their support in the wake of a series of historic and devastating disasters in North Dakota. Above all, I want to thank the people of North Dakota who, despite their losses, have refused to be overcome. They have displayed a remarkable sense of courage, caring, and conviction throughout the ordeal. Never have I been more proud to represent the State of North Dakota than I am now. They are wonderful people. They know the meaning of neighbor. Whenever and wherever they were able, they extended a hand to those less fortunate.

The great spirit of our people is embodied in the mayor of Grand Forks, Pat Owens. While small in stature, she has the heart of a giant. She gave us the courage not to lose courage. Her indomitable spirit held the citizens of Grand Forks together during the worst days of the tragedy, and now is guiding us patiently and compassionately through the recovery.

Finally, I want to thank all the Federal agencies for their long hours and hard work in bringing emergency assistance to relieve the immediate suffering of our citizens. They have done a magnificent job under extremely trying circumstances, and we are grateful for their superhuman efforts. James Lee Witt, the Director of FEMA, has been the guiding light in this endeavor. He came to North Dakota and personally witnessed the devastation, and then rushed personnel and resources into the State to assess damages and provide emergency assistance. He has also coordinated the activities of other Federal agencies in trying to get assistance to those in need as quickly as possible. That process is ongoing, and James Lee remains the stalwart in that endeavor. We thank him for all he has done and continues to do.

I intend to support this bill even though I know it is headed for a veto because of the extraneous provisions contained in it. I am voting for it to keep faith with my constituents, and to give them hope that a very similar bill, absent the political riders, will be passed next week. That bill will provide us with the helping hand we need to rebuild our communities, reunite our families and restore our economic base. We will face the challenge ahead with courage and commitment. With our prairie faith to guide us, we will rebuild, we will recover, and we will be a stronger community.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 36 minutes, and the Senator from West Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FORD. And it be charged to the majority.

Mr. STEVENS. We will take it off our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to add my comments to those already expressed about how important it is that this legislation be passed, that it be acted upon rapidly, that people understand the extraordinary emergency that we are experiencing, that money is not adequately found in the pipeline today to meet all of the contingencies that are currently affecting communities all through the Midwest.

A delay by any other means will send exactly the wrong message to so many people who are waiting for us to act. We know that the legislation in its current form will be vetoed. It is a very dark day in the Senate, and, in my view, it is an extraordinarily unfortunate set of circumstances that today when we have an opportunity to send the right message to all the people who have contacted us, when we have an opportunity to say we do understand, we find many of our colleagues pushing a political agenda that has nothing to do with this legislation at all.

Mr. President, I would hope that the Senate would not adjourn until we find a bill signed by the President. I would hope that once this bill is vetoed, we will move a clean bill immediately, send it back to the President immediately, that we will not allow that veto to be any cause for delay in responding as comprehensively as we know how to respond to the needs we find across this country.

The balanced budget agreement we all voted on just 2 weeks ago makes a continuing resolution virtually unnecessary. We do not need to have a continuing resolution given the fact that we are working now in good faith on both sides of the aisle to resolve what remaining problems there may be with regard to budgetary policy. And I have every expectation we will be able to pass these appropriations bills and we will pass the reconciliation bill along the lines of the agreement that we have just voted on.

We know that there are contentious issues that have to be addressed outside the budget itself. The census sampling question is one that understandably is controversial. But I must say,

the National Academy of Sciences was charged with the responsibility of coming up with a way with which to improve upon the accuracy of the census.

We know that, because of methods used in 1990 by the Bureau of the Census, we were not even as accurate in 1990 as we were in 1980. And as we examine all the other possibilities for attaining a greater degree of accuracy, the one that is universally accepted is the one subscribed to and incorporated in the policy that is the subject of this controversy right now.

This is not something dreamed up by a Democratic or a Republican administration. This is something calculated to be the most accurate response by the National Academy of Sciences. But regardless of how one may view that particular issue, it ought not be in a bill to address the disasters that we face across this country.

There are many, many needs that are unmet. We received letters from communities across South Dakota, across North Dakota. Every one of them has made it very clear that the immediate passage of this supplemental is crucial to their economic viability. No contracts can be awarded to repair the sewer system in Watertown, SD, until this bill is passed.

I have a letter from the mayor of Watertown, who has asserted once more the extraordinary difficulties that she, as mayor, is facing. I will just read a couple of passages.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF WATERTOWN,  
Watertown, SD, June 3, 1997.

Senator TOM DASCHLE,  
Hart Senate Office Bldg.,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I appreciate the opportunity to provide information which underscores the need for the immediate passage of the Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriation bill.

On April 4th, the City of Watertown, a City of approximately 20,000 residents suffered a 500 year flood event which was fought by City, County and State resources in the midst of a 60 mph blizzard in subfreezing temperatures. Flood waters froze and remained for 4-5 weeks. Over 4,000 residents were evacuated during the flood and storm. Approximately seven hundred and fifty homes were left without sewer and water for over four weeks. The sanitary and storm sewer systems were inundated and our wastewater treatment facility which was designed to treat 3.5 million gallons of sewage per day was flooded by over 18 million gallons per day.

Substantial damage was done to the sewer and infrastructure system. Many homes were severely damaged by water and ice. A substantial number of residents remain displaced today.

Both FEMA and SBA, along with Red Cross and the Salvation Army were enormously helpful in meeting the emergency needs of the affected residents and continue to assist to this day; however, without the Supplemental Appropriations bill, it is impossible to begin to fully recover.

As a City, it now becomes our responsibility to prioritize needs, both short term and long term. As we proceed to do so, it is incredibly difficult to make firm plans without the commitment of Federal emergency dollars. Certain emergency projects, which have not been budgeted, must now be done to protect the community from experiencing further damage: the capping of storm sewer pipes from the river to prevent the re-flooding of an entire quadrant of the City; significant sections of sewer must be repaired to prevent the system from being flooded by extremely high groundwater levels, streets must be patched or repaired due to extensive water damage and shorelines along the lake area must be reinforced to stop the ongoing damage due to high water and wave action. No contracts can be awarded without confirmed sources of revenue for projects which the City cannot accommodate due to lack of dollars. In addition, South Dakota construction seasons are very short. Without immediate passage of the Supplemental bill, Watertown will be unable to make many necessary repairs during the current construction season.

Mitigation issues, both short term and long term are dependent on immediate Federal assistance: flood control projects cannot be accurately assessed without the consideration of the buy-out program which serves to relocate businesses and residences out of the flood plain. The degree to which buy-outs or flood prevention structures are necessary cannot be determined without the knowledge of available assistance levels. Residents whose homes would be excellent candidates for buy-outs are in limbo, unable to make decisions about reconstruction or completing the recovery process because the City is unable to negotiate unless firm funding commitments have been made. And, in fact, the result of delayed passage of the Supplemental bill may be that the City is forced to eventually pay more for homes which were repaired in the meantime.

CDBG funds are incredibly important to the States and Cities because they are flexible funds, allowing dollars to be delivered to priority projects in a timely manner. Leveraged with local and EDA funds, communities can get the most for the dollars being spent. No community or State is prepared for the immediate incredible costs of additional staffing needs, mitigation planning and project costs resulting from such devastating, unexpected occurrences. Immediate dollars for planning and technical assistance are critical to our recovery.

In the case of northeast South Dakota, communities such as Watertown continue to be threatened by record high water tables, aquifers and saturated watersheds which bleed into one another increasing the likelihood that flooding will continue to be a problem. Unless necessary measures can be undertaken to reduce our exposure to future floods now, future costs will continue to mount . . . Immediate and future mitigation needs require dollars for both local and State governments working as partners to solve problems as quickly as possible.

Watertown's economy will be enormously impacted by the devastating floods of 1997. Our very livelihood centers around the agricultural community for 100 miles in all directions. With many of the roads under water, travel to patronize our businesses is severely impacted. Without immediate assistance for animals killed during the disastrous winter and historic floods, herds will not be revitalized, profits will plunge and dollars for commerce will be few. Fields unable to be planted will equate into diminished dollars long term for businesses on main street. The very economy of Watertown and many affected rural towns like it, are

dependent upon the immediate response of Congress. We are so grateful for the generosity and assistance provided to us from throughout the United States. We are now in need of dollars to rebuild for the future. The very well-being and livelihood of thousands of affected disaster victims in the upper mid-west cries out for assistance in picking up the pieces of their lives and rebuilding the affected areas of their communities.

In closing, Senator Daschle, I would remind members of Congress that the bottom line in all of this is people. As I have stated before, Watertown is determined to recover and become stronger than ever. The incredible community spirit I have witnessed throughout these very difficult days has been nothing short of inspiring. We simply ask that the Supplemental Appropriations bill be passed as soon as possible to enable our community and others to recover and to heal.

Sincerely,

BRENDA S. BARGER,  
Mayor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is addressed to me. It says:

[I want to underscore] . . . the need for the immediate passage of the Supplemental Disaster Relief Appropriations Bill . . .

As a city, it now becomes our responsibility to prioritize needs, both short term and long term. As we proceed to do so, it is incredibly difficult to make firm plans without the commitment of Federal emergency dollars. No contracts can be awarded without confirmed sources of revenue for projects which the City cannot accommodate due to lack of dollars. . . .

Watertown's economy will be enormously impacted by the devastating floods of 1997. Our very livelihood centers around the agricultural community for 100 miles in all directions. . . . Without immediate assistance for animals killed during the disastrous winter and historic floods, herds will not be revitalized, profits will plunge and dollars for commerce will be few. Fields unable to be planted will equate into diminished dollars long term for businesses on main street. The very economy of Watertown and many affected rural towns like it, are dependent upon the immediate response of Congress.

Mr. President, I do not think you can say it any clearer than that. These people need help. They need it now. They do not understand all these complicated, misguided and extraordinarily problematic extraneous matters added to this legislation at the worst possible time. It is not just mayors, it is not just the people living in most of our communities in eastern South Dakota, North Dakota and Minnesota that are struggling. Farmers and ranchers have also expressed themselves in a myriad of ways.

Mr. President, 350,000 livestock in South Dakota alone were lost in the storms and flood—350,000. We have never had an experience of that magnitude in my lifetime. We have \$145 million in livestock losses alone. Not one dime has been provided or can be provided to indemnify producers for livestock losses until this bill passes. There is no possibility of providing any meaningful relief to livestock producers anywhere in the country until this legislation passes.

Mr. President, I have received so many remarkable letters from people all over South Dakota. I want to read



excerpts of one, and I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1997.

Senator TOM DASCHLE,  
Hart Office Bldg.,  
Washington, DC.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: We live in the far North West corner of South Dakota. We have had a devastating winter to say the least. This last storm just added a finishing flair to the proverbial cake. When the winds finally died, we went to check our cattle. We had bedded heavily and created the best protection we could for them.

We found a horrifying sight; the cows looked as if they were walking snowballs. They had suffocated from ice covering their nostrils. As we went along we found dead calves scattered and tromped into the earth. Some stood like statues froze over with snow, blinded by the same. Our hearts ached, we spent the day dragging in cold calves that were trying their best to hold onto life. We saved what we could, others just gave up hope, as are we.

Our daughter who is eighteen, had never seen such a heinous sight. It is seven days past since the storm. We are still losing calves from the effects. Our greatest fear is not only financially, but that our daughter is tremendously stressed, as well as we. There is no greater pain than watching a child agonize.

As we heard of losses through the community our hearts were further pained. All have lost livestock, all are in pain. Some losses have been such as extreme ones we wonder how any human can live through it. Some are not or have chosen not to.

We implore you to please send some relief our way. A 70/30 deal is to no benefit if you can't afford the 70. We have lost 12 cows and approximately 30 calves. We know people that have lost 100 head to 150 head so we feel fortunate.

Ironically this loss could financially devastate us, so far this winter has costed us \$82,000 more than usual. Yet we feel fortunate it isn't more. We also feel fortunate to still have each other and God to hold us up.

PLEASE.....S.O.S.!!

Sincerely,

NOLAN L. SEIM,  
Shadehill, SD.

Mr. DASCHLE. The letter is from Nolan Seim:

To whom it may concern,

We live in the far North West corner of South Dakota. We have had a devastating winter to say the least. This last storm just adding a finishing flair to the proverbial cake. When the winds finally died, we went to check our cattle. . . .

We found a horrifying sight; the cows looked as if they were walking snowballs. They had suffocated from ice covering their nostrils. As we went along we found dead calves scattered and tromped into the earth. Some stood like statues froze over with snow, blinded by the same. Our hearts ached, we spent the day dragging in cold calves that were trying their best to hold on to life. We saved what we could, others just gave up hope, as are we. . . .

We implore you to please send some relief our way.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. My question to the leader is I hope he realizes this is new

law. Never before in the history of the United States have we assisted people who lost cattle during a disaster. So we are making new law. It is not just an appropriation. It is an authorization bill, too.

I accept what the Senator says. It would be nice to get the bill passed, but I want the Senate to know that we took it upon ourselves to not only appropriate money but to change the law so that disaster aid would be available to people who lost cattle. I understand this is a bad disaster, but there have been many disasters where people have lost cattle before and they received no aid.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I could respond to the distinguished chairman. He has done an outstanding job, and I appreciate his responsiveness to this particular need. We have had other disasters where cattle were detrimentally affected, and ranchers have been compensated for livestock, but they have never been compensated, as he has indicated, for losses as a result of floods or winter snowstorms.

But we have clearly set precedent with regard to the reimbursement of ranchers, and, in fact, that happened in 1992. This legislation is modeled after that particular legislation, and I appreciate greatly his support and the effort he has made to respond to this circumstance as Congress has responded to situations in the past involving livestock.

Mr. President, it is not just livestock producers, it is not just communities. People in South Dakota and across the Midwest have been hit across the board in a number of different ways. It has been the coldest winter on record, we have had the most severe blizzards in our history, a 500-year flood, and there were only 2 days in 1997 when a Presidential disaster was not in effect for South Dakota. The winter storms produced winds chills of 90-degrees-below-zero and 70-mile-an-hour winds, 13,000 miles of road were impassable, and lives and livelihoods were threatened in ways we have never seen before.

My point in reminding all of my colleagues about this loss, Mr. President, is simply this: There is no patience left out there. They have endured the winter. They have endured the floods. They have endured this long, deliberative process about how we respond in the most effective way to all the problems we have across the country in emergencies and disasters where declarations have been made, but they do not understand this. They do not understand how anyone can take a bill this important and use it for vehicles that have nothing to do with the disaster, nothing to do with an emergency, nothing to do with responding as effectively as we possibly can, given the circumstances that they have had.

I do not understand it either, Mr. President, and I just hope that we can collectively respond as soon as the veto is made in a way that will give them more hope and less frustration, more

belief in what we as Republicans and Democrats can do to respond more effectively than we are this afternoon. We have to get rid of the extraordinary cynicism that comes so often when people in the country affected by these circumstances watch what we do. We cannot effectively deal with that cynicism so long as cynical uses are made of legislation this important.

So, again, let me thank the chairman for his best effort in trying to resolve any of these difficulties. Let me thank the ranking member. Senator BYRD has been extremely responsive and cooperative in all ways, as he is in so many instances. I thank the Members for their efforts.

I must say, this is a disaster in and of itself. For us not to be able to respond, for us not to resolve these matters, for us to know that this bill will be vetoed, and do it anyway, is inexcusable and inexplicable. I just hope we can find a way to resolve these matters this week and decide in a mutual fashion that we will get a new bill that will be signed by the President in the shortest possible time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind words that the Democratic leader has made here on the floor. My response to him would be that no President in the history of the United States has closed down the Government like President Clinton did. There are hundreds of thousands of people who were put in a position of being told to stay home, they could not go to work. When they did not go to work, facilities all over this country were closed. People were told they could not get their veterans checks, they could not get any assistance from the Social Security Administration. They were totally closed down.

Now, to use the first vehicle available to us in the appropriations process to try to prevent that, I do not think is a cynical act. I am sorry that he used that word with regard to this provision. It is a legitimate difference of opinion with the administration and with the minority, but I do not believe we are being cynical in trying to protect the people of the United States from another shutdown, which I foresee is going to happen unless we find some way to come to an agreement with this President about the misuse of the Presidential power to shut down the Government when we were not out of money, by the way. We were not out of money. There were funds that could have been used to keep the office open.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me respond very briefly, and I know there are Senators who are seeking recognition. We will differ as to who it was that shut the Government down. I think many of those in the Republican leadership have already admitted themselves that they hold the larger share of the responsibility.

The question is, do we need this vehicle, this bill, as the only means by

which we can resolve that problem in the future? That, in my view, is the cynical part of this. We know we can resolve it. We know we can find a way with which to deal with shutdowns in Government. We know that we can find other ways to resolve our differences. But to use this must-pass piece of legislation to do it, in my view, is wrong. A lot of our colleagues know it is wrong, and I just hope we can put those issues aside and deal with them at another time and get this legislation passed the way it should be passed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the remaining time to the Senators from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator HUTCHISON.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. What is the remaining time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes, twenty-one seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I will speak for 5 minutes, and then I will yield the floor to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on two issues that were brought up by the Senator, the distinguished minority leader, and also others on the floor, and that is, we keep hearing, "Send the President a bill he can sign." Mr. President, we are sending the President a bill that he can sign.

It is like we have a responsibility in Congress just to please the President. Mr. President, I think this is a two-way street. Pennsylvania Avenue runs two ways.

It is well settled in American law that there is a Congress that passes laws and a President who signs or vetoes those laws. So it is not, "Send the President a bill he can sign." We are sending the President a bill he can sign. We are sending the President a bill that he has asked for, to replenish the FEMA funding. The people of North Dakota and South Dakota and Minnesota are getting the help they need—and they should, and we want them to—and we are going to replenish those funds.

In addition, we are providing the notice and the process to not only the people who work for Government, the people who depend on it, about what is going to happen, what process are we going to use for appropriations bills so they can plan, so they will know that the veterans checks will be there, so they will know, if they plan their family vacation on October 2, that they will be able to get into the Grand Canyon, so that if they have a problem with a passport, they will know that there is not an artificial disruption of Government on October 1 because the President and Congress have not agreed. What better time to provide that process than right now in the first appropriations bill of this year?

Mr. President, we are sending the President of the United States a bill that he can sign to replenish the FEMA funding, and we are acting in a most responsible way so that the veterans of this country will never again have to

worry if their check is going to be there on time, so that the very disaster victims that we are trying to assure have coverage will never have to worry that the check is going to get there on time because they will never have to worry that Government might shut down if Congress and the President have not agreed to one or two appropriations bills by the September 30 deadline. We want Congress and the President to have a level playing field, to negotiate in good faith, as Congresses and Presidents have done for years in this country.

The second issue I want to talk about is why we have to do these things in this bill, why we can't do it in a separate bill, as the distinguished minority leader has asked that we do? It is because there is urgency. There is urgency in determining how we are going to do the processes of Government, whether it is census, whether it is just the functions of Government. There is an urgency that we set that process right now. So, Mr. President, when we hear all of the talk about sending the President a clean bill, we are sending the President a clean bill. We are sending the President a bill that provides for the funding for our armed services, to replenish their accounts; we are sending the President the replenishing of the Federal Emergency Management Account; we are providing for the people who are in need as we speak, and we are making sure that there is not a disruption today, nor on October 1 or 2 of this year, because we are providing for the orderly transition of Government from fiscal year to fiscal year.

Mr. President, when you hear all of the horror stories about this bill not being clean, having political overtones, we need to set the record straight. The President can sign the bill that we are sending him, or he can tell us what he doesn't like about it and negotiate in good faith. But to tell the American people that any victim of a disaster is not getting funding, especially when he has not even made a decision yet to declare the victims of a tornado in Texas last week a disaster so that they will know the funding is coming, I think is a specious argument.

I ask the President and the minority leader to cease and desist from telling the American people something that is not true, and that is that we are not providing for the disaster victims and the armed services of our country. We are doing it, and we are providing responsible Government for the people who depend on Government checks, whether it is the worker or a citizen of our country, so they will be able to plan on October 1 of this year that there will not be a disruption for any reason in the normal processes of Government.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me make a very brief comment on this

issue that the minority leader has raised. Then I want to turn to the real purpose that I have come to the floor to speak on today.

What we have done in this bill, recognizing what happened last year when the Government shut down, is simply say to the President that if we have an impasse in deciding on how much money we are going to spend in any given area, while we are working out those differences, the Government, in that area, will have the same level of funding that it had this year, and so the Government will not be shut down and services won't be disrupted.

There is only one reason the President would refuse to go along with this imminently reasonable proposal, and that reason is that the President believes that by having the leverage of shutting down the Government, he can extract additional spending from the Congress. That is what happened in the last week of the session last year. We increased spending by about \$7 billion in that year, and about \$20 billion over the next 4 years, basically because of the power of the President to intimidate a Congress that was frightened because the Government might shut down.

So I hope nobody is confused. This issue is about spending money. The President wants to spend more of it. We would like to begin by saying that while we negotiate on that subject, we will not shut the Government down; we fund it at the existing year's level.

I am sorry to have to come over to be, apparently, the last speaker of the day on a bill that everybody will rejoice in and pound on their chest and say, "Look what we have done for our fellow citizens who had the misfortune of having terrible floods." We have all seen the pictures, and those of us who represent States that weren't flooded have all been thankful that it didn't happen to us. Our hearts have gone out to those who have been victims.

I want to end this debate today by pointing out why this bill represents a failure. It represents a failure for the Congress and the American people, not because we are helping people who suffered from a disaster, but because we are not paying for it. We want to get all this credit for being compassionate. We want to fulfill the obligation that the Government has taken on itself to help people who suffer from natural disasters. But when it comes right down to it, we don't want to do what families have to do in America, or what businesses have to do when they undertake similar activities—that is, we don't want to spend less money on other things. In fact, when we considered this disaster funding bill on the floor of the Senate, I offered an amendment to reduce spending across the board in other areas by .7 percent—hardly massive cuts—so that we could help those who suffered from natural disasters, but do it in such a way as to pay for it. I am sorry to say that my

amendment got only 38 votes. I personally believe that if the American people had the right to vote on paying for the disaster assistance by cutting other programs, they would have voted for that amendment and it would have passed. So I somewhat feel here in the Senate as if my views on this subject are kind of hopelessly out of fashion. But I do believe that when families sit around kitchen tables every night and write their budgets and make tough decisions when they have emergencies, they have to take money away from things they want to do, and I believe they would have been on the side that I took on this issue.

This bill, as now written, with all the good things it will do, will raise the deficit this year by \$760 million. It will raise the deficit, over the next 5 years, by \$6.6 billion. We are going to adopt a budget resolution. We have already adopted it in both Houses of Congress—we are going to work out the differences and adopt it shortly—that is going to set out the claim of balancing the budget. I am not going to drag that dead cat back across the table by pointing out again in great detail that 97 cents out of every dollar of deficit reduction in that budget is simply assumed. It doesn't represent any policy change. But I have to lament, in passing, that before that budget is adopted, we are already busting that budget by \$6.6 billion. The deficit spending in the Senate and the deficit spending in Washington never comes to an end.

I wish we were having a different battle today rather than fighting over continually funding the Government—which I think we should—instead of allowing it to be shut down. But I wish we were having a fight about the fact that this bill doubles the level of funding that was originally requested. I wish we were having a battle about the fact that this bill spends \$8.6 billion—twice as much as originally requested—for flood damage and for replenishment of money for Bosnia. I wish there were greater concerns about the fact that this bill will raise the deficit by \$6.6 billion. But that concern today, while it exists in the Senate, is certainly a minority view. I think it is important on these occasions to simply point out that we have done the right thing in helping our fellow Americans who have had terrible things happen to them that were beyond their control. But we have done the wrong thing by not paying for it, because in helping people that have suffered from a natural disaster, we are contributing once again to not only a man-made, but a Government-made disaster called the deficit. I simply want to predict that this problem is not going to go away and that we are going to be back here some day worrying about the deficit again, and that we might wish that we had not raised it by \$6.6 billion today.

I thank our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for giving me this time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes forty two seconds.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this has been cleared with the Democratic leadership and our leadership. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1469 occur at 6 p.m., as ordered, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not have received the official papers from the House by that time, and that when and if the Senate does receive those papers, the vote at 6 p.m. be considered as a vote on final passage of the conference report, provided that the papers received from the House are identical to the conference report filed in the House last evening.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is here. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes forty eight seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma may speak within the balance of our time on a subject other than the bill.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. INHOFE pertaining to the introduction of S. 842 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 3 minutes and 17 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded.

The vote, pursuant to the previous order, will take place at 6 o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order

to ask for the yeas and nays on the vote at 6 p.m.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as if in morning business.

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

#### OUR TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I just wanted to share a few thoughts with you on something that came up this last week.

I was quite distressed when I heard that the President of the United States—the administration—suggesting that maybe our troops in Bosnia are going to be there for a longer period of time than the deadline having been established of June 30, 1998. This bothers me a great deal, for one reason in particular, and that is, I am chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Back when the decision was made in 1995 to send troops to Bosnia, many of us felt this was not a good idea—not that we are not compassionate, but that we were using our very rare, precious resources, after this administration has decimated virtually our defense budget to send troops over to areas and endanger their lives where we have no national security interest at stake.

This is something that bothers quite a few of us. So we introduced back in November 1995 a resolution of disapproval to stop the President from sending troops over to Bosnia. This only lost by four votes, or we could have perhaps kept our troops from being sent over to Bosnia.

I was concerned about this because I went to Bosnia to see what our interests might be over there. When I went up to the northeast sector, the northeastern part of Bosnia, where it would be under the jurisdiction of the support of the United States for our station troops to be stationed, I got up there, and when I told the people up there that it was going to be 12 months, as the President promised, that our troops would be over there—this is November 1995, keep in mind—General Hoagland, in charge of the northeast