

All I am saying is, take a time out on this issue, on census, until we have more time to work on it, and then we can resolve it this fall or even next year, but we should not get locked in now before we have had a chance to really look into it.

So, I yield to my colleague, Senator DASCHLE, and ask my colleague to answer this question: If the Senate cannot consider this bill today, would he be in a position, if we cannot do it today, to grant consent for the Senate's consideration during Wednesday's session of the birth defects research program bill?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me take the opportunity to respond to a number of points raised by the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. The majority leader says that all disaster bills, all supplemental bills have had extraneous legislation. I suppose that is probably true. But I have also gone back and looked at all these disaster bills and extraneous legislation added to supplemental bills, and there is one difference between all of those in the past and this one: All of those in the past have the agreement of the President; all of those in the past have been negotiated with the White House.

So, of course, you had supplemental legislation. Of course, you had extraneous legislation. But each and every time when that happened, the White House said, "Send it down. I will sign it." In this case, the President has said, "Look, these issues are so controversial and so far reaching and so problematic that I cannot agree." And the difference between this experience and all the others is the majority said, "We will do it anyway."

Now, I give great credit to the Senator from Minnesota, the junior Senator from Minnesota, who sent all of us a letter in the last couple of days. The Senator from Minnesota had a very practical, pragmatic way with which to address this problem. What he suggested is that we simply take those controversial pieces out, have a good debate, have a discussion, see if we can find a compromise. Let's do it. Let's agree right now without any filibusters, without any delay. We can commit to a time certain for legislation dealing with census, for legislation dealing with a continuing resolution, for anything else that may be extraneous and onerous to the White House. We can agree to that.

Now, I have suggested that to some of my Republican colleagues and the answer I get is, "Well, the President is going to veto those bills if they go in their current form and we don't want that." So, in a sense, what they are saying is, we will hold hostage our troops in Bosnia, all of the people detrimentally affected by the natural disasters, and every single other item in this legislation because we want our way. That is what we are being told.

Mr. President, there is no way to compromise with something like that.

Now, like the majority leader, I have tried to find ways, and I give him credit for trying to come up with innovative ways with which to address this problem, but I must say we are in a set of circumstances for which there can be no compromise when it comes to holding hostage victims of natural disasters, holding hostage people serving their country in Bosnia.

We cannot allow that to happen. So, let's take the suggestion made in good faith by the Senator from Minnesota. Let's take those pieces out, let's have a good debate on them, and maybe, in the process, we can find a compromise.

But until that happens, Mr. President, as I said a minute ago, we are going to object to any other piece of legislation coming to the floor. And I object.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the list of some of the extraneous items that have been added to this bill.

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

[In millions of dollars]

Highway trust fund	\$694
Title 1 grants (poor and disadvantaged schools)	101
VA compensation (mandatory)	932
WIC	58
Botanical Gardens	33
Law Enforcement Commission	2
Breast cancer research	15
Retired Coast Guard pay	9
Olympics counterterrorism fund	3
Indian health	3
California vineyards	9
Customs Service expenses	16
VA parking garage, Cleveland, OH	12

Mr. LOTT. I note the figure I used on the parking garage in Cleveland, OH, was not the accurate number. It is actually \$12 million. It also has other interesting things in here, including \$3 million for the Olympics counterterrorism fund, \$3 million for Indian health care, \$9 million for California vineyards.

These may all be good programs and all deserving, but I wonder how they found their way into this supplemental appropriations bill.

Also, I was here during the 1980's and early 1990's. I remember how supplementals worked. Unfortunately, I used to plead with President Reagan not to send supplemental requests up here because I knew it would become a freight train pulling all kinds of things through. I remember Presidents of both parties objecting to things that Congress added to the supplemental appropriations bills. The one we had June 30, 1989, I see one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine add-ons. Some are not exactly insignificant, either, like East European refugee assistance, foreign aid to Haiti, funds for the

Washington Convention Center. The supplemental appropriations also had about nine add-ons, including renewing section 8 housing contracts.

Remember, supplementals are always alleged to be—while they may not all be natural disasters—they are always alleged to be somewhat emergency, or otherwise they would not be coming to the floor of the Congress saying, "Give us some more money." Most administrations and Congress always underfund food stamp programs, knowing full well we will come back next year and add more money to it.

Again, some of this is pretty significant legislation and pretty costly, also.

The same thing again in 1991 and 1994. There is always language that is added. There is always funding that is added to these bills beyond what was originally requested. So, to infer that this is really something new or different is not the case.

Now, what I maintain is different here, if I could make this point.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to respond if I could make this point.

When I have suggested, and others have suggested, let's work together to work this out, I give credit to the Democratic leader. He has always been willing to listen, and I think that some of the things we have suggested he has been willing to think about and discuss with his colleagues. And he, like I, we cannot always say it will be this way or that way. We have a conference we deal with and you have an administration that you have to deal with. I have asked the President and his chief of staff, "Please respond. Come back. Let's see if we cannot work this out." Basically, what they are saying is, "Give us the money and no language. We want it our way and no other way." It does not work that way.

However, in the realization and in recognition of the need for some of this to be done, I am advocating while we continue to work on that, that we do a smaller bill that would address some of the concerns that the Senator from South Dakota has.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, if I could.

Mr. DORGAN. I very much appreciate that.

Mr. LOTT. Only for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader yields for a question.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the Senator from Mississippi yielding for a question.

I ask the Senator if it is not unusual when very controversial amendments are added to disaster bills. I have been around here for some while, as well, and it is clear there have been on the other side of the aisle disaster bills, but not in my memory have very controversial measures been added to disaster bills that attract a Presidential veto and thereby delay or derail the bill.

It seems there are two ways out of this. I ask the Senator from Mississippi

about both of them. One approach to resolve this issue is an approach that I offered this morning on the floor by unanimous consent, and the Senator from Minnesota has also, I believe, suggested something similar, and that would be to simply take the two big controversial items out of this, pass the bill, get a Presidential signature and get disaster aid to the victims of disasters.

The second approach is an approach that the Senator from Mississippi seemed to suggest a few moments ago, and I would like to ask a question about that. As the Senator from Mississippi will recall, about 2½ weeks ago, just prior to the Congress breaking for the Memorial Day recess, there was some discussion that if the larger bill cannot go, at least extract the body of real disaster aid and allow that to happen quickly. Now, that could happen this afternoon if others around here believe—

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator would yield, I have been an advocate of doing that for probably about 3 weeks, and I would entertain doing it. I tell you why I said it to Senator DASCHLE earlier today, so that we can do something quickly. Even if we came to an agreement here in the next 24 hours on how we would do this, it would still have to go through the committees and both floors, with amendments in order. It would take time.

This approach that you are suggesting, and I am suggesting, could take 24 hours if we put our heads to it, and we could go on and continue to work and think about the additional money. And the language, keep it in mind now, I do not know how much they are worried about some of these other issues, but I have the impression from the administration that they have a couple of other issues that they are very, very interested in. So it is not just two.

But I am interested in, and I would like to work that out, and, again, we would have to do it over here, and we would have to get it done on the other side of the Capitol and the President would have to be willing to sign it.

I think that approach makes sense—that is all I am saying. Common sense around here usually works pretty darn good.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield further for an additional question, we had someone on the other side of the Capitol suggest prior to the weekend break, if this does not get resolved the way we—that being them—want it, we may very well cut the amount of disaster aid that is available to victims of disaster. Over the weekend in North Dakota, we had a lot of folks reacting to that with some real quaking, wondering, what does this mean? I hope that cooler heads will prevail and some common sense will prevail.

I assume there has not been that discussion here in the Senate. We had bipartisan cooperation putting together

the disaster portion of the bill, and for that we are very thankful. The trick now, the goal now, is to get that aid to people who woke up this morning and who are homeless, not just dozens but thousands of them, and the Senator suggests an approach I would support, and that is to take those portions of the bill that represent the aid that is necessary to go to disasters to help get their life back in order and pass that.

I ask the Senator—

Mr. LOTT. If I could—

Mr. DORGAN. I just ask if we could assume, with your willingness to do that rather quickly, what kind of impediments does the Senator see to having that get to the President for his signature in the next 24 hours or so?

Mr. LOTT. I think that could be done quickly. It would take—I don't think it could get done right here and how. I'd like to talk further with your leader. One of the problems with the appropriations is they generally begin on the other side. But in furtherance of what you are saying, I have discussed this this morning with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee here in the Senate and with the Speaker of the House. I presume he is consulting with his chairman and others. So I think this is the process by which we might move pretty quickly.

I think there are opponents to this. There are urgent things sort of now with regard to some of the disaster programs—perhaps some of the housing programs, perhaps some of the agriculture. There is a need to get this done as soon as possible because of weather considerations and so forth.

There is a second and third component. There are some other parts of it, some money that will need to be available and that will be available for months and even years down the line.

So there are really two parts of it. The part that is somewhat in the emergency category is different from what we usually have because you are talking about some new programs and some new ideas—which I think have some attractiveness, by the way. I have said that publicly and to the people from your States; I think it is the way to go. I think it would save money if we can find a way to move people out of what you call the flood way—what we call the floodplain in my neck of the woods—into areas where they will not be flooded year after year. That would wind up in the long run saving money.

So there is that part.

Then there is the funding for the longer term which could be available maybe for your State and may be available for other States as we look at these various disasters.

I will yield to the Senator from Missouri. But let me wrap this up. I am ready. I am willing. And I want to work with you to see if we can't do it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would like to ask the majority leader a series

of questions that I think are necessary to clarify where we stand. I apologize for not being on the floor when he began.

I have the responsibility for the subcommittee that appropriates money for FEMA. I wonder—as has been made clear on the floor, the emergency money is now flowing. There is money—\$2 billion in FEMA—that is going for the immediate needs right now. So there is money which can be paid out right now prior to the issuance of the completion of plans and assessments being available.

Is that clear? Has that been made clear?

Mr. LOTT. That has not been made clear, if I could respond to the question in this discussion. But I think repeatedly it has been noted that there is money in the pipeline. The distinguished Senator from Missouri is the chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction in that area. He knows what is available and what should be available to FEMA for housing-type programs. Clearly those funds are flowing. We do need to prospectively for the future have additional funds. But the money is there.

I have spoken to the head of FEMA, James Lee Witt, to ask him that specific question. I have asked him, "Do you need to do something more; something different? You do have the money, don't you? You do have temporary housing available, don't you? If you do not, we would like to help make sure that you have that temporary housing money available and the temporary housing available."

So I think the Senator makes a very good point.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. If I could ask another question—

Mr. LOTT. If I could take another question, then I will go back to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BOND. It has been made clear to our colleagues and to the people viewing this that before major disaster relief can start flowing, there has to be damage assessments. I guess it is the understanding of the majority leader that they are at least 2 weeks away from getting the damage assessments. The State has to have a plan submitted and approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Dollars then go to the State from FEMA and from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Is it the clear understanding that this is a long process which is not being held up during this day or tomorrow, but the money is needed, and we will provide it? But the time required to get the plans in place still has not been completed.

Is that the understanding?

Mr. LOTT. In answer to the Senator's question, that is my understanding. I have been through these disaster situations. I know there is a painful period during which you must have assessments and you must have plans. It is the most difficult time of all. It is actually worse a month after a disaster

than it is the day after, in some respects. Or certainly after 6 months you begin to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

We checked this morning from the staff standpoint with regard to FEMA funds available. I understand there is \$1.5 billion available as of this morning.

So there are funds available, and they are, I believe, probably flowing to the various States that have been affected.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BOND. I have one final question to the majority leader. I very much appreciate his efforts to bring up the Birth Defects Prevention Act, which would deal with a very serious problem of 150,000 babies being born each year with birth defects in this country. We would like to go to it.

It is my understanding that, even if there were no other measure on the floor, the supplemental appropriations bill would have to come over from the House. There is no reason to filibuster or delay the Birth Defects Prevention Act, because taking care of this bill this afternoon will in no way delay the disaster. It will deal with the disaster of birth defects which we can deal with today without slowing down any supplemental emergency appropriations.

Is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. In answer to the Senator's question, it is absolutely right.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for his work on this legislation. He has worked for a good long while and with the help of a lot of other Senators.

He is absolutely right, also, that we have tried this afternoon, during which time we can do this birth defects legislation while we see if we can work out some agreement or some emergency disaster bill. It would have to pass the House. Also, in connection with the Senator's stand, we want to talk about the supplemental.

I am prepared to work with the Senator from South Dakota to make sure we have adequate time later on this afternoon and tonight to have a full discussion.

I thought last week having protracted discussion would have been counterproductive to trying to get an agreement, to get it completed. If the Senators feel strongly that they want time to do that tonight, my advice is to accommodate you in that effort. Of course, we will want Senators from our side of the aisle to have equal time or opportunity to speak also.

I thank the Senator for his questions. I know he is prepared and ready to go to the birth defects legislation.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota for a question only.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, is the majority leader aware that over the weekend on this question of the money in the pipeline that the Republican Congressman from Minnesota said this: "Those who argue

there is money in the pipeline are being disingenuous, at best. There is no money for housing, for livestock, sewerage systems, water supply, housing buyouts. There is no money in the pipeline for those things. They can't really rebuild without the funds that are tied up in the disaster relief bill."

I would like to ask further, is the majority leader aware of what the Republican Governor of South Dakota said on this question? Janklow said, "The delay in the legislation is blocking reconstruction of sewerage facilities, highways, and a state-owned rail line in South Dakota."

He went on to say, "I am not going to award contracts on the come. I'm not a fool."

Janklow said, "What happens if we award a contract and we don't have the money for it?"

Finally, I ask if the majority leader is aware that the mayor of Grand Forks has now written letters to the Senate and said the same thing and asked that the emergency provisions be stripped out—that is, the disaster provisions—and be passed so that in fact the aid can flow.

Is the Senator aware of those developments over the weekend: the Republican Congressman from Minnesota saying the money is not flowing in those specific areas; the Republican Governor of South Dakota saying the same thing; and, finally, the mayor of Grand Forks asking that we move the disaster provisions as expeditiously as possible because they are not getting the aid they desperately need?

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, if I could respond to the question and comments, the Senator is suggesting right there at the end that we try to move the emergency disaster portion of this as expeditiously as possible. I suggested a way we can do that.

I want to remind the Senator also that this additional funding and authorization, I believe, would be available—would have been available yesterday—if the President had signed the bill, a bill that 67 Senators voted for. It would have been available yesterday just like that. But the President of the United States vetoed it because of language that he is not happy with, and, I repeat, a bill that got 67 Senators to vote for it, including, I think, a majority or very close to a majority of Democrats. I know why. And I know that there are some areas where the youth program is being suggested, and I hope we can find a way to move that expeditiously, as has been suggested.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LOTT. I understand we can't use these dollars until the plans are available to use them. Anyway, we are still waiting on plans from FEMA or from the States.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. Yes; I am glad to yield for a question only.

Mr. CONRAD. If I could ask the Senator, with this question of the money

in the FEMA pipeline, is the Senator aware that there are other pipelines that deliver assistance that in fact don't have money in them? That is, housing doesn't have money in their pipeline, agriculture doesn't have money in their pipeline. So the reference to FEMA is very limited with respect to those parts of disaster relief that they address.

Mr. LOTT. In responding to the question, there are perhaps some programs or agencies that may not have specific disaster funds. I know that the Senator from South Dakota has advocated something new or different with regard to livestock, if that is an accurate way to put it.

I know that agriculture has a good bit of money that they could use in a variety of ways that would be helpful. But, as I understand it, this would be a new program which I am sympathetic to. But before any of this is done, I repeat once again, there has to be a plan.

I just say to my colleagues here again that as soon as we complete this dialog and then we hear from others who are awaiting to speak from both sides of the aisle, including the Senator from Minnesota, who wishes to be heard, I will be glad to talk further with the Senators from North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota, or any other States. We can talk about how we can do this thing expeditiously while we continue to work on the bigger package.

Also, I would like to note, if I could, that we hope to move other issues in the days ahead.

I mentioned that I believe we hope to consider the State Department authorization bill next week, as well as the DOD authorization bill. We need to get this resolved as soon as we can so we can get on to those important issues.

I understand that my Democratic colleagues have also objected to the permission of committees to meet during today's session. One of those committees, which is very important, is the Armed Services Committee. The Armed Services Committee is marking up the Department of Defense authorization bill for the next fiscal year.

This year, unlike a lot of past years, I had the impression that the DOD authorization bill and the Armed Services Committee marking up is going smoothly and that it is not going to be as controversial as it has been in the past; that we may have one or two big amendments, but that this is something we can do in a relatively short period of time—perhaps 3 days.

The Armed Services Committee had three subcommittee meetings planned today in an effort to prepare or report the Department of Defense authorization bill.

I really regret that objection. Needless to say, this objection to committee meetings will only delay and hamper their ability to report this bill.

Then, of course, during the week of the 23d, the Senate will consider both

reconciliation bills, both the spending restraint and realignment-of-spending bill. And the tax legislation will be reported out of the Finance Committee.

So we are going to have long days and nights ahead of us. I want the Members to be on notice that we must get this work done before our Fourth of July recess. Therefore, in anticipation of that, Senators should be prepared to be here at least next week throughout all of the week and probably the next week, too. The objection to the birth defects bill, as well as the provisions for committees to meet, will only make these last few weeks even longer.

I understand what you are trying to accomplish here. I hope that we can find a way to allow the committees to meet, and I hope to do that later on this afternoon.

Then I would like also to talk to the Senator from South Dakota the Democratic leader about exactly what we need to do in terms of debate tonight and how long you are thinking about. Also, I need to talk to all of you about how we can move something very quickly and expeditiously.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield to Senator SARBANES for the purpose of a question only.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator agree with me that all Members of the Senate have an interest in making sure that this disaster relief is provided to the people who have been hit by this extraordinary national disaster, and that there is a constant reference to the Senators from North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota? Of course, they have been most immediately impacted, but it seems to me that every Member of the Senate has an interest in responding to this.

Mr. LOTT. In response to that question, why, of course. We all have that interest. As a matter of fact, 35 States have had some amount of disasters—whether it is flooding, freezes, or whatever it may be—including my own State, in which I think for three or four counties a request was made by our Governor to have disaster assistance available, which I might note has been turned down by FEMA even though the State right across the river, which was also flooded, was approved.

But in answer to the Senator's question, the Senate, the Congress, has always shown a desire to, as a matter of fact, address natural disasters; and also a desire to avoid manmade disasters like the fiascoes we have had 11 times since 1981 of Government shutdowns that also cause people pain and suffering and loss of their jobs and income. So, yes, I feel that sympathy. I have been through it. I have been through hurricanes, tornadoes, freezes, droughts—

Mr. SARBANES. That is the other question.

Mr. LOTT. Ice on the trees, endless amounts, and we have always been sympathetic to each other, and we are

this time. We are this time. We are going to provide the disaster assistance the people in the affected States need. We are going to do it.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield? Can we do it today?

Mr. LOTT. The question is, how do we do it.

Mr. CONRAD. Can we do it today?

Mr. LOTT. I hope so. I would like to do that. But we can do it one or two ways. We can do sort of the new portion, the emergency portion, or we can work out an agreement on the bigger package. And I am ready to do either one of those. I think we can do it once we make up our minds to do it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. LOTT. I will yield.

Mr. SARBANES. I recall the Senator's own State was struck with a disaster.

Mr. LOTT. We have had them all. We have had them all.

Mr. SARBANES. We had a major hurricane, and I remember voting to send disaster relief to the Senator's State in order to meet that situation. I don't recall it being caught up in these kinds of delays.

Mr. LOTT. Well, understand once again—

Mr. SARBANES. In personal disaster relief.

Mr. LOTT. There seems to be an abundance of selective memory around here. I remember—in fact, I have been through how that disaster legislation has worked. In fact, I was a staff member one time on the biggest one of all where we did not have FEMA. We did not have existing law. In fact, if you go back and look at the history of what has led to FEMA, it was in legislation we drafted in 1969. The disaster occurred August 18, as I recall it was, something like that, and we had to rely on the Corps of Engineers and people, volunteers to come in and help us. It was weeks, weeks before we got the legislation and, in fact, got many of the programs to help us. In fact, we did not have a lot of the programs that are now on the books.

I am not saying that that is good. I think we have learned from that experience.

Mr. SARBANES. I hope so.

Mr. LOTT. I am glad we have been through that, and now we are going to provide, as we always have, the assistance that is needed to the people in America who cannot help themselves.

There is one thing that worries me about part of this bill. There is a lot of spending in here that does not relate to these disasters. It has just sort of been added as it's gone along, and I am not putting that just on Democrats either. A lot of these projects, if I go down the list, I can trace them back to some of my colleagues. But we are going to get this done. We can do the emergency stuff, and we can do the bigger package.

But right now everybody is trying to find a way to prevail or to claim victory or to get the PR victory, and I am not—I did not say you. I said we. And when we decide, once we make up our minds we are going to get this done, short term or long term, we are going to find a way to do it. But the fact is, as has always been the case—and it will be this time—the people who have been hurt and hit with these disasters in a variety of States are going to get the help they need.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for one final question?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield for a question from the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the majority leader. Let me see if I understand what the majority leader said, and I think I do. I expect it to be a friendly question.

Mr. LOTT. I would not expect it to be any other way from the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The majority leader keeps saying he is determined to get this assistance to the people and he is determined to try and get this done this week. Have I heard that correctly?

Mr. LOTT. I would like very much to be able to do that. It is going to take more than just me though. But that is my desire.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I understand. But the reason I ask the majority leader this, since he is the majority leader, is that—and I put this in the form of a question. Is the majority leader aware—and I believe you are because I think that, agree or disagree on issues, you are very adept at sort of understanding the mood of people in Mississippi or for that matter in the country—is the majority leader aware that the people in our States are just getting sick and tired of it all and they do not understand all the debate about census and all the debate about continuing resolution and all the rest; they do not mind our having separate debate on that and they understand there are disagreements. They do not understand why we just cannot get a clean disaster relief bill to them.

Can the majority leader commit to us that that is what we will do this week, get a clean disaster relief bill that will provide the assistance to people that need it and we will get it done this week? Can the majority leader make that commitment?

Mr. LOTT. I say again I would like that to happen. I am hopeful, and I believe we can get a clean bill through this week but it will not be \$8.6 billion. It would be only—the only chance we have to do that, what you are suggesting at this point, would be the truly emergency portions of the bill.

Now, we may also get an agreement on the bigger package and language that would be attached to it, but based on what I have experienced during the last 4 days, I think that is going to take a little longer.

Keep in mind now, I have not been up in Minneapolis, MN, or the delta of

Mississippi and not thinking about this. I have been on the phone. I have been probing. I have suggested a variety of ways to solve these problems. I did it on Friday. I did it on Monday. I did it last night. I am trying to find a way to solve this problem, and I am open to suggestions with regard to the census language, for instance. I confess this openly here because I am not ashamed of it at all. I went to the Democratic leader, and I said I think you see what our concerns are. Is there some language that you all could live with?

This is not insignificant. When you talk about changing the way the census is done, this is not without major implications. We do have language in the Constitution with regard to the census. I talked to the Secretary of Commerce this very morning. I am not sitting over in a corner just trying to outlast you guys. I have talked to FEMA, the head of FEMA. I have talked to the Secretary of Commerce. I have talked to the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States. I have talked to the President of the United States, the Democratic leadership, the Speaker of the House.

This morning I was talking to the Secretary of Commerce. I said one of the things—or he suggested one of the things we might do would be to set up a process where there could be a quick judicial determination of this constitutional question.

That is important. And census is important for more than just how you count. It is also important from the standpoint of how many representatives a State has—very important. It also has a great impact on how you get Federal funds. I have towns in my State of Mississippi, and I know it is true in Minnesota, that because of the census count, either undercounting or not proper counting programs, that are not eligible as far as some of our Federal grants and loans, and so this is very important for a long time.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Last question.

Mr. LOTT. Sure. I will be glad to yield further for a question.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will not hold the floor any longer. I just want to say to the majority leader I am a little troubled by the very lengthy explanation on the census count only because again I think the question that we have put to the majority leader is why not take that issue, around which there is disagreement, and debate it separately and why not take the issue of appropriations bills and the continuing resolution and debate it separately? But that is what we do not agree on. That is controversial. We can have an honest debate. Why link it to what should be a disaster relief bill—

Mr. LOTT. I have an answer.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Providing assistance to people in our States?

Mr. LOTT. I have two answers to that question.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Does the majority leader understand that in our States—

Mr. LOTT. I have two answers.

Mr. WELLSTONE. People do not care a lot about what the majority leader is talking about; they have got a whole lot of pain they are dealing with. We want to get help to them. Can we get the commitment to get help to them?

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, I have two answers. I have suggested to you today, to the leader on your side of the aisle and the Senators from North Dakota, there is a way we can get the emergency funding and do it quickly if we make up our minds and are determined to do that while we continue to work on the solutions here.

But the other point with regard to the census, the reason why I make the explanation is to show once again an abundance—we can solve this. We can solve this problem, but there is a reason why we have to do it now. The die is being cast; the Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce have indicated we are going to do this. And if we wait until October to deal with this issue, we are going to be in a position of having to reverse something that is already set in place. They are getting ready to do it. So we do not have the luxury of saying, well, we will pick up on this in July or September or October. It would be a fait accompli by then.

So that is a consideration. But we will continue to work on that, and we will find—I think we can find a way to do this this afternoon.

Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to ask another question?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes. I do not want something the Senator said a moment ago to stand here and be misinterpreted. The Senator indicated potential existed—in the past some kind of emergency provision—that it would not be \$8.6 billion. I want to make clear—I assume you do not mean, as some have suggested on the other side, that, well, if we come back to disaster relief, the folks who are waiting for that relief are going to get a whole lot less relief because we are going to cut it. That has been the implication by some.

Now, we have had agreement on the disaster package in this legislation. There has been no disagreement. Republicans and Democrats have agreed. We have put it in. It is done except it has not gotten through to the President for his signature. But I assume the Senator from Mississippi supports the full complement of disaster relief that is in the bill and is not in any way saying that he would at some point revisit and diminish the amount of disaster relief in the bill. Could you clear that up?

Mr. LOTT. I am not here to negotiate the exact amount. I think we have to work with the committee.

Mr. DORGAN. That is not what I am asking.

Mr. LOTT. Well, I am trying to answer the question. I am not going to

say here that it is going to be—I do not know, for instance, what the exact amount is, what the total amount is that would be alleged to, or would be needed for the disaster assistance, so how can I say what the number would finally be? But I am prepared to say this, that there is a difference between the total amount that is requested over a period of months and years for disaster and those parts of it that are urgent, that need to be addressed now, and that is the part I am really focused on. But I am not prepared to say it would be even limited just to that. I think we need to look at what is really needed right now and in the short term or in the foreseeable future and go with that number. I think we have to talk—are you on the appropriations committee?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes. I was part of the conference.

Mr. LOTT. You would certainly be involved in that process.

Mr. DORGAN. But the Senator supported, when the bill passed the Senate the Senator supported the conference report that had this package of disaster assistance in it. I just do not want someone to misinterpret—maybe I am putting words in your mouth, but I do not want someone to misinterpret when you say, well, there may not be \$8.6 billion. My assumption is that you support and others in the Senate support the quantity of disaster aid that was decided upon by the conference committee. Is that not correct?

Mr. LOTT. I also supported, I believe it was about \$1 billion right before the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. DORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. And I realize the situation is different now. But I do not know, I do not know how much different it is. I have supported a lower figure. I supported a higher figure.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. Now, look, again, this bill is \$8.6 billion and it has got a lot more in it than just disaster aid. It has some disaster relief that is not emergency and not needed for months and even years.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield for one additional question. I appreciate the majority leader's indulgence.

I am more concerned than I was before I left my chair.

My assumption has been that we negotiated a disaster relief package. It is significant. It is important. And it is vitally needed by the areas in my part of the country but many others around America as well, and I hope very much that there is no one here who seriously entertains backing away from that commitment.

In any event, one of the reasons that I ask this question is the piece that the Senator from Mississippi provided as samples of nonemergency spending in the supplemental included, for example, \$694 million for the highway trust

fund. And let me just describe something. Maybe the Senator does not understand this, but we have, for example, in North Dakota right now a highway called Highway 57. It is a link to the Spirit Lake Indian Nation. It is now under water, incidentally. That Indian nation is virtually isolated out there, and there are young kids who need doctors' attention and medical help who at this point have to go far around in order to get it. Their lives are at risk. Commerce stops. Emergency medical assistance is not available. And so we need to deal with these emergency road needs, for example, in Devils Lake which has been flooded every year.

Mr. LOTT. If I can respond to that, it is interesting the Senator would raise that. As a matter of fact, I believe that one of the things that will probably be indicated as urgent disaster need would be in the transportation area which is different from the \$694 million that is in the bill, and let me just emphasize this. The President in that area asked I think for about \$300 million, but along the way that figure grew to almost \$1 billion. I have seen this figure I believe that is there, \$694 million. I think that has to do with ISTEA and the allocation formula and that there is a separate emergency transportation item that we might consider. It may not be accurate, but that is the impression I have. That \$694 million is for funds all over the country not related to the disaster.

Mr. DORGAN. I would say to the Senator that I have visited with the Department of Transportation Secretary and others, and they are awaiting this disaster bill in order to unlock the money necessary to deal with these critical road problems in the one area I have mentioned, which is Devils Lake, where an entire Indian tribe is isolated out there because the roads are inundated with water. But let me go back to the point I originally made today to the Senator from Mississippi.

I urge you to consider this afternoon doing the following, which would very simply and quickly unlock this issue. There are two major stumbling blocks to having the President sign this disaster bill. One is the attachment of the anti-Government-shutdown provision and the second is the census issue. Let us, as the Senator from Minnesota and others have suggested, set them aside, debate them separately. We will not stand in the way of debating and voting on those issues. And let's take the other bill that has been crafted by a bipartisan majority, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate and the House, and I was on the conference committee, let us take that to the floor, vote it out, send it, and get it signed and get disaster relief. We could do that this afternoon.

I just don't understand why that is not possible today. Maybe the Senator from Mississippi can tell me why that is practically impossible. I would think it would be the easiest and most imme-

diate solution to getting disaster aid to disaster victims.

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, one of the things that amazes me is the President of the United States would veto a disaster bill because he doesn't want language in there that says we won't have a Government shutdown. As a matter of fact, if we can get this problem worked out now, it will avoid a problem we are surely going to have in October, where, once again, like we do almost every year, we have these fun and games where there is a threat of various departments or agencies or Government shutdowns that has been used by Democrats and Republicans—most effectively, by the Democrats. And all I am saying is, you know, we could work this out. I have suggested some language that I believe most of you could live with, and we ought to go ahead and do that and get this issue resolved and move on.

Of course, obviously, the purpose here would be to separate these things out where the President could veto them, if he wanted to, and not resolve the problem. Why move these on down the line toward another disaster—as I have already pointed out, a manmade disaster—at the end of the fiscal year?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Let me just say, in order to allow other Members to speak, would the minority leader be willing to allow us consent to provide for speeches by Senators DASCHLE, GRAMS, HUTCHINSON, DORGAN, SARBANES, BOND, WELLSTONE, NICKLES, or his designee, say for 10 minutes each, and following those statements that I be recognized?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are many other Senators who want to be recognized to speak, so I wouldn't want to exclude other Senators who would like very much to participate.

Mr. LOTT. I would not want to exclude them. I think this would just get an agreement that these Senators that are here, waiting for an opportunity to speak—I would like to amend that list to include the Senator from North Dakota—that we get a lineup of speakers, led off by the distinguished Democratic leader. Senator GRAMS has been waiting to speak; Senator HUTCHINSON, who is an original cosponsor of the Government shutdown prevention language, and Senator DORGAN and Senator SARBANES have been waiting. Senator BOND is here and wishes to speak on his birth defects bill. That has been blocked now. It is a bill we should be able to have some limited debate on and get agreement to move on.

Senator WELLSTONE, I am sure, would like to be recognized, Senator CONRAD and Senator NICKLES, or his designee, for 10 minutes each with their statements, and then I be recognized at end of that group.

Then, if others come in, we will get time for others to speak, too. There is no desire to cut Senators off. I am just trying to set up some regular order

where I don't hog all the time and I am in a position of saying to you I will yield for a question only so I do not lose control of the floor.

Let's set up an orderly process and we all get our chance to make our speeches, make our statements, without being just a question or response to the question. Would the Senator object to that?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would have two concerns. One is that some Senators may wish to speak longer than 10 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Would you like to make it 15?

Mr. DASCHLE. Second, they may wish to come back and speak again.

Mr. LOTT. We wouldn't limit that, either.

Mr. DASCHLE. I wouldn't want it to be precluded.

Mr. LOTT. I hope before the afternoon is over, we will have an opportunity to get an agreement for an extended period of time of debate which would be open, with the normal recognition of the Chair and going back and forth on both sides of the aisle, that would go on for quite some time.

Again, I want to talk to the Senator about what length of time he is talking about.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, so long as no Member is precluded a second time or speaking for a period longer than 10 minutes at a later time, and so long as no other Senator is precluded from speaking at all by this unanimous consent request—I think that is the assertion, now, of the majority leader?

Mr. LOTT. If I could suggest, again, let's start with this and then I will talk to the Democratic leader, and we will go from there. This is just to get it started.

Mr. DORGAN. I reserve the right to object, and I ask the majority leader a question. On two occasions, on the two most recent business days, we were subject to a motion to adjourn and required to vote on that, even though many of us did not feel we should adjourn. We wanted to continue to discuss this issue and attempt to see if we couldn't get the Senate to do its business and pass a clean bill providing disaster relief.

I would just like to understand what we might face later today. I certainly would object to any unanimous-consent request propounded by anyone under any circumstances unless there is some assurance we are not going to face another motion for adjournment and simply be voted down and told the disaster bill is not a subject they want us to visit about on the floor of the Senate for any extended length. Some of us feel very strongly we would like to spend some time on the Senate floor talking about the disaster relief bill and ways to solve this so we can get disaster relief to disaster victims.

So, I guess, before I would agree to a unanimous-consent request, I would like to have some understanding