

(3) by adding at the end the following:  
 “(VII) waives a provision of section 7(j).”  
**TITLE VIII—2000 DECENNIAL CENSUS**

The Department of Commerce is directed within thirty days of enactment of this Act to provide to the Congress a comprehensive and detailed plan outlining its proposed methodologies for conducting the 2000 decennial Census and available methods to conduct an actual enumeration of the population. This plan description shall specifically include:

(1) a list of all statistical methodologies that may be used in conducting the Census;

(2) an explanation of these statistical methodologies;

(3) a list of statistical errors which may occur as a result of the use of each statistical methodology;

(4) the estimated error rate down to the census tract level;

(5) a cost estimation showing cost allocations for each census activity plan; and

(6) an analysis of all available options for counting hard-to-enumerate individuals, without utilizing sampling or any other statistical methodology, including efforts like the Milwaukee Complete Count project. The Department of Commerce is also directed within thirty days of enactment of this Act to provide to the Congress an estimate and explanation of the error rate at the census block level based upon the 1995 test data.

This Act may be cited as the “1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from Natural Disasters, and for Overseas Peacekeeping Efforts, Including Those in Bosnia”.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House legislation which provides for the continuing of Government funding at a level of 100 percent of the fiscal year 1997 for those fiscal year 1998 appropriations that have not been signed by October 1, 1997, the majority leader may proceed with that legislation after consultation with the Democratic leader.

I did not read that smoothly. This is the continuing resolution, Government shutdown prevention language. We assume we will receive it in this 100 percent form of 1997 levels for those 1998 appropriations that have not been signed. There will then be one relevant amendment in order for each leader, limited to 1 hour each, to be counted against the overall 8 hours, and no other amendments or motions be in order to the bill, there be 8 hours for debate on the bill equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and finally, following the expiration or yielding back of the time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage, all without intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. LOTT. Let me say, Mr. President, that I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from South Dakota. He has been willing to work on a number of different approaches to resolve this matter. This is clearly not the way I thought we should proceed. Apparently, the House-passed bill will be at the full funding level of about \$8.6 bil-

lion. I think that is inappropriate, uncalled for. I think it is important that we get the disaster funds through and the funding for the Department of Defense Bosnia activities, but this bill has grown like Topsy. There is no need for it to be \$8.6 billion. There has been a lot of add-ons on both sides of the Capitol, both parties, and the administration even made an additional request apparently in writing the other day with regard to forward funding.

It seems to be everybody has found a way to add more money here and there, and while enumerated on the floor and put in on the floor, some of the things that have been added—and, again, this is not partisan or it is not aimed at just the Senate or just the House; it is a bicameral, bipartisan exercise—but as the effort has gone forward to try to reduce this funding, basically what this Senator has found is everybody said: No, not mine. Don't take this out. Don't take that out. There is a good reason for that, good reason for this, good reason for everything—always wanting to spend more of the people's tax money. So I am very unhappy with the amount of money involved here.

But I think, as majority leader, it is incumbent upon me to work with all the various parties involved here to find a procedure to get this work done. We have done that, and so now I think we are ready to go forward with the debate. I believe the chairman, Senator STEVENS, is here to give some more details about what is included in this bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would ask if the majority leader would just clarify one, I hope, minor point. In the last unanimous-consent request there was a reference to legislation which provides for the continuing of Government funding at a level of 100 percent of fiscal 1997 for fiscal 1998 appropriations. I assume that the reference to that particular legislation only refers to that particular matter and no other extraneous issues that could be attached. Is that the understanding of the majority leader, there would not be anything else in the bill other than continuing appropriations?

Mr. LOTT. Oh, yes, absolutely. Only that substance. Not other unrelated matters. I can think of lots of things they might try to attach to that.

No, not at all. We want this to be considered upfront in the daylight and a sincere effort to work out a way to avoid the fun and games at the end of the fiscal year. I think this will give us that shot. And if the House adds extraneous to it, it will never come up in this form. I would work with the Senator to make sure that does not happen.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate that clarification. That is exactly the assurance I assumed the majority leader would give, and I appreciate very much appreciate his assertion in that regard.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, has it been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that the unanimous-consent request has been agreed to.

Who seeks time?

Mr. STEVENS. I wanted to make certain, Mr. President, there was an agreement that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. I want to make sure there is an agreement that the conference report that accompanied the bill, the managers' report accompanying the conference report is agreed to without any reservation as being the legislative history for the bill that will be covered by this unanimous-consent agreement. Is that understood?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Alaska making that in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. STEVENS. I do seek to add that to the unanimous consent, that the managers' report—there will be no report accompanying this bill. The statement of managers on the report on H.R. 1469 I wish to be included in this unanimous-consent request as being the legislative history for this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would certainly not object. On this side of the aisle, there are no reservations or objections to that at all.

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

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object—I will not object—my only hesitancy was I was wanting to make sure I understood the ramifications of the Senator's request. I think I do, and based on that I do not have any objections.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank both leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

#### INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS CRIME

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, several days ago a former staff member of mine in Hattiesburg, MS, brought to my attention a speech that was made at the University of Southern Mississippi to the honors college by Dick Thornburgh, former Attorney General of the United States. It was on the subject of “business crime goes international.” In the remarks, former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh talks about the international problems that are created for U.S. businesses by criminal conduct in other countries—extortion, bribery in connection with Government contracts, and the like—and options for dealing with this in a more effective way to help enhance U.S. competitiveness throughout the world. It was such an excellent speech that I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of Dick Thornburgh printed in the RECORD.

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

BUSINESS CRIME GOES INTERNATIONAL  
(By Dick Thornburgh)

Contemporary observations on the world economy are invariably premised on the vast expansion of international trade. This increased internationalization of business provides major opportunities for American interests as we begin to accommodate to the global landscape fashioned by NAFTA, the completion of the Uruguay Round of GATT and the coming into being of the new World Trade Organization.

But, as I will discuss this evening, this prospect for expansion is threatened by an accompanying growth in international business crime. Sophisticated illegal operations and enterprises have burgeoned during the 1990s as the world's economic and financial configuration has adjusted to unprecedented change.

Part of this change derives from the rapid advances in technology, communication and transportation which have made the world a smaller place and produced a network of 24-hour trading marts around the globe. Jet travel, faxes, on-line communications and real-time conferencing capabilities have gone a long way toward the realization of what was once only a hypothetical "global community."

The end of the Cold War and the rise of market economies in many areas where they were previously unknown have contributed to this process of internationalization as well. New opportunities for investors and new markets for manufacturers and service providers now exist in countries that were previously in the thrall of totalitarian governments and centrally-directed economies. In Eastern and Central Europe and in the former Soviet Union, for example, while varying degrees of success have been achieved in the actual transition from state-run economies of private enterprise, in most of these countries the commitment from the top of privatization remains a reality.

Meanwhile, in the third world, developing countries are no longer merely pawns in the struggle between democratic and communist ideologies. The socialist economic models adopted by many of these nations during this lengthy competition have been largely discredited and abandoned. It is widely recognized that private investment in market economies will be the key to figure true growth in these underdeveloped areas.

Let me share with you an experience I had at the United Nations which vividly brought this change of attitude home to me. It involved the Center for Transnational Corporations (CTC), a UN affiliate formed during the 1970s at the behest of the Group of 77, the voice of the third world countries. The CTC was created out of a desire to prevent giant Western corporations from visiting suspected predatory practices on these developing countries. Codes of conduct were proposed to regulate the actions of multinational investors so as to protect fragile developing economies. Now, as we fast forward to the 1990s, we find these same third world countries doing a 180 degree turn. They now urge the United Nations shift its emphasis to induce these same multinational firms to invest in their nations so as to help create the economic growth, jobs and better quality of life that only an expanding economy can produce.

This shift in attitudes about private investment is emphasized in a recent report of the Bretton Woods Commission. This group was established under the chairmanship of Paul Volcker to observe the 50th anniversary of the conference which established the

World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Their report noted: "Of the challenges facing the World Bank Group, none is greater than adapting to a world that has turned from public sector dominance towards private enterprise and free markets. A private sector orientation is a new one for development assistance and the World Bank Group should lead the way."

Clearly, American companies are responding to these messages. Private American investments abroad now exceed \$700 billion dollars and American businesses now employ some 5.4 million persons in foreign countries. While manufacturing operations have traditionally dominated our overseas activities, more and more growth is now taking place in the service sector. A spokesman for the prime U.S. retailer, Wal-Mart, put it this way: "It is our belief that, with trade barriers coming down, the world is going to be one big market place, and he who gets there first, does the best."

Unfortunately, there is a dark underside to this increase in international activity. With greater private sector activity has come an increase in business crime. And with a greater global reach of legitimate business has come a corresponding increase in the internationalization of illegal business activities. It is this phenomenon that I wish to address this evening.

Business crime, of course, is not an alien concept in the United States. During the nearly three decades since I first joined our Department of Justice, federal investigators and prosecutors have concentrated increasingly upon the more sophisticated types of business crimes—what Ralph Nader calls "crime in the suites."

We have seen an unprecedented emphasis in the 1990s, for example, on cases involving failed savings and loans, illegal trading in securities and commodities, defense procurement fraud, money laundering and corrupt public officials, with high rates of conviction and substantial sentences in each area.

Since the 1920s, the American phenomenon of organized crime—the business of crime itself—and its illicit monopolies in narcotics, illegal gambling and loan sharking has beleaguered legitimate enterprise and been a particular focus for intense law enforcement activities as well.

Efforts against these types of crime have been largely carried out at the federal level since these cases often cross state or international boundaries and, more often than not, require sophisticated law enforcement techniques to unravel purposely complicated transactions designed to escape detection.

Now it appears that, just as business growth has been extended into new regions and nations of the world, so has the reach of these same types of criminal activities become more evident. As new market economies have grown abroad, criminal elements have grasped the opportunity to prosper through illegal activities as well. Particularly in countries without a well-developed rule of law and an embedded legal culture (not to mention professional police establishments and an independent judiciary) criminal enterprises can easily gain a foothold and retard the full potential of increased legitimate business activity.

Consider Russia, where the world's biggest economic transition is taking place, and where more than 100 American joint ventures and partnerships are already underway. As the lumbering state-run economy evolves into a new market-oriented system, reform efforts are beset by racketeering and corruption. There we find that:

Last year, Russian organized crime controlled as much as 40 percent of the nation's turnover in goods and services.

An estimated 80 percent of Russian businesses are said to pay "protection" money to gangsters.

Practices such as the infiltration of legitimate businesses, illegal smuggling, black market activities and public corruption are rife.

The largest Russian investment firm, MMM, almost completely unregulated by our standards, virtually collapsed, leaving an estimated 10 million investors disillusioned, not only with the scam artists responsible, but with the whole notion of capitalism.

When I visited Russia as an observer of their historic parliamentary and presidential elections, rumors abounded that particular candidates were funded by the so-called "Mafiya." In Russia today, this term is used all too loosely and, in some quarters, may merely designate anyone who has turned a profit in the new economy. As one observer has noted, "[p]olice and politicians still fall into the Soviet habit of ascribing mafia connections to anyone who possess what seems to be an unreasonable amount of money." This is not surprising in a culture where generations have been taught the Marxist-Leninist catechism that "all property is theft!"

There is, to be sure, real organized crime in the Russian Federation. Its face is an ugly one indeed, as described by one observer:

"When it comes to control of individual companies, the crime bosses' methods are simple but effective. They approach the director of a large business and suggest a more manageable and productive system that will provide everyone with certain guaranteed economic returns. For the director, non-cooperation may mean unbearable operating conditions, refusals of credit, delays in supply, work-place accidents, missing payrolls—even death."

Serious business crime problems are not, of course, confined to the former Soviet sphere. Italy, where the "real" Mafia originated, is in the throes of a major continuing political crisis resulting from the impact of organized crime and official corruption upon its business and governmental structure. An Italian Small Business Association study estimates that the mob controls up to a fifth of all business activity in that country and as many as half of its financial holding companies. Public corruption has already toppled long-standing political institutions and personalities in Italy and the final returns are yet to be tallied.

Activities of other high profile criminal groups as the Japanese Yakuza, the Chinese Triads and, of course, the Colombian drug cartels have impacted the ability of free markets to operate in those countries and visited the heavy toll of corruption upon their economies.

Some even posit the coming into existence of a world-wide criminal cartel which would draw these various groups together to execute their illegal enterprises.

Political change is deeply implicated in the threats posed by business crime. One of the most frequently voiced fears I heard expressed on a recent trip to Hong Kong, for example, is what effect the July 1 take-over by the Peoples Republic of China and the uncertain future of effective law enforcement against business crime and corruption there will have on that community's thriving economy.

And while Hong Kong has highly sophisticated securities regulators and corruption fighters, what of those countries where such mechanisms do not exist? How can market economies be created or sustained without the "checks and balances" inherent in the authority to regulate securities markets, to insure competition through vigorous anti-trust enforcement and to stifle attempts to launder dirty money through legitimate financial institutions?

Money laundering, in particular, has become a \$100 billion worldwide problem. As recently pointed out in a Foreign Affairs treatment of the subject: "[I]nnovative techniques of moving and concealing vast sums of cash \* \* \* often seem to be outstripping the capacity of the international criminal justice system and its diplomatic and legal underpinnings." In one recent case, the concealing of the illegal movement of funds utilized bank and non-bank institutions in 40 different countries. The speed with which electronic transfers can be effected often leaves law enforcement "a day late and [several million] dollars short" in the pursuit of ill-gotten gains.

Finally, American firms also find themselves at a competitive disadvantage in foreign markets due to the failure of other major trading nations to emulate the strictures of our Foreign Corrupt Practices Act which makes bribery abroad a federal criminal offense. The former chief spokesman of the World Bank has pointed out that:

"International corruption hobbles American corporations, which lose deals when foreign rivals bribe foreign officials. It cheats American taxpayers whose aid dollars end up in the private bank accounts of foreign leaders. And it hurts the world's poor, when aid is siphoned off for political kickbacks by contractors intent upon selling unneeded weapons or presidential palaces."

A recent Commerce Department study estimated that U.S. companies had been edged out by foreign competitors on some \$36 billion of international business deals on account of bribes and other government-assisted activities. And—the unkindest cut of all—in many cases, these payments are tax-deductible business expenses for foreign competitors back home.

## II.

How has law enforcement reacted to this increasing internationalization of business crime? In fact, as we passed the mid-point of this decade, a great deal of effort was being expended to cope with these challenges. While the late author Claire Sterling described ours as an era where "borders have gone down for crooks, but not for cops," significant steps are being taken to increase cooperative international law enforcement efforts and help meet the problem of the internationalization of business crime. As you might expect, however, much more remains to be done.

Successful action will be required on three separate fronts: (1) stepped-up domestic law enforcement capabilities in each country; (2) bilateral initiatives to increase cooperation between nations; (3) multi-lateral efforts to insure a maximum international reach of effective law enforcement. Let me set forth a brief progress report in each of these areas.

## A.

Needless to say, an effective response to international criminal activity begins at home. Here the United States has much to share with its global partners in this effort. Statutes defining racketeering activities and various types of conspiracies, together with investigative techniques such as witness immunity, court-authorized wiretaps and expert accounting skills, are lacking in many of the countries now called upon to deal with business crimes.

Many of those with the worst problems are lacking in even the rudiments of legal and law enforcement systems to deal with sophisticated criminal activity.

The central problem for the Russian Federation, for example, is identified by one observer as "the legal vacuum at the heart of the Russian economy." That is to say, he continues, "Russian policymakers . . . tried to develop a free market before constructing

a civil society in which such a market could safely operate."

During my service as attorney general we visited the then Soviet Union in 1989 to discuss the need for the rule of law and its vigorous implementation, not only in the interest of preserving human rights and civil liberties, but to create a climate within which free markets could exist and economic growth could take place. Many of these principles were, happily, to be reflected in the new Russian constitution approved in the December, 1993 referendum.

Our Moscow meetings were following up by further exchanges here and abroad with representatives of the Russian Federation and those from other Eastern and Central European countries such as Ukraine, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland and the former Czechoslovakia, all focused on creating systems within which arbitrary rule would give way to concepts of due process enforced by an independent judiciary.

Once these benchmark principles began to be implanted, our focus switched to the nuts-and-bolts of how to make the system work in areas such as securities regulation, creditors rights, promoting competition and fighting racketeering. That work has been ably reinforced by the American Bar Association's Central and Eastern European Law Initiative (CEELI) project, seeking to establish law enforcement and regulatory mechanisms under which the free enterprise system can take root and those seeking to corrupt the system can be brought to justice.

Recently, I met in Moscow with judges of the newly-expanded commercial court system about the handling of business disputes and with Russia's new chief prosecutor concerning the need to crack down on illegal business practices.

Others have also capitalized on American know-how in dealing with law enforcement challenges. The Italian-American Working Group, established by Attorney General William French Smith, provides a forum for U.S. officials to share the latest in techniques for the investigation of organized criminal activities in both countries. And the Justice Department's International Criminal Assistance Training Program (ICITAP) has made available valuable expertise to Central and South American countries interested in ratcheting up their capabilities to deal with sophisticated criminal activity.

But the basic need continues to be the strengthening of the rule of law and legal cultures within these nations. One Chinese expert, for example, has recently emphasized that "China lacks a legal framework and effective enforcement of a legal system for a market economy." She argued further that the solution to the problem of corruption in China "rests on the development of a . . . modern legal system with binding contracts, property rights and courts to adjudicate disputes."

## B.

It is clear, however, that, no matter how proficient the domestic capabilities of any one country, including the United States, become, the challenge of international criminal activity cannot be met on a go-it-alone basis. Thus, increasing attention is being paid to cooperative efforts to ensure that neither evidence nor suspects can find "safe havens" from prosecution simply by crossing international borders.

Probably the most effective bi-lateral tool established for this type of nation-to-nation cooperation is the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, or MLAT, as it is popularly designated. During the 1970s, when I headed the Justice Department's Criminal Division, a number of executive agreements regarding

the exchange of evidence were established with foreign governments in the aftermath of allegations of illegal payments by Lockheed to foreign officials. The first MLAT treaty, however, was not ratified until 1976 when, not surprisingly, it was the Swiss government which agreed to exchange evidence with U.S. prosecutors on a somewhat limited, but since expanded, basis.

MLATS are now in effect with a total of 15 countries and they provide a useful means by which law enforcement agencies can communicate directly, avoiding sometimes cumbersome diplomatic channels and outmoded formal procedures for the acquisition of evidence. A typical MLAT covers the taking of testimony and providing of documents and other articles of evidence, the service of judicial documents, the execution of searches and seizures, the transfer of persons in custody and assistance in proceedings relating to forfeiture, restitution and the collecting of fines. Counterpart Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) have been entered into between the Securities and Exchange Commission and regulators in other countries to facilitate investigations in this field, deriving from the 1982 MOU with the Swiss government.

Incidentally, in what has been described as "the first break in the concept of universal bank secrecy," Switzerland in 1989 also adopted a tough anti-money laundering statute. This action followed our meeting with leading Swiss bankers to point out to them the threat to their reputation for probity and integrity in the world's financial circles, should they continue to be indifferent to the sources of funds deposited in their famous "Swiss bank accounts." This "know your customer" law was recently buttressed by additional criminal sanctions and the Swiss example has been followed by others as well, including the United Kingdom, Spain, Hong Kong and Canada. Money laundering also received increased emphasis at the G-7 Summit in 1989 out of which came recommendations from the Financial Action Task Force which have been activated by all leading members of the world financial community.

## C.

These multi-lateral efforts have been duplicated by other groups of countries intent upon making the whole of their collective law-enforcement efforts greater than simply the sum of their individual parts.

Within the European Community, for example, the Trevi Group meets twice a year to exchange views on law-enforcement policy and the United States (with Canada) enjoys observer status at such gatherings, giving American law officials a chance to interact with their continental counterparts on a most productive informal basis. Similar mechanisms exist within the Organization of American States and, in 1990, a meeting in Seoul, South Korea brought together attorneys general from 24 Asian and Pacific nations to exchange views on international challenges to law enforcement in that area of the world.

The most significant break-through with regard to multi-lateral law enforcement activity came, however, with the adoption in Vienna in December, 1988 of the United Nations Drug Enforcement Convention, now ratified by 115 nations. This Convention charted an entirely new course for global law enforcement requiring, as it did, the enactment of laws to criminalize specific acts involved in producing and trafficking in illegal drugs (including money-laundering), to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of assets and profits of the drug trade, to simplify the exchange of witnesses and evidence and to expedite extradition procedures.

Although confined for now to drug offenses—a politically popular and highly visible target—the UN Treaty establishes a

model for international cooperation against all types of crime that extend beyond the boundaries and the capabilities of individual countries. It will not be long, I would venture to predict, before its counterpart in the area of international business crime begins to attract substantial support in the world community.

Such a suggestion was indeed made at the World Ministerial Conference on Organized Transnational Crime held in Naples, Italy in November, 1994 and repeated at a conference on International Corruption which I attended last month in Buenos Aires, Argentina under the sponsorship of the United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice.

Why are these extraordinary mechanisms necessary? One observer has identified the "Basic challenge [to be] how to control growing domains of transnational activities that either ignore or take advantage of national borders when the powers of the state remain powerfully circumscribed by the political, geographical and legal limitations that attend notions of national sovereignty."

The international community has already responded to the threat of drug trafficking by relinquishing portions of state sovereignty through the adoption of the UN Drug Enforcement Convention. If the world is to take full advantage of the prospects for economic growth we have examined today, a similar effort against international business crime and official corruption must be mounted with the same vigor.

\* \* \* \* \*

As the nation in the forefront of the commitment to the rule of law and the containment of crime, it is to be hoped that the United States will continue to play a lead role in the endeavor to send a consistent message to international criminals, however sophisticated, that "You can run, but you cannot hide" from effective law enforcement.

To do otherwise might well forfeit the unprecedented opportunity we have to help bring the full benefits of free markets and an improved quality of life to portions of the world desperately in need of both.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. 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 from West Virginia is recognized.

#### 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, in urging the Senate to adopt the disaster assistance supplemental appropriation bill upon its receipt from the House. The funding levels contained in that bill are the same as those adopted by the Senate in the conference report on H.R. 1469 on June 5 by a vote of 67 to 31. That conference agreement, however, also contained a number of extraneous provisions to

which the President objected and which he advised would cause a veto. Upon receipt of the conference agreement to H.R. 1469, the President did, in fact, veto the measure. Subsequently, continuous efforts have been ongoing to resolve the differences on those extraneous provisions in a way that will allow the disaster assistance funding contained in this supplemental to reach the hundreds of thousands of victims of the recent disasters that have beset the Nation over past months.

In all, 33 States will be eligible for the disaster assistance funds provided in the bill. As explained in more detail by the chairman, title I of the bill contains appropriations totaling \$1.8 billion in support of our men and women in uniform engaged in peacekeeping operations around the world, particularly in Bosnia. Title II of the bill contains disaster assistance appropriations for a number of departments and agencies throughout the Federal Government with jurisdiction over the emergency relief efforts. Those appropriations total some \$5.5 billion. The bill also contains an appropriation of over \$937 million for veterans compensation and pensions.

In all, the bill totals some \$8.6 billion, the budget authority of which is fully offset by the rescissions of appropriations which are also contained in the bill.

Regarding the extraneous matters which caused the Presidential veto, it is my understanding that they have all been resolved to the satisfaction of the administration and in a way which will allow the President to sign this bill. While I regret that the enactment of this disaster assistance appropriation bill has required many weeks and a Presidential veto in order to achieve its ultimate enactment, I recognize that the proponents of the extraneous provisions that caused the delay feel very strongly about the merits of their provisions, and I appreciate their willingness to allow the removal or modification of them in a way that will allow this bill to go forward so that its benefits can then be forthcoming to the American people for whom they are intended.

In closing, Mr. President, I urge all Members to support the bill, and I congratulate the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and my House counterpart, Mr. OBEY, for their efforts in reaching this agreement, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. STEVENS. In addition, I also thank our distinguished minority leader, Mr. DASCHLE, who has worked tirelessly day and night in resolving these issues. The majority leader, Mr. LOTT, is also to be commended for his efforts on this bill.

How much time do I have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 29 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD.

Mr. President, this legislation comes as an enormous relief. As the occupant of the Chair knows well, I have come to the floor many times to plead with my colleagues to deliver this assistance and deliver it as quickly as possible. We have been hung up here, now, in the 54th day since the dikes broke at Grand Forks. A town of 50,000 was completely evacuated; tens of thousands of people still, today, are not back. We have people still who are sleeping on cots, living in cars; thousands of people who are wondering when is help going to come.

We heard over the weeks that there was money in the pipeline. I can tell you, from a local perspective, the money has not been getting through that is necessary for rebuilding and recovery. So this legislation that has now come from the House represents an incredible victory for the people in the disaster areas because the offending provisions, those that caused the President to veto the bill, are now removed. What we have is a clean disaster relief bill, which is what the people of the disaster areas have asked for sincerely, and in many ways with, I think, real patience, because 54 days have elapsed before we are finally going to see this legislation pass and be signed by the President of the United States. Mr. President, a clean disaster relief bill, thank goodness; many of us wondered if this day was going to come and here it is. This bill represents real help that is going to make the difference, a real difference in the lives of people.

I just remind my colleagues, this is what we look at in Grand Forks today. This is the rubble that is left by the devastation of downtown Grand Forks. Remember, we experienced a multiplicity of disasters. We had, first of all, 10 feet of snow this winter, the most snow we have ever had, followed by the most powerful winter storm in 50 years that eliminated electricity for 80,000 people for more than a week, followed by a 500-year flood, by far the worst flood ever in our history. It was absolutely devastating. Then, in the midst of that, a fire that burned much of downtown Grand Forks.

I tell you, we began to think this was apocalyptic. But still, today, we are living with the results. This is the picture of just one boulevard. On every street in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, this is what you see: The rubble piled, 5, 6 feet high. You can go down the streets and you can see what kind of washer and dryer everybody had in Grand Forks, because they are all out in the boulevards. Every item of personal furniture and clothing is out on these boulevards. People left at 1 o'clock in the morning with only the