

I will turn to the Senator from Mississippi who will be managing the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, the leader is absolutely correct when he suggests there may very well be another supplemental request submitted. This request that is being presented to the Senate tonight is in response to a direct request from the President for \$2 billion to replenish a fund that has run out of money, or will be exhausted in the morning.

The House is acting tonight to approve the request of the President for the additional \$2 billion. The Senate should act tonight also, without getting into discussions of additional funding for other disasters or other needs around the country, because this situation is an ongoing disaster in Florida. Without these funds being made available tonight, in response to the President's request, they will not be able to continue the debris removal, providing shelter and food for those disaster victims who need those benefits. The disaster relief fund will be exhausted.

So my hope is we can consider additional requests, such as the one being suggested by the distinguished leader from South Dakota. We will carefully consider any other requests, but tonight is not the time to get into the business of picking out which other amendments or additions should be included in this dire emergency request we are being called upon to make to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will quickly respond. It is certainly not my intention to object to this request. I think both Senators have spoken very accurately about the need to expeditiously consider this supplemental funding request. I will say, however, that the ongoing disasters—especially in the Dakotas but around the country—in areas affecting agriculture will have to be addressed. We cannot ignore it indefinitely. We can certainly understand the need for urgent action tonight on this particular request, but I do hope we can come back at a later date, in the not-too-distant future, to address in a more comprehensive way other disasters as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I object to the proposed modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader, what are the factors that decide whether a particular disaster merits this kind of expedited action and which ones do not? I certainly want to agree with what the Democratic leader just said because my

State, which is adjacent to his, has suffered for the last 4 years now from various disasters. After the first 2 years, we were finally able to get the administration to relent and allow for one of those 2 years to be covered for farmers, many of whom lost their entire crop in our State.

Last year, we had another round of natural disasters, and there was no disaster relief provided or authorized by the Congress or agreed to by the administration. Now, this year, my State has just experienced a frost that has cost \$190 million in damages, and it is likely to mount.

Again, when the majority leader—I respect his candor—says that further requests or supplementals may be forthcoming, that is not much consolation to my farmers and constituents; whereas, now in the State of Florida—and I share the Democratic leader's sympathies for that State because there are many Minnesota residents who are affected who have part-time residencies in the State of Florida—but on behalf of those who live all the time in Minnesota, they are not going to be as sympathetic when their needs continue to be ignored and right away Florida gets this kind of expedited assistance.

I wonder, again, what are the criteria and are they going to apply to any State other than Florida?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will make a very brief response because I talked about it a couple times on the floor today. FEMA is out of money—FEMA is out of money—beginning in about 12 hours. So without trying to go through each request by each Senator, certain criteria can be applied. FEMA will be out of money tomorrow. We are talking about FEMA generally. That is why this \$2 billion is being expedited tonight at the request of the President of the United States. I understand there can be many individual requests, but the criteria are the agency in charge of emergency management broadly will be out of money tomorrow.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I do respect the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Thank you, Mr. President.

The farmers in my State are out of money. There are farmers in my State who were out of money last year who have been forced into bankruptcy. How do they make the necessary appeal to the President to get on his list? Is it required that the Governor of the State be the brother of the President? How is this going to be handled? Because based on the most recent hurricane, Frances—again, I am sympathetic to those affected, which includes Minnesotans, but we are going to have another request. Can we have an assurance there will be an opportunity at that time, as the Democratic leader is

trying to obtain, so we can offer amendments to have the Senate consider other requests for disaster aid? Is that something on which we could get a concurrence?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will sort of restate what to the Democratic leader we tried to say. There will be opportunities to consider individual States. Right now we have an emergency for the agency which responds to all of our emergencies—FEMA.

We have a deadline. The President made this specific request last night. There will be opportunities to talk about particular Senators' interests in representing their constituents as to what are legitimate concerns. But I do plead, for the sake of people around the country, including in Florida, as we speak, that we do not, in essence, defund our Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, when we have this opportunity to take a bill that is coming from the House, going to the Senate floor, requested by the President of the United States, so people can have shelter and can have food and emergency services because the deficiency is that tomorrow they will be out of money.

Mr. President, let me just one more time propound the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object to say that I will not object in this case but with the understanding that the next time, as the majority leader said, there will be opportunities. If there is another supplemental request, I will insist on the opportunity to at least have these other requests considered. I will not object.

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

(The text of the bill (H.R. 5005) is printed in today's RECORD under "Message from the House during Adjournment.")

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4567

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, September 8, at 11:30 a.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 588, H.R. 4567, the Homeland Security appropriations bill; provided that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 2537 be inserted in lieu thereof and considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; provided further that no points of order be waived by virtue of this agreement. I further ask consent that the only first-degree amendments in order be related to the text of the bill, homeland security, natural disasters, or Government security contracts, and that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments to

the first degree to which they are offered. Finally, I ask consent that following passage of the bill, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I certainly will not object, but I wish to clarify the matter pertaining to going to conference. I have had a conversation with the majority leader, and he has given me his assurance that this would not be used as a vehicle for debt limit, and we do not intend for this legislation to be a larger omnibus bill. I know some colleagues perhaps on both sides of the aisle have expressed that concern. I think we can say with confidence that is not the intent.

It is also my hope that this unanimous consent agreement would be the first installment perhaps of a series which would also include a finite list, perhaps within the next 24 hours or so, that would give us a clear understanding of what these amendments may be. But we would ask for cooperation on both sides of the aisle in that there will be plenty of opportunities and other circumstances to offer amendments that may exceed the bounds of this agreement. But I am real hopeful we can get good bipartisan cooperation and complete the work on time.

But I would ask the majority leader if he could confirm the clarification with regard to intent when we go to conference.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this is an extension of a conversation we have had. Again, we have been talking over the course of the day as to how we can, as quickly as possible, address the Homeland Security appropriations bill that the distinguished manager will be talking to shortly, sort of introducing what we will be talking about tomorrow.

Indeed, the Democratic leader is correct. This will not be a vehicle either for addressing the debt limit or for an omnibus appropriations type bill. We will work together on this very important bill to efficiently, effectively, and deliberately consider amendments that are appropriate for homeland security and then bring this to closure after appropriate debate and amendment. His understanding is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Homeland Security appropriations legislation is the bill that we will be going to first thing tomorrow. It is a bill that is important. It is a bill that we need to address for the safety and security of the American people. I am very hopeful we can address both concerns and de-

bate the amendments in an expeditious way so we can complete the bill and get it to the President as soon as possible.

With that, I will yield the floor. I know the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is going to want to make some comments at some point as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

#### ESPN 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on a lighter note and a moment of celebration, I would like to take a few minutes of the Senate's time to congratulate an institution located in my home State of Connecticut which is going to be celebrating today its 25th anniversary as an institution. I speak of ESPN, the network which is enjoying 25 years of existence as a network.

I want to read the lead paragraph from a newspaper article that appeared on June 27, 1979, in the *Journal Inquirer*, a newspaper located in Connecticut. The lead paragraph of this story reads as follows:

Cable television may be the place for over 150 hours of local sports programming starting this fall. The Entertainment and Sports Programming Network—

ESPN—

an independent cable television production company, announced here Monday plans to televise up to 20 hours a week—

Think of that, 20 hours a week—

of both professional and amateur local sports programming.

That was 25 years ago. I ask unanimous consent that this news story be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

[From the *Journal Inquirer*, June 27, 1978]

NETWORK PLANNING TV SPORTS

(By Matt Buckler)

PLAINVILLE.—Cable television may be the place for over 150 hours of local sports programming starting this fall. The Entertainment and Sports Programming Network, an independent cable television production company, announced here Monday plans to televise up to 20 hours a week of both professional and amateur local sports programming.

Among the programs scheduled to begin in September are 12 state college football games and 24 state college basketball games. Also in the planning stage is the televising of the New England Whaler road games.

"We've had two exploratory meetings with the Whalers and we have a full-blown proposal in the works," said Ed Eagan, president of Cable Promotions. "We could be televising more Whaler games than have ever been on television before."

Other sports events scheduled to be shown in the first phase of the project, which will run from September 9 to Memorial Day, are a sports magazine show, which will feature such topics as hot air ballooning and hang gliding, a Gordie Howe instructional hockey series, and a talk show with Colleen Howe.

ESP will be offering these programs to the 20 cable television companies throughout Connecticut. It will be up to the individual companies whether or not they want to carry the package and if they will charge extra for it to its subscribers.

"We've talked informally to three cable companies and so far they are very receptive to our idea," said Bill Rasmussen, the vice-president in charge of programming. Rasmussen was formerly the Communications Director for the Whalers.

Scott Rasmussen will serve as Production Director and WTIC announcers Arnold Dean and Lou Palmer will handle the play-by-play.

The series is scheduled to get underway September 9 with a college football game. It is also probable that the company will carry the scholastic basketball and hockey championships, according to Eagan.

Although the company will be based in Plainville, it is not affiliated with any cable company. It will attempt to sell its sports programming to the individual companies.

Mr. DODD. That story was the harbinger of what has become one of the great stories of the media in the last 100 years or longer.

It is not an exaggeration to say that ESPN has radically changed the way we see, hear, and follow sports, not only here in America, but around the world. The network has truly become, as its slogan proclaims, "The Worldwide Leader in Sports."

Over the past quarter-century, ESPN has transformed itself from a minuscule cable television network to one of the leading names in national media, reaching over 94 million Americans each week. If ESPN were an athlete, it would be the little-known draft pick from a small school who made it all the way to the Hall of Fame.

It is hard to believe it today, but in those early years, ESPN found it difficult to fill up its schedule with sports. The June 27, 1978 issue of one of our local newspapers, the *Journal Inquirer*, under the headline "Network Planning TV Sports," reported the modest goals of a new station that would televise "up to 20 hours a week of both professional and amateur local sports programming."

Today, to say that ESPN has managed to fill its schedule is an understatement. Today, if one is asked the question, "What's on ESPN," the most appropriate response might be, "Which ESPN do you mean?" There is ESPN, the flagship network. There is ESPN2. There is ESPNEWS, the 24-hour sports news station. There is ESPN Classic, where nostalgic sports fans can relive the exploits of Mickey Mantle, Jim Brown, Muhammad Ali, and countless others. There is ESPN Deportes, a 24-hour Spanish-language sports network, not to mention ESPN International and ESPN Radio. And, of course, there is ESPN.com, which has become one of the most popular sites on the internet, much to the dismay of office managers everywhere.

ESPN has truly lived the corporate version of the American dream. As its announcers might say, when it comes to sports broadcasting, you can't stop ESPN; you can only hope to contain it.