

that operate the same kind of businesses.

S. 1 also has the potential of causing havoc in the legislative process and aiding in the very gridlock we are all so desperate to avoid. It's very important that we require an analysis of the impact of costs on State and local governments and the private sector before a committee reports a bill to the full Senate for consideration. That's what the hearing process is supposed to be about. The public is supposed to let us know just what the consequences of our proposals could be. And, it's very important that the requirement for a cost analysis be enforced by saying that a point of order will lie against a bill that doesn't have that cost analysis. But to go to the next step and say that an often problematical cost estimate will now become the actual cost—that what CBO estimates will be the cost to State and local governments for each year of the authorization, moves from being a cost estimate to an assertion of actual costs and that that level of costs should be funded—that is an unreasonable approach. And the mechanisms used to enforce that approach could cause endless delays and tie up the legislative process.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I will vote against the conference report. I do want to commend, however, Senator GLENN and Senator KEMPTHORNE in their successful effort on this bill. Setting aside our differing opinions on the final outcome, I think these two gentlemen have conducted themselves in a remarkably able fashion with good humor and a strong sense of fairness. I particularly appreciate Senator GLENN's efforts to be responsive to my concerns, and I congratulate him on accomplishing passage of this bill. The State and local officials have a great friend and supporter in the senior Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

#### YEAS—91

Abraham	Dole	Inouye
Akaka	Domenici	Jeffords
Ashcroft	Dorgan	Johnston
Baucus	Exon	Kassebaum
Bennett	Faircloth	Kemphorne
Biden	Feingold	Kennedy
Bingaman	Feinstein	Kerrey
Bond	Ford	Kerry
Breaux	Frist	Kohl
Brown	Glenn	Kyl
Bryan	Gorton	Lott
Burns	Graham	Lugar
Campbell	Graham	Mack
Chafee	Grams	McCain
Coats	Grassley	McConnell
Cochran	Gregg	Mikulski
Cohen	Harkin	Moseley-Braun
Conrad	Hatch	Moynihan
Coverdell	Hatfield	Murkowski
Craig	Heflin	Murray
D'Amato	Helms	Nickles
Daschle	Hollings	Nunn
DeWine	Hutchison	Packwood
Dodd	Inhofe	Pell

Pressler	Shelby	Thomas
Pryor	Simon	Thompson
Reid	Simpson	Thurmond
Robb	Smith	Warner
Rockefeller	Snowe	Wellstone
Roth	Specter	
Santorum	Stevens	

#### NAYS—9

Boxer	Byrd	Levin
Bradley	Lautenberg	Lieberman
Bumpers	Leahy	Sarbanes

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we be permitted time to submit the final report of the Senate Task Force on Funding Disaster Relief, which Senator BOND and I were commissioned to do last year. And I ask that the pending business be set aside so we can present that report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SENATE DISASTER RELIEF TASK FORCE REPORT

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am very pleased at this time, along with my friend and colleague from Missouri, Mr. BOND, as cochairs to lay before the Senate the Final Report of the Senate Task Force on Funding Disaster Relief. The task force was established pursuant to a sense-of-the-Senate resolution contained in Public Law 103-211, the emergency supplemental appropriations relief bill for victims of the Northridge, CA, earthquake.

I think I can speak for Senator BOND when I say that our sense of accomplishment in presenting this report is somewhat tempered by events past and present, in that we have just marked the solemn 1-year anniversary of the devastating California earthquake. For all the good that has happened in the past year, thanks to selfless efforts by friends, neighbors, charities and, yes, Government bureaucrats of all stripes, we know that for so many their lives have been irrevocably changed.

We also share the grief and shock of the Japanese people who had a tragedy of their own, the horrendous Kobe earthquake. We know the character of the Japanese people, and given some time and help—and we are glad President Clinton and the able Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], James Lee Witt, have offered some of our technical expertise—we know the Japanese will soon be on their feet again.

These catastrophes—and need I mention the terribly destructive floods which recently rained down on Califor-

nia—underscore the importance of having an integrated and comprehensive emergency management system, and we are making great progress toward that goal today.

Our task force was commissioned to look at Federal disaster assistance programs, funding and effectiveness, possible program and policy modifications, budgetary and funding options, and the role of State, local, and other service providers.

The report covers a spectrum of issues on how we can best ensure that Federal assistance will always be there when needed and how our disaster response system might be made more efficient and more cost-effective. Given the enormity of this project, Senator BOND and I decided to enlist the resources of congressional entities such as the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], the Library of Congress, and, in particular, the General Accounting Office [GAO], which we tasked to coordinate and take the lead working with our staff on the preparation of this study.

The end product, I believe, is a testament to the professional work and collaboration of all of these different groups and bodies. Many individuals labored long and hard, and we in the Senate owe them a debt of gratitude.

One of the more striking aspects we found was the lack of comprehensive Government-wide data on Federal disaster expenditures. I had thought going in this would be readily available. We found it was not. While most agencies can produce statistics for a particular disaster or annual spending, the number of persons assisted and estimated benefits, these have not been systematically collected across Government—until now.

GAO has totaled up how much we have spent across the board between 1977 through 1993. In doing so, they examined our disaster planning, mitigation response, and recovery programs, and these programs I would like to describe in just a little bit more detail.

Our disaster preparedness and mitigation programs consist chiefly of FEMA grants and assistance for fire suppression, floodplain management, earthquake and hurricane vulnerability; flood control and coastal erosion works under the Army Corps of Engineers; NOAA's severe weather tracking programs; U.S.G.S. earthquake and volcanic reduction programs, and; coastal zone management activities through the Department of Commerce.

In the area of Federal disaster response and recovery programs, we are dealing primarily with FEMA's individual and public assistance grants, temporary housing, community disaster loans, and unemployment benefits; Small Business Administration loans; repairing crucial roadways through the Department of Transportation; aid for the restoration of school facilities by the Department of Education; disaster