Mr. Speaker, I must also ask why we do not allow the extraneous provisions attached to the disaster bill to stand on their own. Are we afraid they will not stand up to the scrutiny of the committee process? If these are good ideas that will benefit the American people, let them stand alone. If these extraneous provisions have a broad base of support among the American people, allow the Members of this body to consider them on their own merits. Attaching them to a disaster relief bill is cowardly.

I will briefly address just one of these provisions. In the 104th Congress, the House asked the Census Bureau to cut costs on the 2000 census. Followup analysis of the 1990 census done by the Bureau shows that our current method is resulting in an undercount. The National Academy of Sciences has told us a statistical technique called sampling will result in a more accurate count for the final 10 percent of Americans, those who do not respond to the questionnaires. The Census Bureau tells us the use of this technique will save them $1 billion in conducting the 2000 census, almost 25 percent of their cost. The Republicans seek to ban a technique which scientists tell us is better and the counters tell us is cheaper.

Mr. Speaker, this does not add up. The fact that this is attached to a disaster relief bill is a red flag waving high in the sky. It is enormously suspicious, especially when given that a few years back, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, specifically requested sampling to be used in his own State.

Mr. Speaker, one side of this debate has been up front with the victims of this flood and one side has made them pawns in a political game. The Fargo-Moorhead Forum newspaper concluded on Sunday morning and I quote again: ''Republican leaders in Congress continue to play outrageous political games with the lives and futures of Red River Valley flood victims.''

How true and how sad it is.

A clean disaster relief bill is the right thing to do. Mr. Speaker, let us get it done.

WHAT IS A PERCEPTION'S REALITY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate on TV and decided to come over and get involved a little bit. I heard the Beatles' name brought up earlier, and listening to this debate, I am reminded of another Beatles' line out of Strawberry Fields Forever. ''They say living is easy with eyes closed; misunderstanding all you see.'' And then of course the hook is all about how nothing is real in Strawberry Fields.

Well, nothing is real in this debate either. It reminds me so much of what happened over the past couple of years where we had Medicare come up first, and how we Republicans hated our grandmothers and senior citizens because we wanted Medicare to increase at 7.2 percent but the President and the Democrats, who loved our grandparents so much more than us, wanted it to increase at 7.3, 7.4 percent.

Today, I think we voted on the bill in Ways and Means where it passed something like 30 to 3, a similar bill to what so many people were attacking before.

Now it is flood victims. It was also children. We hated children because we only wanted the School Lunch Program to go up 4 percent instead of 6 or 7 percent.

Now we are talking about flood victims, talking about how we want to hurt the flood victims. Of course, as happened during the Government shutdown when the President vetoed bill after bill after bill that we sent him, what people did not recognize was that it was the President who was vetoing the bills. It was the President who vetoed this bill today.

So the President, of course, was handed a wonderful, wonderful issue. It was put in his lap. And I have to wonder how we Republicans keep stepping into it and making these mistakes, but we do because we actually think that we should debate on the merits instead of on political points.

Which brings me to point two. The fact is that this crisis has been created for political purposes. What we do not hear is the fact that FEMA is funded, at least through this month. And we also saw in an AP report about a month ago, when this debate first started coming up before the Memorial Day break, when the President needed an issue, what he did, because the agencies were funded through this time period, he actually pushed up, he forward-funded, according to the AP articles, requirements so he could say, gee, these people are not getting their money.

So the President pushed the dates up for funding so he could create a political crisis, and that is what he did. And so now the President can get out and once again be compassionate and be the one that loves flood victims when Republicans supposedly hate flood victims.

So let us keep a list now. It is senior citizens, it is young children and it is flood victims. I guess the Democrats believe a sucker is born every day.

I can tell my colleagues that I constantly have hurricane victims in my district. I understand how this situation works, and certainly I feel compassion for the people that have been suffering this crisis.

In another area that, again, maybe nothing is real, or maybe as Henry Kissinger says, ''In politics, what is a perception's reality,'' we keep hearing people say just give us a clean bill, just let us fund the flood victims, that is all we really need, when, in reality, if somebody would pick up the New York Times this morning and read in the New York Times that this so-called clean flood bill, where we needed $750 million to actually fund the flood victims, ended up being an $8.4 billion monstrosity.

Now, I want to know where were all these self-righteous people when these emergency parking garages were being put in this bill; when, according to the New York Times article, we threw in, as ''an emergency funding'' a theater, with theater renovations. And they went and asked the guy who owned the theater, is this theater really an emergency, and he said, well, we had a couple of pipes that leaked last year.

The fact is that we have shoved, these same people who are now screaming give us a clean bill were the same people, both sides, Republicans and Democrats, that were shoving as much stuff into this so-called emergency appropriations bill as they could. And yet now they come back and they whine about how they need a clean bill. Well, that did not seem to concern them that much before.

Also, we shoved in money for apple orchardists. I guess they were so shocked and stunned by the visions they saw on TV that they were not able to attend to their apple orchards. Maybe that requires funding in this emergency appropriations bill.

If we read the New York Times article, we can see that these arguments about how they just want a clean bill is disingenuous. Everybody has gathered around the table and thrown all they could on there.

Finally, we should talk about what this issue is all about. It is about a continuing resolution issue, where we wanted to avoid letting the President do what he did before, vetoing appropriation bill after appropriation bill, and then coming out and going I will not let the Republicans do this, that, or the other.

□ 2115

Again, it is disingenuous. This CR is the only way we ensure that we continue funding FEMA and other agencies at 100 percent without the President vetoing these bills time in and time out, without using flood victims for political purposes.

I say, let us get to the facts of the matter and let us stop using the flood victims as political pawns.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Second District of Minnesota. It is a district that contains almost the entire length of Minnesota River. Minnesota River flows through a broad valley. I think for many, it is known as