every person, wherever they are located in the world.

The North Korea Human Rights Act highlights this problem and establishes a position for this country that hopefully will be a model position for many countries around the world in dealing with the human rights tragedy inside North Korea.

I thank the Members of this body for allowing this presentation. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HELP THE VICTIMS OF AGRICULTURAL NATURAL DISASTERS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, South Dakotans have always been generous when our fellow Americans, even those living thousands of miles away, are suffering.

After September 11, we saw equipment makers, firefighters, school children, scout troops, church organizations, and countless other South Dakotans donate whatever they could to the victims. One ranch couple, themselves struggling, even sold 100 calves and dedicated the proceeds to the victims.

As hurricanes ravaged, and continue to threaten, Florida, South Dakotans sent not only their prayers, but also generators and plywood. Yet, while all of these things have taken place, South Dakota has been experiencing its own disaster, the slow-motion disaster of drought.

For the last several years, South Dakotans have been impacted to varying degrees by drought. In fact, 2002 was the worst drought since the Dust Bowl year of 1936. That is why I have worked so hard to get natural disaster aid for our state in the 2002 farm bill. The provision was not in the House-passed farm bill, and it was opposed and eventually stopped by the administration.

That is why I felt that as the Senate considered disaster assistance for the people of Florida, it was time for us to look for ways to help the people of South Dakota and other areas of the Nation who have been the victims of agricultural disasters. Make no mistake about it, this aid would help farmers and ranchers in Florida who have lost a majority of their citrus crop, much of the nursery stock and hundreds of head of cattle. In fact, farmers in Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Georgia and all along the eastern seaboard were seriously damaged by the myriad hurricanes, and the devastation may not be over. But for farmers and ranchers in the upper Midwest, the drought has continued for years.

On August 17, I wrote to the President expressing my support for assistance to hurricane victims and asking him to include other natural disaster victims, including drought-related disaster relief, in any emergency-funding request that he might send to Congress. While the Bush administration did not include this funding in its emergency hurricane funding requests, I still believed there was a way to secure this assistance.

When the first disaster assistance bill for Florida was on the floor of the Senate, I attempted to include agricultural disaster assistance in that legislation. While a procedural maneuver blocked that effort, we were able to secure a commitment from Senator FRIST to allow a vote on drought relief as part of the Homeland Security appropriations measure. On September 15, we got that vote, and the Senate passed a bipartisan provision for $2.9 billion in emergency disaster relief to agricultural producers.

This is a tremendously important for farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation, including those in South Dakota. It is important for our nation's rural economy, and for all of the communities that have waited too long for this relief.

The package includes $2.5 billion in assistance to crop producers through the crop disaster program, $475 million to livestock producers through the livestock assistance program, and $20 million for the tree assistance program. While some of us would have preferred assistance for both 2003 and 2004, the provision that passed would allow producers to choose compensation for either the 2003 or 2004 crop year.

The Senate's passage of this assistance is not the final step in this process, and the Senate and the House are currently meeting to resolve the differences they have with the Homeland Security bill.

I am deeply troubled by news reports that some in the House Republican leadership and the Bush administration are opposed to this most recent emergency aid provision. I would hope that the broad bipartisan support for this disaster provision in the Senate will convince the House and the President to provide the support farmers and ranchers across the country so badly need.

I wholeheartedly support providing States like Florida with the assistance they need to bounce back from a hurricane. By unanimously approving this agriculture-related disaster aid, the Senate also acknowledged something South Dakotans know far too well: victims of agricultural natural disasters are no less deserving of assistance than victims of hurricanes, floods, or tornadoes.

In South Dakota, we believe in helping our neighbors through tough times. But sometimes, we need some help, too.

I am hopeful that help will soon be on the way, and the administration will reverse its long-standing opposition to agricultural disaster aid for farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation.

STATUS OF THE TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the state of the transportation bill. That bill expired a year ago, and we have been operating on short-term extensions ever since. The delay has denied us the opportunity to create over 100,000 jobs and has led to continuing uncertainty in the States as they try to make contract and construction decisions without knowing what funding will be available. Our states, our communities, and our infrastructure deserve better.

It is not as if there have been no efforts to pass a new and stronger transportation bill. The Senate-passed transportation bill was a model of bipartisanship. It met the needs of States like South Dakota, which have a sparse population, but have a large geography and many miles of roads. Likewise, it ensures that the more populated States were treated fairly.

In the Senate bill, we were able to reach an agreement that worked for everyone. Our bill not only treated States fairly, but it treated transit fairly. There has often been a struggle between highways and transit, and the Senate bill struck a good balance. More importantly, it was a bill that did right by America's families, making critical investments in our infrastructure, and creating nearly 2 million jobs in the process.

The one area where we were unable to reach agreement was on the rail provisions, and I am hopeful that we can work to remedy that as we move forward. Having a dependable and affordable rail system to transport goods, including agricultural commodities, is critical to our Nation.

It is clear to me that despite the broad bipartisan agreement we were able to reach in the Senate, the rejection of that agreement by the President and some of the House majority leadership means that we are being denied the opportunity to debate and pass a bipartisan transportation bill.

Senators BOND and REID have suggested that we give some certainty to the States by ensuring that they will have a steady funding stream for the next 6 months. Senator SHELBY and Senator SARBANES, our leaders on the Banking Committee and on transit issues, agree. I, too, think that this is, unfortunately, the best course of action given the situation in which we find ourselves. And so I am hopeful that the majority leader will take up the bill early next week.

The reason for not completing this bill is clearly over the question of resources. The administration has not been willing to consider any bill that is anything other than their proposed $256 billion. In fact, the President threatened to veto both the House and Senate-passed bills because they contained