agree is not a difference between us. There may be others, but this is not, because a volunteer, involved in that type of activity, is not protected.

Mr. President, I might point out, too, the announcement that this legislation would be before the Senate was published in the calendar issued by the majority leader to everybody, including the minority leader, some time back. It specifically said that on Monday, April 28, this is the legislation that would be before us. We are now up to 55 votes to break this filibuster. I guess I could be somewhat relieved. At the rate we are going we will only need five more cloture votes and we will actually be able to proceed to the congressional response to the President's summit on voluntarism. We have heard a lot about gridlock, about not being able to do anything, and this is a very visible example right here on the Senate floor of the obstacle and hurdle, the gridlock that is preventing us from proceeding to a very good piece of legislation. It has broad support all across the country. It would help volunteers step forward and participate and respond to the President's request. But we are being blocked by a Democrat filibuster to prevent our proceeding to S. 543, the Volunteer Protection Act.

I would like to take a moment or two, here, to talk about the responses to the limited debate from the other side about the bill. Most of the debate has been about other subjects.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield?

Mr. COVERDELL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator for yielding. One of the reasons for the discussion about the other subjects is especially the gravity of the disaster that has occurred in the States of Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota. A number of us wanted to address the issue. We face a markup this afternoon, and hope very much that can occur without extraneous amendments and we wanted to discuss that a bit. I appreciate very much the courtesy.

I wonder if the Senator might indicate to me when we might be able to get some time?

Mr. COVERDELL. Of course we are on S. 543, as you know.

Mr. DORGAN. I understand.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would say I would need maybe another 10 or 15 minutes on this matter before yielding to the other side.

Let me also say, in deference, having experienced this sort of natural disaster in my own State, I can appreciate the deep concern of the Senator about it. It is my understanding that the supplemental is being marked up this afternoon. To have listened to the debate yesterday, you would have thought it was already out of committee, though. That is a proposal that is still in committee. This is a matter that is before the Senate.

We have heard that voluntarism is healthier than ever, we have millions of volunteers, and we do not need a bill to encourage voluntarism. That is simply not the case, clearly not the case. According to the Independent Sector report, the percentage of Americans volunteering dropped from 54 percent in 1989 to 51 percent in 1991 and 48 percent in 1993. So, from 1989, the number of Americans willing to volunteer has dropped 54, to 51, to 48. There may be any number of factors involved. I commend the President and ex-Presidents for trying to step forward and call on Americans to reverse the trend.

If they want to reverse the trend, they are going to have to deal with this subject. They are going to have to make it not a threat to be a volunteer. They are going to have to create a condition that the volunteer, in addition to being asked to come forward and provide the public service, is not at the same time saying, ''And I am going to take my family's home and bank account and put them on a Russian roulette lottery wheel to see if they are going to be at risk.''

The Gallup organization studied voluntarism and found, in a study titled, ''Liability Crisis and the Use of Volunteers of Nonprofit Associations,'' that approximately 1 in 10 nonprofit organizations has experienced the resignation of a volunteer due to liability concerns. The only way we are going to turn that around is to pass S. 543, and to do it quickly. All the work of General Powell and the Presidents and the 30 Governors and 100 mayors in Philadelphia—that is a beautiful visual, and inspirational, but, unless we do something pragmatic like protecting these volunteers, you are not going to get the response that you are looking for.

The Gallup organization also found that one in six volunteers reported withholding services due to a fear of exposure to liability suits. That is the point I made about, you step forward to volunteer but you are also putting at risk your home, your assets, your savings accounts. That is a little bit more to ask of a volunteer than I think they will find to be acceptable.

One in seven nonprofit agencies have eliminated one or more of their valuable programs because of exposure to lawsuits. So, there are a number of conditions at play here. Not only do the organizations have to invest more of their dollars into insurance costs to try to protect the volunteers—and of course when it goes to insurance it is not buying swimming lessons, it is not feeding the hungry, it does not pay for medicine or assistance that goes to an elderly person. It goes to an insurance company to protect the volunteer, as best they can, from a lawyer in a lawsuit.

So, it is diverting resources away from the purposes of the charity. It says, ''We have heard that there is no evidence of a national crisis involving a flood of lawsuits and huge damage awards against volunteers of nonprofit organizations.''

First, volunteers and organizations sued are not interested in publicizing the fact. They would just as soon it not be heard. So you really don't have a true sense of the magnitude of these lawsuits. Second, many cases are settled out of court. So there is no judgment entered. Again, insurance companies are not interested in publicizing or providing data on their settlements.

Mr. President, I am told we have several Senators who are seeking time on various matters. I am going to ask unanimous consent, see if I can get this right, that we would next turn to Senator DORGAN for 10 minutes, go to Senator MCCAIN for 10 minutes, Senator CONRAD for 10 minutes and Senator HUTCHISON for 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

THE DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I know there is discussion this morning, again, about a meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee this afternoon, now scheduled for 2 o'clock, to deal with the disaster supplemental appropriations bill. I come to the floor only to urge, as I did yesterday, that the committee consider the disaster appropriations bill and the issues in that bill without adding additional extraneous amendments or matters that are unrelated to the bill.

I do not want to or intend to debate other issues. There are people who have amendments, I am sure, that they feel strongly about—amendments on various bills. But I encourage them very strongly to find other places to offer amendments if they feel they need to offer amendments.

We have several amendments that I understand have been noticed that have nothing at all to do with the disaster supplemental bill. They are extraneous, unrelated issues that people want to put on this piece of legislation because, I suppose, they believe this kind of legislation will ultimately be signed by the President. But, to add extraneous or unrelated matters to this supplemental appropriations bill that is to be passed to respond to a disaster, only will increase the amount of time it takes to enact this bill. It will jeopardize the passage, I suspect, if they are very controversial amendments. And, in my judgment, that is not what we should do on this disaster bill.

So, I encourage my colleagues today, as we go to a markup, to join all of us in working to pass a bill that is free of extraneous or unrelated amendments that would cause problems for the bill.

I want, as I did yesterday, to commend Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD and all of the others on the committee who, in a bipartisan way, have worked very hard with us to respond to a disaster that occurred in our part of the country.

In many ways, facing the kind of disaster that was faced in North and

South Dakota and Minnesota brings out the best in people. It was really heartwarming to have seen during this disaster the thousands and thousands of people, many of them young people—high school and college students—and folks in their senior years, show up at sandbag lines to stack sandbags to build dikes to fight the river.

It is an extraordinary thing to see what people have done, the acts of heroism that have occurred so frequently, especially up in the Red River Valley, in this flood fight and the fight against the fire and the fight to overcome the effects of the massive blizzards.

The victims of all of this are the tens of thousands of people who were displaced. The city of Grand Forks is a city of nearly 50,000 people with no one living there, streets inundated with water. The only traffic in Grand Forks was by three or four Coast Guard boats taking people up and down and some law enforcement people on the outside of the city trying to make certain that there was order. But other than that, this was a city inundated and a city evacuated.

Of all the wonderful things people have done—and there are so many—I noticed last evening that an unidentified woman from California decided that she wanted to make a personal donation of $2,000 per household in Grand Forks, ND, to those men and women who have suffered damages to their homes. What a wonderful thing for someone to do. That will cost millions of dollars. An anonymous donor says, ''I want to step up here and help.'' What a wonderful thing to do.

Part of what is needed to be done, as well, is the Federal Government to understand that that region cannot recover by itself. It needs a helping hand by the Government to say to our region, ''You're not alone. The rest of the people in this country want to help,'' as we have done so often in other parts of the country in floods, fires, tornadoes, and earthquakes.

In order for the Federal Government to provide that assistance, we must pass a disaster supplemental appropriations bill. We should, in my judgment, do that without any extraneous amendments that are unrelated to the bill. I encourage all those who are inclined to want to add amendments to try to find a way to bring those issues to the floor at a different time. I am not here to suggest that the ideas that will be offered have no merit, that they are inappropriate ideas to be discussing or debating. I am not suggesting that at all. I just ask that we stick with what we should be doing; that is, understanding the people who have had such a heavy burden placed on them, in many cases losing everything they have, being evacuated from their homes, the people who I saw in shelters with tears in their eyes, worried about tomorrow, about whether there will be hope, whether there will be opportunity again, whether there will be help for them and their families, their children, and their parents. I just hope we can pass a piece of legislation that is without extraneous amendments that offers that kind of help.

The Senator from Arizona is on the floor. I want to say to him that I don't judge ideas that others are attempting to offer anywhere. They may have merit. I just urge everyone to take a look at the importance of this bill and see if we can't find other places to debate these ideas. I think the men and women of the Senate are men and women of enormous good will. We always try to do the right thing.

I said yesterday and want to say again, Senator STEVENS, Senator BYRD, and others have done a remarkable job in working with us to try to develop a package of assistance to that region that will be enormously helpful and enormously beneficial. I hope at the end of the day, at the end of this week, we will have moved something through this committee to the floor of the Senate to be scheduled early next week that can then be accepted by the House and be signed by the President and will extend the helping hand of the Federal Government to a lot of folks who have been hit very, very hard.

I do not intend to have a debate with anybody about the merits of this or that issue. I only come to say that this is very important, vitally important, to our region of the country, and I urge in the strongest possible terms that the Congress be allowed to pass this supplemental disaster appropriations bill without extraneous amendments attached to it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, like all of us here today, I want to extend my sympathies to the communities and families of the upper Midwest who have experienced the terrible flooding over the past several weeks.

It brings back vivid memories of the flooding that hit western Maryland last year and I know all Marylanders join me in extending our thoughts and prayers to everyone in the Midwest.

Like many of my colleagues, I was hoping for quick consideration of this important legislation so we could speed relief to disaster victims. They are counting on us to help them get back on their feet—to help them rebuild their homes and businesses.

I am so disappointed that what should have been a speedy, nonpartisan targeted relief bill has turned into another nasty partisan battle.

I am greatly concerned about the many extraneous provisions that have been wedged into this bill. The provisions are designed to inflame and divide us and to provoke a veto from the President.

They make it so much more difficult to get assistance to the people in flood ravaged communities who are counting on us. I am particularly alarmed by the inclusion in this package of what is artfully called the Shutdown Prevention Act.

Nobody knows the pain of a Government shutdown better than me and the Marylanders I represent. When the last shutdown occurred, I visited Government agencies that had to remain open.

I saw the frustration on the faces of the workers and the financial hardship it caused for all Federal employees.

I do not want another shutdown and will do everything I can to prevent it. But, the revised bill now provides for a permanent continuing resolution which is nothing more than a partisan trick.

It is designed to lock in deep cuts to important programs under the cover of preventing a Government shutdown. I am opposed to this provision and urge my colleagues to oppose it.

In addition, I am disturbed by the way in which we have chosen to pay for this bill. This bill takes $3.6 billion in unobligated funds from HUD's section 8 public housing program to pay for FEMA's disaster relief fund.

I do not believe we should be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Eventually, Peter will be broke.

The projected budget problems with regard to the section 8 program are well known.

In fiscal year 1998, section 8 renewals will cost $10.2 billion. That is a $7 billion increase over the fiscal year 1997 funding level.

We will need the unobligated funds to pay for the section 8 renewals in fiscal year 1998. We should not be raiding the program to pay for disaster funding.

I am pleased that of the $5.8 billion in unobligated section 8 funds, $2.2 billion will be saved to cover fiscal year 1998 section 8 renewal costs. However, as the budget estimates show, we will need every dollar we can find to cover the huge increase in section 8 costs next year.

The VA/HUD Subcommittee cannot serve as the ATM machine for the rest of the committee. If we are going to pay for emergency disasters, one subcommittee should not bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

We must find a new way to pay for emergency supplemental appropriations bills. These disasters are not going to end.

We could be facing even more expensive disasters in the near future. Are we going to continually robe the VA/HUD account to pay for these bills?

I believe we need a new system or a new arrangement to deal with these type of disasters—a new system that is off-budget.

I wanted to support this bill because it is so important to the families and communities who need help. However, the changes that were added at the last minute make it impossible for me to do so. I hope in the future we can avoid partisan fights over disaster relief bills and find a more equitable way to pay for them.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I, of course, like all Americans, extend my deep and profound sympathy and

pledge of assistance to those who have been ravaged by these natural disasters which are unprecedented in some parts of the country. But I am, frankly, very surprised that the Senator from North Dakota, and others, would not want to also prevent a man-made disaster that took place 2 years ago.

I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he realizes, if the Government were to shut down again, whether those people would be able to get that assistance? The answer is no, I say to the Senator from North Dakota, and it is foolishness—it is foolishness—not to understand that when there are manmade disasters, it affects people just as badly as natural disasters do.

I say to the Senator from North Dakota, I am sorry he is not concerned about the people of Arizona, the hundreds of families who were put out of work and lost their livelihood the last time the Government was shut down, the thousands of families who didn't work for the Federal Government, who were never repaid—never ever repaid—when the Secretary of the Interior, my fellow Arizonan, in his wisdom decided to shut down the Grand Canyon for the first time in 76 years.

Mr. President, I am astounded at the arguments that are made against this amendment that Senator HUTCHISON and I and those of us on this side of the aisle are supportive of to prevent the effects of a manmade disaster which happened 2 years ago, which every American decried, which every American thought was terrible, the hundreds of millions of dollars that were lost, the people who were trying to apply for Medicare benefits, the people who were trying to apply for Social Security, the other aspects of Government services that they lost, like getting a passport so they could get back from school in Europe or take a vacation—all of the Government services that we were deprived of. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have the unmitigated gall to call this an extraneous provision.

I don't know where the Senator from North Dakota was—and I am sorry he left the floor—3 years ago when the California emergency earthquake supplemental contained language inserted by then Majority Leader Mitchell that dealt with the investigation of potato diseases.

I didn't see the Senator from North Dakota on the floor when Senator BYRD put language in the bill that funded employees at the fingerprint lab in West Virginia. You know, it is a long way from West Virginia to California, Mr. President, and that language required $20 million to be expended to hire 500 employees to remain available, to be expended without regard to any other law—without regard to any other law. That was put in the California emergency earthquake supplemental.

Where were my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when all of these extraneous provisions were put in, which is a habit around here which I have decried and taken the floor in opposition to time after time after time.

Mr. President, this is crazy, this is just crazy, and do you know why they are doing it? Because they want to be able to threaten the shutdown of the Government so they can achieve one of two things: one, an enormous political advantage like they gained 2 years ago when, over Christmas, we saw pictures of Federal workers sitting around empty Christmas trees; or what they were able to do last year, and that is to basically blackmail the Congress into spending around $9 billion more than had been budgeted for. That is the kind of leverage they want to maintain.

Do you know what, Mr. President? I understand political leverage, I think I understand it fairly well after a few years around here, but I am not prepared to do it at the expense of the lives and welfare of the American people, and clearly those on the other side are willing to do that. I view that as gross and crass and cynical and the worst aspect of this kind of process that we are engaged in here.

We are trying to prevent the shutdown of the Federal Government, which affects the lives of millions of Americans, perhaps 250 million, and for the Senator from North Dakota, who I am glad came back to the floor, to say that this is an extraneous amendment when it has been a habit in the Congress to put extraneous information—where was the Senator from North Dakota when Senator BYRD put on the amendment that required $20 million in the hiring of 500 employees in West Virginia on the California earthquake disaster bill? Where was the Senator from North Dakota when then Majority Leader Mitchell put in the California emergency earthquake supplemental an investigation of potato diseases?

I hope the American people know better than to accept these bogus arguments when we are trying to prevent a manmade disaster.

I repeat, again, to the Senator from North Dakota, I am concerned about the people of North Dakota. I want to get them money as quickly as possible, but I am deeply disturbed he doesn't care about the people who live around the Grand Canyon who, if the Government shut down, would be out of work and not get the money back. It happened in my State. I don't know what happened in North Dakota when we shut down the Government. I know what happened in Arizona. I know what happened in Texas. I know what happened all over the country. I was flooded with calls and letters and messages: ''What are you idiots doing in Washington shutting down the Government?''

I do not want it to happen again. It cannot happen again. This is a big issue; this is an important issue. I am going to object and come to this floor every time someone from the other side of the aisle says this is extraneous and the President is going to veto it. If the President wants to veto it, fine. The President of the United States then will be responsible the next time the Government shuts down—don't blame us—and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, too, who don't support preventing the Government from being shut down. That is where the responsibility will lie.

The President may veto it. It may come back. We may cave. We have done that before. If we do, the record will be clear, I say to my colleague from North Dakota. I really appreciate, again, his concern about extraneous amendments. I hope he joins me the next time a supplemental bill comes to the floor and we will propose amendments together to take out those extraneous amendments, because he wasn't there on the other times that I have been on the floor when there have been extraneous amendments on a supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, thank you. I commend my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, for his commitment to trying to do what is right. We are supposed to learn from our mistakes, and I think everyone believes that it was a mistake that we had a Government shutdown. It is not anything anyone intended, but to say that we would allow ourselves to go forward into a disaster like that again would be saying you cannot learn a lesson of history.

We are learning the lesson of history. We know what it was like when veterans were not sure they would get their benefits because this administration refused to say that veterans benefits were essential payments, and they really lived in fear that those benefits that they earned would not be there. Not to mention all of the other Federal employees who wanted to come to work but could not by law do it and were not sure if the money to pay their mortgages would be there.

Mr. President, let's talk about the timing. This is the first bill out of the Appropriations Committee. It is a supplemental bill asked for by the President to cover some of the unforeseen expenses. But there are other things in the bill as well, Mr. President. I don't think the Senator from North Dakota can just pick and choose which things are essential. We have to look at good government, and we have to look at our responsibility. Part of our responsibility is seeing that the victims in North Dakota, who have suffered greatly—and we all understand that. I grew up on the gulf coast and have lived through hurricanes and have seen people not have homes. I, of all people, understand disaster. We are going to do the right thing, and part of doing the right thing is we are going to take up raises for the District of Columbia police officers. We are going to take up

U.N. dues. That is part of this bill, in addition to disaster relief and taking care of our soldiers and their requirements in Bosnia.

So this is the time that we are able to address how we will appropriate this year. What we are saying is, we are not going to shut down Government. This may work to the benefit of the President; it may work to the benefit of Congress. We do not really know. But what we are saying is, we are not going to shut down Government. We are going to allow the negotiations that occur on September 30, that are still occurring to continue to occur based on the merits without any artificial hammers over anyone's head, not the President, not Congress.

That is the only responsible way we know how to deal with these disagreements. So we are saying, come September 30, we will fund at present levels minus 2-percent because in fact that 2-percent going into the next fiscal year is appropriating money that we have not yet decided how to appropriate. We did not say 75 percent. We are not looking at Draconian cuts here. We are looking at staying with the budget resolution that we passed out of this Congress and sticking to it.

The budget resolution says that we would have $541 billion for the next year in the budget plan that marches toward the year 2002 in a responsible approach to cutting the rate of growth of spending.

The President's request for the 1998 budget that we are discussing was actually somewhat under that. So how someone can say we are actually cutting the President's budget is really hard to understand because we are actually over what the President said he wanted for the 1998 year; we are over that by $3 billion.

So what has happened here is the President has come in and asked for $25 billion more; and we are being accused of cutting the $25 billion-add that he has put on to his own budget submitted last year.

So, Mr. President, this is a lot of rigmarole to say that we are not trying to do the responsible thing. We are doing it in the first bill that comes out of the Appropriations Committee to set the process for this next year. And the process is going to be that if we do not have agreements by September 30, which we hope we do, but if we do not, that we are going to continue at present levels minus 2 percent. If any agency of State or Federal Government cannot operate on a 2 percent cut, ask them to call any small business, ask them to call any family that has had trouble making ends meet to see if they would be able to budget a 2 percent cut. If 2 percent is a Draconian cut, it is time these people came into the real world, the real world of taxpayers trying to make ends meet.

So we are saying, everyone will be on notice that if we do not have an agreement for a particular appropriations bill, we will continue funding, there will not be a shutdown, and if you cannot cut 2 percent out of your budget with 6 months' notice then you really do not deserve to be running the Federal Government.

Second, Mr. President, I think it is very important when we are addressing the issue of responsible governing that we say we are going to cover disaster victims and we are going to do it in a timely way.

If the President says that a 2-percent cut in present spending is something that would make him veto the bill, then the President should answer to the victims of North Dakota, the President should answer to the soldiers in Bosnia. Because 2 percent from what we are spending today, if we do not have an agreement, I think is quite responsible.

We are not talking Draconian cuts. We are talking responsible Government. In fact, you know we had hoped to have total bipartisan support for this. We thought from all the things that were said when the Government was shut down that we would have a huge Democrat-Republican alliance to say, let us address it now. Let us give everyone notice so that everyone can plan.

In fact, I will quote from Senator DASCHLE, December 30, 1995, talking about the Government shutdown:

> The Government remains shut because some Members . . . want it shut. It is Government by gimmick, and it is wrong.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. We are addressing the concerns raised by Senator DASCHLE. And those concerns are addressed so that we will not have Government by gimmick, so that we will have responsible Government, so that everyone will know what the rules are, and so that we will be able to negotiate in good faith on appropriations that have not been finished by September 30.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a brief question on the shutdown issue?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Does the Senator know how many times in the 200-year history of America the U.S. Government has shut down for an extended period of time?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I would appreciate hearing from the Senator from California on that.

Mrs. BOXER. It only happened one time when this Congress was put in the hands of her party. And I would just like to say to my friend, who is my friend—and we do work on other things together; I am very happy about that—that on this matter it is tragic—tragic. And I wish you would go to North Dakota or maybe come to California where 120,000 people had to be evacuated from their homes. That we are putting a budget fight on an emergency supplemental—emergency—we do not have a budget.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. We are not having a budget fight. We are talking about responsible Government.

Mrs. BOXER. If we can meet on the——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the time.

Mrs. BOXER. I would just say, if we did this work we would not have this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has her time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I have seen victims of floods. And I am glad the Senator from California suggested it because I have seen the victims of flood. I live on the gulf coast. I have lived through hurricanes. I have seen my own home flooded. I have seen neighbors who have not had homes to live in, who stayed in our home because of the water. I know what it is like to see a tornado tear up an entire city in Dallas County.

But you know something? This is trying to do the responsible thing. If the President decides to veto a bill because we are trying to stop the Government by gimmick that Senator DASCHLE accused us of doing—and the Senator from California points out that we have only had a shutdown for an extended period of time one time. And I am saying, we have learned from history.

The President vetoed the bills back in 1995, but he blamed it on Congress. So Congress is saying, let us do the responsible thing. Let us make sure that we do not have a Government shutdown. If it is our fault, then we are trying to correct it, we are trying to do the right thing. And it is not a budget fight. It is the first bill out of the Appropriations Committee. And we are trying to set a process that would allow us to meet the needs of the victims of North Dakota, the soldiers in Bosnia, pay U.N. dues, raise the salaries of D.C. police, and make sure that everyone is on notice that we are not going to have Government by gimmick, we are going to have Government by responsible people, and we are going to set the parameters right now which it is in our prerogative to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you.

I will be very brief.

Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives for 10 years, and I served on the Budget Committee for 6 years during that time. I now serve on the Budget Committee and happen to be on the Appropriations Committee as well. And since the Senator from Texas wants to learn from history, let me share some history with her.

In all those years on the Budget Committee—it is actually 11 in all; 6 in the House, 5 in the Senate—I have never seen the majority party, whether it was Republican or Democrat, not put forward a budget. I have never seen such a dereliction of duty. I miss my Budget Committee chairman. I want to

send him a card: ''Looking forward to seeing you.''

I like working with Chairman PETE DOMENICI. We do not even meet anymore, Mr. President. We are not doing our work. And now on an emergency supplemental bill, where the people who have been suffering are counting on us, we move a piece of legislation on to that bill that has nothing to do with a natural disaster, that has to do with a budgetary fight which is an admission of surrender by the people who are offering it that they cannot play by the rules of the game, by the laws of this Congress which say you must have a budget on the floor by April 15.

And then to come to the floor and criticize the Senator from North Dakota, who has been working, as I have, with our Republican friends, with our Democratic friends, to craft an emergency bill that is fiscally responsible, that meets the needs of people, to have my friend from North Dakota attacked as not being empathetic to the needs of this country, to me, is beyond repair.

We have two jobs to do today. We have to pass an emergency supplemental appropriations to help the people of California, to help the people of North Dakota, indeed, to help the people of 22 States who have suffered, who have lost their homes, their businesses, who were evacuated—we have to do that—and we have to do it fast. We have to help our farmers, our small businesspeople.

I do not think I will ever forget the vision of that city in North Dakota that is a ghost town. It just looked like something out of a picture out of World War II—burning buildings sitting in water. And we are putting our budget battle on to this emergency bill. And I just have to say, I am so surprised that this has occurred. It did not happen on the House side.

Our chairman, Chairman STEVENS, called off the hearing—the markup—after telling us that he was prepared to go forward with a clean bill but others wanted this added. In respect to his colleagues, of course, he did the right thing, called off the markup.

So I hope we can come together as Democrats and Republicans. That is what the people want us to do. And let us do our job. Let us get these people the help they need.

There are other amendments now on there, environmental amendments that totally eviscerate environmental laws that should not be part of this bill.

There is a labor fight going on about how much you pay workers at construction projects. That has now gotten on to this emergency bill.

We have procedures here. We have processes here to deal with these other matters. So I am hoping we do two things today: We pass a clean bill in the committee, and we are going to go to that markup at 2 o'clock; and, second, we ask our colleagues on the Budget Committee, ''Put your budget on the table before you try to resort to across-the-board cuts.''

And I want to correct the record on this point. My friend from Texas made a point that in actuality this continuing resolution is going to be a level of spending higher than the President suggested. Now, this may be true for the overall number, but I can assure my friend, he has an initiative in education, he has an initiative in children's health, he has an initiative to clean up Superfund sites, he has an initiative on crime. This President has initiatives in his budget. So if you just go ahead and say, well, we have decided to forget about our free markup budget, and throw in the towel, and put this solution down on the table——

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. Put this 2-percent solution on the table and indicate to the President that there will not be severe cuts in education, the environment, in crime, in health research, that is simply not true.

As a matter of fact, our analysis that we have done thus far—and we are still working on it—shows in some cases a 7-, 8-, 9-percent reduction that will result in young people not having Pell grants, kids not getting into Head Start, Superfund sites being delayed, veterans benefits being delayed, if that 2-percent solution goes forward. I hope we can have that debate another day.

I am happy to yield for a question.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I think the Senator is saying I was correct, then, that we are increasing over the President's own budget that he put forward last year.

The Senator is making the point that there are new expenditures that you would like to make. I ask the Senator from California if she does not think it would be more responsible if the President would keep his word, keep to the $539 million that he asked for last year for this year, and set the priorities.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me answer your first question. If you want a second question, I will answer your second question. Let me answer your first question.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. You let me ask the question.

Mrs. BOXER. You asked me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. It will be delayed if there is a Government shutdown, but not with a 2-percent cut.

Mrs. BOXER. I am delighted to yield as long as you want, but I do not want to forget your first question.

You asked me, did I not think it would be more responsible for the President to stick to last year's budget? No, absolutely not. Maybe the Senator has forgotten, we had an election, and this President won. Do you know what the election was about? It was about how much you ought to cut Medicare, how much you ought to spend on the environment, how much you ought to spend on education, how many more cops we should put on the beat. We had the election and the American people chose this President.

I am answering your question.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I need to finish my answer, Mr. President, and then I will be happy to yield again.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. The President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If we could have some order. The California Senator has the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Let me finish. The Senator is asking what is responsible.

It would be irresponsible for this President to back down on what he said he would do for the American people. I know there are some of my colleagues who do not agree with this President, who do not want to spend more on education, who do not want to spend more cleaning up the environment, who want to cut more out of Medicare, who would like to give tax breaks to the very wealthiest.

That is a fair debate, I say to my friend. This is a debate about budget priorities.

What I think would be responsible for this President is to stick with the promises he made in his campaign to the American people.

The second thing I think would be responsible for us is to keep this emergency supplemental appropriation clean of this budget battle. I think the American people can see in the debate between the Senator from Texas and myself, in the remarks that were made by the Senator from Arizona, that the budget battle is a very heartfelt battle. As a matter of fact, it differentiates the parties. So what is responsible for this President, it seems to me, is to get this emergency supplemental to the people, clean of these other amendments, and what is responsible for this U.S. Senate is to produce a budget and do our work.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly convinced if we do that, we do not need a 2-percent gimmick. We can have a real budget debate and a real balanced budget for the people of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield to myself the 10 minutes allocated previously.

Mr. President, the only thing that matters to me at the end of the day is, has the Congress proceeded to enact the disaster supplemental bill? And will the disaster supplemental, as enacted, be free of provisions that would otherwise engender a Presidential veto? Will the Congress get its work done on the disaster supplemental bill? That is all I came to talk about and all I intend to talk about.

There was a demonstration here on the floor by those who say, well, if you do not support our amendment, whatever our amendment is, you do not care about Government shutdowns. What a load of nonsense. I will not respond to

all of this, but just to say this: I did not come to the floor to criticize anybody and I will not respond as I am tempted to do. I came here asking only one thing: That when the Senate Committee marks up its bill at 2 o'clock, that we mark up a supplemental disaster appropriations bill without attaching amendments that are unrelated to the bill.

One Member came and took great offense to that and ranted about the fact that I or others do not support efforts to stop Government shutdowns, and so on. I have no idea how people learn these techniques—the technique of misstating your opponent's position and going on and debating them. That is an old debating technique that some memorize. It does not serve a particular interest to me.

I am very happy to work with all Members of the Senate in finding ways to avoid any Government shutdown, at any time. I have never supported a Government shutdown. I am happy to work with anybody at any time to avoid a Government shutdown. I do not want someone coming to the floor to ascribe motives I do not have. My motive was for one purpose today, and that is to encourage all Members of the Senate to understand this disaster supplemental has the word ''disaster'' attached to it because some parts of the country are suffering a disaster. We want, at the end of the day, to pass a bill that extends a helping hand to those folks.

Now, I understand everybody else has 800 objections to it, and they have different agendas. We have in our caucus, people who have agendas, they want to bring things to attach to this bill. They are saying, ''This is the first appropriations bill. We want to attach something to it.'' My position to them was exactly the same. It does not matter what party you are in. I have told members of our caucus, ''I do not want you to attach things to this bill.'' I will tell them that today if somebody says they want to do it.

Leave this bill alone. This bill affects 22 States. It affects people who have been driven from their homes who need help. We do not need people to come to the floor pointing and shouting about who supports Government shutdowns in September or October. Who is willing to help pass a disaster bill in April and May? That is the question.

I get sorely tempted some days to come and respond in kind to some of the things I hear. But my Scandinavian heritage overcomes that urge from time to time, and it will again today. My response would be in a more personal way to those with whom I take offense when they suggest somehow that those of us who want to see a disaster bill passed without interference have an agenda that does not care about the rest of the country and Government shutdowns. People know better than that. We should have reasonable and thoughtful debates here in the Senate. We should not do that sort of thing.

The agenda of the Senate, it seems to me, in the Appropriations Committee this afternoon, is how does this country respond to a series of disasters. That is what I care about. There are other issues that others care about. That is fine. We should talk about the issues. But I would feel the same way, I guess, if it was your disaster. I would want your people to get the help they deserve. And I have done that on earthquakes, fires, floods, and tornadoes all around the country in all the years I have been here.

My hope is, without ascribing ill motives to anyone in the Senate, that we can just decide to work together. I have said three times, and let me say again, Senator STEVENS is a wonderful chairman of that committee and he has been enormously helpful, I think doing a terrific job, as are other members of that Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD and others, in difficult circumstances, putting together a disaster relief bill that extends a helping hand to people who desperately need help in this time.

Mr. President, my hope is that when we convene at 2 o'clock, we will proceed through this bill and probably be able to talk some people out of offering amendments that might load this bill down and not allow it to get passed on an expeditious basis. My hope is perhaps at the end of next week all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike who care about this, can join the President in a bill-signing ceremony that says we did what we were supposed to do. We did what was necessary. This Government extended a helping hand to people who were down and out, flat on their back, who needed help, and that there were not intramural political games being played here, there and everywhere that would delay and do the things that people so often and too often now expect of the Congress.

I understand sometimes why the American people look at this process and become profoundly disappointed—profoundly disappointed—because almost everything that happens is someone thumping their chest saying, ''I am the one that will save the Republic.'' The fact is, what saves the Republic is the good will of men and women working together on common problems in this country in a sensible, thoughtful way. I hope that we will begin doing that and continue to do that not just on this bill but on bills that affect all of America and all of Americans. That is my hope.

I yield the floor.

VOLUNTEER PROTECTION ACT OF 1977—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion to proceed to S. 543.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I came to the floor to speak to that piece of legislation, but also to speak to the supplemental and the current situation the Senate finds itself in at this moment.

Senator DORGAN has spoken passionately, as he should, about a concern for the citizens of his State and that their needs are responded to because of the devastating floods that are ongoing in his State. For that, this Senate will respond.

I now have the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee, and I must tell you that it is my intent to support a supplemental appropriation that has disaster relief in it—for the citizens of North Dakota, yes, but also for the citizens of Midvale, ID, my hometown.

In early January of this year, the national television cameras did not sweep across the 4 feet of water that surged through my hometown, that displaced 40 residents, destroyed homes, took the one small general store and put it out of business. I flew over it a few days later in a helicopter to see utter devastation like I had never seen before and like my friends and neighbors had never witnessed. I remembered looking at the files of the local newspaper and the flood of 1950 when I was a small child in that community. This, of course, was even worse. This was, without doubt, the 100-year flood.

Now, what I found out at that time—and I have great praise for FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers and others—is that they did respond and they responded immediately. The citizens of Midvale were cared for within the limitations of the law and prescriptive to their needs. I am pleased about that and played a small role in helping them.

What I also find out is that the citizens of North Dakota are being cared for at this moment. There is adequate money at this moment to deal with the immediate needs. They are being cared for. Will there be necessary moneys for the future needs of rebuilding and repair? No. That is what the supplemental is all about. There is adequate time for a responsible and reasoned debate on what we do about the expenditures of our Government.

I am going to support a continuing resolution tied to the supplemental appropriation. Why? Because I do not like the budget process gamed. I do not like a President, who owns a bully pulpit, to veto and then stand on that pulpit, when it was his pen that brought the Government to a halt, turning and saying, ''Look at those folks up on the Hill. They did not give me what I wanted, so I am shutting the Government down.'' He says, ''They did not give me what I wanted, so they are shutting the Government down,'' and he got away with it. The American people said, ''Oh my goodness, isn't that terrible. Congress should not have done that.''

Congress did not intend to do that. Congress will not do that again. That is why we have considered amongst