

gained more respect for her, for her insight and her knowledge, as time went on.

As a member of the staff of the House Rules Committee, she was where the action was. She was where you knew what legislation was coming up and what the process was. And she was a great source of information and encouragement for me, as someone who had never worked as a member of the staff or had been closely involved in the workings of the Congress before my election in 1972.

Her appreciation of the Congress was contagious, and so was her enthusiasm. Everyone I knew liked her. In time, her capabilities and dedication were rewarded with an offer to work at the White House. At the Office of Management and Budget, she helped guide to passage some of the most important budget reforms ever adopted. During her career as a member of the staff of the House, and in the Executive Office of the President, she was one of the most dependable, conscientious, and effective employees who has ever worked at either place.

Since then, she has been involved in a wide range of activities, most of which have been related to business or Government. She began her own business, J.L. Gourmand, Inc., to manufacture and market her Pesto Plus products. She organized women's groups to support other entrepreneurs and professional women here and around the world. She traveled to other countries to help explain to those with new democracies how best to guarantee the blessings of self-government. And she developed her considerable talent with water colors as a painter of flowers, which are collected and appreciated throughout the National Capital area and in the houses of her friends and admirers all across the country. And that is a lot of houses, because she has many friends and admirers.

All of her friends, and I am so pleased and privileged to have been one of her close friends for the past 25 years, wish we could see a modern miracle make her well because nobody could be a better or more unselfish friend than Jonna Lynne Cullen.

With our good wishes we also send to her our thanks for all she has done and all she has given to make the Congress and the country so much better off, because of her good work and her well-lived life.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to join with the majority leader in paying tribute to an extraordinary woman, J.L. Cullen.

It would be accurate to say that J.L. worked for the House Rules Committee, but that wouldn't begin to capture the spirit of this wonderful person. Yes, she was an outstanding and dedicated staffer, but for those of us who have served in the House—especially women—she was so much more. She was our friend.

From my first days in the House I was privileged to know J.L. and our re-

lationship grew from there. Her wonderful sense of humor, her warmth and her intellect made an impression on all of us, as our distinguished majority leader can attest from his days in the House.

As an unofficial morale officer, J.L. brought together women of the House of Representatives, on a number of occasions hosting my female colleagues and me for dinner at her home. I will always fondly remember dinners with J.L., NANCY JOHNSON, and Lynn Martin—for both the company and the cooking! J.L. knew her way around a kitchen as well as she knew her way around House procedure, and in fact ultimately opened up her own business selling pesto.

No matter what she did, J.L. was always gracious, always hospitable. And in the House, she quietly but effectively fostered unity and camaraderie among Members. She was there through dark days as well as the bright ones, and she was a tremendous resource for us.

When I last had the pleasure of seeing J.L. at a reception recently, despite her illness, she greeted me with her usual good cheer and humor. She is truly a remarkable person and the way in which she has handled her illness with strength and dignity is inspirational to me. J.L. is one of those rare people who lends perspective to what we do here in Washington and brings into sharp focus the things that are truly important in life.

I hope J.L. is watching us today, to see and hear our comments, Mr. President. Because I want her to know how deeply she has touched the lives of those with whom she worked. J.L. may not be a Member of Congress, but she is as much a credit to this institution as any of its finest elected officials. And she is as much a part of this Congress as any one of us who are Members.

So often, one hears of the unelected staff. For so many, they are the nameless faceless people who work in the shadow of the dome—out of the glare of public attention usually reserved for those elected to the House or Senate. J.L. Cullen is among the finest of those people. Uninterested in the spotlight, she measures her contributions solely by the lives she touches or the results she achieves.

But today, I want the public to know her name. I want them to know that she is a person without whom the people's business—the work of this institution, indeed the work of this Nation—would not have been done. And I want America to know that she has been a public servant in the very finest sense of the word.

J.L., if you're watching, please know that you are in my heart and in my prayers. You helped make this native-born Mainer feel at home in Washington, you helped me to do my job better, and you helped me to laugh along the way, too. I will forever cherish your caring and friendship, and remember your exemplary service to Congress and the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am recognized for 20 minutes, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, that's correct.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened to my colleagues describe Jonna Lynne Cullen, and while I did not and do not know her, the description given by my two colleagues makes me, and I am sure other colleagues here in the Congress, wish we knew her. She is undoubtedly like friends that all of us have around this country, who represent the very small part of our population that gets involved and makes things happen, and truly demonstrate what good citizenship is all about.

So, while I don't know Jonna Lynne Cullen, I commend my two colleagues from Mississippi. I also wish her well because she represents what is best of America.

#### THE DISASTER IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to speak just for a moment about what is happening in North Dakota, my home State, the disaster that occurred there and my disappointment, my profound disappointment that it appears that Congress will leave for the Memorial Day recess without having addressed that issue.

First, a number of us think there are important things we do from time to time. Today was important for a couple of reasons. My daughter Haley, age 7, last evening, when I arrived home at 10 o'clock, because the Congress is going late every day, asked me if I was going to be able to come to her second grade puppet show this morning. And I said of course, I wouldn't miss her second grade puppet show, because she has been talking about it for a month. So I missed the first votes this morning to go to my daughter's puppet show. While I regret I missed votes, I think I did what was most important.

Some of these choices that we make about what we must do to meet certain obligations sometimes are difficult—that is not a difficult one—because the schedule here in the Senate is kind of a difficult schedule. As the presiding officer knows, the difficulty in balancing our obligations sometimes presents significant obstacles for us. Almost every night this week we have worked very late. I have been a conferee on the supplemental appropriations bill as a Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have been working day after day on that piece of legislation. We have also been working on the budget agreement.

While one of the important things I did this morning was to attend a second grade puppet show for a young girl I am enormously proud of, another important thing I did today was to cast a vote in support of a budget proposal that I think is important for this country. I have cast previous votes just like

that. In 1993 I cast a vote for a budget agreement that was a tough vote. It only prevailed by one vote; one vote. The Vice President had to come to this Chamber and cast the tie-breaking vote, the deciding vote. It cut spending, increased some taxes, and people said, "If you do it, you are going to cause a depression in this country and put this country in a tailspin."

We said, I said, the President said, and those of us who voted for it said: It is important for us to do what's necessary to get this Federal deficit under control, and if the medicine is tough medicine, so be it. We are willing to support it. I voted for it and I am glad I did.

Since that time, since 1993, we have had steady economic growth. We have had lower inflation—down, down, and down for 4 years; unemployment has dropped, down, down, and down for 4 years. We have an economy that is in good shape—low unemployment, low inflation, good economic growth, and the Federal deficits have come down 75-percent since 1993. There has been a 75-percent reduction in the Federal deficit because, in 1993, we did what was the right thing to do.

My political party paid an awful price for that, as a matter of fact. Some of my colleagues who were willing to vote for that are not in this Chamber any longer. But it was the right thing to do. And now the Congress takes the second step. This one, I am pleased to say, is bipartisan. The previous one, we did not get any votes from that side of the aisle—not one. And we prevailed by one vote. Today, I am pleased to say—and I hope the American people feel some comfort—that it is a bipartisan effort. The second step is bipartisan and that makes a great deal more sense in our country, for us to be working together. Instead of trying to figure out how do you get the worst of each, maybe we ought to spend time trying to figure out how to get the best of both: How do you work together, not how do you fight each other. And this budget agreement is an agreement hammered out by the White House and by Republican and Democratic leaders in the Congress.

Is it perfect? No. Would I have done it differently, had I written it myself? Yes. Is there more to do? Sure. But is it the right thing for this country, to be saying to the American people on a bipartisan basis that fiscal responsibility is important; that your comfort about the future of this country can increase because the Congress is not going to continue to spend money it doesn't have on things it doesn't need; is not going to continue to charge what it now consumes to our kids and grandkids? That is important. And that is the second thing I did today that was important. And I am pleased I cast that vote and I expect I will remain satisfied over the years that I was a part of that effort.

But not every day has moments that are satisfying. We each make of our in-

dividual days what we choose to make of them. You can get up and have a bad attitude and be in a bad mood all day long, if you like. The one thing we are in charge of is our attitude. You can decide you are going to make something of yourself, do something good for the country; you are going to do something worthwhile for your families. Well, all of us have different ways of dealing with the days. I mentioned a couple of ways that satisfy me today, a second grade puppet show and a budget deal that I think makes sense for this country.

Let me also, if I might, describe something that causes me enormous heartache today. I have worked for weeks with colleagues here in the Senate on a disaster appropriations bill. My colleagues in the Senate, from Senator STEVENS, the chairman of that committee, to Senator BYRD, the ranking member of the committee, and so many others on the Senate Appropriations Committee have done a remarkable job, a wonderful job of creating a disaster bill that says to the people who suffer in our region of the country: We want to help you. You are not alone.

We worked day and night and one would have hoped that a bill providing disaster relief would have been enacted before the Congress takes a recess for Memorial Day. But, guess what, last evening we were told that the other body had decided it cannot provide a disaster relief bill. All of the provisions of the disaster relief in the supplemental appropriations bill are largely agreed to. They are not in controversy. There is no disagreement. So the money is agreed to. Yet, this bill that contains other issues, some of them totally unrelated to the disaster, and some of them very controversial—those are the provisions, incidentally, that have held up the bill and derailed the bill—we are told, because of those other provisions, it cannot be done. The House of Representatives, the other body, says it just will not do it.

Let me tell you why this is important and why I think it is an enormous setback for the people who are out there, waiting for disaster aid. If some do not now know, and I expect all Americans do, having watched television, about what my constituents have faced, and the constituents in Minnesota and South Dakota have faced, let me describe it again briefly: 3 years worth of snow in 3 months in North Dakota, seven to eight major blizzards closing down virtually all of the roads in the State. The last blizzard put nearly 2 feet of snow across the State of North Dakota; tens of thousands, over 100,000 head of livestock dead, 1.7 million acres of farmland inundated by water; a river not 100 yards wide becomes a lake 150 miles by 20 and 30 miles.

As that river is channeled through our cities, it reaches Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, and it reaches a record level never before

reached on the Red River in those two cities. And then the dike breaks in the middle of the night and the dike begins failing all across the town and the residents of East Grand Forks, MN, and Grand Forks, ND, had to flee for their lives. Many of them rushed down the street to get on a National Guard truck, with only the clothes on their back, having left everything behind in their homes. They have left their vehicles. They have left all their personal goods, and they get on a truck, or some other device, and they flee the community. In East Grand Forks, MN, 9,000 people were evacuated. The entire town was evacuated. In Grand Forks, ND, 50,000 population, 90 percent of the town evacuated.

When you tour the town next, a day or two after the dike broke, you tour it with a Coast Guard boat and the cars that were on Main Street could not be seen because the water was well above the level of those automobiles. There was nobody in town of a town of 50,000 people or a town of 9,000 people—totally evacuated.

Then a fire starts and destroys parts of several downtown blocks. One entire block is devastated, 11 major buildings in the historic district of downtown Grand Forks are destroyed and firefighters, fighting a fire chest-deep in ice cold water, suffering hypothermia, were fighting a fire in a flood, trying to get in front of a fire that destroyed part of the downtown of a city. Meantime, 4,000 people are out in an aircraft hangar at the Grand Forks Air Force Base leaving their homes now to sleep on a cot.

So we went to the Air Force base. Vice President GORE came to North Dakota. President Clinton came to North Dakota. And you see men and women and families, children out in these airplane hangars sleeping on cots, living in hangars because there was nowhere to go.

Today, weeks later, there are somewhere between 10,000 and 15,000 people in Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, who are not yet back in their homes. So this morning, they woke up in a strange place. Tonight, they will go to bed in a strange place, and what of Members of Congress? They recessed for Memorial Day. It was time to go home. Oh, they had some unfinished business. One piece of unfinished business was to say to the people in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and people in South Dakota and Minnesota that "you are not alone; here is a helping hand." We just passed a disaster bill, but the people in the other body didn't have time for that. Do you know why they didn't have time for it? They said to us yesterday, "If we had taken the disaster portions out of the supplemental appropriations bill and passed them alone, we would have lost our leverage."

What kind of leverage is it that they are talking about, do you think? The leverage to pass an amendment that they have stuck on that bill which has

nothing to do with the disaster. It has to do with Government shutdowns—very controversial amendment—and has no relationship to a disaster bill. But they stuck it on there knowing they could hold hostage thousands of victims of these floods, and that is exactly what happened.

We have come to the end of this week, and the other body decided it doesn't have time; they were unwilling to pass a disaster bill.

I have been around this institution for some long while, first in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate. There is not a precedent for this. Nowhere that I know of is there a precedent for a disaster bill, when people have suffered in a region of this country, for someone else to say, "Oh, by the way, I know this is a disaster, so I am going to stick this on my agenda, and either you pass it that way or it doesn't get passed." At no time that I know of has someone in Congress said to those who suffered earthquakes in California or floods along the Mississippi in 1993 or tornadoes or fires, never have I heard the Congress say, "And, by the way, yes, we're in the business of disaster relief, but we want to stick extraneous amendments on which are controversial, and we are willing to play with the threat of a veto by a President because we're not so concerned about the victims of a disaster."

Some have said, "Well, it's not urgent; it can wait a couple of weeks." Let me describe for my colleagues why it is urgent and why what the House has done, if it continues to do it—and it looks like it will—why it is significant to the people of our region.

The money in this bill, \$500 million for Community Development Block Grants, which is the most flexible money available to help rebuild and recover, cannot be made available, cannot be obligated and cannot be committed by these cities to say to those folks who lost everything, and lost their homes especially, that "here is our new floodplain, here is where we are going to buy out the homes, here is a commitment we will buy out your home, and now you can start building anew." This delays that. It delays recovery. It delays rebuilding. It delays repair. And delay is critical in our part of the country.

We have a very short construction season. This 2-week delay, 4-week delay, or 6-week delay, whatever it turns out to be, is a devastating delay to people who are not in their homes and who are awaiting answers from local officials about what will happen to the home that is already destroyed.

So, Mr. President, there is no excuse for what has happened. I want to make it clear that the Senate Appropriations Committee created a disaster portion of this bill that is a wonderful, wonderful response to the people of our region.

I commend Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD and all of the people who worked together to do that. That is not

where the problem is. They are to be complimented. The problem exists because we had some folks on the other side of the Capitol who said, "We don't care. We're leaving. We've got a plane ticket and a ride out of town."

I ask those who are now on their way, if they have the time in the next week when the Congress is on recess, to stop by Grand Forks, ND. I just finished talking to the mayor. There is a line of people outside the civic center, and every single one of them is asking, "What is happening to the funding? Do you have the ability to commit so we know if there is going to be a buyout of our house? Do you have some commitment to rebuild?" Every one of them is asking, "When will we know?"

To those who believe it is important to go on recess and ignore the needs of people in a disaster, I say, "Stop by Grand Forks and explain to those folks why that was their priority."

This disaster portion of this bill is a good portion of the bill. The Senator from Washington is here. He serves on the Senate Appropriations Committee with me. All of it with respect to disaster is now agreed to—all of it. I compliment every member of that committee because they have done a wonderful job. It simply could have been lifted out and passed so at least the disaster portion is available, because we did it and did it right. Republicans and Democrats working together did it right.

But what happened was, last evening, some folks on the other side said, "We're sorry, we're just not going to do that, we're going home." And if I sound a little angry—I guess that is probably an appropriate word to describe it. I don't think that I ought to stand here and say, "Well, that's the way the system works." I represent thousands of people who don't have a home, thousands of people who don't have much hope, thousands of people who are asking for help. And I think it is unconscionable that anyone on that side of the Capitol believes it is appropriate to leave those people high and dry without an answer, without hope, and without help.

Oh, yes, it is going to come, and when it comes, I am going to be thankful that it is there. But, between now and then, it is delayed—delay of recovery, delay of rebuilding and delay of providing hope that we should well provide to the people of that region. There hasn't been one instance since I have been in Congress that I have not been the first to say, "Sign me up" when there is an earthquake in California that devastates that region. I say it is our job, yes, our job as North Dakota taxpayers to say to them, "We want to help you."

The same is true of every region of the country that has suffered disaster. It is important for us to reach out and help, and it is especially important now when we need help for the rest of the country to do that. The Senate Appropriations Committee was prepared

to do it and had written a piece to do it. Regrettably, it is Friday afternoon, and it now looks like there will be a recess without disaster aid going to people who will not be sleeping in their bed—not a hundred of them, not a thousand of them, but thousands and thousands—who the mayors of these cities say await word of when this help is coming.

I don't know if there is going to be other news today on this subject, but I hope some way is found and that this will not be the final message as this Congress leaves for the Memorial Day recess. If it is, I pledge to be on the floor the first time this Congress reconvenes to say to my colleagues that now is the time to at least pass the disaster portion of this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if the Senator from Washington will yield for an inquiry as to how long he expects to be.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Washington will take somewhere between 10 and 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator.

#### BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the budget resolution which has just been adopted by this body is a remarkable achievement. It is a remarkable achievement partly because, for the first time in decades, it was adopted by a large bipartisan majority rather than as a simple partisan document. It is a remarkable achievement as well, I believe, because each of the 78 Members of this body who voted for it did so with serious reservations about substantial portions of that budget resolution. Yes, it meets the primary objective of the President and of the vast majority of Members in Congress in that it establishes policies under which the budget will, in fact, come into balance shortly after the turn of the century.

Yes, it does, in fact, limit spending and the growth of Government to a slower rate at least than would take place were we on automatic pilot.

Yes, it meets some but by no means all of the President's priorities as he outlined them in his State of the Union Address.

And, yes, it provides very real tax relief for the American people, most particularly for working American parents and their children. But those of us for whom tax relief was a major goal are unhappy because it is insufficient and because there are too many new spending programs, and those relatively indifferent to tax relief but in favor of all of the President's priorities, and more, are unhappy because there is not enough spending included in this resolution.

In the long run, however, Mr. President, I believe that it represents a triumph, or rather the culmination of a set of conflicting ideas which somehow