

WOMEN IN CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to comment on an issue that I think is so important. In reading the Hill publication Roll Call, I think it speaks volumes to look at page 13. I see the distinguished Democratic leader coming in, and I am sure he would agree with that.

On this page, it indicates why, from the time he and I came to the Senate, things have changed for the better. This is a picture of all the women in the Senate. There are 3 Republicans and I think 9 or 10 Democrats. It is really a tremendously important picture.

I recall last year when the military construction appropriations bill came to the floor. That committee was chaired by the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and the ranking member was the Senator from Texas, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON. That says it all.

I think this is a better place and we are a better country for having these women in the Senate.

Then I show to my distinguished friend, the Democratic leader, on this same page there is a picture of the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI. I think that is really tremendous, and we should think every day about what a better place this is because of the women who have been elected to the House and Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

A CHANGE OF HEART OR ONLY A CHANGE OF FACE?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, the assistant Democratic leader. We have made a great deal of progress, as is evidenced by the number of women who now serve in the Senate as well as the House. In addition, of course, as we look to the election of the first woman as a leader of either caucus, I think that, too, speaks volumes for the transition that this country and the Congress itself have experienced over the course of the last couple of decades. We have made progress on women's rights, and many of us would like to think we have made progress as well on civil rights.

Over the course of the last several weeks, this country has been focused on the issue of civil rights. I think virtually every Member of the body spoke strongly about the need for healing and reconciliation as we consider the issue of civil rights and the rights of minorities in this country. We recognize we have a long way to go.

We have a new leader in the Republican caucus who has pledged to pursue these goals, and I applaud him for his willingness to do so. Unfortunately, yesterday the Republican leader may have caused confusion about his intent in that regard. His comments indicated to me that among the Republican lead-

ership there may have been a change of face, but there has not been a change of heart.

When the administration chose to renominate Charles Pickering to the second highest court in the land, it now appears that in many respects, they did not even have a change of face. The question is whether or not all of us, Republicans and Democrats, can express in our actions what so many have expressed in words. If indeed it is a change of heart, we need to see actions that bear out such a change.

On the question of affirmative action, Senator FRIST said he supports it if affirmative action is defined as it was in the 1960 Civil Rights Act. Well, that was not affirmative action; that was civil rights. That was equal rights.

The real question of affirmative educational opportunity is now being asked in the United States Supreme Court. The administration has chosen to remain silent. Yesterday the Republican leader in the Senate did not ask them to break that silence or indicate a desire to break his.

When it comes to protecting equal rights, we still have a lot of work to do in changing hearts, in changing minds, and in changing laws. Unfortunately, that lesson still seems to be lost on a number of our Republican colleagues, in spite of their expressions of intent over the course of the last several weeks.

There will be much more to say and do on the issue of racial reconciliation in the coming weeks. I hope to see more than just words from our Republican colleagues, because yesterday it appeared that what we had hoped was a change of heart was little more than a change of face.

Last week the administration announced we would be able to see the details of the economic stimulus package they intend to offer.

Last week we also learned that during the month of December we lost 100,000 jobs; 100,000 jobs in December. That brings the total job loss since George Bush took office to 2.3 million jobs. When the President puts forth his stimulus plan, my concern is it will be a stimulus plan for the rich and a sedative for the rest. The reason I say that, in part, is because there is very little job creation in the first year under what we know of the President's plan. The President has acknowledged that in his first year he will be creating approximately 190,000 jobs. When that 190,000 jobs is compared to the 100,000 jobs lost in December alone, or the 2.3 million jobs lost in the first 2 years, 190,000 jobs is hardly a drop in the bucket. It is hardly worth writing home about. It is not the stimulus that all economists and the rest of the country expect the Congress to consider. That is the concern many have: 90 percent of the so-called stimulus plan the President is proposing takes place in the outyears—not when we are losing the jobs by the hundreds of thousands each month. It takes place in years beyond 2003.

If anything, the economists have said over and over if you are going to create a stimulus package, make sure it is immediate. Make sure it takes effect now, not at some point in the outyears. We made that mistake before. We are feeling the consequences of it. So, the fact it does not stimulate the economy is the first concern we have.

My second concern is the question of fairness. Mr. President, 200,000 millionaires get tax relief that exceeds the salary of 92 million Americans who make \$50,000 or less. Again, 200,000 millionaires will get \$89,000 annually as a tax cut while those who are making \$50,000 a year or less will get somewhere in the vicinity of \$70 or \$80 a year in tax reduction. This proposal flunks the test of fairness.

I am troubled on two other accounts. In the last few weeks young men and women at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota have been sent off to the Persian Gulf to prepare for war. We hope that war will not come. But if war does come, they will be asked to put their lives on the line. They will be asked to put their lives on the line at the very time these millionaires are going to get an \$89,000 tax break. For the life of me, I don't see where the fairness is in that.

Over the last 333 days, we have also suggested there has to be some form of drought relief, some form of assistance given to farmers and ranchers and people in rural areas who are suffering as a consequence of the drought. So far we have been unsuccessful. We have been unsuccessful because the administration has said we cannot afford \$6 billion in drought assistance. What I don't understand is how in the name of fiscal fairness we can support \$764 billion in tax cuts largely directed to those at the very top while we tell our farmers and ranchers they are not eligible for any assistance and while we send our young men and women off to war. On the issue of fairness, this plan also fails.

Perhaps my biggest concern, however, goes to how reckless this plan is. People have to be reminded we are borrowing every single dollar of these funds to pay for the tax cut. We are borrowing that out of Social Security. We have no other recourse. Whatever money is going to go to the tax cut this year will be borrowed from the Social Security trust fund. So the fact we are borrowing at a time when we may go to war, where we may actually have to draw down more resources to be able to fight that war, seems senseless to me. To borrow at the magnitude the President is proposing, \$764 billion in face value and perhaps \$1 trillion when interest costs are factored in, \$1 trillion when we have to fight a war, seems like the most reckless course for fiscal responsibility I can think of.

The Governors are not sounding a false alarm when they tell us this plan will cost them \$4 billion. That is over and above the \$50 billion shortfall they are currently experiencing all over this

country. In my own State of South Dakota, we are experiencing about a \$50 million shortfall, one of the largest on record. But it is \$50 billion nationwide. This tax plan will exacerbate that \$50 billion by another \$4 billion.

Mr. President, from the point of view of its stimulative value, from the point of view of fairness, from the point of view of our responsibilities and the potential for recklessness, this plan leaves a great deal to be desired. In fact, it causes very great concern to many.

I am also troubled that as we contemplate the need for action on this stimulus package, as we contemplate the need to address the omnibus appropriations bill, as we recognize we still have to work out our organizing resolution, that the Congress may take vacation next week. I hope we would refrain from taking a vacation next week. I hope we come to the floor, resolve these matters, work on them intently, bring this economic stimulus plan, have a good debate, make sure we are acting in good faith to try to deal with these tragic unemployment numbers that roll out month after month. That is my hope, that we stay here next week, that we address these concerns in a realistic, in a bipartisan, and in an immediate way, sending a clear message we are a lot more interested in getting this work done than we are in taking a few days off so soon into the new session. I stand ready to work with our Republican leadership and certainly with those in the committees as we begin to do our work.

Senator FRIST and I have had some conversations with regard to the organizing resolution. We are not yet able to say with any confidence when we may finish those discussions. It is fair to say, as everyone knows, we had exactly the mirror circumstances in the 107th Congress that we have today. In the 107th Congress, there were 51 Members in the majority and 49 Members in the minority. In the 108th Congress, there are 51 Members in the majority and 49 Members in the minority. It would seem to me given the fact that we have simply seen a reverse, the mirror image of the makeup of the 107th Congress, we ought to have exactly the same organizing resolution; the same funding, the same membership, the same space, the same circumstances. That really is as simply as I can describe what the Democratic position is. If it was good enough for Republicans and Democrats in the 107th Congress, you would think it would be good enough for Democrats and Republicans in the 108th Congress.

We are willing to settle for 49 percent of the resources, 49 percent of the space, and a one-vote Republican majority on committees in the 108th Congress. That is our position. It is the same position we held last time. Unfortunately, there are some who have argued that ratio is not satisfactory any longer. Since they are in the majority, they want more—more resources, more

space. I hope, in the interests filling the committee positions and moving through the legislative agenda we have before us, that we can move as quickly as possible to a resolution of this matter.

Let's do in this Congress what we did in the last one. We all signed off on it. We all said it was the right thing to do. We all agreed, and the time has come for us to agree again.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I will be happy to.

Mr. REID. The leader has made it very clear, but I want to make sure again that everyone hears the fact the Democrats simply want to have the same exact program for committees that was here last year. The only thing is the Democrats are now in the minority and Republicans are now in the majority, but the funding and the staffing and the space would be exactly the same, is that right?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, that is exactly what I am proposing and what I assume would be the circumstance in the 108th Congress.

As I say, I did not have one chairman last year express a concern about the inadequacy of resources while we were in the majority. I can't imagine, with the cost-of-living adjustment, that anyone would have difficulty accepting those resources—as I say, with a cost-of-living adjustment—in this Congress.

Mr. REID. If there is a problem here and the organizational efforts are not going forward, it would not be anything the Democratic leader has done? You want exactly the same situation as last year, is that right?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely correct. What we are simply saying is what we had agreed to with a 51-49 breakdown in the 107th Congress is what we ought to agree to with a 51-49 breakdown in the 108th Congress.

Mr. REID. If I could ask the Democratic leader one other series of questions based upon what I think was his very clear speech, the Wall Street Journal, which I understand has a circulation of about 2.5 million people, came out today with something you usually don't see in the Wall Street Journal, something supporting what we think is going wrong in the country. The headline in the Wall Street Journal:

U.S. Job-Market Slump Is Longest in Decades—Near-Term Prospects for Workers Remain Grim . . .

The leader is aware that even the Wall Street Journal is painting a very bleak picture about this economy, is that true?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is certainly true. I read that article this morning. I commend the distinguished Senator from Nevada for raising its content.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 13, 2003]
U.S. JOB-MARKET SLUMP IS LONGEST IN DECADES—NEAR TERM PROSPECTS FOR WORKERS REMAIN GRIM DESPITE HOPEFUL FORECASTS
(By Jon E. Hilsenrath)

The labor market in the U.S. appears to be in the most protracted slump in decades, and the near-term prospect for workers isn't encouraging.

The Labor Department said payroll employment contracted by 101,000 in December, led by more hemorrhaging in the manufacturing sector, which eliminated jobs for the 29th straight month, and by struggling retailers that hired less than normally during the Christmas selling season. The unemployment rate was steady in December at 6%, mainly because workers are leaving the labor force, which contracted by 191,000 last month.

For more than a year, economists have said that the current economic recovery was too limp to spur hiring because corporate profits have been so weak. In recent weeks, however, economists have speculated that the jobs market would start to pick up later this year, in part because they expect business confidence to improve. Some recent reports support that argument. The Institute for Supply Management, for instance, said earlier this month that orders to manufacturers picked up in December.

But Friday's report suggested that, despite signs that the corporate sector is healing, cost cutting remains the order of the day for many companies. That could mean more setbacks for labor.

The surprising labor market weakness heightened attention on Wall Street and in Washington on the need for fiscal stimulus. President George W. Bush last week proposed \$674 billion in tax cuts and spending increases to lift economic growth. Analysts said the weak job market probably softens opposition to some kind of action out of Congress in the months ahead, although the shape of that action remains to be hashed out by Washington partisans.

Bush administration officials seized on the report to make their case. "The president views the latest report on unemployment as another reason why it's so important for Congress to pass the president's job-creating economic plan," said presidential spokesman Ari Fleischer. Democrats argue that the Bush plan doesn't provide enough short-term stimulus and costs too much in the long-term.

Even before Friday's report, economists were likening the U.S. economy's performance to the jobless recovery of the early 1990s. The latest data suggest it might be that and more. Few job-market downturns have been this protracted. The 29 straight declines in manufacturing employment is the longest stretch of manufacturing retrenchment in post World War II history. Overall in the 22 months since the recession began in March 2001, employers have eliminated 1.75 million jobs. By contrast, 22 months after the 1990 recession began, employment had already started to pick up, and fewer jobs—1.57 million—had been eliminated.

Executive caution about hiring has made it increasingly hard for unemployed workers to get back in the work force once they have lost jobs. The Labor Department said 22% of all unemployed workers have been out of work for more than half a year, the highest ratio of long-term unemployed workers since 1992. Also in December, 30% of workers said jobs were hard to get, the highest level since 1994, an earlier report by the Conference Board indicated.

Some economists said the weak job market puts the economy on more insecure footing

at the beginning of 2003. Business spending has been held back for months by uncertainties surrounding the possibility of war with Iraq. Economists are becoming concerned that the weak job market could pinch consumer spending.

But the job market news wasn't all bad last week. Several economists said they expect the employment statistics to look a bit better in January because of seasonal adjustment factors. And the U.S. government's measure of retail employment fell for December after seasonal adjustments, because retailers hired fewer workers than they normally do in the month. In January, they are conversely likely to lay off fewer seasonal workers, which should boost the retail employment statistics.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, simply to summarize the article, it says not only are we suffering month-to-month joblessness at levels we have not seen in 8 years, but if you look at the joblessness in the context of the economy over the last several decades, this is one of the most severe slumps we have seen in decades.

So we have both an immediate context and a long-term context. In both of those contexts, as the Wall Street Journal article points out, this matter is of great consequence. Mr. President, 2.3 million jobs, now, in the last 24 months have been lost. What the article simply states is that, while it is a serious immediate concern, we have to be very concerned about the long-term repercussions of this joblessness. I thought it was one of the better articles I had seen in recent times with regard to the economic dilemma we face as we deal with the stimulus package later this month.

Mr. REID. If I could ask one more question? The leader mentioned we were borrowing money. It is true, is it not, that when this administration took over there was a 10-year surplus, in the trillions of dollars? Whether it was \$5 trillion or \$6 trillion, it was trillions of dollars. In the last 2 years every penny of that is gone, and the leader is certainly aware of that, is that true?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would say to the Senator from Nevada, that is one of my greatest concerns. Obviously, the debt we were able to eliminate over the final years of the 1990s, thinking that somehow—I can recall having conversations that we may be spending down the debt too fast. People expressed the concern we might be eliminating the debt too fast.

I just now shake my head in disbelief we even had conversations like that. But, nonetheless, that was one of the concerns expressed by some during that period of time.

I can recall so vividly this question about what it is we were going to do with a \$5.5 trillion projected surplus. We no longer have that surplus projection. We no longer have those year-to-year balanced budgets we were proud to report to the American people. We now have a deficit of \$200 billion to \$300 billion, depending on whether or not you consider the Social Security trust fund. We are expected now to see a def-

icit of \$350 billion in the next fiscal year. So we will see debts of a magnitude we have not seen, deficits of a magnitude we have not experienced as a result of what has happened over the course of the last 24 months.

In spite of it, we are going to be actually borrowing to exacerbate that debt even more, borrowing to provide a tax cut to those at the very top of the income scale.

I have always been concerned about the relationship between the circumstances we face now in the war on terror and the circumstances we faced in World War II. President Roosevelt stood up and said: I want all Americans to sacrifice. In fact, he raised revenue, he did everything possible to ensure there was an adequate degree of sacrifice across the board. Now we are asking young men and women to sacrifice perhaps their lives at the very time we turn around and give a millionaire an \$89,000 tax break. It turns logic on its head, but that is the concern I have.

I appreciate very much the Senator from Nevada raising the question.

Mr. REID. I know how busy the Democratic leader is, but I would ask one more question. The Democratic leader is going into his 9th year being leader of this caucus. Prior to that time Senator Mitchell of Maine was leader. I can remember the Democratic leader today and myself going into a meeting with Senator Mitchell. The problem there is the Republicans were having a mad rush to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but they were going to use Social Security surpluses to offset that deficit. The Senator remembers that, does he not?

Mr. DASCHLE. I sure do.

Mr. REID. You remember at that time I agreed to sponsor an amendment to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget but not using Social Security surpluses? That worked out well enough that we were able to stop that very mischievous amendment from passing. It would have wiped out Social Security. Social Security would be gone by now.

But I say to my friend, the Democratic leader, the money that is being borrowed now is coming from Social Security. Not only that, the deficit would even be more if they didn't use Social Security surpluses to hide it, isn't that also true?

Mr. DASCHLE. That's the concern we have about a \$200 billion Social Security cushion that is all being drawn down; not only this year, but for every year in the foreseeable future, every year in the coming decade. Every dollar of Social Security revenue coming in will be used to offset the costs involved in running the Government and providing the resources for the tax cuts the President has either advocated or actually enacted.

There is no doubt that the fiscal irresponsibility and the recklessness that comes with the extraordinary reliance

on Social Security trust funds at the very time the baby boomers are coming into retirement age is very troubling. I think it ought to be the subject of a lot more debate and scrutiny in the days and weeks ahead.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the leader is leaving the floor, I wish to recognize my friend from North Dakota who after I offered that amendment was on the forefront of the next Congress making sure that we continued our efforts to beat down that mischievous constitutional amendment to balance the budget which would have used the Social Security surplus to balance the budget. I applaud my friend from North Dakota for taking that tough stand which allowed us to move forward and help us defeat one of the most dangerous efforts in the guise of balancing the budget and destroying Social Security.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota.

FUNDING FOR COMMITTEE STAFFING AND THE PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT PROPOSAL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to make observations on two important points that have already been alluded to by my colleagues from South Dakota and Nevada during this session. One has to do with the need to resolve the issue of funding for committee staffing.

One ordinarily would think this would be an administrative decision that would not be of enormous consequence, but the fact is, until that is resolved, this Senate is not able to go forward with legislation of any kind, much less to resolving the fiscal year 2003 appropriations issue involving 11 of the 13 appropriations bills remaining incomplete and needing work. These are bills that should have been concluded prior to October 1 of last year, and yet here we are now well into January with that work incomplete.

I have some concerns about the size of the budget cuts—roughly \$9 billion—that will be required, apparently, to come out of these 11 appropriations bills in order to accommodate President Bush and the Republican leadership budget baseline to which they have agreed. I look forward to offering amendments to moderate that for purposes of agriculture, veterans health care, and other areas. But we cannot go forward, in any way, until a resolution is reached.

Unfortunately, the majority leader, at this point, appears to have taken the position of the far right of his caucus in demanding that his party have