

time workers in Louisiana, for the 1.085 million workers in Louisiana who work on an hourly wage, and for the 42,000 workers in Louisiana who work at the minimum wage, \$5.15—I will repeat that—\$5.15—because this President and the Republican leadership refuse to increase the minimum wage, so these workers are working at \$5.15 an hour because this President refuses to raise the minimum wage, or to support a raise in the minimum wage—we are going to tell these people that while there is \$26 billion in the trust fund, we choose not to “expand” the program.

Let me register my strongest objection to that, and let me on behalf of the 4.5 million people in my State register their strong objection to that and say how disappointed they are that this administration and the House Republican leadership refuse to give them the money they put in the fund so when times went bad they would have it to keep paying their house note, so they didn't lose all the equity they have spent the last 20 years of their lives working for.

Let me also object to the sentiment expressed too often on this floor that we have to give people an incentive to work. I don't know too many people who don't want to work. I really don't. Whether they work for a paycheck or stay at home raising seven children, or nine children, or four children, they work very hard. I don't know too many Americans who don't want to work because with work comes dignity, with work comes self-satisfaction, with work comes thinking that you are doing something to help yourself and your family and your country. I know that a job or a small business is what most people aspire overwhelmingly to. But when that small business or that job slips out of their hands, not because they didn't do a great job or because they don't enjoy working, but because the company and because the policies that we are managing have come short, and we hand them that pink slip and we say, go for it, you have 13 weeks to find another job—a job having the same benefits and salary—and when it runs out, we might consider giving you another 13 weeks, we have to look people in the eye and say I am sorry, there is no more help—when there is \$26 billion sitting in this account.

So I wanted to register my strongest objection to leaving out a portion of these workers and to say for the workers in my State that I am going to be here now for 6 years fighting for them, talking for them. I hope I can do it adequately to meet how worthy they are. I am going to do my very best to represent them in as forceful and effective way possible on this and many other issues.

Let me close with giving a few concrete suggestions. If we are going to have a stimulus package, let's be truthful and honest about the portions of it that will actually stimulate the economy and those that might stimu-

late our conference next election time. I ask the administration to relook at their package. Why don't we have the payroll tax holiday? The payroll tax holiday has been judged by conservative and liberal think tanks to be one of the most effective, immediate stimuli we can provide for the Nation. The money doesn't have to come out of the Social Security trust fund. It can come out of the general fund, based on payroll taxes. It is fair to every worker—the very wealthy, the middle income, and the poor. It rewards the idea of work. It is immediate and it is \$1,500 per family. That \$1,500 could be used immediately in this economy to give people confidence and to prime the pump, if you will.

The Social Security offset—again, putting money into the hands of workers, retirees, people who have worked hard now, instead of getting both their full retirement checks—teachers in many instances are offset by their Social Security benefits—what good does that do if we can provide both, which we have the money to do, which is less expensive than this package, and give them both of those checks.

Those people are in a time of their life when they are spending that money—not saving it, but spending it to live. That primes the pump in this Nation, as well as everything we can do to give depreciation for real estate, which would help in investments, and accelerating tax reductions for small business owners. But anything outside of that is actually nothing but stimulating some other special interests for other purposes, other than, in my opinion, strengthening this economy. That is wrong.

I hope Congress and this Senate will work hard to fashion a stimulus package that is truly stimulative, affordable, financially responsible, and something that really helps all people, and not just those at the very top, but those who count on us to do our part to help them do what they are trying to do for their families and their communities.

Mr. President, I am here giving my strongest support for moving forward with the unemployment compensation benefits, but very disappointed—extremely disappointed—that over a third to a half of workers in this Nation have been left out, and to say that we should include everyone, and we should focus on making the program better and more effective so that it is more helpful. I will tell you \$182 a week, or \$250 a week—the average payment in Louisiana—doesn't go far. You cannot even pay a grocery bill for a family with three or four children with \$200 a week. I don't know where you get gas money, rent money, or mortgage payments on top of that. So this Congress has a lot to do when it comes to reforming, reshaping, revitalizing, and redesigning the unemployment insurance program for this Nation. I hope to be a part of that. But for today, extending that benefit—at least for all

the workers who deserve it—again, it is not our money; it is theirs. They worked hard for it. There is \$26 billion in the trust fund and we should give it to them.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask that the time be equally charged to both sides.

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

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

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, we also are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ALLARD pertaining to the introduction of S. 98 are located in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

THE MISSING MILLION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am happy we were able to get an extension of unemployment compensation earlier today so there is a seamless flow of checks from December 28 through the period of our new legislation. If we had not completed it today, and hopefully in the House tomorrow and with the President's signature on Thursday, there would have been a lapse of those checks. We could have gone back and made up the difference but there still would have been a period of time that unemployed people would not get checks. I know there was a lot of concern on the other side of the aisle that we were trying to pass this too quickly. I am glad they backed down and allowed us to move ahead.

During the debate that took the form of reserving the right to object, there were a number of statements made about what they wanted to do. I take the opportunity to clarify the record of what my Democratic colleagues were really talking about. A number of colleagues have made the statement that the unemployment extension we passed earlier today leaves out a million workers.

Under the regular State unemployment program—and this is under long-standing law—workers are entitled to as much as 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. Under the temporary federally funded unemployment program that Congress passed last March, which we are continuing now, those who exhaust their State regular unemployment benefits can receive up to 13 weeks of additional benefits. In addition, the program we passed last March provided up to 13 weeks of yet more benefits in extremely high unemployment States. In those high unemployment States, that means a maximum of 26 weeks of Federal benefits on top of the usual 26 weeks of State benefits. I repeat, workers in every State can collect 39 weeks of benefits—26 weeks State, plus 13 weeks Federal. And workers in high unemployment States can collect 52 weeks of benefits—26 weeks of State benefits and 13 weeks Federal, plus an additional 13 weeks for unemployed people in the high unemployment States.

As we discussed, the bill we passed earlier today would allow more than 2 million workers to collect extended benefits through May of this year. According to some of my Democratic colleagues, that is not enough. They want to let workers who have collected 26 weeks of regular State benefits plus 13 weeks of federally funded benefits collect an additional 13 weeks of benefits, for a total of 52 weeks of benefits for everyone, every place, regardless of the unemployment rate of a particular State. In other words, the agreement we reached last March to provide up to 9 months of benefits in every State, and 12 months of benefits in high unemployment States, is no longer good enough as indicated by the debate of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle earlier this afternoon. They want 12 months of benefits for everyone in every State regardless of whether unemployment is going up or going down.

They claim extending last year's agreement leaves out a million workers. I respectfully disagree. Their proposal goes well beyond anything Congress has ever done. It provides 12 months of federally funded benefits to all workers in every State. While the national unemployment rate is higher than it was at this time last year, the unemployment rate in 20 States is now lower than it was a year ago.

Under current law, no one can receive more in federally funded benefits than they received in State benefits. In other words, those who collect 26 weeks of State benefits could also collect 26 weeks of federally funded benefits; but in those States that might have only 20 weeks of State benefits, then there would only be 20 weeks of federally funded benefits under current law. So there is a link between what we give in Federal benefits and State benefits. This link is designed to give States the ability to honor their unemployment program.

Although we have not seen the latest version, the Democratic proposal would

break this link. By breaking the link, it would pay federally funded benefits without regard to the 26 week level of State benefits. This represents a very historic and unprecedented expansion of the unemployment program.

While we may need to revisit the issue of unemployment benefits later this year, it seems to me that we should carefully review this proposal before final action. In the meantime, we have had an opportunity to make sure that there is a seamless flow of checks from December 28, now, to those 750,000 unemployed people who would otherwise have had a lapse in receiving unemployment compensation, plus probably 2.5 million people connected with those respective families. And, for people on the other side of the aisle who think they have legitimacy and want to discuss these additional issues, the institution of the Senate is very prone towards hearing any idea that Senators want presented, having an environment or a forum for the presentation of that. So we probably will be forced to, and maybe ought to, review what the Democrats propose today. But we should not do it in an environment as we had today. If it had been adopted today, I am sure the House of Representatives would not have accepted it and, obviously, if we had gone to conference to work out the differences, no bill would have been presented to the President of the United States by Thursday—for his signature in time, then, to keep a seamless flow of unemployment checks.

So I am glad we were able to work this out. Obviously, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I have to be open to discussion of any issues dealing with unemployment. I look forward to those discussions but in an environment that does not stall the flow of checks for people who are deserving of them, and that is those people who would have otherwise been cut off on December 28.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will again suggest the absence of a quorum, but I ask the time be evenly charged against each side.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to have a vote in a short time. It is going to be a vote on adjourning the Senate. That is what the vote will be.

But in substance it is more than that. We have had a number of Senators here who have requested a vote on adjournment. The reason they have done that is because they believe they should be able to have a vote on unemployment benefits for the people who are not covered in the legislation we just passed. So let there be no mistake, even though this procedurally is a vote on adjourning the Senate, the substantive aspect of this vote is that people who vote to adjourn the Senate today at approximately 5 o'clock will be voting to not allow about 1 million people to have unemployment benefits.

That is what this is about. I have told my friend, my counterpart, that there are a number of people who believed a vote was inappropriate. There are people who have worked on both sides of the aisle not to have a vote today. But there are a number of people who believe the vote is important. I want to make sure, before that vote occurs at 5 o'clock, that people know what the purpose of the vote is.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend from Nevada, the motion to adjourn will have absolutely nothing to do with unemployment benefits. It is simply, in the judgment of this Senator, an ill-advised attempt to disrupt what is typically a ceremonial day. We have Members of the Senate who were sworn in today—some of them brand new, some of them for the second and third and fourth and fifth terms—who have family in town. They are scattered all about the Capitol and off the Capitol with receptions for their friends.

There is nothing, I would say, that the other side could do today on this issue that they could not do on Thursday on this issue. If they want to make a point on the subject, certainly that is always possible in the Senate, the Senate being the Senate.

But this is going to be extremely disruptive to the Members and their families. I am told by floor staff there is nothing we can do to prevent this vote, and so we will have it. But hopefully we will have it with enough notice to give our colleagues, who are scattered around town with their families and friends, an opportunity to come back and cast a completely unnecessary vote, which has nothing to do with anything other than whether or not we adjourn tonight.

Make no mistake about it, this is a meaningless vote. It is simply a procedural vote that we normally would not take at the end of the day. No effort to describe it otherwise would be sufficient to convince anyone that this is anything more than simply a motion to adjourn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY NOMINATIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today the Senate received from the President the nominations for the positions of Secretary of Homeland Security and Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security. I understand that these nominations will be referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs because at this time the primary responsibility of these two officials will be to implement the structural reorganization of disparate entities into this new agency. I understand that in the future nominations for various positions created by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 may be referred on the basis of the responsibilities of those officials at that time, and that the initial referral of these nominations will not serve as precedent binding the Chair in the future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SALT RIVER PROJECT'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. KYL. Mr. President, my best wishes today go to the Salt River Project on the celebration of its centennial of service to the communities of central Arizona.

When the Salt River Project, or SRP, was created on February 7, 1903, Arizona was still a territory and the people who had settled its central desert valleys had just endured a period of devastating droughts. They knew the future of their farms, businesses, and families depended on securing a reliable supply of water. If they failed, they were sure to witness the continued withering of their farms and livelihoods.

With commitment, they banded together to form the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, later to become SRP. With courage, they mortgaged their lands as debt collateral for a federal loan that was granted under terms of the National Reclamation Act of 1902. And the result eight years later was the completion of a great monolithic stone dam that was named after the President, Theodore Roosevelt. It would be the first of other dams and water works built through partnership with SRP and federal and local governments to ensure the economic vitality of my native state.

Without Roosevelt Dam, Arizona's early communities could not have grown. Similarly, growth would not have continued without SRP's development and management of early hydro-power resources and later leadership and partnership in constructing extensive generation and transmission systems to fuel Arizona's economy.

In the past century, SRP has become Arizona's largest water supplier and

the third largest public power provider in the nation. It has gained a reputation as a utility with a record for service, safety, and commitment to the environment and human services. As SRP celebrates its centennial, it deserves recognition for its past achievements and for the important role it will continue to play in Arizona's advancement in the 21st century.●

TRIBUTE TO GOVERNOR FELIX CAMACHO AND LT. GOVERNOR KALEO MOYLAN

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, hafa adai and happy new year from our Nation's capital. It gives me great pleasure to congratulate Governor Felix Camacho and Lt. Governor Kaleo Moylan on their inauguration day as the seventh elected governor and lieutenant governor of Guam.

Guam's people have shown their patriotism to America time and time again. Indeed, it is this allegiance, coupled with a rich island culture, that make Guam so unique in our American family and an integral and indispensable part of our nation. As incoming Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, I look forward to working with both the governor and lieutenant governor, as we tackle Guam's present challenges.

As they embark on rebuilding their community, some progress will be swift and dramatic. At other times, improvements may be slower and only with perseverance and diligent hard work will they be finally achieved. Together, Guam and Washington will overcome these challenges.

I join the people of Guam in congratulating Governor Felix Camacho and Lt. Governor Kaleo Moylan, once again, and I look forward to meeting and working with them to address their island's needs. For this reason and in order to memorialize this moment, I have submitted this letter to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 7, 2003.●

RETIREMENT OF JERRY SONGY

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, in 1998, the Senate passed the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act, which I strongly supported. This landmark legislation set the Internal Revenue Service, IRS, on a new course, one that most Members of this body would agree is the right one. Today, the IRS is much more focused on customer service and education to achieve compliance with the Nation's tax laws.

It takes more than a new law, however, to change the way an agency fulfills its mission. It takes talented people committed to those reforms in order to turn the words in the statute into reality. We all know the role that former Commissioner Charles O. Rossotti played in restructuring the agency, and I commend him again for his invaluable service to the IRS and the Nation.

Today, I rise to recognize one of Mr. Rossotti's key aides, Jerry Songy, who

is retiring after 34 years of dedication to agency. In early 1998, Jerry was selected to lead an organizational modernization effort that was intended to transform the IRS into a more customer-focused organization. Jerry's contributions to this business-process reengineering effort have greatly improved the delivery of products and services to all of America's taxpayers, and small businesses and the self-employed taxpayers in particular.

In addition to serving as Executive Director, Modernization Design, Jerry was instrumental in the design of the Small Business/Self-Employed, SB/SE, operating division, which serves approximately 45 million small businesses and self-employed taxpayers. He was also a driving force in the creation of the Taxpayer Education and Communication, TEC, section and has led the SB/SE division in its outreach and education efforts to small business and self-employed taxpayers. As the former Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I had the pleasure of working with Jerry in that capacity.

Through his efforts, the IRS has created innovative web site applications, multilingual CDs, and a series of web cast programs to assist taxpayers with their tax filing and payment responsibilities. The IRS has partnered with tax practitioner and payroll organizations, trade and professional organizations, educational institutions, and corporate America on joint tax education initiatives. In short, our constituents are seeing the tangible benefits of Jerry's hard work on behalf of small enterprises across the nation.

Jerry was born and raised in New Orleans, LA and graduated from Loyola University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting. He has two sons, three grandchildren, and will be joined in retirement by his wife, Lea, who also has had a distinguished career with the IRS.

On behalf of the 45 million small businesses and self-employed taxpayers throughout the country that have benefitted from his hard work and dedication, I commend Jerry Songy for his exemplary contributions to public service.●

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE NICKOL

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Bonnie Nickol of Little Rock, Arkansas, who has committed herself to helping working families in Arkansas through the Arkansas Single Parent Scholarship Fund.

Bonnie's first involvement with the scholarship fund came in 1997. The fund's director, Ralph Nesson, knowing of Bonnie's interest in education, introduced her to several of the people who benefit from this statewide network of scholarship programs that help single parents get the education they need to better provide for their families. Bonnie was touched by the efforts