

defer the payment of taxes. People who normally would have an estimated tax payment—personal business maybe—on September 15 will be given until the end of October to make that payment. They were looking for ways we, through the Federal Government, could exercise some charity, some consideration for those who were in harm's way and are now in desperate straits to pull their lives back together.

I come from a State where we have a lot of banks. We probably have more credit card banks per capita—probably issue half the credit cards issued in America. I am empowered to speak on this point. We have a lot of financial services companies around the world. They extend credit. Most do a great job of extending credit to people through America, the Northeast, Midwest, Southwest, and also the Gulf Coast States. Just as the Department of Treasury is trying to find ways to show kindness and a little consideration to those who are affected in the disaster areas on the tax side, my hope is our financial services companies which are going to be benefiting from the implementation of our new bankruptcy law this fall, this might be a good opportunity for some of them to say—and some of them already are doing this, I should point that out. Some financial services companies are saying: We want to help folks in the Southeast United States who have been affected, and here are the variety of ways we will do that. Some are not entirely forgiving indebtedness but are providing payment holidays, extending the dates on which payments are due, and taking away interest and finance charges. That is what we ought to applaud and the behavior we ought to encourage others to undertake.

Today, in addition to saying goodbye to our Chief Justice and to saying terrific work by folks from all walks of life to help people in dire straights, well done, we say to our financial services companies around the country that are trying to find their own ways to reach out and help people, God bless you. Good for you. Finally, to say to those who aren't, maybe you would like to join the parade and lend a helping hand as well.

(The remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1627 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CARPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of South Carolina, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 3:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:30 p.m., recessed until 3:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MARTINEZ).

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business with Senators recognized for up to 10 minutes.

The Senator from Idaho.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my 10 minutes, the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, be recognized for 10 minutes, to be followed by the Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK.

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

#### HONORING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to speak for three very important reasons. Of course, first is to recognize our Chief Justice who has just passed, William Rehnquist.

Today the Senate paid its respects to the late Justice Rehnquist, filing through the halls of the Supreme Court where he served this Nation with distinction for more than 33 years.

I could not help but remember a conversation I had with Chief Justice Rehnquist a couple of years ago. I was walking to work and happened to run into him on one of his legendary strolls around the Court. We talked a bit about what was happening in the judicial nomination process in the Senate. But the specifics of that conversation are probably less important than the style of the conversation. He was informal, approachable, genteel, but certainly direct. And regardless of his physical frailty, he had lost none of his interest or his ability to give a shrewd analysis of the events of the day. If you spent any time at all with this very important man, you would feel the force of his great personality.

Much has already been written about the legal legacy of Justice Rehnquist because he was one of the most influential jurists of our time. He anchored and presided over a shift to conservative principles, underscoring in particular the importance of federalism and limitations on Government. I know some in the conservative community were disappointed that the Supreme Court, on his watch, did not reverse more prior left-leaning precedents, but his strong hand was certainly obvious in a long series of history-making decisions. William Rehnquist's impact on jurisprudence was profound and will be felt for many years to come.

In his personal life, I know this engaging man had many friends, and to all of them, as well as his family, I extend my deepest condolences. The Court has lost a brilliant and fair leader. America has lost a great public servant. I consider myself fortunate to have had the chance to know and be inspired by William Rehnquist.

I thank the leader for this opportunity to add one more voice to the chorus of tributes from a grateful Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAMON TOBIAS AND GEORGE O'CONNOR

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, if you serve long enough in the Congress—I had the opportunity to serve 10 years in the House, and now I am into my third term in the Senate—you have a lot of very capable and wonderful people who work for you. If you serve long enough, as I have mentioned, they not only work for you but sometimes they decide to retire. In my situation, in my office, I have two people retiring this month, and I am going to miss them greatly. I want to speak a few moments about them.

First, I talk about Damon Tobias. Damon has been on my staff and handling my budget and tax issues and appropriations issues for a good number of years. I first met Damon in the House of Representatives when he was on the staff of Congressman Charlie Stenholm of Texas. Damon and I and Congressman Stenholm became involved in the balanced budget amendment movement at a time when deficits were totally out of control, and many of us worked to bring them under control. That is when Damon and I became friends. Through the 1980s we worked together on this most important issue.

I left the House to come to the Senate, and Damon left the Stenholm office to go to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Later on, 2 years after I came to the Senate, Damon joined my staff in March of 1992. Damon has continued to work for me over that time, dealing with the balanced budget amendment, dealing with taxes and budget and labor issues, immigration issues. Probably Damon has spent more time, along with me, trying to solve the immigration question for American agriculture and for workers in the American agricultural economy than nearly any other issue. Of course, that paramount bill he worked so much on now has majority support in this Senate and a vast coalition of Americans behind it, known as AgJOBS, and it is a legacy of which Damon can be truly proud. He worked on appropriations and small business and Hispanic issues.

He and his bride are going to return to his home State of New Mexico where Damon, I am sure, will proceed to do other things along with taking care of his aging mother. I and my staff are going to miss Damon Tobias, and I am convinced the Senate will also miss him.

Mr. President, I now wish to speak about George O'Connor. Many who are in the energy field not only here in the Senate but across the United States know George O'Connor. He has served with me as counsel, on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for a good number of years. He came to this city as a lawyer in 1980, working for the Stein, Mitchell & Mezines law firm as a litigator. He specialized in administrative law litigation before the Federal Trade Commission. He became a trial attorney for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Office of General Counsel in the Division of Hydroelectric Licensing in 1982.

He worked then as a legal advisor to FERC Commissioner Charles A. Trabandt from 1985 until 1993 and was responsible for environmental issues associated with energy projects. He returned to the FERC's Office of General Counsel until 1997.

In 1998, George joined my staff as a fellow, and it was not long before I realized I needed his talent on a full-time basis in the area of energy and natural resources. In the year 2000, he became directly involved with me and has worked in that capacity for a tremendous number of years. I must say that both George and I, at the close of the session for the August recess and the passage of the National Energy Policy Act, saw that as not only a culmination of a great career here in the Senate for George O'Connor but a substantial success for myself and other members of the Energy Committee who were much involved in that.

George has worked a total of 24 years in the Federal Government, and a total of 8 years in my office. I say, without question, I am going to miss George O'Connor. He is retiring to go downtown to do other things, and I am sure he will be back here when we need him helping us with his expertise and his talent. He is well known by all who associate with him as a tough but very fairminded and talented man.

I must say that George O'Connor has served my State of Idaho well, has served the Pacific Northwest well, where hydro is still a dominant producer of our electricity, and has served this Nation and the Senate well.

My hope for George O'Connor and Damon Tobias is that in their next life, which they are now about to assume, they will do well and be as successful in it as they have been as very talented and capable staffers here in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

HONORING CHIEF JUSTICE  
WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wish to join with all my colleagues and with America in expressing our condolences to the Rehnquist family and, obviously, our great appreciation for his extraordinary service to this Nation. I hope at a later date to put in a more

extensive statement. He was a man whose commitment to the law was exceptional, but his commitment to the country was even higher. We are very fortunate to have had him as our Chief Justice and as a Justice on the Supreme Court for so long.

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Mr. GREGG. I rise today basically to speak about another issue, and that is a letter which I have received as chairman of the Budget Committee and which was sent to the majority leader, the Speaker of the House, and the chairman of the Budget Committee on the House side by the leadership of the Democratic membership of the Senate and the House—Congresswoman PELOSI; JOHN SPRATT, who is ranking member on the House Budget Committee on the Democratic side; Senator REID, who, of course, is the Democratic leader; and KENT CONRAD, who is the ranking Democratic member of the Budget Committee.

The letter asks that we indefinitely postpone reconciliation, reconciliation being the mechanism by which we address the entitlement spending and tax policy here at the Federal level. It is an outgrowth, of course, of the budget process.

Now, the letter itself, if I can look at it, although I can hardly see it—I wish they would send these letters in larger fonts so those of us getting older would not have to take out our glasses to read them. But, in any event, the letter itself is structured in a way to assert a number of items, boldly assert items which essentially are inaccurate. In fact, the boldness of these inaccuracies is such that it would be humorous if they were not going to, I am sure, become part of the nomenclature of the left in the country and, indeed, be carried forth by the echo chambers, such as National Public Radio, which speaks for the left.

But their language says this:

Now is not the time to cut services for our most vulnerable, cut taxes for our most fortunate, and add \$35 billion to the deficit.

That is the basic theme of the letter.

If allowed to go forward, this bill—

They are talking about the reconciliation bill—would likely cut programs that many victims of Hurricane Katrina will be relying on, including Medicaid, food stamps, and student loans.

Those two statements are, as I said, boldly inaccurate and reflect a failure to accept history and a failure to look at the specifics of the reconciliation bill as it passed the Senate.

Now that does not surprise me. I have to admit, and the folks who signed this letter readily admit, they did not vote for the budget when it first passed 8 months ago or 7 months ago, however long ago, 6 months ago. When it first passed, these four individuals and their caucuses strongly opposed putting in place here in the Congress a budget

that had fiscal discipline, and they voted against it. So it should not come as a surprise and this letter should not come as a surprise that they are still against it and they still want to indefinitely postpone the key mechanisms which will make this budget effective.

But what is a little surprising is that they would assert such inaccuracies in their letter. Let's begin with the tax inaccuracy. They must be ignoring or they must not just look at history. They must not look at the history of the Kennedy tax cuts and the Reagan tax cuts, and most recently the George W. Bush tax cuts because one thing we proved beyond any reasonable doubt is that when you significantly cut taxes on the productive side of the American economy, you create economic activity, and as a result, you create jobs and you give people work and you create revenues for the Federal Government.

The numbers are incontrovertible. In the last 3 years, revenues have been jumping dramatically relative to the base we hit as a bottom as a result of the recession we experienced as a result of the bubble bursting, the Internet bubble of the 1990s, and the effects of 9/11. In fact, 2 years ago revenues jumped by 9 percent.

This year, revenues are literally going to jump by more than that. The revenue projections for the next few years are projected to increase by 7 percent, 6 percent, 7 percent. And the deficit has dropped by over \$150 billion from the original estimates purely as a result of economic activity that has been stimulated in large part because we have reduced the tax burden on the productive side of the ledger and created an incentive for people to go out and invest. As a result, there is an incentive for people to create jobs.

We had some of the best job creation in the history of this country over the last 2 years. As a result, people are paying taxes and revenues are going up. It is totally ignored and misrepresented in this letter. More specifically, and I think the thing that I find most unreasonable about the terms of this letter—or, as I say, most boldly inaccurate—is its representation that the reconciliation instructions, as they relate to the mandatory accounts, will somehow affect programs that benefit people relative to the problems which we have in the South today as a result of Hurricane Katrina. Nothing could be further from the truth, be more inaccurate, or be more of an attempt to use the trauma and tragedy of Katrina to assert a political agenda here in the Congress of the United States, which they have been trying to assert, as I said, since they voted against that budget 6 months ago. The two have no substantive relationship, but there is an attempt now to use the political arena to try to link them up.

The fact is that the reconciliation instructions in this bill will in no way reduce student loans. In fact, the committee which has jurisdiction over this issue, under the extraordinarily able