

## 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