303(h)(2)(C)(iii) of such Act and section 430(h)(2)(C)(iii) of such Code (as added by such amendments) shall be used in lieu of the interest rate otherwise used.

(B) TERMINATION LIABILITY.—If an eligible spunoff plan terminates under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2010, the liability of the employer maintaining such plan resulting from such termination under section 4062 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 shall be determined in accordance with the assumptions and methods described in subsection (c)(2)(A). The employer's liability, as so determined, shall be in lien of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan.

(c) LIABILITY OF EMPLOYERS NOT ELECTING SPINOFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an applicable pension plan is terminated under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, an eligible employer which does not make the election described in subsection (b) shall be liable to the corporation with respect to the applicable pension plan (in lieu of any other liability to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation or to the applicable pension plan with respect to the applicable pension plan) in an amount equal to the fractional portion of the adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities of such plan as of December 31, 2005, determined without regard to any adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities to be transferred to an eligible spunoff plan pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) ADJUSTED UNFUNDED BENEFIT LIABILITIES.—The term ''adjusted unfunded benefit liabilities'' means the amount of unfunded benefit liabilities (as defined in section 4001(a)(18) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974), except that the interest assumption shall be the rate of interest under section 302(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 412(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect before the amendments made by the Pension Protection Act of 2006, for the most recent plan year for which such rate exists.

(B) FRACTIONAL PORTION.—The term ''fractional portion'' means a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount required to be contributed to the applicable pension plan for the 5 plan years ending before December 31, 2005, by such employer, and the denominator of which is the amount required to be contributed to such plan for such plan years by all employers which do not make the election described in subsection (b).

(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) APPLICABLE PENSION PLAN.—The term ''applicable pension plan'' means a single employer plan which—

(A) was established in the State of Alaska on March 18, 1967, and

(B) as of January 1, 2005, had 2 or more contributing sponsors at least 2 of which were not under common control.

(2) ALLOCABLE PORTION.—The term ''allocable portion'' means, with respect to any eligible employer making an election under subsection (b), the portion of an applicable pension plan's liabilities and assets which bears the same ratio to all such liabilities and assets as such employer's share (determined under subsection (c) as if no eligible employer made an election under subsection (b)) of the excess (if any) of—

(A) the liabilities of the plan, valued in accordance with subsection (c), over

(B) the assets of the plan,

bears to the total amount of such excess.

(3) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER.—An ''eligible employer'' is an employer which participated in an eligible multiple employer plan on or after January 1, 2000.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

SUSAN MCCUE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for 16 years I have had a woman working for me who has been outstanding. She has worked in my press department for the last 8 years. She has been my chief of staff. Her name is Susan McCue. She has a wonderful background. She is one of 10 children. She put herself through college working as a waitress, among other things. She is a graduate of Rutgers University with a bachelor's degree.

Some people are born with the ability to jump high and throw balls a long ways, and some people go to the finest business schools in the country to learn how to manage people. Susan has an innate ability, as if she were a skilled athlete, a skill to be an administrator. What she did to develop my staff is something that I am sure someday will be used as a ''how you should hire a staff in Washington, DC.''

I have such great affection for Susan. She has worked so hard for me. She has decided to leave after 16 years to go downtown and work, seeking not a job where she can make a lot of money but working in a program that will deal with poor people around the world. She will make just a little bit more money than she is being paid right here. But being the person she is, a kind, thoughtful, considerate person, she thought it was time for a change.

As hard as it is for me to let someone go who has done such a wonderful job for me, I must be as loyal and dedicated to her as she has been to me.

I want everyone to know—and I especially want Susan to know—that her work on my behalf has been something that I and my family will long remember. I have never had anyone in my professional career as a lawyer, as a government worker, who has been more dedicated or more skilled than Susan McCue. I will miss her greatly. I know our paths will cross, but I am a better person for having had her run my office. And poor people of the world will be well served with Susan McCue looking after them.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX EXTENDERS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I have spoken a lot in the last week, but I want to talk very briefly about the bill that will be before the Senate in a few minutes, and speak about one particular provision, the antitrade bill.

I thank BILL THOMAS, I thank BILL FRIST, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator BAUCUS, CHARLIE RANGEL, KENDRICK MEEKS. I thank the Chair, I thank Senator DURBIN, the leadership in the House and the Senate of both parties, for including this provision in the bill.

BILL THOMAS told me a moment ago, as I congratulated him and thanked him, that this should have passed 4 years ago. I think it should have. We worked on it for a long time.

The good news is that it will make a difference. It will create many jobs in Haiti, a country that has about 70-percent unemployment, gross underemployment, a country that Fran and I visited again last week, where we saw Paul Farmer's hospital in the central part of Haiti, with children who were grossly malnourished, children who do not have enough to eat, children who would have died but for getting into Paul's hospital, children whose hair was turning orange because of malnutrition. When we went to Sisters of Charity in Port-au-Prince, we saw twins who had been brought in by their dad who did not have enough to eat; they were clinging to life. That is replicated all over Haiti.

This bill will not solve all the problems of Haiti, but it will begin to do the one thing that is needed: Create jobs. The Haitian people are an industrious people. They are hard working. They line up for jobs. Jobs in Haiti are what the country needs. It is what the new Government, that has been duly elected, needs—to be able to show some progress, to be able to give the people of Haiti some hope.

I thank my colleagues. I thank all of them for including this provision. I thank my friend Lindsey Graham and others who represent textile interests. I know they had problems with this bill. We tried to work out some of those problems. They represented their constituents well. But they also had the heart for the people of Haiti.

This is not just a question about humanitarian concern; it is also about our national interests. It is about our foreign policy. Haiti, as the Presiding Officer knows, being from Florida knows, is very close to Miami. It is probably an hour and 20 minute flight from Miami. Boat people come up there time and time again. We have had

United States Marines, United States troops in Haiti twice in the last decade. It is a country that we need to care about. It is very important to us.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for including this provision. It is a provision that will make a difference. It is a provision that will save lives. I thank my colleagues for this.

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

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

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 102, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 102) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I deeply regret that we will soon adjourn having adopted only 2 of the 12 fiscal year 2007 appropriations bills.

This year, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported all of the bills under its jurisdiction by July 20, the earliest that has been done in 18 years. These bills were all within the budget allocation, and the total funding appropriated was lower in real dollars than last year. I regret that the Senate was not allowed to consider these bills in time to complete action before the beginning of this fiscal year.

In this continuing resolution, which is now before the Senate, we have made sure that the Department of Veterans Affairs has sufficient resources to provide all the benefits veterans are entitled to receive under the law and that no veteran will be denied any benefit or receive anything less than the finest care available.

I urge the Senate to approve this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we are now 69 days into the fiscal year and only 2 of the 12 appropriations bills are public law. The Senate now has before it a third continuing resolution that funds 13 of the 15 executive branch Cabinet departments through February 15.

When it comes to funding bills for domestic agencies, the majority leadership is apparently satisfied with a restrictive continuing resolution. Eight of the 12 bills were never even debated in the Senate. When it comes to caring for our veterans, the education of our children, the health of our elderly, and the ability of our deteriorating infrastructure to sustain a growing economy, the majority leadership is satisfied with a rubberstamp continuing resolution, kicking the decisions down the road to the next Congress. This dismal performance is not the result of the work of the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee did its work and, on a bipartisan basis, reported all 12 of its bills by July 26. Chairman COCHRAN did an outstanding job in leading the committee.

Sadly, the appropriations process, once again, has fallen prey to politics.

Next year, the 110th Congress will have to complete the 2007 appropriations bills, a war supplemental, and the 2008 bills.

This will be a huge challenge. However, in the bipartisan tradition of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am committed to working with my colleagues to meet this challenge.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the continuing resolution we are considering here today has a 6-week moratorium on a cost-of-living adjustment for Members of Congress. I support this provision because we should not give ourselves a raise until we pass legislation raising the minimum wage.

It has been a decade since Congress last increased the minimum wage to $5.15 an hour. Since then, the real value of the minimum wage has eroded by 20 percent, since—unlike Congress's pay raise—we did not increase the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation.

Twenty-nine States have answered the call and raised the minimum wage. Illinois is one of those States—it has a minimum wage of $6.50, and in December the Governor is expected to sign recently passed legislation raising the minimum wage to $7.50 in July.

But there are still 6 million Americans making $5.15 an hour.

We have been trying for nearly a decade to get the attention of the Republican leadership that there are millions of Americans who go to work every single day and can't make enough money to provide decent day care for their kids, pay medical and utility bills, and provide food and other essentials that are just a part of every family's daily life.

A Low Income Housing Coalition study shows that, for the first time, there was not one county anywhere in America in which a minimum wage worker could afford a one-bedroom apt. On average, workers have to make three times the minimum wage to afford a one-bedroom apartment in this country. So people who are working full time for minimum wage literally can't afford to keep a roof over their children's heads.

These hardworking Americans who work full time and make the minimum wage earn just $10,700 per year—$6,000 below the poverty level. In Illinois, $6.50 minimum wage workers currently earn $13,520. And now there are 37 million Americans in poverty—a 5.4 million increase since President Bush took office.

While the Republicans in this town refuse to raise the minimum wage to help millions out of poverty, Congress has seen its pay increased by $31,600. Something is wrong here.

We hope to send a message to the Republican leadership in Congress that these hardworking families deserve a raise too, because it's time for a Congress that truly is sensitive to real family values.

Because one of those real family values is when you get up and go to work every morning, doing your best for your kids and your family, you deserve a decent pay check.

Democrats believe that, and that is why we support passing legislation raising the minimum wage to $7.25 an hour over 2 years before we allow Members to receive a roughly $3,000 increase.

While some people may say that the amount of the automatic raise Members are foregoing—$350—is only symbolic, keep in mind that minimum wage earners only earn $206 per week. To them, $350 isn't symbolic, it is the equivalent of 68 hours worth of hard work.

Therefore, on behalf of 6 million Americans making the minimum wage, I urge Republicans to join with Democrats in passing a clean minimum wage bill in January before any automatic pay adjustment for Members takes effect.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 102) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NOTICE

Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in Book II