

our time and the 4 minutes leadership time, so that the time of the vote will be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there are a lot of amendments that we offered and the minority offered that are good amendments. Being realistic, we spent all day yesterday talking about the estate tax, making the repeal permanent, which does not take place for 10 years. That is not very stimulative. We have been told by the President and others that to have stimulative efforts, it must be short term and do nothing to exacerbate the deficit. That simply does not apply in this instance.

With all due respect to my friend, the minority whip, this is a filibuster by the Republicans. Everyone knows it is. Members can say it isn't as many times as they want, but it is still a filibuster.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Let me say why the Senator from Nevada is wrong. Yesterday at about this time, morning business was imposed. We could have discussed the amendments and voted in the morning, and then when we came back at 2:15 after caucuses, there were opportunities to vote. It was announced there would be no more votes. If we are filibustering, how come the other side would not let us have time to vote on our amendments yesterday? Why piddle around the whole day?

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I praise Senator GRASSLEY for his heroic efforts in trying to bring together a bipartisan group to come up with a package that would help our economy recover. I am disappointed the Senate majority leader has announced his intention to abandon work on the economic recovery package.

In light of that reality, however, it is absolutely imperative that the Senate move today to extend to unemployed workers an additional 13 weeks of benefits. This has been needed for a long time, and it is something I have been working on for the past 4 months.

In October of last year, I introduced a bipartisan bill for a 13-week extension. I was joined by Senators LANDRIEU, GORDON SMITH, CLELAND, and VOINOVICH. We introduced this bill because we thought it was important to quickly pass a measure of additional security for the 7 million unemployed workers across our Nation. Since that time, unemployment rolls have swelled by 900,000 and over 1.2 million Americans have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits without being able to find new jobs.

Last week, Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island and I wrote to the Senate

leaders to ask them to call up legislation extending unemployment benefits as soon as possible. I am pleased that the assistant leader has indicated his intention to do just that.

Unfortunately, we saw the handwriting on the wall, spelling the demise of the broader economic recovery legislation which I believe is still very much needed.

Regular unemployment benefits end after 26 weeks in most States. When times are good and businesses are hiring, that is an adequate period of time for most unemployed workers to either find new jobs or to be rehired to their old jobs. In fact, that usually happens long before the 26 weeks have expired. However, when times are tough—and they are tough now—finding work is much more difficult and many unemployed workers exhaust their 26 weeks of regular unemployment compensation.

Congress needs to do what it has traditionally done whenever our country has been plunged into a recession. That is to temporarily extend the safety net by providing 13 additional weeks of unemployment compensation. This package would do just that for up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who lost their jobs after the economic downturn began in March and who have exhausted their benefits prior to being rehired or finding new employment.

More than 10,000 unemployed workers in my home State of Maine exhausted their unemployment benefits last year without being able to find a new job. They work hard. They want to work. They want new employment. And they have been looking very diligently. However, the economy is such that they simply have been unable to find new work. An unemployment extension would provide immediate relief to hundreds of thousands of Americans, including the 10,000 Mainers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits and have yet to find work.

Over the course of the coming year, approximately 3 million Americans who are out of work and looking for a job would be assisted. This proposal would provide approximately \$60 million in assistance to unemployed workers in Maine alone. These are our neighbors; these are families who have been hurt most by the economic downturn.

Let us, therefore, today pass this much needed legislation to extend benefits to millions of unemployed workers. Even if we have failed in coming up with a compromise on the broader package, we can at least do that, and do it today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, could the Chair inform the Members of the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 minutes remaining under the majority's control.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND ASSISTANCE FOR AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2002

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will use my leader time in addition to the remaining Democratic time for my closing comments.

Mr. President, the other day I came to the floor to talk briefly about our current circumstances. I will recount one last time for the record in case there is any question about how it is we got to this point this morning. I will again briefly recount the events over the course of the last several months. There were bipartisan Finance Committee discussions as early as last September about an economic stimulus package. There was a hope that we could come together, Republicans and Democrats, on an economic stimulus package as we did on airport security, on counterterrorism, on the assistance provided to New York and to the Defense Department in the wake of the tragedy of September 11.

We reached out to experts who could give us guidance on what the principles ought to be for an economic stimulus package. We had a number of conversations with Alan Greenspan and Bob Rubin, both, early in the months of September and October.

The bipartisan Budget Committee, I think on a unanimous basis, issued some principles on October 4. Those principles were: If you are going to have a stimulus package, make sure it is truly stimulative. If you are going to have a stimulus package, make sure it is temporary. If you are going to have a stimulus package, make sure it is immediate. If you are going to have a stimulus package, make sure you take into account cost. All of those principles were ones enunciated by the economists and agreed to, in large measure on a bipartisan basis, by the Budget Committee.

That was the lead up to the discussions we had. The House Republicans broke off those bipartisan talks. What they said is that they wanted to use the regular order, move through the committee and present the Senate a bill. The Republicans blocked the Finance Committee bill on a point of order in December, even though they could have amended it. They could have said: Look, we don't like this but we will offer something else. We do not like this but we will amend this bill and have up-or-down votes on amendments.

The Republicans refused to negotiate for a 3-week period of time, as they did mostly throughout the fall. There were no negotiations in large measure because Republicans delayed. First, they didn't like virtually the shape of the table. Then they didn't like who was in the room. They came up with reason after reason why we could not sit down and talk: delay, inaction, and ultimately a conflict that could not be resolved.

In negotiations, the Republicans insisted on a couple of issues: repeal of

the alternative minimum tax and an acceleration of the rates passed last spring. The session ended, obviously, without agreement. We got nowhere. They insisted on these issues. We had ideas they didn't like. So we ended in a stalemate last December.

Over the break I kept examining ways that we might break the impasse, try to find ways with which to deal with the clear inability we had at the end of last year to come to some resolution. So what I did was to work with staff and examine just where the overlap was. Certainly all that the Republicans had proposed was not foreign to what the Democrats had suggested. And all that the Democrats had proposed was not foreign to what the Republicans had suggested. So we came up with a diagram that kind of looks like a MasterCard, ironically.

You take the circle on the right-hand side and these two columns represent basically what the Democrats insisted ought to be in an economic stimulus package. We wanted to increase the unemployment benefits. We wanted to provide coverage for part-time workers and recent hires. Republicans said: Oh, no, we can't do that. That is ripping off the Federal Government. How terrible it would be if we gave those benefits to unemployed workers. Heavens. We can't afford that.

Affordable group health coverage for the unemployed, we can't do that. We aren't going to start new entitlements, for Heaven's sake. Let's get real here.

Job creation tax credit for business is something they said might be a possibility but that clearly isn't as good as a corporate AMT repeal.

Republicans had ideas we did not like. We did not like the accelerated rate reduction. When I say "we," I am talking about probably 95 percent of the Democratic caucus. We did not like corporate AMT repeal, or health coverage for the unemployed going through the individual insurance market, pitting an individual against a company, an individual with a pre-existing condition, and just saying good luck—we can't do that.

What I said was if we can't do that, and they don't want us to do it, how about if we do the things we both said might work? We both said we wanted to extend unemployment benefits.

Again, when I say "we both," there were proposals for these issues by large numbers on both sides of the aisle. Not every single Member, but tax rebates, bonus depreciation, and 62 Senators voted for fiscal relief for States—62.

Republicans, to a Governor, across the country, are saying if you are going to do us any good at all, if you are going to help us at all, give us some relief, especially through Medicaid. Letter after letter from Governors has come to the attention of every Member of this Senate, urging support for that fiscal relief.

That was a bona fide effort to try to find common ground. I know the Republicans do not like that either be-

cause what they said, basically—and what they are saying this morning—is if you don't give us everything in our circle, we don't want to have an economic stimulus package. It is all of this or it is nothing at all.

We aren't saying if it isn't all of this it is nothing at all. We are saying we will just take what is here and it's a ticket to conference and then let's see what happens. What could possibly be wrong with sending a bill to conference, allowing both the House, the Senate, and the White House to work out a compromise? They don't want to do that. They are saying it is this entire package or we don't want to work with you. We don't want a consensus. We don't want a bill.

They have said that now for 3 weeks. They have rejected the common ground approach. They are continuing to insist on two things that I hope everybody fully appreciates before they vote this morning. They are insisting on making the estate tax repeal and the Bush tax cuts permanent—that is what they are insisting on.

Making the estate tax repeal permanent presents two concerns. If we are serious about listening to the Budget Committee recommendations, the principles the Budget Committee suggested ought to guide us, then I can't imagine that anybody with a straight face would say we want to repeal the estate tax permanently now under the guise of economic stimulus.

First of all, the Budget Committee said—didn't they?—that you have to make sure it is temporary and that it is immediate. This does not take effect until the year 2011. There may be a recession in 2011, and it might be nice to be able to deal with that 2011 recession, but not with the recession happening in the year 2002.

This thing costs \$104 billion. We agreed the entire stimulus package should not be more than \$75 billion, but they want to spend \$104 billion of Social Security money to make it permanent when it doesn't take effect until the year 2011.

The tax cut, they want to make it permanent. CBO has provided an estimate of \$350 billion in the first 10 years, \$4 trillion in the second 10. There is nothing cost effective about that. And it, too, does not take effect until 2011. Again, what is the stimulative value of a tax provision that takes place in the year 2011? What is the wisdom—I guess that is the word I am looking for—what is the wisdom of exacerbating our already growing deficit this year by adding \$350 billion more?

I don't know the answers to those questions, but I know this. On a bipartisan basis the Budget Committee said this is not the direction we should go.

On a bipartisan basis, they said let us try to contain the cost. Let's do something stimulative, and do something immediate—not in the year 2011, but now.

Really, there are only two choices. We can pass it, or we can block it. I do not know of anything else.

I hope our Republican colleagues will pass it. I hope they won't block it. I hope we will do the right thing. I hope we will send the measure to conference so that we can try to work through these issues and resolve them and come back with a bill which we can support and move on to other priorities.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

HOPE FOR CHILDREN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 622, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 622) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Baucus amendment No. 2698, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid (for Baucus) amendment No. 2721 (to amendment No. 2698), to provide emergency agriculture assistance.

Hatch/Bennett amendment No. 2724 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the carryback of certain net operating losses for 7 years.

Domenici amendment No. 2723 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to provide for a payroll tax holiday.

Allard/Hatch/Allen amendment No. 2722 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit and to increase the rates of the alternative incremental credit.

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2732 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to provide a waiver of the early withdrawal penalty for distributions from qualified retirement plans to individuals called to active duty during the national emergency declared by the President on September 14, 2001.

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2733 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory tax on income earned within such State by non-residents of such State.

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2734 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to provide that tips received for certain services shall not be subject to income or employment taxes.

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2735 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to allow a deduction for real property taxes whether or not the taxpayer itemizes other deductions.

Sessions amendment No. 2736 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and provide for the payment of emergency extended unemployment compensation.

Grassley (for McCain) amendment No. 2700 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services