

motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD, with the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 2924) was read the third time and passed.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on Tuesday, we began debate about the economic stimulus package. We know the economy is in trouble, and we know we have to act. Clearly, by any standard, we face an economic emergency that demands responsible action by Congress.

The American people want action by Congress too. They strongly support our Democratic proposals to provide unemployment insurance and health insurance to laid-off workers, and Federal assistance to States. They know it's an emergency in the economy and they know it is an emergency for the hundreds of thousands of men and women without unemployment insurance or health insurance.

Yet, some of our colleagues in Congress oppose this action. Instead, they support a bill that would retroactively repeal the corporate minimum tax and give the largest corporations \$25 billion in direct payments from the U.S. Treasury. They don't think laid-off workers who can't afford, or don't have, health insurance are an emergency. Instead, they support spending \$120 billion to accelerate the reduction of upper income tax rates, 80 percent of which won't go into the economy until after next year.

Our economy is in trouble. There is no denying it. Just ask the men and women who have lost their jobs and have to tell their families every week that they cannot find new employment. They will tell you how hard it is to put food on their families' tables each week. They will tell you how hard it is to watch their bills piling up with no end in sight.

If that's not enough, look at the numbers.

Only 38 percent of unemployed workers receive unemployment insurance. This figure is down from 75 percent in 1975. And, the figure is much worse for low-wage workers. According to a new study by the National Campaign for Jobs and Income Support, only 20 percent of unemployed low-wage workers will qualify for benefits during a recession.

These workers are least likely to qualify for unemployment benefits, and they are most likely to be laid off. They are struggling to keep a roof over their families' heads and to afford food for their children. We know that the number of hungry children has grown in recent years. Unless we do more to help, the number will continue to grow.

Yesterday, America's Second Harvest released the largest, most comprehen-

sive report on the plight of hungry Americans. Last year, 23 million Americans, including 9 million children, sought emergency food relief through America's Second Harvest. The current downturn in the economy means that even more families are facing the difficult choice between feeding their children and paying the rent, a choice no person should have to make.

These findings demonstrate the dramatic rise in hunger and related health problems among children. They demonstrate that current unemployment benefits are not adequate to help working families during the current economic downturn. We need to do more to see that families can afford to put food on their tables. Our Democratic plan provides unemployment benefits to 600,000 more low-wage and part-time workers and increase these benefits by at least \$25 a week.

The economy needs stimulus now. Workers need assistance now.

The best way to accomplish both of these goals is to get relief to the families who need it the most. Economists across the country agree that providing relief to low- and moderate-income families is one of the most effective ways to stimulate the economy.

The Democratic plan would stimulate the economy right away, by putting money in the hands of the people most likely to spend it—dislocated workers and their families. We do that by strengthening the unemployment insurance system, improving workers' ability to afford health care, and providing a tax rebate for those who did not receive a full rebate earlier this year.

Unemployment insurance is the Nation's first line of defense in an economic recession. By putting UI trust fund dollars into the declining economy, we automatically boost consumer spending in communities affected by rising unemployment, while meeting essential needs of households hurt by layoffs.

A recent study by the Department of Labor shows that every \$1 invested in unemployment insurance generates \$2.15 for the Nation's economy. That same study estimated that unemployment insurance "mitigated the real loss in GDP by 15 percent" in the last five recessions.

According to Joseph Stiglitz, "we should extend the duration and magnitude of the benefits we provide to our unemployed. This is not only the fairest proposal, but also the most effective. People who become unemployed cut back on their expenditures. Giving them more money will directly increase expenditures."

The Congressional Research Service agrees: "Extending unemployment compensation is, in fact, likely to be a more successful policy for stimulating aggregate demand than many other . . . changes."

The Republican plan will put very little money into the hands of unemployed workers. It offers no guarantees

of extended benefits in most states. In fact, the States with the highest unemployment rates are the least likely to receive help under that plan. Even for those few workers who will be helped, the plan won't provide any benefits until next spring. America's working families must not be left behind when Congress acts on an economic recovery package.

We must also help families afford health insurance. It is also the right thing to do for them, and it is the right thing to do for economy. Providing health insurance for laid-off workers improves the health of our economy. When a parent is forced to choose between health insurance and food on their table, it is unfair for their family, and it undermines the economy.

On average, health insurance premiums for these families cost nearly two-thirds of their unemployment insurance. That is why only 18 percent of workers eligible for COBRA use this coverage. And millions of workers are not eligible for COBRA at all.

This is no time to accept an increase in the uninsured. It is wrong for families and wrong for hospitals, nursing homes, health care workers and many others in the health care sector, which makes up one-seventh of our economy.

The Democratic economic recovery plan provides temporary health insurance for workers who have been laid off in the slowing economy. Currently, workers must pay 65 percent of their unemployment check to purchase COBRA health insurance coverage. Our plan to subsidize COBRA coverage would make health care affordable for all displaced workers. States also could receive Federal Medicaid matching payments to cover other laid-off workers who do not qualify for COBRA.

By protecting both workers eligible for COBRA coverage and increasing the Medicaid matching payments, the Senate Democratic plan provides meaningful health coverage for unemployed Americans while the Republican plan will leave families behind. For unemployed workers who are eligible for COBRA, the Senate Democratic plan provides health coverage for 12 months during the economic downturn. The Senate Republican plan provides enough for only 2 weeks of coverage. For unemployed Americans who are not eligible for COBRA, the Democratic plan again provides coverage for 1 year, while the Republican plan offers no assistance.

The plan to provide unemployed workers with health insurance coverage will also be good for the economy by helping to stop a decline in the health care sector. If unemployed individuals who lack health insurance forgo health care, the health care sector will be hurt during the downturn. The health care system has been one of the most vibrant sectors of the economy in recent years. It has been responsible for 30 percent of the real growth in gross domestic product and 45 percent of the net increase in jobs in

the past year. A reduction in the purchase of health care services has an effect on the economy similar to that of other reductions in consumer spending, it dampens economic activity.

Finally, a federal stimulus package will do no good if States have to make spending cuts or raise taxes. The current recession is already having an impact on state budgets. In fact, 35 States have reported budget shortfalls—a shortfall that already totals more than \$15 billion and will grow to \$30 billion if unemployment continues to increase.

This means that states across the country will have to make drastic cuts. In particular, they are cutting back on Medicaid. In fact, 20 States are already planning to cut Medicaid. At the same time, the number of people on Medicaid is expected to grow by as much as 3 million during this recession, about 2 million of them could be children.

If States cut Medicaid just as more people need it, we are going to see an increase in the uninsured. Also, leading economists believe substantial cuts in state Medicaid budgets would have dramatic ripple effects on the national economy.

Our plan provides financial assistance to States to help avoid devastating cuts in Medicaid, cuts that will hurt State economies and reduce health coverage. States would receive \$5.5 billion through an increased Federal Medicaid matching rate, providing an immediate influx of cash into States suffering from the recession-driven budget crisis.

The Senate Republican alternative is unacceptable. It fails to address aid to the States, health care or unemployment insurance in any meaningful way.

The Democratic plan is a fair balance between tax incentives and spending incentives for the economy. The tax incentives in the plan meet the three essential criteria for a stimulus: They will put money into the economy now; they do not impose substantial new long-term costs on the federal budget; and they treat fairly those who are most in need.

Seventy percent of Americans today pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes. Yet many of them received no tax rebate earlier this year. The rebate unfairly ignored these low and moderate income families. A one-time rebate of payroll taxes to them now will immediately inject \$15 billion into the economy, placing the dollars in the hands of people who are likely to spend them immediately. Economists tell us that families with modest incomes are likely to spend the extra money they receive right away on needed consumer goods. Those with higher incomes are more likely to save it.

The Democratic bill also includes temporary, targeted tax cuts to stimulate immediate business activity. These changes provide more favorable treatment for new investments now, and they deserve to be supported.

Because the tax cuts in the Democratic plan are truly designed to be an

immediate economic stimulus, they do not incur any substantial cost beyond 2003. This point is vital to our economic recovery. Enacting new permanent tax cuts which can trigger large long-term Federal deficits would be counter-productive. Permanent new tax cuts, on top of the nearly \$2 trillion in tax cuts enacted earlier this year, would actually hurt the economy now, by raising the cost of long-term borrowing and discouraging the kinds of investment we need most today.

The House of Representatives passed, by the narrowest of margins, a so-called stimulus package that will not stimulate economic growth in the short term, and will not be affordable in the long term. It merely repackages old, unfair, permanent tax breaks, which were rejected by Congress last spring, under the new label of “economic stimulus.” The American people deserve better.

The long-term cost of the House plan is too high, and less than half of the dollars would reach the economy next year. The House plan offers \$46 billion in tax breaks to big businesses by permanently repealing the corporate alternative minimum tax and by giving permanent new tax cuts for multinational corporations. These provisions are an unacceptable giveaway of public resources.

The alternative suggested by our Republican colleagues in the Senate is also flawed. Their proposal to accelerate the reduction of upper income tax rates would cost \$120 billion over the next decade. Only a small percentage of these dollars, less than one dollar in four, would go into the economy in 2002. And these dollars would go to those least likely to spend them. The result would be little immediate stimulus, large long-term costs, and a grossly unfair distribution to the wealthiest individuals in our society.

In fact, the House Republican proposal gives \$115 billion in permanent new tax breaks to wealthy individuals and corporations, while the Senate plan would give them \$142 billion in new tax breaks. Yet each of the Republican tax plans provide only \$14 billion for low and moderate income families. Under the GOP plan, the tax cuts for corporations and wealthy individuals are permanent, while the cuts for working families are limited to just one year. The result is unfair, and it won't provide the economic stimulus that the nation urgently needs now.

Perhaps never before in history has our nation faced such grave challenges. The tragedy of September 11 has touched us all. Together, we witnessed a horror we could not have imagined, and bravery which inspires us all. The tragedy may have shaken our basic assumptions about the world in which we live. But, Americans have not retreated in fear. Instead, they have risen to meet these new challenges. The spirit of September 11 has compelled vast numbers of our fellow citizens to ask what they can do for their communities and our country.

It is time for Congress to do its part to respond to the emergency we face. We must respond to the economic crisis the Nation faces. As we do so, we must show our dedication to America's best ideals. As we fight for a safer society, we can also create a more just society at the same time. September 11 has taught all Americans that we need to help each other as never before.

We will not ignore the plight of millions of Americans hurt by this tragedy and by economic forces beyond their control. As we work together to get our economy moving again, we can also work together to see that none are left behind.

We have a unique opportunity to give help and hope to every American as we enact a stimulus plan that puts America back to work.

The American people are meeting this challenge, and we must demonstrate to them that Congress is capable of meeting it too. The test we face now is to pass a stimulus package that truly lifts the economy, and lifts it fairly and responsibly. We do have an emergency, and we must address it. The American people are watching this debate closely, and they are waiting for our answer.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, President Bush has asked us to send him an effective, anti-recession stimulus package. In the spirit of bipartisanship and good faith, he proposed a series of provisions that enjoyed both Republican and Democratic support. After much foot-dragging, the Democratic majority has finally produced a bill. Unfortunately, it appears to be nothing more than a collage of special interest wish lists, from livestock assistance to new entitlements—with very little if anything that will actually stimulate the economy.

It is fat on claims but thin on data. It struts around in the light of day as a bipartisan package, but makes deals in the dark of night to secure votes. The bill before us is an embarrassment to the Senate; it is no good for our country, and it is certainly no good for our economy. There may be many good political reasons for Congress to pass an economic stimulus package, but when pet projects trump fiscal prudence, we miss a historic opportunity to help the American people during a time of great need. We must improve the incentives to work, save, and invest—the real catalysts of economic growth—and the Democratic bill fails on all three counts.

Instead, Democrats insist that increased Government spending serves as the primary tool for boosting economic activity. But look what they are spending money on—sugar beet disaster programs, rural telecommunications infrastructure, and water-treatment and waste disposal facilities. It is no mystery to leading economists, although my colleagues across the aisle will tell you otherwise, that the better approach is to lower tax rates and the tax burden on labor and capital to improve

incentives for workers and business owners. This produces more jobs and generates higher incomes, which in turn translate into higher investment and consumer spending.

Democrats prefer to add new health-care entitlements and massive pork-barrel spending items rather than accelerate tax cuts for businesses and individuals. Given the amount of money that would be spent under this bill, we would be better off passing no bill at all. The Republican minority strongly supports the President's proposal, and has crafted a bill that reaffirms his principles for economic recovery. As such, criticism of the Republican bill is direct criticism of the President, because it is his bare-bones proposal we introduced. To my Democratic friends, I say, don't take refuge in calling Republicans partisan; if you object to our bill, criticize the President—it's his proposal. The truth is: he's right, and you're wrong.

The American economy is starved for business investment. The President's proposals are designed to stimulate business investment. My Democratic friends say rich people don't spend, only poor people do. Now that is real voodoo economics. Alternative Minimum Tax relief for a business provides money for reinvestment. Neither rich people nor corporations hide their money in a mattress. They invest it, which does . . . what? It creates jobs. What do we need to do today? Create jobs. And what happens when we do that? People have more money to spend. I would rather people have a job than an unemployment check. I would rather they spend their paycheck than an unemployment check.

I recently read an article in which a key Democratic political operative said, in effect, we will stand with the President in the war, but on the domestic front, we'll use issues to our political advantage. Righting our economy is critical to our war effort. We shouldn't be playing politics with it.

So let's stop the political games. Time is short. The President has asked us to produce a bill for him by the end of the month, and the minority intends to do so. We have already come a good distance toward the other side. It is time for Democrats to do the same, and converge upon what the President and the American people think is best.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Economic Recovery and Assistance to American Workers Act. This legislation is about security, economic security and physical security. This bill will help us achieve two national priorities: homeland defense and economic recovery.

I have four principles for economic stimulus. First, any measure should have a strong, immediate impact. Next, economic recovery provisions should be temporary—sunsetting within one or two years. The overall package should be fiscally responsible to ensure long-term interest rates are not negatively affected. And, lastly, the proposal

should be focused on those who need the help the most.

I also have four principles for homeland defense legislation. First, it must give law enforcement the tools they need to prevent attacks. Next, it must give first responders the tools they need to respond to an act of terrorism. Also, it must improve security of our infrastructure. Lastly, it must provide for greater public information, since information is the antidote for panic.

The legislation we're considering today meets my principles.

Our Nation is fighting a war against terrorism. This war is on two fronts: in Afghanistan, and in every community in America. Our military has the right stuff to defeat our enemies. They have honor, courage and patriotism. They also have the best training, best intelligence, best equipment.

Yet on the home front, our communities are foraging. They are forced to choose between keeping communities safe from drug dealers and other thugs, and keeping key infrastructure safe—like bridges, power plants and stadiums.

I recently held a hearing in the VA-HUD Subcommittee to hear the mayors perspective on homeland defense. What did we learn at the hearing? We learned that our local governments are on the front lines of homeland defense. We learned that they are responsible for the protection of our infrastructure, including our bridges, tunnels, and mass transit as well as our first responders, our police and fire fighters.

Yet their resources don't match their responsibilities.

What will happen if we don't pass this homeland security bill?

Costs are shifted to local governments who must forage for funds from local programs. That means higher local taxes and lower security across our Nation.

What does this legislation do? It provides the resources we need to secure our homeland. Local law enforcement is essential to our fight against terrorism. They are our front line of defense. There are 650,000 local police officers and only 11,000 FBI agents. This legislation will provide \$2 billion that will go to states to be used for counter-terrorism training for police to train them to prevent and respond to terrorist attacks and for new equipment.

Our firefighters are our protectors. We must protect the protectors. Simply put, that means making sure they have the equipment they need to save lives. Yet fire equipment is very expensive. A new fire engine costs \$300,000. A new rescue vehicle costs \$500,000. A suit of protective gear for our firefighters costs \$1,000 and wears out quickly.

Each year we provide funds for grants to local fire companies, but the funding has been spartan and skimpy. Over 30,000 fire companies requested almost \$3 billion dollars worth of equipment this year, including \$400 million just for personal protection equipment. In Maryland, 198 fire companies applied

for funds so far this year, and yet only 5 received funding.

Clearly, we need to do better.

Even before the tragedy of September 11th, I was fighting for our firefighters. We were able to increase funding for the fire grant program by 50 percent to \$150 million in the VA-HUD bill. The Homeland Security bill does even better by providing \$600 million for our firefighters.

The Homeland Security bill provides \$4 billion for our nation's bioterrorism preparedness and response needs. Our country's ability to recognize and respond to a bioterrorist attack depends on a strong, coordinated public health system. This bill gives state and local public health departments additional resources to prepare for this new germ warfare. State and local public health departments have already been stretched thin. This bill gives them the resources to detect, respond, and contain a possible bioterrorist attack.

This bill recognizes the important role the CDC plays in a public health emergency. It expands CDC's laboratory capacity so public health officials can quickly and accurately identify a suspected biological agent.

To prepare our Nation for a bioterrorist attack, this bill upgrades State and local public health departments; expands laboratory capacity and surveillance at the State, local, and Federal level; and trains first responders to recognize the signs and symptoms of a bioterrorist attack. The bill also improves State and local communications systems; ensures that hospitals and emergency rooms have the expertise and equipment to handle a surge in patients from a bioterrorist attack; increases our nation's supply of antidotes and vaccines against possible biological agents; and, provides significant new resources so that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) can protect the safety of our nation's food supply with more inspectors and additional tools.

Investments in the fight against bioterrorism will help in our battles against infectious disease and antimicrobial resistance. Our nation's public health system is on the front lines of this new biological war. This bill will make sure they are combat ready and fit-for-duty.

Our Coast Guard used to focus on drug and migrant interdiction, and search and rescue. Today, its primary role is national security by keeping our ports safe, patrolling around power plants and under bridges, and searching suspicious vessels.

This bill provides \$177 million in operating funds. These funds will be used to improve training, and allow for increased patrols without forcing the Coast Guard to cut back on its other missions.

Terrorists look for weaknesses. We can not let them find these weaknesses on our nation's railroads. We must ensure the safety of all the components of our rail system. This means providing

tunnel security which means preventing people from entering tunnels. It includes terminal safety—the fact that most terminals are intermodal, bringing together different forms of transportation which means that it's hard to screen passengers. It means providing bridge security and the protection of track switchboards.

Why is railroad security so important? Because each day, 350,000 people ride on our railroads. That's over 20 million people a year. Forty percent of all freight is transported on our rails which is more than any other mode of transportation.

A terrorist attack on our rails could result in a catastrophic loss of life and paralyze our economy. Amtrak is ready and willing to improve rail safety, but it must also address its critical infrastructure needs.

For example, the tunnels that run through Washington, Baltimore, and New York accommodate trains that carry roughly 350,000 people a day. These tunnels don't meet minimum safety standards. They do not have proper ventilation, and there is not adequate lighting.

Rail safety requires Federal help. Yet Federal support for Amtrak has been cut by eighty percent in the last three years eighty percent. Annual appropriations for Amtrak is frozen at \$521 million. That's only about half of what Congress authorized in the TEA-21 bill.

What does this legislation do? It enables Amtrak to enhance security of their overall network by providing \$300 million and enabling Amtrak to upgrade it's most dangerous tunnels by providing \$760 million for tunnel safety.

As stated before, I have four principles for economy recovery. These principles have been widely adopted. When I compare the different proposals for economic recovery to these principles, the answer is clear.

The Economic Recovery package proposed by Senator BAUCUS meets my principles and provides real and effective measures for economic recovery.

This package provides real economic recovery that benefits working Americans who have lost their jobs, helps businesses recover from the recent attacks and the economic downturn, and provides real the boost that this economy needs.

The Economic Recovery bill will provide tax relief to nearly 44 million working Americans who were left out of the last round of rebates. This bill will provide the same \$300 checks to individuals or \$600 checks to married couples who tend to pay only payroll taxes. These are the people who live paycheck to paycheck. These are the working Americans who will benefit most from a rebate check.

Often times, these hard working Americans have trouble making end meet. This Democratic proposal will help them make ends meet thus ensuring that the vast majority of these rebates will actually be spent which will

help provide the real boost this economy needs.

The Democratic proposal also contains provisions that would help businesses invest in the new equipment and infrastructure needed to rebuild, would help small businesses acquire new equipment, and would provide rebates to companies quickly.

The Economic Recovery bill will also help unemployed working Americans by providing a 13 week extension of the period during which they can collect unemployment insurance, by increasing the amount that unemployed workers can collect, and by including more displaced workers in the unemployment insurance program.

I am sure that many will ask how does this help the economy recover? These Americans do not even have a paycheck to live on anymore. But they still have to meet their basic needs of food and shelter. For example, the average unemployment benefits in Maryland are about \$950 per month, the average rent in Baltimore is about \$500/month, and the average grocery bill for a family is about \$475. Thus, under the current benefit levels families are falling behind and could not continue their health care which costs at an estimated average cost of \$ 650/month in my State.

Unemployment Insurance is an essential part of the valuable social safety net. In every recession over the past thirty years, unemployment insurance has been extended. It is absolutely crucial to continue this good practice. The Democratic proposal would also expand the eligibility of those qualifying for benefits. For example, this would allow working mothers to look for part-time work.

The Economic Recovery proposal would also increase benefits by 15 percent or at least \$25 a week. This is enough for a couple of bags of groceries or two tanks of gas.

President Bush has a proposal that would address unemployment benefits. But the devil is in the details. The Democratic plan helps the 3.2 million already unemployed workers left out by the Bush plan. Under the Bush proposal, about 25,000 to 30,000 more Marylanders would have to lose their jobs and wait until March 2002 before Maryland's workers would qualify for any extensions under the Bush proposal.

The Economic Recovery bill provides guaranteed benefits to workers laid off prior to September 11 who may be having difficulty finding their next job. It would extend benefits to part-time workers, low-wage workers, and would help most hospitality and airline workers that have been especially hard hit.

The Economic Recovery bill would also help provide health care to displaced workers who have lost their jobs since September 11th through the coming year. So that just because they temporarily lose their job they do not also lose their health care.

The economic recovery bill provides a 75 percent COBRA subsidy for up to

12 months for workers to continue health insurance through their former employer's plan. It allows States to cover the remaining 25 percent of the premium for low-income workers.

For unemployed workers who are not eligible for COBRA, it gives States the option to provide Medicaid coverage for these workers for up to 12 months. These proposals are temporary; they end on Dec. 31, 2002.

Under the Democratic Economic Recovery plan, unemployed workers will get the health care they need, temporarily, and this will help stimulate the economy. Unemployed workers with health insurance will have more money to spend on other items because they won't have to pay high out-of-pocket health care costs.

For example, a mom or dad in Prince George's County can afford to buy a refrigerator to replace the broken one or buy school clothes for their growing child because they did not have to pay lots of money to take their child to the emergency room for a severe earache.

Unemployed workers will spend money on health care because if you have health insurance, you are more likely to go to the doctor to get the treatment you need.

Finally, the Democratic proposal temporarily strengthens the Medicaid safety net when unemployed workers will need it the most. States across the country are facing budget shortfalls and are considering Medicaid cuts at the same time more unemployed workers will need health care through Medicaid. This provision provides additional resources to states so that states don't have to resort to serious cutbacks in their Medicaid program in order to balance their budgets this year. This provision is important to Maryland and has the strong support of the National Governors' Association.

During times of crisis, our Nation comes together. We have seen that since the terrible events of September 11th. The terrorists thought they would cripple us, but they have only made us stronger. We want to help those in need.

Yet volunteers and philanthropy cannot take the place of public policy. The Economic Recovery and Homeland Security bill puts our values into action to help our fellow citizens to get back on their feet and to protect our citizens from the evil acts of our enemies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a matter that should be intertwined with any economic stimulus package that passes this Chamber—providing airline depreciation on the sale of new and refurbished aircraft.

The aviation industry and the industry's employees have been hit especially hard in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. The economic woes reach far beyond slumping ticket sales and the layoff of airport personnel. These difficult times are stretching to

the heart of the aviation industry, to the companies that manufacture, reconstruct, and refurbish aircraft.

By providing a depreciation allowance for the aviation industry, we will avert the loss of more jobs in this major industry.

Kansas is a state that has a tremendous interest in the aviation industry. Boeing, Cessna, Raytheon, and Bombardier, which all have major plants based in Wichita, employ tens of thousands of Kansans. While the airline bailout package will go a long way toward preventing immediate mass layoffs, it is not doing enough to ensure that the sale of aircraft will rebound from their current lulls.

If we provide a depreciation allowance equal to 40 percent of the adjusted basis for the qualified property acquired by those purchasing aircraft, we will provide a strong incentive for individuals and corporations to increase their purchases from the aviation industry. In so doing, we would provide an immediate boost to the economy, while at the same time providing security for aviation-industry employees beyond the 1-year period of the airline bailout.

Moreover, it is important that we extend this depreciation allowance to include not only new orders, but also aircraft that have been purchased or taken in a trade and refurbished or reconstructed, and sold to a third party.

By taking such steps, production orders will increase, and we will be able to ensure that hard-working Americans have jobs beyond the time-table of the airline bailout package.

This is good for America. It is good for Kansas, and it is something that I will be working to see implemented as part of an economic stimulus package.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I was hoping to make a statement yesterday on this important subject, but I was tied up chairing the Agriculture Committee in consideration of our new farm bill. I would like to speak briefly on the subject of bioterrorism and the economic stimulus/homeland security proposal considered by the Senate. The defeat of this legislation on a budget point of order was especially disappointing to me because it included a crucial \$4 billion initiative to combat bioterrorism. Senator SPECTER and I worked closely with Senator BYRD to develop this funding proposal, which is a comprehensive plan to better protect Americans from anthrax, smallpox, and other bioterrorism threats.

I have the privilege to chair the appropriations subcommittee which funds our health programs. Our subcommittee has for the past several years provided increased funding to combat bioterrorism. We have made real progress as a result. However, much more remains to be done. To determine what additional steps are necessary, our subcommittee has held three hearings during the past 2 months.

We heard from our top Federal officials, including the Secretary of Health

and Human Services, the head of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and head of FBI bioterrorism efforts. We also heard from distinguished State and local officials and top scientists from the public and private sectors. Their testimony made clear that we are not adequately prepared for this threat. We do not have enough vaccines to respond to an attack. Our public health system has been allowed to decay, and needs more help to detect an outbreak quickly, to treat a large number of infectious patients, and to vaccinate large parts of the country.

As I said before, to put the state of our public health system into military terms, our troops are ill-trained, our radar is out of date, and we are short on ammunition.

The plan we developed and which was included in the stimulus package is a thoughtful, bipartisan approach. It closely follows the 7 point plan I outlined last month. It provides more than twice the resources of the President's to bolster our Nation's defenses against a bioterrorist attack.

In contrast to the President's plan, our proposal prioritizes funding to "first responders" at the State and local level. We have put the bulk of the funding, \$1.3 billion, into improving our public health departments, beefing up local lab capacity and expanding the Health Alert Network. We desperately need to make these investments if we want to quickly identify, track and contain a bioterrorist attack should we ever be confronted with one. The President's plan neglects this vital piece of our response system.

Our proposal also includes funding for the production of enough smallpox vaccine for every American should that ever be necessary. As we have seen in recent press reports, the administration's request is too low to produce enough smallpox vaccine for all Americans.

We also allocate \$116 million for research on new vaccines. Earlier this month my subcommittee heard testimony from Dr. Fauci at NIH about the promising future of antivirals against smallpox. The administration's plan devotes no money to developing these new drugs.

Our plan also provides more money than the President to bolster the work of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We need to upgrade their overburdened lab capacity and their disease surveillance systems.

It also includes \$650 million to improve safety and to safeguard our animal disease labs.

I would like to thank Chairman BYRD for the opportunity to work with him on this important funding package. Our Nation's public health system is now the front lines in our war against terrorism; it should be prepared accordingly.

I believe that we cannot leave this year without addressing the bioterrorism threat. Whether our package is

included in the stimulus plan or another appropriations bill, we must get it done.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the stimulus package we recently considered in the Senate, and the disturbing new definition of patriotism that was associated with it. As I think most of my colleagues are aware, the bill we considered was laden with rewards for wealthy donors. Now, I think these days we would hardly be able to recognize a stimulus package, or any kind of emergency spending, if it weren't loaded down with provisions designed to benefit special interests. This practice certainly isn't new. But what is new, is the attempt to cloak these giveaways in a kind of patriotism.

A recent Washington Post editorial quoted a lobbyist for PricewaterhouseCoopers, who has been pushing tax breaks in the bill that would profit clients such as GE and IBM, saying that it would have been "irresponsible" and even unpatriotic for him to behave otherwise.

Patriotic to push for a taxbreak for major corporations? I never thought I'd see the day. But here we are, in the midst of the war on terrorism, trying to stop a deepening recession, and we were faced with a stimulus package that was designed to reward wealthy interests, but did very little to boost the economy. And now, to add insult to injury, we've been told that this isn't merely pork barrel politics, but that it is downright patriotic. I find that appalling, and I'm sure many of my colleagues did as well.

Because today this country is brimming with real patriotism, and I think many of us draw strength from that shared sense of pride in our country. But some versions of the stimulus bill were nothing to be proud of.

At this moment I believe that we may well need a stimulus package. But that's not what we were considering; instead we were faced with the same kind of pork-barrel spending we have seen year in and year out, except that now these provisions were dressed up in red, white and blue. That kind of opportunism, at a time like this, is an affront to the American people, and it should be unwelcome in this Chamber.

The stimulus bill, and in particular, the House-passed version of the bill, represents a lost opportunity for the Nation, and I think the American people have the right to ask what went wrong. How, at a time when the Nation needs a strong stimulus package, did we end up with this pile of pork? And when I say pile of pork, I'm being kind. The St. Louis Post Dispatch called it chicken manure. From time to time I like to Call the Bankroll on legislation, and talk about the potent mix of money and influence that results in the kind of legislation that's before us today. I think it's appropriate to review the donations given by the interests that could reap such tremendous benefits from this bill.

According to information from Common Cause and Citizens for Tax Justice, just 14 corporations alone would reap a \$6.3 billion windfall from the retroactive repeal of the alternative minimum tax in the House-passed package. Enron, which has given more than \$3.7 million in soft money from 1991 through 2000, will get an estimated \$254 million refund under this bill. Chevron Texaco, which gave more than \$3.6 million in soft money over the last 10 years, will get an estimated refund of \$572 million. General Electric gave \$1.3 million, and they'll get \$671 million. And this list goes on. Billions upon billions of dollars being funneled back to big donors at a time when more and more Americans are out of work, lacking health care coverage and struggling to pay their bills.

The House package also gave a temporary tax break to multinational corporations on some profits from their foreign operations. As the Washington Post pointed out, "it's hard to see how this measure, which would encourage firms to keep money outside the country, would do anything to stimulate the American economy." This measure rewards some of the biggest donors in the banking, investment and life insurance industries. Some of the biggest donors in these industries include Merrill Lynch, which has given more than \$2.2 million in soft money over the last 10 years, and Citigroup, which has given more than \$2.1 million during the last 10 years, according to Common Cause.

The House-passed package even included Medical Savings Accounts, which soft money donor Golden Rule Financial Corporation and other insurance interests have lobbied for for many years. Golden Rule gave just shy of \$1.3 million in soft money in the last ten years.

The stimulus bill should have been an opportunity to stimulate the economy; instead it turned out to be a chance for special interests to add the provisions they've been pushing for all these years. Wealthy interests haven't hesitated to take this difficult period for the country and exploit it for their own gain. And if this version of the bill ever passes, they will reap an enormous financial windfall.

In the last few months, the Nation has endured a great deal, and we will continue to face enormous challenges. As a Congress, we must address the issues before us with the kind of integrity that these challenges will demand. But we can't meet those challenges when the legislative process is hobbled by the clout of special interests. The stimulus bill was a sobering example of a bill that went through that process, and fell far short of its goal.

The stimulus bill was a missed opportunity that the Nation may pay dearly for down the road. We've missed an opportunity, but we don't have to miss another one. I hope when Congress returns next year, we will rise to meet the next challenge before us: getting

campaign finance reform to the President's desk. The Nation is closely watching our work here, more now than ever in the wake of September 11. And bills like the stimulus package would make any American wonder whether we are truly conducting the people's business on this floor. We must restore integrity to legislative process, and restore the people's faith in us and what we do.

I think we can start by voting against this bill, if it comes to us in a form like the House-passed bill. But we must do much more, we must abolish soft money and shut down the issue ad loophole, and it can't wait another year. Campaign finance reform should be one of the first orders of business when we return next year. The American people are looking to us for leadership, and I believe that this Senate can provide that leadership. We can show the American people that we have the courage and leadership they seek, and we can start by making campaign finance reform the law of the land.

TRIBUTE TO KEVIN P. POWER, NASA FELLOW

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding NASA Manager, Kevin P. Power, upon his departure from my staff. Mr. Power was selected as a Congressional Fellow to work in my office because of his knowledge of the aerospace industry, NASA programs, and the John C. Stennis Space Center in my home State of Mississippi. It is a privilege for me to recognize the many outstanding achievements he has provided for the U.S. Senate, NASA, and our great Nation.

During his NASA fellowship, Mr. Power worked on legislation affecting NASA and the aerospace industry. He worked hard to ensure that the NASA appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 included legislative provisions that will support specific programs aimed at fostering the development of a robust U.S. space propulsion industry, which includes rocket engine testing at Stennis Space Center. Specifically, he helped ensure that NASA's rocket engine test facilities are ready to provide continued support for testing under NASA's Space Launch Initiative.

Mr. Power also worked to ensure that adherence to past legislative provisions affecting land remote sensing data buys are being met to continue the stimulation of a private sector remote sensing industry without competition from the U.S. Government.

Mr. Power graduated from the University of New Orleans, where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering, prior to beginning his engineering career with the U.S. Navy in Annapolis, MD, as a civilian engineer working on submarine acoustics. He transitioned to an aerospace career as a contract engineer supporting Space Shuttle launches at NASA's Kennedy Space Center in Florida

and then joined NASA shortly after the Shuttle's return to flight following the Challenger disaster.

As a project engineer with NASA, he supported various propulsion development programs at Stennis Space Center, including the Air Force's New Launch System, NASA's Advanced Solid Rocket Motor, the NASA/Air Force National Aerospace Plane, and the NASA X-33 Aerospike Engine. During this time he attended Florida Tech, where he received a Master of Science in Management degree and eventually transitioned to a job with more responsibilities as a NASA project manager for Boeing's Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle and NASA's Rocket Based Combined Cycle test facility.

Mr. President, Mr. Power is married to the former Susan Foreman of Crowley, LA. They have two children, a 7-year-old-son Brandon and a 5-year-old daughter Madison, and are expecting their third child next year in March. Mr. Power will return to NASA Stennis Space Center to continue his endeavors in the area of rocket propulsion testing. I will truly miss his experience and assistance he has provided to me, and I wish him all the very best as he helps NASA advance its efforts in the areas of space propulsion and remote sensing in the 21st century.

RECLASSIFICATION OF SCRANTON-WILKES BARRE-HAZLETON, WILLIAMSPORT, AND SHARON METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Pennsylvania for working with me on this very important issue of Medicare provider payment policy, particularly in light of the unique financial pressures being faced by the hospitals in Scranton-Wilkes Barre, Williamsport, and Sharon metropolitan statistical areas, MSAs, which emanate in part from some glaring disparities in Medicare's payment formulas.

As I travel around the Commonwealth, many health care leaders have conveyed to me their continued concerns about the impact of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, BBA, on their health care delivery operations. Our Pennsylvania constituents, who represent rural, urban and community hospitals and systems, have shared with us detailed information about the financially strained health care delivery environment under the BBA.

We are all aware of the administrative and financial challenges that health care providers all across the country face, particularly in their service to our Nation's elderly population. But the environment in which the hospitals in these three areas of Pennsylvania are seeking to deliver quality health care to their respective communities is even more challenging given that their MSAs contain areas or border on areas from which higher compensated providers, with similar health care delivery costs, draw their patients, and more importantly, their