

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 400) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Ronald Reagan Boyhood Home National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 400) was read the third time and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

HISTORY STANDARDS IN NEW JERSEY TEXTBOOKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, yesterday there was an article in the newspaper that caught my attention. I hope sincerely that the article was incorrect. All Members have had the experience of being quoted in the newspaper and wondering where the reporter got the information that was the basis of the story. I hope that is the case with this article.

It was reported in the State of New Jersey a new set of history standards have been adopted and that textbooks in New Jersey high schools dealing with American history will now fail to mention the names of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, or Thomas Jefferson. Further, it said the word "war" had been removed from the textbooks and in its place we have the word "conflict," and there would be no discussion of wars.

Mr. President, I hope this is incorrect. It indicates that at least someone in New Jersey is prepared to make that State an isolated island of ignorance about American history. To think we can bring citizens into maturity in this country without their having any understanding of, indeed, no mention of, the names of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and the other Founding Fathers is absurd.

One of the best-selling books currently in the marketplace is the history of John Adams by David McCullough. On the dust jacket of the book, McCullough says, accurately, we as Americans cannot know too much about our Founding Fathers. We must never forget them. We must always learn as much as we possibly can about them.

I would say to those who are supporting this position in New Jersey schools, how are you going to explain to your students the fact that we take the Fourth of July as a holiday in this country if you are not going to tell them anything about the Revolu-

tionary War? If you cannot even use the word "war," how are you going to explain to these students that the country honors those who founded it and who fought that war; if you can't tell them the name of the commander of the Continental Army and the forces on the American side of that war because you think that name somehow no longer matters?

How are you going to describe what happened on the Fourth of July if you cannot use the name of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, that was proclaimed to the country on that day? How are you going to explain to high school students who decide they are going to enter public service, and take an oath of office, that they are swearing to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States when you will not have been able to describe the Constitutional Convention, the President of which was George Washington, and one of the leading figures in which was Benjamin Franklin, if you have exorcized the names of Washington and Franklin from your textbooks? What meaning does the oath of office have if you cannot explain where the Constitution came from or describe the convention that created it?

How are you going to describe some of the major problems that have existed in this country stemming from the great battle that was the Civil War, that went across five Aprils, and divided this country in a fundamental way that has taken us a century or more to heal?

No, we can't discuss that. We can talk about conflicts, but we will not discuss the leaders of that war. We will not discuss many of the problems of that war because it isn't politically correct to raise those issues anymore.

We have talked about history in this Chamber before. There have been those who have been trying to rewrite our history, trying to change it and shape it and slice it and dice it in ways that become politically correct in today's mode of conversation. You cannot do that and be accurate to the requirement of telling the truth about what really happened.

That is Orwellian. We read the novel by George Orwell, "1984," in which the hero of the novel spent all of his time at his job changing the past. He worked for the Ministry of Truth and his job was to go back and correct the record so as to rob the present society of a true understanding of the past in the name of the state, thus the adjective "Orwellian" entered our language.

What is being proposed in New Jersey is Orwellian. It is stupid and it needs to be condemned.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS EXTENSION

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on behalf of the amend-

ment offered by my very distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, regarding unemployment benefits for Americans who are not now receiving them. The legislation offered by Senator DASCHLE has a very important provision to extend unemployment benefits by 13 weeks for the people in this country who are receiving unemployment now and whose benefits are scheduled to run out in the very near future.

We have lost, in this country, almost 2 million jobs since January of a year ago. Yet we have not done what this Congress has done in most previous recessions, certainly the last two or three recessions, which is to extend unemployment benefits. Already in Minnesota, and I am sure in other States, the unemployment benefits are running out for people who lost their jobs earlier in the year. It is just simple decency, it is simple justice, to be offering that extension now.

In fact, as you know, we have tried to do that in this body, for instance, last September, at the time we passed legislation to prevent a bankruptcy in our Nation's airlines. At that time, many of us wanted to increase the unemployment benefits duration and were then not able to do so.

This is something that is long overdue. I commend our majority leader for making that a keystone of his proposal now on economic stimulus. I was delighted to read the President purportedly will be indicating his support for extending unemployment benefits tonight. So I hope this is something we will be able to address on a bipartisan basis.

Additionally, however, reports are that over half of the Americans who are out of work, who have lost their jobs during this last year, are not receiving any unemployment benefits whatsoever. They are not eligible. Even though they were working Americans, even though they have been in the workforce, because they held only part-time jobs, because maybe they held multiple part-time jobs, they are not receiving any unemployment benefits whatsoever. That is over half of the people who are out of work in this country, including my State of Minnesota.

That is a national disgrace. That totally repudiates the kind of safety net that we say we are going to create for people who, through no fault of their own, who through no choice of their own, are thrown into economic hard times, their families into economic despair. They lose their health benefits; they lose their income; they lose their jobs. No wonder people are devastated by that kind of experience.

The amendment of Senator DURBIN very importantly would extend unemployment coverage for those 13 weeks to men and women throughout this country who have just lost their jobs but are now not receiving any unemployment benefits whatsoever. The Durbin amendment would also slightly

increase the amount of money that those who are receiving unemployment benefits will get during those 13 weeks because, again, we are talking about people who, through no fault or choice of their own, are thrown out of the workforce.

In many States, those unemployment benefits are not even enough to reach a bare minimum poverty level. We can afford to be generous. We can't afford not to be generous for people in that circumstance.

I commend Senator DURBIN for this important addition to Senator DASCHLE's amendment. I hope we will receive today the kind of compassion and support the President purportedly will be calling for tonight, and that we can do, in advance of his speech, what we should have done months ago, which is to provide this extension and include others in it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding, under a previous unanimous consent request, I am recognized now between 11 and 11:30 to share time with those in support and in opposition to my amendment, and at 11:30 there will be a vote on my amendment No. 2714.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Morning business is closed.

HOPE FOR CHILDREN ACT— Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative 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.

Durbin amendment No. 2714 (to amendment No. 2698), to provide enhanced unemployment compensation benefits.

Nickles (for Bond) amendment No. 2717, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a temporary increase in expressing under section 179 of such code.

Reid (for Baucus/Torricelli/Bayh) amendment No. 2718 (to amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a special depreciation allowance for certain property acquired after December 31, 2001, and before January 1, 2004.

Reid (for Harkin) amendment No. 2719 (to amendment No. 2698), to provide for a tem-

porary increase in the Federal medical assistance percentage for the medicaid program for fiscal year 2002.

Allen amendment No. 2702 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to exclude from gross income certain terrorist attack zone compensation of civilian uniformed personnel.

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

Bunning/Inhofe modified amendment No. 2699 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to provide that the exclusion from gross income for foster care payments shall also apply to payments by qualified placement agencies.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2714

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there shall be 30 minutes of debate on the pending Durbin amendment No. 2714, to be equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is an amendment to the economic stimulus bill, and it relates to unemployment compensation. There are many arguments that I will make about the justice and fairness of this amendment, but that is not where I am going to start. I want to start with the economics of this amendment.

This is an economic stimulus bill. It is not designed first and foremost to be a bill for restoring justice to unemployment compensation, although I think this amendment achieves that. The first thing it is supposed to do is help the economy move forward. If there is a problem in America's economy today that is easily defined, it is the fact that we have an overcapacity and overproduction of goods and services and limited demand. As a result, businesses across America have said: People are not buying as much as they used to, so we are going to cut back on production. We are going to lay off workers.

That has had a ripple effect in the wrong direction. It has created a recession, which has created unemployment, which has lessened business activity. First and foremost, whatever we do in an economic stimulus package should attack this problem. First and foremost, it should stimulate demand and spending for goods and services. And in stimulating that demand, I believe it will increase the demand for production, and it will increase employment in production industries and start this economy back on the road again.

Here is something that should be kept in mind. For every dollar we put into the economy, we get an impact.

We don't know what the impact might be until we see who receives the dollar. If you happen to be a person of great wealth who, frankly, doesn't take each dollar you receive and put it into a purchase, then what they call the multiplier effect might not even be a dollar for a dollar. That dollar may go into a savings account or into an investment. It won't go into the actual demand for goods and services that creates the jobs I mentioned.

We know dollars given to unemployed people are dollars that are spent and respend in a hurry. In fact, the Labor Department has come out with a study that says for every dollar in unemployment benefit we put into the economy, it increases the gross domestic product, the sum total of goods and services in America, by \$2.15. These funds are spent and turned over several times in the economy. So if we want to really get the engine roaring when it comes to demand, give the money to the people who are struggling on a daily basis. They will spend it in a hurry. They need to spend it on the obvious necessities of life.

First and foremost, this is an economic stimulus amendment.

Let me speak to the justice and fairness of this amendment. It is a sad reality that only 33 percent of the people who are unemployed receive unemployment insurance. This was not always the case. In fact, not too long ago, 75 percent of unemployed people received unemployment insurance. That was in 1975, 27 years ago. Now it is down to 33 percent. Why the difference? Why is it if you were unemployed in 1975, you were much more likely, more than twice as likely to receive unemployment insurance? Because the nature of employment has changed in America. It is no longer the full-time employee, the 40-hour-a-week employee, who is unemployed. More and more, it is the part-time employee. It is the mother with children, taking a job and only working 4 days a week and who doesn't get any benefits on the job, who finally loses that job and then, unemployed, turns to a system which says: No, the door is closed. We don't have unemployment insurance for part-time workers.

My amendment seeks to do two things: first, to increase unemployment insurance benefits by providing an additional 15 percent or \$25, which isn't a huge sum, but it can be helpful to people who are unemployed. Sadly, the unemployment insurance payments to individual workers across America have been falling behind. Take Illinois, for example. The average benefit is only \$1,005 a month. The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment is \$776 a month. A family couldn't even pay the rent on that money, never mind food, clothes, utilities, and all other family expenses.

Since 1990, we have seen the percentage of lost income replaced by unemployment benefits falling 5 percent. The decline has had a serious impact