

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 overlay 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

and Foreign Service in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence.

Kyl amendment No. 2758 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to remove the sunset on the repeal of the estate tax.

Reid modified amendment No. 2764 (to amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for recreational travel, and to modify the business expense limits.

Reid (for Durbin) amendment No. 2766 (to amendment No. 2698), to provide enhanced unemployment compensation benefits.

Lincoln amendment No. 2767 (to amendment No. 2698), to delay until at least June 30, 2002, any changes in Medicaid regulations that modify the Medicaid upper payment limit for non-State Government-owned or operated hospitals.

Thomas amendment No. 2728 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualified small issue bond provisions.

Craig amendment No. 2770 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the availability of Archer medical savings accounts.

Grassley amendment No. 2773 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2698), to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and assistance to displaced workers.

Sessions (for Kyl) amendment No. 2807 (to amendment No. 2721), to remove the sunset on the repeal of the estate tax.

Dorgan amendment No. 2808 (to amendment No. 2764), to preserve the continued viability of the United States travel industry.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Daschle and others substitute amendment No. 2698 for Calendar No. 71, H.R. 622, the adoption credit bill:

Max Baucus, Mark Dayton, Richard J. Durbin, Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, John F. Kerry, Daniel K. Inouye, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Byron L. Dorgan, Jack Reed, Deborah Ann Stabenow, Tom R. Carper, Maria Cantwell, John B. Breaux, Jean Carnahan, and Herb Kohl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Daschle and others substitute amendment No. 2698 for Calendar No. 71, H.R. 622, the adoption credit bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr.

MCCAIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Akaka	Durbin	Miller
Baucus	Edwards	Murray
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Graham	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Breaux	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Inouye	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kennedy	Snowe
Clinton	Kerry	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stabenow
Conrad	Landrieu	Torricelli
Corzine	Leahy	Voinovich
Daschle	Levin	Warner
Dayton	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—39

Allard	DeWine	Lott
Allen	Ensign	Lugar
Bennett	Enzi	McConnell
Bond	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Brownback	Frist	Nickles
Bunning	Gramm	Roberts
Burns	Grassley	Santorum
Byrd	Gregg	Sessions
Campbell	Hagel	Shelby
Chafee	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—5

Domenici	Jeffords	Thompson
Helms	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair directs the clerk to report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the pending Grassley amendment:

Charles E. Grassley, Bob Smith, Craig Thomas, Pat Roberts, Jeff Sessions, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, George Allen, Larry E. Craig, Jim Bunning, Robert Bennett, Jon Kyl, John Ensign, Michael D. Crapo, Frank Murkowski, Olympia J. Snowe, Don Nickles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2773 offered by the Senator from Iowa to the bill, H.R. 622, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Allard	Enzi	Miller
Allen	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Roberts
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Hutchison	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Specter
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Craig	Landrieu	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Ensign	McConnell	Warner

NAYS—47

Akaka	Dodd	Lieberman
Baucus	Dorgan	Lincoln
Bayh	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Edwards	Murray
Bingaman	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Feinstein	Reed
Byrd	Graham	Reid
Cantwell	Harkin	Rockefeller
Carnahan	Hollings	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Johnson	Shelby
Clinton	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Torricelli
Corzine	Kohl	Wellstone
Daschle	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	

NOT VOTING—5

Domenici	Jeffords	Thompson
Helms	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 48, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, it is unfortunate we were unable to move the economic stimulus legislation forward, but I hope at the very least we could recognize, as we have in past recessions, that at some point one has to acknowledge the pain, the uncertainty, the financial difficulty that so many families are facing. In 1992, we extended unemployment benefits for up to 59 weeks. In 1982, we extended them for up to 49 weeks. In 1974, we extended them for up to 65 weeks. I ask unanimous consent that we extend them for at least 13 weeks now.

I have been discussing the matter with our Republican colleagues, and they have had the opportunity to view the language. Let me make one other clarification. This is a simple extension of current law. There is no other

extraneous matter, and there is no other issue I would suggest at this point be included in the extension. So for all Senators, this is simply an extension of current law as we now have it enacted.

AMENDMENT NO. 2819

(Purpose: To provide for a program of temporary extended unemployment compensation.)

Mr. DASCHLE. I send an amendment to the desk regarding 13 weeks' extension of unemployment benefits. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, I believe what Senator DASCHLE is offering is something that this Senate should support in a bipartisan fashion. I ask unanimous consent to add to Senator DASCHLE's request an amendment to the same bill relative to unemployment insurance benefits, which had 57 votes and 3 absentees who are present today, a sufficient number that it be included in this unanimous consent request. It is an effort to improve and increase unemployment insurance benefits by \$25 a week to try to keep up with the cost of inflation but, more importantly, to cover temporarily displaced workers as well as expand coverage to low-wage and recent hires. This money is all Federal money going to the States. Governors have entire discretion as to whether or not they want to enhance the unemployment insurance benefits.

I ask unanimous consent to amend the request of the Senator from South Dakota, our majority leader, to include this amendment, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DODD. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I hope our colleagues on the other side give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to raise this issue. This is a very modest request to include this amendment as part of the package. The other measures of the bill obviously are going to have to be addressed some other way, but I cannot imagine anyone in this Chamber, regardless of party, who would deny people who have lost jobs under the circumstance of this past number of months would want to turn down what the Senator from Illinois is suggesting. This is basic stuff for people who are hurting, and I urge my colleagues on the other side, whatever differences we may have on other issues, please do not disagree with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, reserving the right to object, we debated this before. If my colleague from South Dakota wants to, we have a couple of amendments on our side we did not get a vote on that I believe we would have a majority vote on as well.

Now I oppose the amendment of my colleague from Illinois because he is expanding a program that we have never done before. The majority leader mentioned all the times we have expanded unemployment compensation in the past. We have never done that for temporary workers. That is a brand new expansion that doubles the cost. That increases the cost from about \$8 billion to \$16 billion. So with great respect, I object to the unanimous consent request of my colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I think the proposal the Senator from Illinois offered should be commended. It has been objected to. I certainly hope, the amendment having been objected to, that the proposal being put forward by the majority leader would not be objected to, which is a simple extension for an additional 13 weeks of unemployment insurance under the current arrangement, as I understand it.

I ask the majority leader, is that correct?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. This is far overdue already. There are people now out of work who are hurting. The unemployment insurance for many of them has already run out. For others, it will soon run out. This is not an effort, as the Senator from Oklahoma indicated, to broaden the program in terms of its beneficiaries or its benefits. It is simply to extend it in order to take care of people who are in real and desperate need.

So I very much hope the request of the majority leader will be honored and we will at least be able to move on that aspect of this problem. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I do object to the fact we are standing in the Senate today, and we are taking care of one group of people—and we need to and I support it—in extending unemployment benefits, but there are millions of others who are sitting in their offices watching us working who are afraid that tomorrow may be their day and we are not doing anything to help them keep their jobs. We may be giving them unemployment checks, but we are doing absolutely nothing for the millions and millions of people in America who watch us on television as their neighbors get laid off, who watch what is going on around the country with layoffs, who think they

may be next. We have done nothing to help them keep their jobs. We have done nothing in this bill. We will do nothing to help those who have been laid off, who are going to get unemployment checks, to get a paycheck again. That has been the fight all along.

The President from day 1 said we need to extend benefits. We have been unanimously supportive of extending unemployment benefits for another 13 weeks. The problem has been, and consistently is, what are we going to do about the people who want a paycheck, not an unemployment check? What are we going to do about the people who are in jobs right now who are worried about losing their jobs? What are we going to do to help those businesses survive? What are we going to do about helping those individuals who are afraid of what might happen, not what has already happened? That is the problem with what has happened in the Senate. We have provided no security for the 90-plus percent of Americans who have jobs that they will be able to keep their jobs. That is the real unfortunate situation.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, could I have 30 seconds?

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I will first, again, propound the unanimous consent request, and then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that all pending amendments be withdrawn. So I propound the unanimous consent request once more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I, too, want to say this is too little to late. The Senator from Maryland is right. We would like to have done more. We would like to have helped all the people of this country. We could have had a stimulus package if we had had a compromise. We could have had a stimulus package that would have stabilized our economy, that would have preserved jobs. We could have given tax relief to people so they could have spent their own money that they earned.

So I hope this modest proposal that would extend the benefits for 13 weeks is not the end. I hope it is the beginning.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, I heard my colleague from Pennsylvania speak; I heard my colleague from Texas speak. My colleague from Pennsylvania was talking about the problem being this or that and we need to make sure people are able to go back to work.

Obviously, political truth can be elusive and there can be different definitions of what we need to do. Most of the people I have talked to in coffee shops in Minnesota cannot figure out how \$1 billion for this multinational and \$1 billion for that multinational

and \$13 billion of tax breaks helps them. But that is almost beside the point.

The real problem is this. We can put aside all of our differences, because we have different views about what needs to be done, and we can say: Let's help people right now. Right now. No more rhetoric. No more speeches.

People are flat on their backs, through no fault of their own. Can we not just at least have a straight extension of unemployment insurance? That is all this vote is on now. The majority leader is asking for unanimous consent for that alone. That is it. Let's end the speeches and end the rhetoric and just support him.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, as I stated on the floor earlier this week, I support a 13 week extension of unemployment insurance. I do so as an issue of basic fairness to help and protect those who have been hurt by the economic downturn. Unemployed workers need assistance now.

There are people in my State of California, and indeed across the country, who need an extension not because they have not been looking for a job, but because the downturn in the economy has made jobs difficult to keep, and even more difficult to find.

As I stated earlier this week, there are over a million people unemployed in California, and since September 11, unemployment benefits have run out for 190,000 Californians.

Because an average of 40 percent of Californians who go on unemployment exhaust their regular unemployment benefits, over 360,000 people in California alone could be helped by receiving this 13-week extension.

These are the people who would be immediately helped by an extension of unemployment benefits.

Throughout the United States, workers are running out of unemployment benefits while competing for less and less open jobs. In New York, there are 515,000 people without jobs, and over 90,000 of them have exhausted their unemployment benefits since September 11. The same is true for 86,000 Texans, 47,000 Floridians, and 52,000 people from Illinois. In Pennsylvania, over 300,000 people are unemployed, and almost 47,000 of them have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

Extending unemployment coverage will benefit more than 600,000 people nationwide, and help revive an economy that needs a boost to get back on its feet.

Since the program's inception in 1934, Unemployment Insurance has served time and again to act as a stabilizing device—providing direct economic assistance to people who are likely to spend any additional money in providing basic needs for themselves and their families.

The need is no different now. As an issue of basic fairness, I strongly believe that the Senate should act to extend UI benefits by 13 weeks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, there is good news today for working men and women across the Nation.

For months, we have fought to extend unemployment benefits for the millions of workers who need them in this troubled economy. Today, after weeks of debate, our opponents in the Senate finally relented. They joined us to pass a 13-week extension for all laid-off workers who have exhausted their benefits.

Since the beginning of the recession more than 2 million workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Extending benefits will help these workers, including nearly sixty thousand workers in Massachusetts who have lost their jobs, and are still looking for new employment. They have been refinancing their homes, and in some cases, even selling them, just to make ends meet.

The battle is not over. We still need to get approval from the House of Representatives. And then it is up to President Bush to honor the commitment he made in his State of the Union speech to make this achievement a reality for our workers.

Unfinished business remains. Outdated unemployment rules exclude hundreds of thousands of workers who have been laid-off through no fault of their own. Laid-off part-time and low-wage workers have paid into the system, but often fail to receive the benefits they need. Recent data suggest that only 18 percent of unemployed low-wage workers were collecting benefits. For months, we have fought to expand coverage to benefit more than 600,000 additional unemployed part-time and low-wage workers. We will not give up that fight.

We have also fought to increase weekly unemployment benefits by the greater of \$25 a week, or 15 percent. Currently, unemployment benefits do not replace enough lost wages to keep workers out of poverty. In 2000, average unemployment benefits replaced only 33 percent of workers' lost income, a major reduction from the 46 percent of workers' wages replaced by jobless benefits during the recessions of the 1970's and 1980's. During an economic crisis, unemployed workers have few opportunities to rejoin a declining workforce. They depend on unemployment benefits. We will continue to work for a benefit increase to ensure that laid-off workers are not impoverished during periods of unemployment.

Benefit levels are too low for laid-off workers to afford the health care they need. Health premiums can cost nearly \$600 a month for a family—most of an unemployment check. That is why only about one in five laid-off workers today continue their coverage, even if they are eligible. For months, we have fought to pass an economic recovery plan that would cover 75 percent of the health care premium for those who are eligible to continue their coverage, but can't afford the cost.

Some workers are not eligible for any continuing health plan. Our plan would have allowed states to cover these vulnerable workers. Taken together, our

plan would have ensured that men and women who lose their jobs don't have to worry about losing their health insurance as well. We cannot let our workers down when it comes to health care. America deserves better.

We have also fought to provide fiscal relief to the states, which face serious budget shortfalls, yet must meet yearly balanced budget requirements. We have been working to increase Medicaid payments, so that states don't have to cut back on coverage, just as more workers need help. This is the top priority for Republican and Democratic Governors. We should provide our States relief now.

The American people have strongly supported our efforts to give workers the support and assistance they deserve. But some of our colleagues in Congress have stalled our efforts to help these courageous workers. Democrats have proposed an effective and balanced plan to stimulate the faltering economy, but throughout the past few months, our opponents have used procedural maneuvers to block the measure. When House and Senate negotiators tried to reach a compromise, our opponents delayed it at every turn.

They were unwilling to support any recovery package unless it contained tens of billions of dollars for new tax breaks for wealthy individuals and corporations, including \$250 million in tax breaks for Enron. It makes no sense to hold laid-off workers hostage to such irresponsible and costly tax breaks.

Our opponents consistently offered plans that fail the nation's workers. They offered a plan to extend unemployment benefits, but only to laid-off workers in a few states. They offered a plan to use National Emergency Grants for unemployment insurance, health care and job training—guaranteeing that few funds would actually go to unemployment insurance. They offered a plan to provide Reed Act distributions that would primarily be used for state tax cuts and could go into state unemployment trust funds, instead of offering new or extended benefits.

Today, we will vote to extend unemployment benefits for 13 weeks, something we have done in every recession. Today, we will celebrate our long-fought for victory. Tomorrow, we will continue the fight for America's workers.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, over the past nearly 5 months, the entire Nation has been inspired by the grit, bravery and selflessness of the workers at the World Trade Center site who have labored around the clock on the rescue and recovery efforts. The courageous images of firefighters, police officers, emergency medical personnel, construction workers and clergy have inspired workers throughout the country.

There are many other images of New York, however, that have not been shown on the news, but that are also

the heart-wrenching results of the terrible September 11 attack and a weak economy.

These images that our Nation has not seen, but that everyone here knows all too well, are the faces of hundreds of New Yorkers who have found themselves without a job. These are the workers whose jobs were literally destroyed, jobs when the Twin Towers collapsed: The janitors, the doormen, the waiters and waitresses, the secretaries, and messengers.

Or, the workers who did not work in lower Manhattan, but who have felt the ripple effect of the so-called frozen zone primarily the hotel workers and small businesses owners.

In New York State, we have 71 percent more workers on Unemployment Insurance than we did one year ago. In New York City, we are experiencing unemployment rates that we haven't seen in years. In December, the unemployment rate continued to spike up to 7.4 percent—2.4 percent above the national average for the same period. New York City is expected to lose 150,000 jobs in the aftermath of September 11 and we are not expected to rebound until 2004.

What is happening to our unemployed who are waiting for the economy to rebound? Well, let me tell you—in the last quarter alone, over 65,000 unemployed workers exhausted their UI benefits.

Over the past two weeks, I have received hundreds of calls and pleas from my constituents in New York—some are being evicted from their homes, others are uncertain how they will continue to put food on their tables, and all are desperate to go back to work.

Senator DASCHLE has put forward a proposal to extend unemployment for an additional 13 weeks. This proposal is not only the right thing to do for our thousands of workers who are without a job, but it is the right thing to do for the economy. In fact, some experts argue that extending unemployment insurance is more likely than any other policy to stimulate the economy.

We may not agree on a comprehensive package to stimulate the economy, but I think we all agree that we must do the right thing for the workers of this country by extending unemployment insurance.

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

The amendment (No. 2819) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 622), as amended, was passed.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I hope the House will take the matter up immediately, perhaps as early as this afternoon, and get it to the President. As has been noted, the President has indicated already he supports the extension. I think it is now up to the House to do their part so that these people will be a little more confident they can be given some assistance now. Too many of them have already run out of benefits to which they are entitled. We have to act now.

For those who have lamented the fact we could not reach a compromise, 56 Senators went on record today looking for that compromise. We only fell four short. There were a couple of absentees. So there is no doubt that there is a growing percentage, an overwhelming majority, in my view, who want to move forward. I would have only hoped some of those who lamented this could have supported cloture so we could have had the ticket to conference. We were denied that. But I have said on the floor before, and I will say it again, I am open to any overtures, any suggestions, on how we might do it, that will allow the 60 votes required to move forward. Anytime I can be assured that a 60-vote margin can be achieved, we will bring this bill back up. It is unfortunate we could not do more than this, but I am very pleased and grateful to colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their willingness to support this.

AMENDMENT NO. 2820

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment with respect to H.R. 622 be considered and agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the title as to read:

“A bill to provide for temporary unemployment compensation.”

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now enter into a period of morning business for 35 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. There is another matter we want to try to take care of at this point. I don't know if this is the proper time.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I might say to my colleague, this is not the appropriate time, but we will certainly work with the Senator and find a time, perhaps before the end of the day today, where we can take up the legislation. We need to run a hotline to ensure that we can get a unanimous consent agreement to take the bill up. We will certainly do that and come back to the floor as soon as we have the assurances on both sides of the aisle that this bill can be agreed to.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I remove my objection.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I thank the majority leader and also appreciate his willingness to modify the

unemployment compensation amendment to make it basically universal for all States for 13 weeks. I think that is fair, appropriate, and supported by all Senators. I am glad we were able to pass it. I encourage my colleagues in the House to pass it as well.

Also, our colleague and friend, Senator LANDRIEU from Louisiana, has suggested improvements to be made on the adoption credit. Senator BUNNING also has an amendment dealing with adoption and deductibility. We will work with both colleagues to see if we cannot come up with a package in the not too distant future that I hope all of our colleagues will pass and likewise I hope the House will favorably review.

I make one additional comment. I am disappointed we have not been successful at making the bridge in partisan warfare to pass the stimulus package to help create jobs. I urge our colleagues not to be quite so fast in the future with cloture votes. I didn't like cloture votes when this side offered them, and I don't like them when the other side offers them. It denies the Senators the opportunity to offer amendments. We had several amendments on this side that we could not offer because of cloture. If cloture were invoked, they would not have the ability to offer a permanent R&D amendment, which I believe has a majority vote; we could not offer making the death tax repeal permanent, which I believe has a majority vote; we could not offer an amendment that Senator DOMENICI was pushing for, a payroll tax holiday, which many people on both sides of the aisle say has merit.

I hope in the future, when we are talking about the farm bill—and I believe we will go to the farm bill soon—I urge the majority leader not to move forward with cloture. Consider amendments. No one I know wants to filibuster the farm bill, no one was filibustering the stimulus package, but we had several provisions in the stimulus package to try to make it truly stimulative and create jobs. When we get to the farm bill, I hope the first thing we look at is not a cloture vote. Some Members want an amendment to have payment limitations so some farmers are not making millions—corporate farmers are not making millions out of the farm bill. We find out they are under present law. So there is an amendment to have payment limitations. Those amendments would fall if cloture were invoked.

I urge our colleagues to offer amendments, be timely, be considerate of others, have good debate, find out where the votes are, and, hopefully, not go through the idea of a cloture vote, and if we don't get cloture we pull the bill down. That is a recipe for getting nothing done. That is how the stimulus bill did not pass. We cannot get 60 votes; we will pull the bill down. I wish that were not the result.

I suggested we maybe take up the stimulus bill and consider X number of amendments on each side and pass the