

Mr. LEVIN. I very much thank my friend from Utah.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I think we have a basic obligation to provide relief to Americans who have lost their jobs. This is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of this Congress. The extension of unemployment benefits today for an additional 13 weeks is a way of carrying out that obligation.

We are all aware of the increase in the number of Americans who have lost their jobs as a result of this recession. Every one of our States is feeling it. Michigan alone has over 300,000 workers who have lost their jobs, and that number, as the numbers in many of our States, is likely to continue to rise in the coming months.

I am terribly disappointed we could not agree on an economic stimulus package, but that is no excuse for failing to address the plight of Americans who have lost their jobs. Extending unemployment benefits is not just about doing what is right and doing what is equitable and doing what is fair; it is elementary economics. It is common sense. Providing additional unemployment benefits is a very good economic stimulus.

The Department of Labor has found that for every dollar invested in unemployment insurance, we generate \$2.15 for our gross domestic product. So putting money into the hands of people who need it, we are also putting money into the hands of people who are going to spend it. That helps our economy. That helps create jobs.

I congratulate Senator DASCHLE for offering this legislation today, and I hope now that the House will promptly pass it.

I thank my friend from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

INABILITY TO ACT

Mr. BENNETT. The Chamber seems to be filled with congratulatory messages. We are congratulating ourselves that we have finally acted, when, in fact, all we have done is the least possible, minimum, lowest common denominator kind of action, and we have demonstrated our inability to act on any kind of visionary plan.

The majority leader says he will be happy to bring this subject up again if there is an indication that we can get something upon which we can agree. There is an indication that we can get something upon which we can agree, that we can get something that is a compromise, that we can get something that cuts across party lines. That is the proposal made by the Centrist Coalition.

I have been a member of the Centrist Coalition, and its predecessor names of the group, ever since I came to the

Senate in 1993. We started out holding meetings in Senator John Chafee's hideaway. John Chafee was the founder of this group. He said, let's reach across party lines and see if we can't put partisanship aside and come up with some kind of a solution. We have had our good moments. We have had our disappointing moments. But we have hung together as a group, even as the membership has changed in the years since I have been here.

The Centrist Coalition, involving Democrats and Republicans, involving people of very strong positions on the liberal side of issues and very strong positions on the conservative side of issues, have said: For the good of the country, let's see if we can't fashion a package that makes sense. And the majority leader will not allow a vote on that package.

He will not allow us even to debate it. He will not allow us to bring it up. He will not allow people who were not part of the Centrist Coalition to offer amendments. Then as he shuts the process down, he says: I am open to any suggestion from anybody. I will take him at his word, and I have a suggestion for him. I say to the majority leader, bring up the Centrist Coalition stimulus package backed by Republicans as well as Democrats. Put it on the floor and allow it to be amended by those who say it isn't wonderful; allow the normal parliamentary procedure to go forward; and then allow it to come to a vote.

I suggest to you that if the majority leader really believes we need a stimulus package, if he is really true to his word that he is open to any suggestion, if he really does want to move in this direction, that is the way he should go. But he has not allowed that. He has not allowed a vote. Let us understand that.

There is a proposal. It is not a series of rehashed tax ideas, as the Senator from Rhode Island suggested, about some of the things people on this aisle wanted to put in. It is something worked out by a group of Republicans and Democrats acting in good faith and in consultation with the White House—reaching out beyond the Congress to get the opinion of the President of the United States, and receiving from the President the comment that, well, it is not exactly what I want but I would be willing to sign it.

It seems to me this is an extraordinary moment in cooperation, reaching out, and resolution that the majority leader will not allow to come up. This is an extraordinary opportunity which the majority leader will not allow to happen.

I hope the majority leader reconsiders. I hope he recognizes that taking a strong partisan position on one side, or taking a strong partisan position on the other side, has been proven ineffective; that he recognizes that there are those of us who have spent time talking to each other across the aisle outside of the partisan straitjacket who have reached out in an effort to find a

compromise that makes sense, who have crafted something that we think will pass and the President has indicated he will sign, and that this is available to the majority leader and to the country if the majority leader will simply allow it to come to a vote.

Mr. President, as you and others know, my father served in this body for 24 years. My first experience here was sitting up in the family gallery as a teenager watching the Senate operate as I tried to understand it. My father said something that was very profound. When people would say to him, why didn't you do this or why didn't you do that, he would say: We legislate at the highest level at which we can obtain a majority.

I think there is a majority for the centrist package. I ask the majority leader to let us find out.

NEED FOR AN ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, over four months after the idea was originally proposed, the Senate remains divided on an economic stimulus package.

Much has changed since an economic stimulus was first proposed in response to the September 11 attacks. Both the stock markets and the economy have proved to be more resilient than economists had expected.

Moreover, there are signs, as Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan told the Budget Committee last month, that some of the forces that have been restraining the economy over the past year are starting to loosen their strangle hold. The Fed Chairman told the Committee that "while 3 months ago, [a stimulus package] was clearly a desirable action . . . I do not think it is a critically important issue to do. I think the economy will recover in any event."

Aside from the positive economic data that have been released by government agencies in recent weeks, there is already a significant amount of stimulus in the pipelines.

That's not to say that we are home free. As Chairman Greenspan pointed out last month, the economy could go either way at this point. Most troubling is the higher unemployment rate since last year.

However, we must not delude ourselves into thinking that an economic stimulus package—whether crafted by Democrats or Republicans—is some sort of panacea. Stimulus packages can't work miracles. We have a \$10 trillion economy. That's gross domestic product—the total of all spending. We cannot flip the economy over like a pancake. A boost of \$70 billion to \$100 billion would amount to less than 1 percent of GDP.

Nobody can say at this point with certainty in which direction the economy is headed.

What we know is that, since the recession began last March, the Labor Department reports that 1.8 million

workers have lost their jobs. We could address this problem by temporarily extending unemployment insurance.

What we do not know, is whether a more comprehensive stimulus package at this point is really necessary.

I submit that the danger we face is not that the economy won't turn around—inevitably it will—but that we may unnecessarily worsen our budgetary position by taking unnecessary, but politically popular, action on a so-called “stimulus package.”

Any stimulus package, at least in the short-term, will increase the projected budget deficits for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. We may well need to devote more resources to our military overseas and to homeland defense, and we will have to bear the costs of doing so.

The erosion in the budget picture over the past year, along with the defense and homeland security demands placed on our budget and the inevitable long-term Social Security and Medicare deficits overshadowing the retirement of the baby-boomers, suggests that tough choices must be made as to whether the limited dollars we spend will provide a worthwhile return on our investment. From what we have seen from experts ranging from the Federal Reserve Chairman, to Congressional Budget Office officials, to private-sector economists, a stimulus package does not meet that test.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Senate's inability to pass an economic stimulus package. I, like most of my colleagues, wanted to pass an economic stimulus package. We wanted to pass such a package not only at the end of last year, but at the beginning of this year in order to jump start our economy.

Finally, the majority leader allowed us an opportunity to look at an economic stimulus bill. But it wasn't a bill that came out of the Senate Finance Committee nor was it the bipartisan/centrist proposal offered by my colleagues and which the President said he would support. Instead, it was a one-man show, put on the floor with no input from other Senators.

As I said on the floor almost 2 weeks ago, the Daschle substitute amendment is much like a patient needing emergency treatment. Our only choice was to patch it up.

So, for the last several days, we were performing emergency surgery—one “amendment bandage” at a time. Some of my colleagues have since described the stimulus package or the economy as a patient on life support.

While I am not a surgeon, I do take great pride in being the only accountant in the Senate. As a result, I think I have a good understanding of what is needed to help the economy. So, I had a few amendments to offer to fix up the substitute amendment offered by the majority leader, and to really help stimulate the economy.

One of those amendments would have repealed the special occupational tax on alcohol. This is an unfair tax imposed on all businesses that manufacture, distribute or sell alcohol products. It is one of the most egregious taxes to affect small businesses. My amendment would have taken a regulation and tax off the books which the General Accounting Office has concluded cost too much to administer compared to the revenues it generates. That is a bad tax.

And it is unfair, too. The same tax is paid by little businesses as large ones. Let me explain. Right now, four small family-owned bait shops which sell beer pay as much in taxes as the nation's largest single site brewery—a whopping \$1,000.

Repeal of this tax would have helped stimulate the economy. Last year, rebate checks put \$300 in American citizens' back pockets, and most people went out and spent it on much needed back-to-school clothes and supplies; toward that new computer; and to buy groceries.

My amendment would have put \$250 to \$500 back in the hands of small “Mom and Pop” businesses around the country. In turn, those small businesses owners would have used that extra money to make more needed purchases or pay expenses.

I also had a couple other amendments to offer. One would have put more money into the hands of charities, who in turn could buy needed supplies, including food, clothing, shelter, blankets, medicine, and hygiene and other products. When charities buy these things they are not only helping those in need, they are helping businesses and workers who manufacture or sell those products or services. In a small, but important way, this would also stimulate the economy.

How would my amendment have done this? It would have allowed those contributing their IRA's to charities to not have to pay a tax on the distribution to the charity. In other words, the government won't be skimming money off the donation. As a result, charities would have had more money, and the donors would have had the pleasure of giving more and the feeling of helping their communities and our nation.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle had good amendments to offer too. The senior Senator from Montana and I had a drought relief amendment we could have used to help ranchers and farmers. I proudly endorsed our bipartisan amendment. Wyoming really needs the drought relief contained in that piece of legislation.

The senior Senator from Texas had amendments to speed up the tax rate reductions and tax cuts implemented last year. Senator BOND had an amendment that passed the Senate 92 to 0 to allow an increase in small businesses expensing. This would have given vital assistance to small businesses across this country affected by the recession we are in. The Senator from Idaho had

an amendment to make the death tax repeal permanent.

Well, we do have a death right now to contend with, and it's a casualty that even Senator KYL's death tax amendment can't help. As my colleague from Georgia explained, we are now having to pull the plug on an economic stimulus bill and will be attending a funeral on its demise. Why? Because this country could have largely benefitted from a reasonable economic stimulus package, which now will not be passed.

Like my distinguished colleague Senator MILLER said, we are all here giving our eulogies. Those eulogies extend to those many amendments truly meant to stimulate the economy. It is extremely disappointing we will not be able to help the unemployed, or our American workers and small businesses.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE NEED FOR A STIMULUS BILL

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, with the votes that have been cast this afternoon, we have once again shown the American people that we have put politics before their needs. Quite frankly, I think this body should be ashamed that we could not rise above our party differences and give the American people a stimulus package that will help secure our economy, put people back to work and respond to the human suffering that is occurring as a result of the recession.

Too often, it seems to me, we spend more time trying to score political points than addressing the needs of real people. And I can tell you, there are real needs in the State of Ohio. Despite claims that an economic turn around is just around the corner, the citizens of my State are still suffering the effects of this recession. Many more are “shaking in their boots,” wondering if they are going to be laid-off and the next to join the unemployment line.

Since the first week of December, we have had 320 companies in Ohio announce their intention to lay-off workers, affecting nearly 70,000 people.

Right now, we have some 191,000 people receiving unemployment benefits, and each week, thousands file for initial benefits.

Also each week, around 3,000 people exhaust their benefits without having found another job.

In 2001, initial unemployment claims in my state jumped by 41.5 percent compared to 2000—the highest since 1992.

While the U.S. Department of Commerce reported a two tenths of a percent increase in the economy in the fourth quarter, I consider it anemic economic growth, which is providing little benefit—if any to the men and women of Ohio.

We need robust growth, and a balanced stimulus package is critical to getting us there.

The President was right on target in his State of the Union address last