

**Health Care for Dislocated Workers.**—As Congress considers proposals to assist dislocated workers in gaining access to health insurance, Congress must recognize that states will not have available funds for any new matching requirements or options.

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS**

**Expansion of Eligibility for Unemployment Benefits.**—By temporarily modifying existing Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) eligibility requirements, the DUA program (already in operation or on ready standby in all states) could be used only to provide Unemployment Insurance (UI) equivalent benefits to individuals affected by declared disasters, but also to those affected by resulting economic contraction. These UI-equivalent benefits would be particularly beneficial for those who do not qualify for UI benefits due to insufficient duration of employment or level of earnings.

**Extension of Unemployment Benefits.**—Congress also should temporarily extend the duration of regular UI benefits through 100 percent federal funding to ensure that unemployed workers can secure employment prior to the termination of UI benefits.

**Acceleration of Reed Act Distributions.**—Congress should accelerate distribution to state accounts of excess funds (as defined by the Reed Act) being held in the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund. This could be achieved by retaining the 0.25 percent ceiling on the Federal Unemployment Account. The immediate transfer of an estimated \$9.3 billion can be used by states only for providing UI benefits, employment services, and program administration.

**Increase Funding for Dislocated Workers Employment and Job Training Services.**—Fiscal 2001 funds for this Workforce Investment Act (WIA) programs were rescinded by \$177.5 million, while the President's proposed fiscal 2002 budget requests a reduction of \$207 million. Congress should restore these funds.

**STIMULATE THE ECONOMY THROUGH CAPITAL INVESTMENT**

**State Match.**—Temporarily reduce or eliminate state match requirements for capital investment programs.

**Federal Investment.**—Increase federal funding for infrastructure investment critical to homeland security.

**Private Activity Volume Cap.**—Lift the private activity volume cap, which would accelerate housing and economic development construction activities.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there is another important point that must be made today. Five months ago, when we last considered a huge tax cut that mostly benefitted the wealthiest Americans, the money to pay for it was to come from the non-Social Security surplus.

Today those surpluses are gone. So whatever is spent on this stimulus package will, at least over the next 5 years, come mainly out of Social Security and Medicare funds. We may even return to deficit spending, if we are not careful. That is why we must be even more prudent, and more vigilant, about what is included in this economic recovery package.

The Democratic plan has a one-year cost of \$74 billion. Over 10 years, its cost increases to \$84 billion. As I said, the Republican plan costs \$89 billion in 2002. Over 10 years, it explodes to \$175 billion—and it runs the risk of damaging our long-term economic health.

Their plan costs more but does less for our economy, less for laid off workers, and nothing for homeland security.

I hope every Senator will ask himself or herself a simple question: Would my constituents want their Social Security and Medicare money to be spent on this proposal?

Democrats have tried to write our package with this concern in mind. We think the American people want us to invest in bioterrorism preparedness, for example.

But would Americans want their Social Security payroll tax money spent on new tax cuts for the wealthy or on huge permanent new tax breaks for profitable corporations? I don't think so.

In fact, it seems especially unjust when you consider that Americans at the lower end of the income scale pay payroll taxes on every dollar of their income. Meanwhile, wealthy Americans pay zero in Social Security payroll taxes on all income above \$80,000.

In other words, the Republican plan would spend the hard-earned Social Security payroll tax dollars of ordinary workers at the bottom and use them to pay for tax cuts for corporations and people at the top.

We have been told that Senate Republicans will attempt to raise a budget point of order against this bill.

Let me make clear what that means. A budget point of order is a procedural technicality aimed at killing this bill by saying that what our nation is now facing is not an emergency.

A vote for this procedural motion is a vote to kill unemployment insurance for laid off workers.

It is a vote to kill health care for struggling families.

It is a vote to kill tax cuts for businesses that create jobs and for people who did not get a rebate in the last round.

It is a vote to kill funding to build our national pharmaceutical stockpile, security at our nuclear power plants, protections for our bridges, tunnels, and ports, and the safety of our food and water supply.

This is a vote to kill all of these items by saying that this is not an emergency.

Thousands of people have lost their lives. Millions of people are out of work. We are at war abroad, and we are facing threats to our safety here at home.

If that's not an emergency, I don't know what is.

There is still time for us to come together and pass an economic recovery plan that will work for the nation.

In the days since September 11, we have seen more clearly than ever that we are indeed one nation, indivisible.

The victims of those attacks were from all races and ethnicities, all segments of society.

The heroes who came to their aid didn't ask, What's in it for me?

As we look to lift up the economy for all Americans, the most fortunate

among us should not be asking what's in it for them.

Those workers I met in Rapid City aren't looking to us to solve all of their problems. They are just looking for a little help to get through one of the most difficult times of their lives.

It may be difficult for us to reach agreement, but for them—and for our nation—it is vitally important that we do so.

I strongly believe that with every challenge comes an opportunity, and right now we have an opportunity to help those who are hurting, lift our economy, and secure our Nation.

We will be judged on whether we seize it.

I hope and pray that we will.

I yield the floor.

**EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 11:30 and that the time be divided equally between the Democrats and Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary position?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is to last until 11:15 with no division of time.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Texas wishes to speak.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, there is no objection to the request.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, is there a unanimous consent request pending?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, there is.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, could it be repeated?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have morning business now until 11:15. The leader used his leader time, and I asked unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 11:30 with the time to be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I would like to amend that. I don't know who else will come to speak. I would like to amend that to say I will be recognized to follow the Senator from Kentucky, if no one else is here.

Mr. BAUCUS. I object.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what we have tried to do—as I explained to Senator BUNNING this morning—is, until there is some reason not to do so, we would alternate back and forth. I would also think it would be appropriate that Senators speaking during morning business be limited to 10 minutes each. I do not know how long the Senator from Kentucky wishes to speak.

Mr. BUNNING. I have a little more than 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. I am sure the Senator could get that.

So anyway, Mr. President, my request is that we extend morning business until 11:30, and the time be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object, if the chairman would like to speak after the Senator from Kentucky, that would be fine. Having come over and having listened to the majority leader's speech, I would like to be sure that somewhere within that time I get an opportunity to speak.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Texas, I know Senator BUNNING has been here all morning. He was here when I arrived this morning before 10:30. When he completes his comments, I do not know if the chairman wishes to speak.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, perhaps I can help matters out. I see three speakers who wish to speak.

Mr. REID. I think maybe what we should do is extend the morning business time until 11:45, with Senator BUNNING having 15 minutes, Senator BAUCUS having 15 minutes, and Senator GRAMM having 15 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in support of a strong economic stimulus package to help create jobs and to kick-start our economy. Right now, I don't think there is a doubt in anyone's mind that we have fallen into a recession.

Consumer confidence is down. Lay-offs are up. Economic activity has slowed dramatically. After years of economic good times, we are skidding into a sharp downturn.

Before the horrific terrorist attacks on September 11, our economy was already teetering on the brink. But that day sent us over the edge. In the third quarter, gross domestic product ended up actually shrinking by an estimated four-tenths of 1 percent. When the revised figures come out, I am afraid that number will fall even further down, maybe a full percentage point.

I think there is a chance that the fourth quarter could be worse and we could see GDP contraction of minus 2 or 3 percentage points, plus unemployment rising from 5.4 percent—which it is now—to well over 6 percent. In other words we have hit the wall.

Now we have to ask: What is the best way to get America moving again. That is the issue confronting the Senate. Do we try to cut taxes and provide for efficient, long-term growth that will create jobs or do we go for more Federal spending and a short-term approach, as the majority leader suggested?

To make things worse, September 11 compounded our problems. It made consumers more nervous and investors more anxious. It pushed a number of vital industries—airlines and transportation, investment companies, and tourism—to the edge of the cliff, and some over the edge.

Congress has already acted quickly to help the airlines and to shore up parts of our economy that were badly wounded by September 11. Now we need to figure out what we can do to set consumers' and investors' minds at ease and to help convince them that even though we are at war, it is time to get going with our lives and our business.

I believe that we must act quickly, but we must act correctly. The wrong economic package could make things worse.

The best way I know to create jobs is to provide incentives to business to grow and to expand. And the best way I know to convince business to get moving is taking in the language they understand: dollars and cents. The dollars and cents that every businessman and businesswoman in America knows best is taxes.

We need to cut taxes on business now, and not just nickel and dime stuff. We need real tax reductions that will have a broad impact across the economy and send a signal to the entire business community that Washington understands their problems and is going to do everything possible to help.

It is not time to pick or choose with help for just a few industries. Our whole economy is hurting, and we need general relief across the board.

I know that every time we have this debate the opponents of tax cuts, like our majority leader, shake their fists and point their fingers and cry out that tax cuts only benefit the rich. After awhile, they start to sound like a broken record. What the opponents of tax cuts in an economic jobs package need to understand is that these tax cuts are for businesses—and not corporate executives. No one seriously thinks and talks about helping rich people and hurting poor people.

The question is how we can best act to spur business right now to create real, long-term, permanent jobs. We have all heard from our people back home—the experts who are out there everyday trying to brow their businesses and to expand their companies—about the real, broad-based tax cuts that can make a difference.

We need to cut corporate AMT taxes, the punitive tax goes out of its way to punish enterprising employers, particularly those who are losing their shirt in this economy. Companies need better expensing rules and accelerated depreciation schedules so they can write off costs faster and free up their capital for investment and more job creation. And we need to slash capital gains taxes so that money can flow more quickly to businesses that are ready to invest and spend now.

I don't think anyone in this body really believes that by trying to cut business taxes and create jobs we are really helping rich people. The American people don't buy those class warfare arguments, and they are a lot smarter than many in Congress give them credit. There is a world of business between cutting taxes on rich individuals and cutting taxes on business that create jobs and help families put food on their table. There is nothing better than giving a job to somebody who really wants to work.

As our economy grew over the past decade, as middle-class Americans invested in the market and watched their savings grow, more and more we came to understand that what is good for business in America is good for the American people and the American worker. In the past, when the economy took a turn for the worse, Congress too often took the easy way out. Instead of pushing for tax reductions and promoting growth, we went for the public checkbook and tried to buy our way out of recession with more Government spending. But considering how quickly our budget surplus is shrinking. It doesn't make any sense to write checks that the Treasury might not be able to pay without going into debt once again.

More than anything else, we must not return to the bad old days of Federal deficits and stagnant growth. It may feel good for Congress to pass more spending as a gesture to show "we care," but everyone knows that in the long-run the Government doesn't create jobs—business does—and caring means we have a job for anyone who wants to work.

More spending might help for a little bit, but I worry that it would just be a band-aid approach when our economy needs serious, long-term treatment. Extra spending on public works is sometimes necessary, but it is not a long-term solution to our economic problem. It is only a temporary fix.

And no one has ever accused Government spending, and money for projects funded through Government programs, of getting into the economy faster than tax cuts that would right now put money into the hands of private entrepreneurs.

In short, Mr. President, the best way to get our economy back on track is to cut taxes.

Reducing taxes frees capital. It lets business react swiftly to market conditions and to make crucial decisions quickly. And it affects the bottom line right now.

I do not think I am plowing any new ground here.

We have heard a lot of these arguments before. But I can't remember a time when the debate was as important as it is now.

We are at war. Our economy needs help. It is time to act now and to act swiftly.

I urge my colleagues to pass an economic jobs bill now, one that really