

amendment because it is still far better than full repeal. It retains the estate tax for the ultra-rich, but would protect small business owners and family farmers. And it would save hundreds of billions over the next 20 years compared to full repeal.

Let me also point out one final irony in this debate. I mentioned yesterday the bizarreness of colleagues voting against raising the debt limit, and then in the same day turning around and supporting a bill that would raise the national debt by hundreds of thousands more.

Today's irony is that this is supposed to be a debate about small businesses, but my friends on the other side are opposing the Dorgan amendment that gives permanent relief from the estate tax from small businesses and family farmers right now—compared to 7 years from now under the Gramm approach. Let me repeat that, my colleagues on the other side say they are for the small business owner. They say they are for the family farmer. Yet they are opposing immediate relief for small business owners and farmers. Why? To protect their tax breaks for billionaires.

Small businesses and farmers are the pawns in this debate. They have literally been used by those who want to give billionaires a tax break. I don't know if there is a single person in this body who would oppose giving permanent, targeted estate tax relief to small business owners and family farmers. I think it could pass 100 to 0. But it didn't because if the supporters of full repeal let the small business owner get relief then they lose this issue. And they won't get repeal for billionaires. And they would rather have the issue to campaign on, and they aren't going to let the little guy on Main Street get his tax break unless they can get it for the fat cat on Wall Street.

The Dorgan amendment should be an eye opener for small business owners and farmers. It betrays the real agenda behind full repeal of the estate tax. It's not about the little guy. It is not about the shopkeeper, the farmer, the contractor, the wholesaler. They are the hostages in this debate.

I will not jeopardize Social Security—which tens of millions of Americans rely upon for their retirement—to grant tax breaks to the heirs of multimillionaires and billionaires.

We cannot afford to give a few lucky Americans a tax free inheritance of hundreds of millions or billions of dollars and protect the tens of millions of Americans and over 740,000 Minnesotans who rely on Social Security.

But we can afford to shield small estates, small businesses, and family farms from the estate tax at the same time we safeguard the retirement security of all Minnesotans. That is what I voted to do.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, June 14,

the Senate proceed concurrently, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader, to two bills relating to cloning, a bill to be introduced by Senators HATCH, FEINSTEIN, SPECTER, and others, and a bill to be introduced by Senator BROWNBACK. I further ask that Senator BROWNBACK or his designee be recognized to immediately offer a cloture motion on his bill, to be followed by Senator HATCH or his designee offering a cloture motion on his bill. I further ask unanimous consent that no amendments or motions to commit be in order to either bill and there be the following limitations for debate with respect to both bills: 3 hours equally divided between the two sponsors or their designees on Friday; 4 hours equally divided in the same fashion on Monday, June 17; 1 hour equally divided in the same fashion on Tuesday, June 18; that following the use or yielding back of time, on Tuesday, the Senate proceed to vote on the cloture motion on Senator BROWNBACK's bill and, notwithstanding the outcome of that vote, to be followed by an immediate cloture vote on Senator HATCH's bill; further, if cloture is invoked on either bill, the Senate then resume consideration under the provisions of rule XXII. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that, if cloture is not invoked on either bill, then each bill be placed back on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate my colleague from Nevada bringing this forward. I hope we can work out a reasonable and prudent way to address what I consider to be a critical issue—many people consider to be a critical issue in front of the country. I say we still may be able to get to an agreement that would get ample time and opportunity for the Senate to speak on this timely legislation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent for the following modifications to this pending request. I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, June 14, the Senate proceed to the bill just mentioned, introduced by Senator KENNEDY, Senator HATCH, and others, and that Senator LANDRIEU, myself, and Senator HUTCHISON be permitted to offer up to four relevant amendments to the bill; further, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be in order notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, and that no other amendments be in order to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. REID. I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Then I am afraid I must object and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am, of course, disappointed. Many people

worked long and hard to come up with this agreement. Senator DASCHLE, I believe, has fulfilled his commitment. As I understand it, the only dispute is to when the respective votes should occur, and I submit that shouldn't matter that much, but that is the unanimous consent agreement that was pronounced. Senator DASCHLE has worked with others long and hard. Maybe later we can work something else out. At the present time, I think Senator DASCHLE has fulfilled his commitment.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2600

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 410, S. 2600, the terrorism insurance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I ultimately will not object, but I want to propose that the unanimous consent request be amended to read as follows: I ask unanimous consent that at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 252, H.R. 3210, and it be considered under the following limitations, the only amendments in order be the following: A substitute amendment by Senator GRAMM and myself, the text of which will be printed in the RECORD upon the granting of the consent; three relevant first-degree amendments to the substitute to be offered by each leader or their designees, and that no motions to recommit be in order; I further ask unanimous consent that, following a vote on or in relation to the above-listed first-degree amendments and any debate time, there be a vote on or in relation to the substitute amendment; finally, I ask unanimous consent that when and if the bill is passed, the Senate then insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to respond to the Chair, I would simply say this: We have been through this now for months. I have been down here on a number of occasions, trying to get something that we believe will expedite this very important legislation. We have tried one amendment on each side, two amendments on each side, three amendments on each side. I think we finally got to five amendments on each side. I think the best thing to do is just get to the bill. It is an important piece of legislation and if it is as important as the major industries believe it is, we are