

clear to me that the Democratic leadership, Senator DASCHLE through the membership, will continue to fight for the million people who are not covered by this resolution, but we cannot turn our backs on the 2.8 million who need this check on Thursday.

I will not object to this unanimous consent request.

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

The bill (S. 23) was read the third time and passed.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. I ask the period of morning business be extended for 3 hours under the earlier parameters.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent the 3 hours be divided equally.

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

The Democratic leader.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for not objecting to this resolution. He and my colleagues feel very strongly, as is evidenced by the debate this afternoon. We will not give up, we will not relent, we will not allow those million Americans who have no coverage not getting the consideration they deserve in the Senate. We will continue to offer amendments.

I put my colleagues on notice: On this legislation and on any other occasion that we have the opportunity to avail ourselves of an amendment, we will do so, because this deserves a vote. It deserves debate. It deserves passage. It is shameful we are leaving out these million people today. There is absolutely no excuse, especially when the President of the United States today is in Chicago talking about more tax cuts for those at the very top. That is wrong.

It is an illustration of the extraordinary difference in philosophy about how we stimulate the economy. This is not only good for the economy, it is good for 1 million people left out as a result of the actions today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. On the Democratic side we have a number of Senators who have asked for a specific time. I ask unanimous consent on our side, and on an alternating basis if, in fact, there are Republicans who wish to speak, that Senator BOXER first be recognized for 5 minutes, Senator SCHUMER for 5 minutes, Senator STABENOW for 5 minutes, Senator DORGAN for 5 minutes, Senator REID of Rhode Island for 5 minutes, Senator MURRAY for 5 minutes. That is a total, I believe, of 35 minutes, leaving 55 minutes for other Senators on this side of the aisle who wish to speak. The normal procedure is to alternate back

and forth on the time evenly divided between now and 5 p.m.

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

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my assistant Democratic leader for the time.

During the brief debate we had before we voted to extend these unemployment benefits, the Senator from Pennsylvania asked, What is wrong with you people? What has changed, that you really want to protect now these 1 million people, when several months ago you did not speak as loudly for their inclusion?

I state for the record what has happened in this period of time. As we go out and about our States, as I think we all did during this break, we find high anxiety among the people—high anxiety because of this economy. We are seeing more foreclosures than ever. Two million jobs have been lost in the private sector. On top of that we are seeing budget deficits that we have not seen in many years.

My friend who is now presiding, my esteemed colleague, understands this anxiety. We have teamed up to work on giving a jump-start to the high-tech sector with a bill on wireless fidelity, which I believe is going to really help this economy. He understands that.

We have a sense of urgency about that bill because we know we can turn things around. In my State we have a horrible situation in the northern areas because of what I would call a depression, really, in the high-tech sector. Some of it was to be expected; we went through this huge period of growth. We have some settling down there. But nonetheless, it is a problem. We have thousands of people in northern California who are suffering through no fault of their own. These people, who are intelligent, educated, and excellent workers, are out on the street. They are running out of benefits, and some of them have run out already. That is why we on this side of the aisle believe those million people should not be left out of the equation.

I have a State of 35 million people. In terms of its economy, it would be the sixth largest economy in the world. The fact is, the good people in that State need help. Why we on this side of the aisle were so upset and why we kept objecting or reserving the right to object is we wanted to make sure the people's voices were heard. That is what the Senate ought to be, a place where the voice of the people is heard.

We have a situation where our States are worse off. They cannot come in and help because they are financially strapped because of the recession. So people are turning to us. Today we took care of some people. I am very proud we did that, but we have left out in the cold a million people. I will not be satisfied, speaking as one Senator, until we have taken care of all those who are in need.

The Senator from Pennsylvania also made a comment that just some of the

States have problems. This is not true. These million people reside in all of the States. In my own State, the pockets of real trouble are in the north of the State right now; the south of the State is doing better. But individuals all over this country need help.

In summary, I say the Democrats are back. We are ready to go to work. We will stay. We will stay late into the night. But we are going to offer, all through this day and all through the coming days, a unanimous consent request saying we need to take care of those million people, those long-term unemployed people whose checks have already run out, who do not know where they are going to get the money to pay the rent, who don't know if they will get evicted, who don't know if they can take care of their children.

There is a new term of art that has come about. It is called "food insecurity." Food insecurity—that is a delicate way of saying people are hungry.

We are seeing food insecurity. We are seeing housing insecurity. We are seeing joblessness. Can we turn it around? Of course we could turn it around.

I have seen the President's plan. In my personal opinion, having looked at where the benefits go, it is a bonanza to the wealthiest in the country, and it is a bust for the middle class. It is a budget deficit disaster. But he has a plan out there. It is a huge plan, and we are going to work to make it better, to get the benefits to those who need them. But if you want to talk about stimulus, talk about the million people who have no money to put bread on the table.

In closing, let's help those million people. I intend to stay here all this week and next and into future weeks to make sure we do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been here throughout this debate. I have not been involved in this issue prior to this point, as many have. But it has been an interesting and rather surprising sequence of events here on this first day, this sort of ceremonial day, in which we get into this kind of head-to-head arrangement. It is surprising.

I do understand why this issue was brought to the floor. That is because there is a time element. We heard a letter from the Secretary of Labor indicating that in order to get a continuation of the unemployment benefits of those who are still eligible, we have to do it by Thursday. So I think that is a pretty compelling issue. In order to get that done, we obviously also have to do something that has been agreed to, apparently, by the House as well.

So it is surprising to me that we have this effort made within the Senate, and also with House leadership, to try to do something within this time that is imperative we do, yet we come to the floor and apparently the very people who helped make the agreement now

are proposing an amendment which would kill the bill. Certainly it would not make it available in the time that is necessary.

There is no reason for anybody to argue with the fact that there are those out there who need some additional help. This bill is not a total remedy. I think everyone admits that. We have to come back and do some other things. But this was argued last year. We could not get it done. We should have gotten it done last year and didn't. Now we have an opportunity to do something today to get it to the President, to get it through the House before they adjourn—apparently today.

It really sounds as if the process is such that it is pretty compelling that we do what seems to be available, and that is to pass a bill which would extend unemployment benefits to, apparently, up to 2 million people whose benefits otherwise would expire at the end of this week. If there are others who are eligible who still need some help—and there obviously are—then we can do that. We can come back and do that. But to sacrifice what we can do today to argue about something that we do not agree on yet and can do tomorrow does not seem to make good sense.

I hate to think it is a political issue, bringing up now the President's economic package. It really is not a part of this debate. The President has said all along that he wants to have the unemployment relief extended. So it is a puzzle to me. I hope we can now move forward. We have passed the bill. I say that is the greatest thing we could have done today. Certainly we needed to do that. We can come back and take a look at these other issues and everyone can get their opportunity to express their political issues and, I think, seek to separate us from the other side. I hate to think that is the case, but it seems to be. And it is too bad.

The notion that some of us do not want to do anything is not accurate. How we do it is what we are talking about. We have been through it before.

I am glad we are able to move forward. I think we ought to get in our minds a way to work on the issues that remain to be worked on and do that in the appropriate time. But I am reluctant to think we want to continue to confront one another today and to talk about all the bad things we can think of. That is not quite what is involved with this first session of the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, there is no question that today is a day for family, a day for congratulations. I congratulate all my colleagues who were just sworn in. I know it is a very exciting day. I remember being in this position 2 years ago. It is a very special day.

But in addition to celebrating family in the Senate today, we are very concerned about those families who find themselves in the difficult position of

having no income coming in because of unemployment, through no cause of their own.

They want to work. But because of the changing economy, the structure of the economy, or because of a variety of other reasons, they have found themselves unemployed. Certainly in Michigan we find that the changing economic structure has occurred for many people. Many of us have been asking that we remember them. We asked during the holidays that we remember those whose unemployment benefits would be ending during the holidays and that we take action before we left last year. That did not happen. We are back today.

I commend the new leadership for their willingness to come forward with this issue of unemployment compensation. However, what we have seen today is a willingness to only do half the job. How can we say to a million people, and to their families, on a day when we celebrate families, that they don't count? We are told that the House of Representatives would not support solving this problem completely or addressing it completely—that they would only support addressing half of it.

We have said let us support solving the problem. And we did in fact pass a resolution to move forward solving half the problem.

But our leader, Senator DASCHLE, also proposed that we add a separate resolution to complete the job to help those 1 million individuals who also find themselves in a situation of needing to extend their unemployment benefits. Yet we were told no again. We have been told no so many times on this floor as it relates to helping unemployed workers. It is very regrettable that today, one more time, we were told no. I think, more specifically, families were told no. Those who have lost their jobs were told no. One million people were told no.

We celebrate today people coming into new commissions, new jobs, and with great pride, as they should. We know the ability to work and to be able to provide an income and care for your family is one of the basics of our society and our economy. We know that there are Americans today who find themselves in a difficult situation of searching for work, of being unemployed, and asking that their Government support their families as they move forward to find new employment so that they can care for their families in the way they would like to provide for them. Unfortunately, I believe today a tone was set by choosing not to address this problem completely at a time when we are seeing, unfortunately, one more time, an economic plan rolled out to help those who have been helped so many times who are at the very top of the income bracket in our country.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I have heard many economists, including Alan Greenspan, say that by

extending unemployment benefits—and by putting dollars into people's pockets so they can pay their bills, buy the shoes for their children, and be able to continue providing groceries for their families and paying other bills which they have—we actually stimulate the economy. We create demand. When there is money in people's pockets, they are spending it. We know someone who is unemployed is going to be spending it because they have to. The money coming in is not being saved. It is being spent on clothes, food, the electric bills, the car payment, the mortgage payment, and so on.

We know that is a short-term economic stimulus—certainly at a time when we are debating economic stimulus.

What we have been asking for today is something that is not only fair and right to address—all of those who find themselves in a situation of being unemployed, not leave 1 million people out of the solution—but we are also asking, as we talk about economic stimulus, that we in fact provide the kind of stimulus that puts money back into the economy and helping those who need to spend it to care for their families, to pay their bills, to be able to remain independent in their homes, and to be able to know that they are a part of the economic equation, and when we talk economic stimulus, that they are not left out.

While I am pleased we were able to pass the resolution, I am very disappointed that this very first time we were not able to address or even bring forward in a separate resolution the ability to address 1 million people today who are looking to us, at a time of celebration, and asking us to remember them; to ask on their behalf so they, too, can have the ability to care for their families. I hope we will, as quickly as possible, finish the job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent that Senator SCHUMER be placed as the next Democrat to be recognized in the order of recognition.

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

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, let me remind not only my colleagues, but the American people, why we are forced today, at the eleventh hour, to make a very cruel choice between helping some Americans and abandoning other Americans. It is because all through last fall, the Republican House of Representatives refused to take up and vote upon unemployment benefits in a meaningful way that would lead to successful passage. The President did not involve himself on this issue until the unemployment rate reached 6 percent. He fired his economic team, and they discovered there really were Americans who desperately need help.

Today we were forced to make those choices that you see sometimes in the movies about who gets to stay in the life boat. It was a completely unnecessary choice.

The Senator from Oklahoma talked about one proposal costing \$4 billion and another proposal costing \$1 billion. The House wanted \$1 billion.

There is a surplus today in the unemployment insurance trust fund of \$24 billion. There is absolutely no fiscal reason we could not provide these benefits to 1 million Americans who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. We heard from colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they are categorically opposed to giving any extension of benefits beyond a certain time. This not only defies logic and defies the fiscal status of the trust fund but also defies history.

In the early 1990s, this Government extended unemployment compensation a total of five times—three times under President George Herbert Walker Bush because unemployment continued to rise for the 15th month after the so-called end of the recession. There are cases in which individuals were able to collect unemployment benefits for a total of 52 weeks because they qualified for these extensions.

Why is this so important? Because people are desperate. They had good jobs. They lost those jobs. They are looking for comparable work. They cannot find it. The record of this economy under this President is dismal. Family incomes have fallen for the first time in 8 years. Poverty is increasing. Families at all income levels are losing their health insurance left and right. Gross domestic product is growing, but it is growing too feebly to generate the jobs these people need.

Since the President took office, 2.2 million private payroll jobs have been lost. We are losing jobs. We are not gaining jobs. We are asking them to find jobs; we are setting them on a task that is extraordinarily difficult.

So what can we do in the interim?

We can at least give them unemployment compensation, extended, if necessary. It is the fair thing to do. It is the wise thing to do. The President, in his economic speech in Chicago, talked about some special \$3,000 benefit for those people who are unemployed. Let's do the mathematics. That \$3,000 represents probably a fraction of the unemployment insurance someone would collect if we voted for these benefits. That is not a good deal for the people of America—a \$3,000, one-time payment, some type of scheme in which they can use it either to pay their household costs or go to training versus receiving, on a regular basis, unemployment compensation as they look for work.

The reality, as my colleague from Montana pointed out, is that unemployment is different today than it was even 10 years ago in the recession of the early 1990s. It is different because the economy has changed.

The State which the Presiding Officer and I represent used to be a manufacturing center, not just to the United States but to the world. That is changing. As I go about our State talking to people, the unemployed are 50-year-old, former mid-level management people who used to work for a company. They did not get fired. They did not get laid off. The company went away, went out of business, moved its operations to Mexico, moved its operations to Singapore. And then you ask this person, with a mortgage, college tuitions—and the health care benefits which they used to get at work are now his responsibility or her responsibility—to go look for a job with comparable pay? They are not hiring people like that. They are looking for the 35-year-old, with a computer degree, who will work cheaper, who does not have those responsibilities of a family, of a mortgage.

That is the reality out there. That is what we are fighting about today, not the number "1 million," but a million Americans, struggling to find work, trying to find work. They need help. And we turn our back on them today. I heard my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma, say he would never bring up extension of these benefits to people who have exhausted their benefits already. I heard the majority leader sort of talk about: Well, we want to deal with this issue, but let's get this issue done first.

The message is pretty clear to me and should be clear to the American public: We are walking away today from a million people. We should not do that.

This seems to me to be so clear and so obvious that I am, in fact, amazed and shocked at what we did. The money is there. This is a benefit for people who are looking for work. Once they find work, the benefit expires. We are talking about stimulating the economy. What is more stimulating than giving people money to pay for their household goods as they look for work?

I am more than disappointed. But we were forced today, because of the inattention of the administration and the House, at the last minute, to choose between denying benefits to all unemployed Americans or abandoning about a million—a cruel, unnecessary choice. We can do better. We should do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If nobody yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the time be

equally charged to both sides during the quorum call I am about to suggest.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TRENT LOTT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this is the first day of the 108th Congress. I remember the former Senator from Kansas, Nancy Kassebaum, used to refer to these days as the first day of school, coming back after the recess. Of course, it is a time of celebration as new Senators gather. This one is particular in that it is a time of a new majority leader. I rise to express my confidence in and give my congratulations to Senator FRIST of Tennessee in his assuming the position as majority leader. He will prove to be an outstanding leader. The Senate and the people of the United States will be well served by his stewardship.

However, I wish to take this opportunity to make a few comments about the previous majority leader, Senator LOTT of Mississippi. Senator LOTT has been very much in the news of the last few weeks. He ultimately made what I consider to be the right decision in stepping aside so that the challenges raised to him would not get in the way of the business of the Senate or of the country. The caricature of Senator LOTT that appeared in much of the national media did not match in any way the man that I know and love.

I rise to comment briefly on the contribution Senator LOTT has made to this institution and to the Nation and take the opportunity of the shifting of power to pay tribute to Senator LOTT and the work he has done.

There are many things in his career that we could point to. This is not his funeral so I won't run through a list. But there is one in particular that stands out in my mind, which I will share with those who may be watching, that demonstrates the kind of leader TRENT LOTT WAS. I refer to the experience many of us described as the most significant of our careers, and that was the historic moment when the Senate sat in judgment as a trial for the impeachment of the President of the United States. For only the second time in our history, a President had been impeached by the House of Representatives, and we were required