under the Constitution to hold a trial to determine whether the President should be convicted of those crimes of which he was impeached.

Many in the press, many uninformed, asked: Why is the Senate wasting its time dealing with this challenge?

The Constitution left us with no choice. Once the House of Representatives had voted impeachment, the Senate was required under the Constitution to hold a trial, with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding. It was a historic time, and many of my colleagues commented that this was the most significant vote they would ever cast in their political careers.

We met in the old Senate Chamber to discuss what we should do. That was a historic meeting, off the record, if you will, because it was not here with an official reporter taking down every word. But it was an opportunity for Senators to speak freely and openly. In very solemn and somber proceedings, we discussed what we should do. I am not violating any confidences because it has been reported in the press that the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, spoke on behalf of the Democrats as we addressed that issue. He made this point. I can't remember his exact words, but these were the words that are in my mind.

Referring to the case before us, he said: This case is toxic. It has besmirched the Presidency, and it has soiled the House of Representatives. And it is about to do the same thing to us.

I believe his analysis was correct, that the case of President Clinton and his actions did indeed besmirch the Presidency, degrade the Presidency, and I think the way it ultimately played out in the House of Representatives stained that body and left bitterness that is still producing bitter fruit. Senator BYRD warned this case, this toxic case, was about to affect the Senate.

The majority leader, who had to handle such a case, was TRENT LOTT of Mississippi. I was at his side in many of his meetings. I watched from afar in many of the other things he did. Senator LOTT handled that historic challenge with as much sensitivity, finesse, wisdom and, yes, grace as it would be possible to do.

When it was over, Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE met in the well of the Senate, embraced each other, and said: We did it.

Yes, they did. And they did it together. But the primary responsibility was on the shoulders of Senator LOTT. He made Senator BYRD's prophecy not come true. Instead of staining the Senate, instead of soiling the Senate the way that case soiled the Presidency and the House, it was in many ways the Senate's finest hour. The case was handled with dignity. The case was handled with dispatch. And the case was handled with a minimum of bad feelings on both sides.

There are some outside the Senate who attacked Senator LOTT and said: You should have had a full-blown trial. You should have let this drag on for 6 weeks, even 6 months. And at the end of that period of time, maybe, just maybe, you would have had a conviction.

Senator LOTT understood that the dignity of this body and the unity of the country required the kind of handling of that case that he gave us.

History will look back on the stewardship of TRENT LOTT as majority leader of the United States with great approval and kindness. This is a man of extraordinary skills who handled himself in an extraordinary way, and all of us who sat in the Senate through that experience benefited by his leadership.

Now he is moving on to other assignments. As I congratulate Senator FRIST on his ascension to the majority leadership, I also congratulate Senator LOTT on the prospect of a continued career of contribution, perhaps in the policy area more than in the process area. He has demonstrated that he can master the legislative process as well as anyone on the planet. I expect he will now demonstrate that he can make contributions of equal significance in the policy area.

On a personal note, while he is many years my junior in this business of politics, he has acted as my mentor and my teacher. I can think of many times when I have been tangled up in the minutia and arcane nature of the way this body works, where I had nowhere else to go to get myself untangled and set straight. I called Senator LOTT and, with calmness and clarity, he said, why don't we do this and, suddenly, the Gordian knot was cut and I emerged ready to go forward in my career because of his wisdom and his guidance.

Again, I congratulate Senator FRIST. I was happy to vote for him when the opportunity came. I am looking forward to working with Senator FRIST as he demonstrates his ability to lead this body. I have every confidence that that will be a tremendous period in the Senate's history, but, at the same time, I wanted to rise and make it clear that as we embrace Senator FRIST's leadership we should recognize and pay tribute to the contribution made to this body and ultimately to the country by Senator TRENT LOTT of Mississippi.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I congratulate all of my new colleagues who were sworn in today, and all of those who won reelection—but particularly those who are here for the first time, and my good friend from New Jersey who is here for the second time, with a hiatus. I congratulate the new leadership on the Republican side, along with Majority Leader FRIST. We look forward to working together for the good of our country.

Today, I stand here feeling, I guess I would say, boxed in because we on this side of the aisle who feel that the unemployment package was not adequate are faced with the choice of taking half a loaf or none. Of course, when you are in a legislative body, you tend to take that half loaf. We will do it today—or we have done it already today. But when it comes to people out of work, when it comes to the pain in the eyes of fathers and mothers, young men and women who talk about missing or losing a job, knocking on doors and not being able to find one, half a loaf is not very adequate.

I find it confounding that the other side did not allow the amendment my colleague from New York proffered. We only asked for a half hour of debate, so it cannot be that it would take up much time. We certainly do not believe that they didn't want to help the unemployed. So the only logical answer is dollars. They thought it might be too expensive. To me—the main point I want to make this afternoon is this—the contrast of our President speaking in Chicago and putting forward a $600 billion plan of relief, mostly on the tax side—and the vast majority of that plan goes to the very highest income levels. I read somewhere that 42 percent goes to 1 percent; 1 percent of the highest income get 42 percent of the relief. One percent is 311,000. So there is $600 billion to go to tax relief, mainly for the most well off, and there is not a billion dollars to include a million people—150,000 New Yorkers—to give them the unemployment benefits they now do not have.

How many Americans would support that? Our job is to juxtapose those two issues. I hope the media will do that. These are not two separate issues because we have not heard a single reason that we cannot take the larger bill. They say our colleagues in the House will object. Then let the American people look at them and say to them, if you can afford and you are going to support $600 billion in tax relief, largely to extremely wealthy, high-income individuals and families, why can't you support a billion dollars for the unemployed?

If the election we just held were on that issue, what do you think would have happened? My guess is that the results would have been quite different. Frankly, our colleagues in the House and some on the other side of the aisle don't like to see this issue contrasted. The tax relief—huge amounts of it—is going to the upper income spectrums and the stingiest, the parsimonious attitude when it comes to the unemployed. It is not that we cannot afford it, because I offer to my colleagues, let's do $599 billion of tax relief and do this billion dollars. Hardly anyone would notice, except those million people who are out of work and desperately looking for work.

So I hope we will have another opportunity to work this amendment forward. I worry that we can make a lot of speeches on the floor of the Senate, but, yes, they will say, bring it up as

part of the stimulus package, we will pass it in the Senate. But it will die in conference, and then there is nothing we can do legislatively.

So while I didn't agree with my colleague from Illinois for objecting because we are in such a box—I thought we should not object and try to persuade them—I sympathize with his anger and with his frustration that we could not spend a half hour to talk about some money for people who are out of work, or our colleagues here would have withdrawn the bill and hurt the 2.8 million who will benefit, and justifiably so.

The issue of money for the jobless doesn't change America. Unfortunately, it is not the most important issue we face. Getting a good education and good health care and more jobs for people is far more important than a stopgap measure. Until we are able to do that—so far we have not—we have to help those who need help. These are not people sitting on their duffs trying to get a check. They are people who are knocking on doors every day. When a notice goes out that one company is hiring, you see hundreds and even thousands in my city and elsewhere throughout my State lined up around the block.

People desperately want work. The best thing we can do is give them jobs by stimulating the economy in a real way. But until we do, it is our fundamental and solemn and important responsibility to at least let them live a life of dignity, maintain the payment on the home, feed the child, put a coat on the spouse's back. That is all we were trying to do today. It is unfortunate that we were put in such a box and we were told take half a loaf or none. When it comes to unemployment, we should not have to deal with half a loaf.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I regret what happened in the Senate today. We passed some legislation that will offer some assistance to some who are unemployed in this country, but we left 1 million people who should have received the help of Members of the Senate, from the Congress, and from the President, without the kind of help they need. A lot of folks in this country don't have people clogging the hallways of the Capitol lobbying on their behalf—certainly not the people who are without means, at the lower end of the economic ladder; they have not hired people in the hallways of the Capitol to represent their interests. They rely on us to do that. There are so many families in this country who know things that Members of the Senate do not know. They know about a second shift, they know about a second job, they know about a second mortgage, and they know about buying a secondhand car. They know firsthand that they are the first in this country during an economic downturn to be called into an office and be told, by the way, you are being laid off, you are losing your job.

Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Americans have had to go home to tell their families that, through no fault of theirs, they were given a notice that their job was gone. They are no longer employed. It is a devastating thing for families to experience that. In most cases, during an economic downturn, the Congress has moved very quickly to say, yes, you lost your job, but it wasn't through your fault, it wasn't something you did, and we want to help you, we want to extend a helping hand during this rough spell in the American economy. Congress has always done that—that is, until last year when we tried and tried in the Senate to pass legislation to extend that helping hand and extend unemployment benefits, and now again today when we made the effort once again.

It is terribly disappointing that today the President is in Chicago announcing his tax proposal. At a time when we are experiencing very substantial budget deficits, the President is proposing a tax cut of $675 billion over the next 10 years. That is $65 billion, $70 billion a year for 10 years in tax cuts, and then we are told: But there is not enough money really to fund that rather small amount needed to help those who are unemployed, who have lost their jobs. I do not understand that.

It is interesting to me, and also a little perplexing, that we are told the budget deficits are just a result of the economy; it is just because the economy turned sour. A year and three-quarters ago, we had a debate in the Chamber of the Senate about a new fiscal policy. We were told we ought to embrace the idea of very large tax cuts for the long term.

Some of us stood up at these desks and said: Wait a second, it is pretty hard to see very far down the road. Shouldn't we worry perhaps some unforeseen consequences could run this economy into the ditch and cause very serious problems? Not to worry, they said. We have all that covered. We have contingency plans. So just pass this big tax cut of ours. The Congress did—not with my vote, but they did pass that large tax cut.

Within months, we discovered our economy was in a recession. Months later, on September 11, we were attacked by terrorists. And then there were corporate scandals almost unprecedented in this country's history. The tech bubble burst in the stock market. All of a sudden, very large Federal budget surpluses turned into very large Federal budget deficits, and now we are in a fix. Now we have competing needs, one of which is the item we discussed today: The need during an economic downturn to reach out a hand and help those who need help, to help those who have lost their job, by extending unemployment benefits.

Another competing interest and need was announced today by President Bush, saying what we really need at a time of unprecedented budget deficits—as far as the eye can see—is more tax cuts, $675 billion in additional tax cuts.

Interestingly enough, in terms of priorities, they say no to the people who have lost their jobs and need their unemployment extended, but they say yes in public policy, in this tax proposal, that we ought to tax people who work: Let's tax work and let's exempt investment. What kind of a value system is that?

There are many ways of making money. Some of them are to go to work, work hard, and get a paycheck. No one is proposing eliminating the tax on the paycheck, are they? So they say: Let's tax work.

Another way to make money is to collect substantial dividends from stockholdings and stock purchases, and the President is saying: Let's exempt that; we should not tax that at all.

I do not understand the value system: Let's tax work but exempt investment. Guess what that says. That says to the American people who are working—who, in my judgment, are the people who make this economic engine work well—we are going to tax you, but the folks who just sit back and collect their dividends—incidentally, the folks at the top of the income earning ladder—we are going to exempt you. Not with my vote we are not. Yet in terms of priorities on the very day the President says let's have a $675 billion tax cut, let's keep taxing work and exempt from taxation investment, he and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: We cannot afford that small amount of money to extend unemployment benefits to those at the bottom of the economic ladder, those who have had to come home with shattered dreams to tell their family: I have lost my job. What a devastating situation that is. These are people who want to work, who did work and, through no fault of their own but through a bad economy, lost their ability to work.

The best tradition in this country has always been for this Congress, during an economic downturn, for sound reasons, including trying to provide some stimulus to the economy, to say to those who have lost their jobs: We want to help you. It helps this country to help you. We are there now to give you some help during a tough time for you and your family.

I regret very much that today we were not able to do that for 1 million Americans who look to Capitol Hill and this capital city for us to make the right decision at the right time.

Today, regrettably, the majority in the Senate failed. There will be another day, and my hope is we will see a different decision, a better decision for those folks at the bottom of the economic ladder who want to work, who did work but lost their jobs, and

for whom no one is clogging the hallways of Congress lobbying on their behalf. If this were a big economic interest, you can bet this Capitol would be full of people, well paid, with dark suits, ready to make the case for their economic interest.

There are a lot of folks out there today who are going to gather around their supper table and talk about their lot in life during an economic downturn and talk about where they looked for a job today, talk about the job they used to have, and talk about the hopes they had that we would help them during this tough period. They today will be mighty disappointed.

My hope is in a week or in a month, perhaps we can persuade our colleagues that today's decision was the wrong choice for our country and certainly the wrong choice for a lot of American families relying on the Congress to make the right decision today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota who has, once again, eloquently put this issue into a much larger context, a context that concerns the economic and tax policies of our country.

Today I have introduced a bill to help those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, the nearly 1 million Americans we have heard spoken about from so many of my colleagues from Washington to North Dakota to Rhode Island, who have just run out of time and run out of money. They were eligible for the programs that each State administers, as it should be, because in many of our States we have had an increase in unemployment over the last year.

We now have a 6 to 6.5-percent unemployment rate in many parts of the country. In New York City, which is still dealing with the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, we have an 8-percent unemployment rate. Many of these people who lost their jobs have been working all their lives. When something happened—a layoff, a bankruptcy, a terrorist attack—and many of them have spent month after month looking for work and not finding it. In an economy such as we have now, which is not producing jobs, many people for the first time ever, especially given what we enjoyed during the 1990s, are finding it impossible, not just to find a job that paid what they were used to receiving through their job, but paying anything.

I recently had a number of such New Yorkers to my office in New York City shortly before the December 28 cutoff of unemployment benefits. I wish they could be here in the Chamber.

I wish that all of my colleagues could speak with the man who had worked on the Windows of the World restaurant at the top of the World Trade Center for more than 20 years, a manual laborer but a good hearted, decent American who, year after year, showed up, did what he was supposed to do, and luckily for him and his family was not at work on the morning of September 11, but unluckily for him and his four children, he no longer has any work. He has gone from place to place.

I wish my colleagues could meet the woman from Queens who was widowed when her husband died 3 years ago, had worked in the same business for many years, and now has lost her job and no longer has unemployment benefits. What are we supposed to tell these people?

We ended welfare as we knew it because we did not want anyone to be dependent, to produce generational dependency, and I supported that. There is not any better social program than a job. But when we do not produce jobs in the economy for decent, hard-working Americans, what do we expect to happen?

Some of the things that are happening: In many States, after being in decline for years, welfare rolls are climbing. In many States, homelessness is increasing, and it is homelessness of families with children. Bankruptcies are growing. Individuals who are chronically unemployed are going on Social Security disability in order to have some kind of income, one of the fastest growing programs in our country.

When we first started talking about extending unemployment benefits—I introduced a bill last July—we did not get to first base. We did not even get out of the dugout. We would raise it time and again. My wonderful friend, our late colleague, Senator Wellstone from Minnesota, used to be at that desk. He would never be in the chair but would be pacing about. Before his tragic accident, every day he came to the floor asking that we extend unemployment benefits.

We often harkened back to the situation during the recession of the early 1990s when unemployment benefits were extended five times and signed into law by the first President Bush, as well as President Clinton. Finally, the Senate passed a measure.

I appreciated greatly working with my colleague, Senator NICKLES from Oklahoma, to get that done last year. We could not get it through the House. We did not have the support of the administration. But today, we have done the right thing, at least half the right thing. I am very grateful for that. I thank the President for his support. I thank the Republican leadership in the House for their support, but I mostly thank my colleagues and our new majority leader, Senator FRIST, for making sure this was the first order of business for this 108th Congress.

What we did today to help the nearly 800,000 Americans who watched their unemployment benefits disappear at the stroke of midnight on Saturday, December 28, to make sure the program will be there for those who are unfortunately coming on to the unemployment rolls was important, but it was not enough. We have to do more. We have to recognize the people who have exhausted their benefits, who are working as hard as they can to get work, who are found throughout our country, in every walk of life, doing every kind of job with every sort of challenge one could imagine. But what are we going to say to them?

We have a big task ahead of us to try to get our economy growing again, create jobs, move our Nation in the right direction. This new problem in the 21st century—new in the wake of the economic boom of the 1990s, that we have tens of thousands of Americans who want to work but cannot find a job—will have to be addressed.

Mr. President, I would now like to discuss a bill I am introducing.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. CLINTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 87 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

WESTERN DROUGHT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, in listening to my friend from New York talk about homeland security and the work we will be doing, she agreed to cochair the A 9/11 caucus. I invite other Members of this body to get interested. We found out cell phones worked pretty well during 9/11. Communications worked fairly good. There were some weak points, but those are being addressed. When we talk about 9/11 and wireless communications, there will be several of those issues that will come up in this Congress. We welcome the input of our colleagues as those issues move along.

Today we did take care of part of the unemployment compensation problem, extending it to workers involuntarily and who became involuntarily unemployed during 9/11 or as a result of 9/11. There is not one in this body who was not sympathetic to their cause. However, I have another segment of the American economy that is hurting just as badly. I will talk a little, by the way, today about the situation called drought. It is expanding throughout not only the upper Midwest but through the western part of Kansas, Nebraska, Dakotas, Montana, and Colorado, and extending down into New Mexico and the panhandle of Oklahoma.

There are always islands and spots that get enough moisture. In this morning's newspaper, the Billings Gazette in my hometown of Billings, MT, it was reported the water contents in the lower Yellowstone Basin snow pack rank the third lowest on record. It is only 63 percent of average. That one year at 63 percent average does not give cause for alarm. However, when