The American people not only need help, but they will not tolerate a partisan debate that ultimately produces sound and fury but nothing to help them hold their jobs or help their families.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 28

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday, November 13, the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 219, S.J. Res. 28; that the statutory time limitation be reduced to 2 hours, with the time equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be laid aside, and the vote on final passage of the joint resolution occur immediately following the vote on confirmation of the Executive Calendar No. 511, with no intervening action or debate.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled debate and vote on Executive Calendar No. 511, Edith Brown Clement, be changed to reflect that the debate time occur at 4:45 p.m. and the vote on confirmation occur at 5 p.m., with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect, with the above occurring without further intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, on Tuesday, as a result of this unanimous consent agreement, there will be no votes until 5 o'clock. There will be a number of matters, as indicated in the unanimous consent request, taken up. That is the beginning of the time also for the debate on the stimulus package. We are going to be very busy Tuesday, but the first vote will not occur until 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I rise to talk a bit about the economic recovery plan.

I begin by saying that yesterday, I chaired a hearing dealing with the U.S. Postal Service. My colleague, Senator BYRD from West Virginia, attended the hearing and asked the Postmaster General a series of questions. As with a lot of areas in our country since September 11, the U.S. Postal Service has been dramatically affected, perhaps more so than others. They have had postal workers die as a result of terrorists who used the system as a delivery mechanism for terror and death from the anthrax spores sent through the mail.

I told the Postmaster General that this country expresses its sorrow for what has happened to the Postal Service workers. These are wonderful people.

I mentioned one of the stories about the two Postal Service workers who died which described both of them in quite remarkable terms. One of them had worked 15 years on the night shift and had never, in 15 years, used 1 day of sick leave. One should not judge someone by whether or not they use sick leave. The point is, this person's neighbors talked about what a wonderful human being this person was.

The U.S. Postal Service is populated with men and women who do their job, as we say, in rain, sleet, and snow; regrettably now with anthrax, which has taken the lives of a couple of them.

I told the Postmaster General yesterday about a town meeting I had in Glenburn, ND, a small town with hundreds of people. At my town meeting, a fellow stood up and said: There is a lot of criticism about things and good government. I want to give you one piece of good news about the U.S. Post Office.

I asked: What is that?

He said: I got a letter out at my farm that was addressed ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND.'' It was from my grandson.

I asked: How on earth could that have been? How would you have gotten a letter addressed ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND''?

He said: You can ask the postmaster over there.

So I asked the postmaster: How would that have happened?

He said: We got the letter that said ''Grandpa, Glenburn, ND.'' We looked at the postmark and it was Silver Spring, MD. We knew the only person around here that had relatives in Silver Spring was Frank, so we sent it out to Frank's farm. Sure enough, it got to the right grandpa.

I told the Postmaster General that story. So many others like it describe quite a remarkable system that has worked for a long while and one that we must preserve and keep and nurture and protect during these difficult times.

I rise to talk about all of the challenges, not just to the U.S. Postal Service but to our country. We face several challenges now. One is the challenge dealing with national security. One is a challenge dealing with economic security. And another is the challenge dealing with energy security. Some of my colleagues spoke about that earlier.

National security doesn't need much more description. Most of us understand that some sick, twisted minds hatched a plot that murdered thousands of Americans in cold blood. Terrorism has visited our land in a manner that we never thought before possible. Now this Nation is one in its determination to find and bring to justice those who committed these acts of terror.

It is a different time. There is a pre-September 11 and a post-September 11. We have a President who has spoken to the American people about putting the men and women in America's uniform in harm's way to try to find the terrorists and bring them to justice, to root out the terrorist cells formed around the world who would commit acts of these types. This country supports our President and the men and women in uniform who are risking their lives to do that.

I toured Ground Zero in New York about a week after the tragedy. I saw on the highest twisted metal beam yet standing where an iron worker had climbed and attached an American flag to that highest metal beam. As we came upon that tragic site, that is what we saw, carnage, destruction, but also an American flag gently blowing in the breeze that morning.

Two days later, I was in North Dakota driving between Bismarck and Dickinson, ND, on interstate 94, a patch where you couldn't see a structure of any kind anywhere, just rolling prairies. Someone had taken a flag pole with a flag on it and attached to it a fence post there in the middle of the prairie where you could see nothing that was made by human hand except from this fence post—a single American flag also blowing in the gentle morning breeze in North Dakota.

The connection between the flag and the Trade Center and the flag in North Dakota was a connection of unity of spirit and one Nation doing what it needs to do to protect itself and to bring to justice those who committed these terrorists acts.

Our Nation was having some difficulty even prior to September 11 with an economy that was very week. Our economy had softened a great deal and people were beginning to lose jobs. Our economy was losing steam and strength. September 11 cut a hole right through the belly of this country's economy.

The news since that time has been more layoffs. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their jobs. They, too, in many ways are victims of terrorist attacks.

What do we do about the soft economy in the aftermath of these terrorist attacks? We are unified as a Nation in going after the terrorists and trying to prevent terrorist action from occurring again. Are we unified with respect to how we come together as a nation to try to provide a boost to the American economy?

The answer to that is, no, not so unified these days. We have a lot of different ideas about how you promote economic growth and how you help the

American people during an economic downturn.

This is the political system. I don't regret the fact that there is debate about these things. With respect to national security issues, this country has unity. On some of the other issues, we have debate. I don't regret that. It strengthens us. There is an old saying when everyone in the room is thinking the same thing, no one is thinking about much. I don't shrink from debate. We should not shrink from debate. When in debate we get the best of what everyone has to offer, democracy is served.

Groucho Marx once said: Politics is the art of looking for trouble; finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and then applying the wrong remedies.

Groucho Marx was a humorist. Politics takes a lot of humor and should over many years. But politics is the process by which we make judgments and decisions about the country. That is politics; that is the best of the American people. It is what served this country well for a long time. So as we talk now together in this country about how we apply some remedies and develop policies that strengthen America's economy, we have ideas coming from all sides. Let me describe some of them. Some of them are wonderful, challenging, interesting; some of them are nutty—but that is the way the process works.

We have, for example, one piece of legislation that was developed by the other body, and it was described as something that is a stimulus package and is going to help the country. I will give you a couple of examples: They put in a $21 billion tax piece that benefits many of the largest corporations in the country for the purpose of incentivizing them to move and keep needed investment capital overseas. How would I classify that? Nutty.

Does anybody think that is going to strengthen our country, strengthen our economy, by saying to big companies: What we would like you to do, by the way, is keep investing overseas. We would like you to move capital overseas because we think that is just great.

Well, that is not the way to strengthen our economy, the way to provide a lift and boost and helium to the American economy. But that is exactly what came out of this package from the U.S. House of Representatives. There are so many other items in that bill that it's almost hard to start when you describe things you think are kind of off base.

Another provision would retroactively repeal the corporate alternative minimum tax. That means that IBM, for example, would get a $1.4 billion tax cut. General Motors would get a $833 million tax cut.

It seems to me that is kind of larding up a piece of legislation that is supposed to be designed to help our country recover. Instead, it becomes a carrier for the favored old tax cuts for the biggest and most powerful economic interests among us.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator spoke of ''larding up.'' Would he say that is a cholesterol-laden piece of pork?

Mr. DORGAN. I hadn't thought about that.

Mr. BYRD. When I was a young man, which was quite a while ago, I worked in a meat shop in a coal mining camp. All of the ladies who came to the store, including my mother and my wife's mother, bought lard. Those coal miners, before they went into the bowels of the earth and did that back-breaking work, ate sausage and bacon fried in a deep skillet with lard. We never heard of the word ''cholesterol'' in those days. That is a new word in my lexicon, coming along probably about in the middle of my life. So I was interested when the Senator used the words ''larding up.'' Was he talking about a spending measure or was he talking about pork? What did the Senator have reference to? I missed that. Would he say that again?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was actually using that term to describe something done on a tax bill in the other body. I described it as ''larding up.'' It is plugging the arteries of this system by putting in place certain provisions. I will give you an example.

Mr. BYRD. Would that be cholesterol?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes. When I talk about larding up, the Senator from West Virginia is talking about how people always refer to spending bills as pork, but never refer to tax bills as pork. In fact, there is more lard and larding up of tax bills than almost anything else.

The retroactive repeal of the corporate alternative minimum tax in the House tax bill does as I said it would—it provides the biggest tax benefits to the biggest, most powerful corporations in the country.

Here is what the chief economist from Merrill Lynch said about it because, remember now, the only reason we are going through this exercise is to try to determine how we help the American economy. Bruce Steinberg, chief economist, said:

> The silliest idea is the retroactive AMT payments. If you want to stimulate spending in the future, you don't give out tax breaks for things that already happened.

It is as simple as that.

Mr. BYRD. That is the epitome of pork, isn't it? It drips with lard.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator describes it in a way that makes it visual. But it is a slow turn on a medium-hot spit—or ''pit,'' I guess it would be in West Virginia. Let me continue.

Will Rogers said something I want to put up on a chart.

Will Rogers said this a long time ago:

> The unemployed here ain't eating regular, but we will get round to them soon as we get everybody else fixed up OK.

Now, while IBM, General Electric, and others are prepared, according to the House bill, to get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts retroactively, last Friday it was announced that 415,000 people lost their jobs in October. What about those folks? When you talk about stimulating the economy, what about giving the people who lost their jobs some assistance? How about a helping hand to somebody who got a pink slip or a notice that said: By the way, you do a good job and I am glad you are here. It is just that our company is shrinking. We don't have as much business. So guess what, we don't have room for you. Tell your family tonight when you go home and sit at the supper table that you have lost your job. Tell them it is not your fault, that you worked hard, we appreciated you, but you can't go to work on Monday because you no longer have a job.

What about those people? For example, in New York, when that act of terrorism struck the World Trade Center, it is true that the people who were climbing those stairs, even as the buildings were collapsing, were people making $30,000, $40,000, $50,000 a year, willing to risk their lives in public service—firefighters, law enforcement folks, and others. There are a lot of folks around this country of ours who don't have a lot, don't make a lot, and don't ask for a lot. They don't have a million dollars. They are not going to get $1.4 billion in tax refunds. They are not on this list with K-Mart, American Airlines, and Enron. They are the folks who, last month, had to tell their families they were no longer employed. And if the families asked why, is it a part of a soft economy or part of terrorist acts? The answer is: Yes, it is.

What do we do about that? Do we in the U.S. Congress have a concern about those folks, or is it just about the upper income and the big economic behemoths who really have clout? Is there anybody within 100 yards of this building today, Friday, who is here because they are lobbying on behalf of somebody who lost their job last month? No one. It is just the folks who have a lot of money, a lot of assets and a lot at stake. They are here and they are trying to get more than their share.

I will tell you, they succeeded in the U.S. House. So we are trying to write a stimulus package, something that provides economic recovery.

We have a couple of thoughts in mind. One is there is no quicker or more effective way, and there is no way, in my judgment, that provides more justice to this system as well than to help people who are out of work. They are going to spend that money instantly. When we extend unemployment benefits, that money goes right back into the economy. All economists tell you: Step one, help those who lost jobs because that is stimulative, helps the economy. It is not only just and the right thing to do, it is the most effective thing to provide some lift to this economy.

So we are going to have a debate about that because some don't want to

do much for these folks. That is wrong-headed, in my judgment. We have a responsibility to the country to reach out and tell them they are not alone; we want to help them and we want to help this economy.

Obviously, what we want in the end is for the economy to get back on its feet and for those folks who have lost jobs to become employed once again.

That is what we want. There is no social program much better than a good job. There is nothing like a good job that pays well and has security. What we are trying to do is put together a recovery package that recognizes what is just, what is right, and what will be effective in providing lift to this country's economy.

Extending unemployment benefits, paying for 75 percent of the COBRA benefits—all of that provides lift to this economy and is the right thing to do.

In addition, coming from the Finance Committee, we have put in place some tax provisions we think will provide a lift to this economy. We had a tax cut for people in this country earlier this year. Not everybody got a tax cut. More than 70,000 North Dakotans did not get a tax cut. They did not get a tax cut because it was based on percentage of income taxes paid.

Everybody who works pays payroll taxes. In fact, that is a proportional tax. Everybody pays the same rate; it does not matter how much you make. Yet those folks did not get a tax cut. So we propose a tax rebate for those people. That also will be spent immediately and provide lift to the economy.

We have a whole series of items we have proposed that we think represent the first step in the right direction to provide lift to this country's economy.

Let me make the most important point about all of this. The only way our economy is going to experience a recovery is if the American people are confident about the future. We do not have a ship of state in which there is an engine room with dials, knobs, gauges, and levers and we have some people in there fiddling with the dials, knobs, gauges, and levers and get it just right with tax cuts and move the ship along.

That is not how the system works. What propels this economy is people's confidence in the future. If people are confident about tomorrow, next month, next year, they will do things that represent that confidence. They will take a trip. They will buy a car. They will buy a house. They will make life decisions that express their view about the future.

Confidence means expansion. If they are not confident, they will not take the trip, they will defer the purchase of the car, they will defer the purchase of the house, and our economy will contract.

There is nothing more important than instilling confidence. Our job is to, one, prosecute the war abroad. We have to do that and support our President doing that—and increase security at home. Part of our economic recovery package is investment in security at home. Senator BYRD has a homeland security proposal that is stimulative. It is not only stimulative and gives lift to the economy because it invests in this country and our security, but it is also the right thing and the necessary thing to do.

When we can marry the right and necessary things to do with actions that will give lift to our country's economy, that is exactly the course people expect us to take.

We need to prosecute the war, increase security at home, and give businesses and individuals the extra incentives they need to make those key purchases and key investments, not 6 months from now, not over a year from now, but now. Now. This needs to be temporary. It needs to have a significant, compelling urge to it to give the American people confidence about the future that we are doing the right thing.

If we err as a Congress, I want us to err on the side of doing something, even doing too much. I do not want to err on the side of doing nothing because there are too many families out of work. Our economy is perilously close to a very deep recession, and it could be a lengthy recession. We have a responsibility to blend good fiscal policy in the Congress with monetary policy at the Federal Reserve Board to say to the American people: We are going to put in place the right plans to give you hope for the future.

Winston Churchill gave many stirring speeches in the Second World War to fire up the interest and urgency of his countrymen to the cause of the war. At one point, he challenged his countrymen to imagine a thousand years in the future and what they would say about that current generation's efforts. He asked that they do things now that would allow people in the future to look back and say that this was their finest hour, even in the face of substantial challenge.

That is what we, it seems to me, need to do now in confronting terrorism, in the challenge to provide economic security. We must fight as hard as we can possibly fight for the right policies now that give this country and economy a chance to do well so all American families can, again, do well and will not have to worry about next week or next month having to tell their family they lost their job.

This is about hope. It is about opportunity. It is about expanding this country's economy. The New York Times last week had the headline: ''Attacks Hit Low Paid Jobs the Hardest.'' I had a hearing 2 weeks ago, and the head of the hotel and restaurant union testified. He had a dozen of his members behind him. Each one stood up and told me their name, told me where they worked, when they got fired, how long they had worked there, and what it meant to them to lose their job. It was just gripping. It just breaks one's heart to see someone who struggled all their life, found a good job and worked for 8 years or 10 years or 15 years and had a good record and was making it on their own, only to learn a pink slip has come that says this economy has shrunk and you are out of a job.

It requires us to understand this is not about numbers, this is about people. It is about our future. That is why we must get this right.

I am pleased with the work the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, Senator DASCHLE, all of us have done together to try to get the right solution in place for this country's future. We are going to have a debate about this next week. Let us not shrink from it. Let us not think that debate injures this country or hurts this country. It strengthens this country.

At the end of the debate, I hope we can convince everyone there is a right way and a wrong way. The wrong way leads to economic trouble, and the right way leads to hope, confidence, and economic expansion. That rides on our making the right decision on behalf of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized at the completion of the remarks by the distinguished junior Senator from New York and that I may be recognized for as much time as I may consume.

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

The Senator from New York.

STIMULATING THE ECONOMY

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and a great leader of this body and our country, for that courtesy. I thank my colleague from North Dakota for very thoughtful and thought-provoking remarks. I join those remarks, and I ask that as we do move toward this debate on how we stimulate our economy and how we take care of our people, we put it in a broader context.

I sometimes worry that talk about economic stimulus, talk about Tax Code provisions, talk about a lot of the issues that come before the Finance Committee and then come before the Senate may not be communicating directly and effectively with the public who need to follow this debate closely because what we will be or will not be deciding over the course of the next several weeks will have profound effects on our daily lives, on our quality of life, on our national security at home and abroad, and on the future of our economic growth and opportunities.

The Finance Committee came out with a package that should deserve the