

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask the time be charged equally between Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise in this period of morning business to raise a continuing and serious problem that we believe most acutely in New York but which I know is shared in other parts of our Nation.

Last month, the Nation joined New Yorkers in our reflection and sorrow as the workers at ground zero removed the final debris from the 16-acre World Trade Center site.

While this event, which was accomplished ahead of schedule and below budget by the most dedicated workforce that I think you could find anywhere in the world—unionized building trades and construction workers who worked on that pile for 12- to 15-hour days, 7 case days a week, for months, and, therefore, because of their heroic efforts we moved one step closer to the beginning of the rebuilding process—there are many workers who have not been able to begin rebuilding their lives simply because there are not enough jobs right now.

Many of us will remember a photograph shortly after September 11 that the press ran showing hundreds of people standing in lines at a job fair that was held in the city, people who had lost their jobs, both directly because of the attack on the World Trade Center and indirectly because of the ripple effect through the economy.

There were workers—and I have met with scores and scores of them—whose jobs were literally destroyed when the Twin Towers collapsed. They were the janitors. They were the doormen. They were the waiters and waitresses. They were the secretaries and the messengers. They went to work every day in that huge complex of offices. There were those who served the small businesses that took care of the workers in those buildings. And, of course, then there were those throughout the city who may not have worked at ground zero but who lost their jobs because of the aftermath on the entire economy because of the terrorist attacks.

We all know that thousands of hard-working Americans have been thrown out of work because of the combination of the jobless recovery and the terrorist attacks.

Prior to September 11, our economy was beginning to slow down. Our national unemployment rate rose from 4.5 percent a year ago to 4.9 percent in September and to 5.9 percent today. But I think that somehow does not even tell the whole story because what we have seen occurring since September 11 is this so-called jobless recovery.

The Wall Street Journal just ran an article about it stating that employment has now shown 13 consecutive months of decline through April. That exceeds the 11 straight months of loss in the 1990-91 recession, the only recent comparable period, about a decade ago.

I ask unanimous consent that article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

UNEMPLOYMENT HIT 5.9% IN JUNE; REVISIONS
SHOW GRIM JOB PICTURE

(By Greg Ip)

WASHINGTON—WITH WEAK STOCK PRICES AND CORPORATE SCANDALS DAMPING COMPANIES' HIRING PLANS, THE RECOVERY IS STARTING FOR WORKERS TO LOOK AS BAD AS, IF NOT WORSE THAN, THE "JOBLESS RECOVERY" OF 1991-92.

The number of nonagricultural jobs rose just 36,000 in June from May, and the unemployment rate edged up to 5.9% from 5.8%, the Labor Department said Friday. Government statisticians once again revised down prior months' levels of employment, revealing a job market far weaker than previously thought.

"The economy is on the road to recovery [though] the recovery is a bit anemic," said Labor Secretary Elaine Chao. "The labor market lags behind changes in real economic activity."

While the Labor Department regularly revises its payroll estimates, those revisions have been strikingly negative this year, with every month's report being revised downward—often sharply. The agency originally said payrolls rose 66,000 in February, but now it says they fell 165,000. An originally reported gain of 58,000 jobs in March is now a loss of 5,000, and a gain of 43,000 in April is a loss of 21,000. May's gains were revised down to 24,000 from 41,000.

A "benchmark" revision a month ago also reduced employment throughout last year. Employment in November 2001 was 340,000 below original estimates.

As a result, employment now shows 13 consecutive monthly declines through April. That exceeds the 11 straight losses in 1990-1991, though those declines were steeper. Back then, job losses continued intermittently through 1991 and into early 1992. A similarly tough spell could be in store for workers now, with the recovery so far subpar and employers more determined than usual to boost output per employee rather than the number of employees.

Lois Orr, acting commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, said recent revisions haven't been statistically significant, but she couldn't explain why they have been overwhelmingly negative. Data compiled by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia show that in 1991, as the economy emerged from recession, early payroll revisions were alternately positive and negative, though benchmark revisions years later sharply lowered employment levels.

While job creation was stagnant last month, there were still signs in the jobs report that the economy is continuing to grow.

The average work week rose to 34.3 hours from 34.2 hours, and in manufacturing it jumped to 41.1 from 40.9 hours. When firms see an increase in business but aren't sure if it will last, they often boost the hours of current employees before hiring new ones, because it is easier to cut back hours later than to sack workers.

Temporary employment, another way for firms to raise output without adding to permanent payrolls, edged up by 9,000. Manufacturing payrolls fell 23,000, though that was one of the smallest declines in two years. In services, losses in retail trade were offset by gains in health care and government.

"Businesses are hesitant to expand, due to concerns about the stock market and heightened uncertainty over the geopolitical outlook," Bank Credit Analyst, a financial-markets research firm, said in a report Friday. "The attack on accounting standards and concerns about re-regulation are additional factors keeping corporate executives from expanding."

Long-distance phone company WorldCom Inc. announced 17,000 layoffs two weeks ago when it disclosed it had understated operating expenses by \$3.8 billion. Electronic Data Systems Corp., a major supplier to WorldCom whose accounting has also come under scrutiny by investors, said last week it would lay off about 2,000 employees in response to sluggish demand for its computer services.

The weak job market doesn't mean a shrinking economy because firms are squeezing increased production out of their current employees.

Merrill Lynch estimates that productivity, or output per hour worked, expanded at more than a 3% annual rate in the second quarter, down from the first quarter's remarkable 8.4%, but still robust.

Mrs. CLINTON. So here we are with a national unemployment rate of 5.9 percent, and the situation in New York is even worse. In our State, it is 6.1 percent unemployment, and in New York City, 8 percent unemployment.

We did the right thing a few months ago when we passed unemployment insurance and disaster unemployment assistance for 13 weeks. Those are both very important programs.

The disaster unemployment assistance, which comes through FEMA, goes directly to those workers who actually lost their jobs because of the physical destruction of September 11. Unemployment insurance, as we know, is triggered when there is a lack of jobs for whatever reason. And, of course, more people are out of work in New York and throughout our Nation because of the impact of September 11.

Unfortunately, these extensions, which provided a very needed safety net for thousands of workers, are about to expire for many of those workers. Nationally, 686,000 individuals will have exhausted their benefits with no job to enter.

On Monday, I participated in an announcement of a study that was commissioned by a group called the 9/11 United Services, which is a coordinating group that tried to bring all the charities together. A very accomplished corporate executive was asked to come in and serve as the temporary chairman. He immediately said: We don't have any data. We don't know what the facts are.

He commissioned a study by McKenzie and Company to try to figure out what the economic challenges are that we are confronting. Their survey, which was announced on Monday, showed that approximately 45,000 workers in New York City whose jobs were affected continue to suffer an income loss of more than 25 percent. Approximately 28,000 are still unemployed. In other words, we got down to about 45,000, and of those 45,000, about 17,000 did get a job, although it cut their income considerably, and 28,000 are still unemployed.

It is clear, despite the very best efforts of private charities and very extraordinarily generous people, we just cannot make up the losses of income and joblessness that we are still confronting.

The New York State Department of Labor confirmed these figures from the McKenzie study, but, in fact, theirs are even more dire, and they are the official figures. They show that 105,000 people were on unemployment insurance as a direct result of the World Trade Center attacks. We have an increasing number who are running out of time. Nearly 7,000 of the 24,000 are still unemployed, looking for jobs, and have exhausted all their benefits. There is no job in sight.

The disaster unemployment assistance expired, dropping 1,100 people who still have not found a job, who have not been placed anywhere else because their companies, if they are still in New York—as many, thankfully, are—have downsized, have moved, and have not been able to provide all the jobs that were once there.

I have provided these statistics just to give you some insight. But, of course, the personal stories are what are most wrenching and what I encounter every time I am in the city, or my caseworkers and staff, as they field phone calls, e-mails, and letters from people who worked at jobs for 18 years, 25 years, who put two children through college, and now have nothing to fall back on, who are on the brink of being evicted from the apartment they have lived in for decades, or are about to be foreclosed on in the homes they have struggled to buy.

I know that it is sometimes difficult to think about these faceless people out there, but we have tried very hard to do the right thing in the wake of the World Trade Center. We certainly tried to provide the resources that businesses needed to get back on their feet.

This body and the President and the House were extremely generous to provide the public funds that we needed to begin the rebuilding process, to clean up the debris, to do what we needed to get back on the right track in Lower Manhattan. But I just do not want to see our workers—people who were gainfully employed, doing the right thing—forgotten.

Certainly, I have a great deal of sympathy for people in other parts of the country who are really caught up in this so-called jobless recovery as well.

I am introducing two pieces of legislation, along with Senators SCHUMER and KENNEDY, to extend both unemployment insurance and disaster unemployment assistance for an additional 13 weeks. It is our hope that the jobs will start coming back into the economy.

In fact, experts certainly agree that extending unemployment insurance is more likely than anything else we can do to get money into the economy that people will have to start spending because they do not have any choice.

Over the last five recessions, every \$1 spent on unemployment benefits generated a \$2.15 increase in the gross domestic product. I went back and looked. What did we do the last time we were in any kind of comparable period?

Mr. President, the period of 1990–91 was the most recent time in which to compare this. In the early 1990s, benefits were extended four times, for it became clear, in the absence of that safety net, that lifeline, we would have even greater problems with which to deal.

What are we going to do with people who get foreclosed on and evicted? Not everybody has a family to go to and crowd on to a sofa bed or into a spare room. We are going to have increases in homelessness. We are going to have all kinds of problems that at least we can try to forestall and, hopefully, eliminate.

These benefits would be extended for just an additional 13 weeks—half the time they were extended back in the early 1990s.

Clearly, I think we need systemic changes to the unemployment insurance system. I think it is kind of an odd position for us all to be in: Coming back, asking to extend it whenever it is needed, that we have to have new congressional action. There ought to be some ways where we can also be more sensitive to different parts of the country.

I know there are parts of the country—there are parts of my State—that are below the national average in unemployment. But there are concentrated pockets that we don't, frankly, want to spread and have more expensive problems to deal with, which is one of the additional reasons I hope the Senate will support this action.

I am very appreciative of all of the support that New York and New Yorkers have received over the last many months. This has been obviously a traumatic and terrible time for many families. Certainly nothing we can say or do will bring back a loved one or even bring back a job that was there for 20, 25 years. But we do have to continue to try to send out this lifeline, the help that is needed, so people can try to get themselves back on their feet and that we don't claim more victims because of the horrific attack on September 11.

Mrs. CLINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant 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. I ask unanimous consent the time be equally charged to both sides during the course of the quorum calls.

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

INVESTOR CONFIDENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Sarbanes legislation.

We have been buffeted over the last several months on a daily basis with news of companies with accounting practices that have led them to bankruptcy, have left them without the means to carry on their business, have left their workers without jobs, and have devastated their pension funds. Day after day after day, a litany of accounting irregularities surface on the front pages of America. It has translated into a growing lack of confidence in our markets.

We are here today with the critical role of reassuring the American public that we will pass legislation quickly that will restore their confidence in our financial system.

This crisis is deepening with each day. Therefore, we must move forward deliberately, carefully but very quickly, to ensure that we can communicate with the American people and let them know we are aware of these problems and we are correcting them.

I just came from a press conference to which we invited representatives who manage public pension funds. It is a staggering sense that we are seeing out there, not just problems on Wall Street but problems on Main Street. Essentially what has happened is that the American public has become invested heavily in our capital markets, in our equities, not just individually but particularly through pension funds. Sixty percent of the assets of defined contribution plans are invested in equities or mutual funds. About 70 percent of all of these funds together is creating a situation in which, when Wall Street has a problem, it translates to every corner of the country.

We have to step forward. We are stepping forward. The Sarbanes bill is a strong bill. It has been made even stronger with the adoption yesterday, in a bipartisan vote, of the Leahy amendment. We are going to create an oversight board for accountants that will truly be independent and will have the force and the teeth to get the job done.

The Sarbanes bill also proposes the serious separation of the auditing function and other consulting functions that accountants can perform. If you