

NOT VOTING—15

Boxer	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Ensign	Murkowski	Thomas
Enzi	Roberts	Thompson
Helms	Sarbanes	Torricelli
Kennedy	Sessions	Wellstone

The nomination was confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and with the time to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from New York.

THE ECONOMY AND
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue of great concern to my constituents and, indeed, to our entire country—the state of our Nation's economy. We know our economy was already in recession on September 10 and it was devastated on September 11 by the horrific attacks we suffered, and it is stalled now. Too many Americans are out of work. Too many have seen their pension and retirement security disappear because of the illegal, unethical, and simply inexplicable behavior of corporate executives. Too many people who lost their jobs as a result of September 11 have not yet been able to find work.

Let me just mention one of the hundreds of thousands—millions of such people: A New Yorker by the name of Felix Batista. Mr. Batista had worked for years, 25 years I believe, as a member of the wait staff at the restaurant known as Windows On The World at the top of the World Trade Center. He has four children. He was on vacation on September 11 when 73 of his coworkers were murdered. He lost not only friends and colleagues, he lost his job, and he has been unemployed since that terrible day. He is a man who had a wonderful employment record who now spends his days looking for work. He exhausted his unemployment benefits almost 3 months ago. How is he going to support his four children? He is a victim of the terrorist attacks on New York and America, and he is not alone.

Like so many other New Yorkers and Americans, despite their steadfast efforts to find work, and their overwhelming desire to get back to work, they remain out of work, struggling to

make ends meet. In New York, there are 135,000 New Yorkers who have exhausted their benefits. Across the country, the number of people who have been unemployed for 6 months or longer has almost doubled, from 800,000 to 1.5 million in the last year, and that number is expected to increase to more than 2 million by December.

What have we, the elected representatives of all the people, including the people who are unemployed, the people such as Felix who have lost their jobs—what have we done to respond? We have extended unemployment benefits once—but only once. Contrast that with the recession of the early 1990s when Congress extended temporary benefits five times. But this year, even in the wake of the combination of a slowdown in the economy and terrorism, we have only extended benefits once. Once is not enough. Congress must act to extend unemployment insurance and disaster unemployment assistance for an additional 13 weeks each.

With more people losing their benefits every day and being put into the terrible position in which Mr. Batista finds himself, these extensions should be passed before Congress adjourns.

The Wall Street Journal says our economy is in the midst of a “jobless recovery.” From what I hear, that phrase is only half true.

Across New York State, 553,000 New Yorkers are out of work, and the same story is true of company layoffs and plant closings in Niagara Falls, Rochester, and so many parts of New York.

Unfortunately, this is a story that is compounded by the corporate irresponsibility and illegality. They have added even more uncertainty to our economic condition. We not only are seeing plants closing and people losing their jobs because there is no business and there are no orders, but we are also in Rochester seeing 500 people out of work after Global Crossing filed for bankruptcy.

If there is any doubt that the economic situation is not producing jobs for people, take a look at this chart. It shows the number of jobs that are available compared with the number of people who are looking for work. As you can clearly see, during most of 2002, jobseekers far outnumbered job availability. In fact, in June, there were almost three jobseekers for every available job.

When President Bush took office in January 2001, there were approximately 1.5 jobseekers for every job. In just a short year and a half, we have gone from one job opening for every one and a half unemployed person to one job opening for nearly three unemployed persons.

But only looking at the statistics and the unemployment rate doesn't paint a complete picture. The constituents that I talk to in New York describe an endless, frustrating job search—that hopeless feeling that comes when you go out every day and

read the want ads and follow up every single lead. These are people who are young and old and middle-aged. They are male, they are female, they are skilled and unskilled; they are white, they are black, and they are Latino. They are every kind of American. They want to work. But until this economy turns around, they need additional help.

The so-called jobless recovery has hit long-term unemployed workers particularly hard. The number of people who cannot find jobs for 6 months or longer has grown by almost 90 percent in the past year. In fact, the share of the unemployed today who have been without work for more than 26 weeks exceeds that of the recession of the early 1990s and the early 1980s.

According to a recent study, “an increase in the long term unemployment of workers with significant workforce experience” is particularly striking. But why should we be surprised? We have companies such as Enron, Global Crossing, WorldCom, and Tyco that are laying off, going into bankruptcy, and rendering unemployed highly skilled workers—people who got their education, went to college, and improved their skills. They were part of the new economy, and, all of a sudden, they find themselves on the unemployment lines.

What this means for real Americans is that people who are trying hard, who have played by the rules, who have been responsible, and, through no fault of their own—a corporate executive who commits illegalities, or a terrorist who destroys a building—are now unemployed.

The number of workers who have exhausted their benefits has doubled compared to 2 years ago. The number of workers who have exhausted their State benefits is 2.3 million, more than we had 10 years ago during the recession of the early 1990s.

As you can see from this chart, the number of workers exhausting their unemployment benefits without a job has risen steadily since last spring. If you are wondering what this means for individual States, I have information about every State in our country. This is not just a New York problem. This is a national problem. We may have the highest number of people who have exhausted their benefits, but, of course, you would expect that. We lost tens of thousands of jobs because of the attack and the collapse of the buildings. Because it was a crime scene, they couldn't reopen and get back into business.

Our unemployment rate in New York City is 8 percent—higher than the national average—unfortunately reflecting a condition that affects all Americans.

Back in the recession of the early 1990s when the first President Bush was in office, people who were unfortunate enough to lose their jobs got a compassionate response from the White House. The first President Bush said: You

know, I am going to be there to help you. And, working with the Congress, that is exactly what happened. We extended unemployment benefits five times.

Are the people today less deserving? Are the workers who lost their jobs because of corporate illegality, economic slowdown, or terrorist attacks somehow not worthy of our help? I don't think so. I certainly hope not.

As you can see from this chart, which has a lot of writing on it, basically the bottom line is that during the early stage of the recession in the 1990s, 35 States received 26 weeks of benefits, and 16 received 33 weeks. And it is so clear that today during our recession we only have 39 States getting 13 weeks of benefits and 12 receiving 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. CLINTON. This is not only a comparison—it should cause us to wonder what our national policy is—it is also a reflection of how we have no economic policy in America right now. We don't have an emphasis on creating jobs, prosperity, and economic opportunity.

Our leader, Senator DASCHLE, came to the floor earlier this week and, in a series of charts, made clear that we are not attending to America's business. We all know we have foreign policy challenges. I, for one, have supported our men and women in uniform and supported our need for homeland security. I will continue to do so because our threats are real, and we have to deal with them. But we are a great nation. We can do more than one thing at a time. We should be paying attention to our economy. We should be taking care of our unemployed workers. It is the right thing to do. I hope we will do it because it takes care of people.

Look at this next chart. Every dollar we spend on unemployment insurance adds \$2.50 to our gross domestic product. It is a good investment. Why? Because when the unemployed get those benefits—when Mr. Batista and others like him finally get some help—what do they do? They go out and spend it. They have no other means. They have to buy food, they have to pay the rent, and they have to make a car payment. The money goes right into the economy, and it provides stimulus.

In contrast, President Bush's solution is to stimulate the economy for the wealthiest—keep giving them big tax cuts and hope that it trickles down to people such as Mr. Batista. That didn't work in the 1980s, it didn't work in the 1990s, and it will not work in the 21st century, either.

I believe the President is using the wrong approach. Our economy needs to help people. It needs to stimulate jobs. And we owe it to the unemployed such as Mr. Batista to act now.

Finally, obviously, I believe our economic policy during the 1990s worked

for all Americans—the rich, middle income, and poor. It provided more than 22 million new jobs. We were on the right track in America when it came to the economy. For reasons that escape me, we threw all of that good work away, and now we are back into the deficits. We are not taking care of the unemployed. We are not creating jobs. And I don't think we have any plan to do so.

I earnestly request that our colleagues here take leadership and support our unemployed people. Do what was done in the 1990s, provide these benefits, stimulate the economy, and let us get back on the right track for America's future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 minutes over and above the order that has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

IRAQ

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call attention to an article in the Washington Post of September 15, Sunday, the final edition. I shall read excerpts therefrom. The headline: "In Iraqi War Scenario, Oil Is Key Issue; U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool." The article is by Dan Morgan and David B. Ottaway, Washington Post staff writers.

I will proceed now with reading the first three paragraphs:

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein would open a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

The importance of Iraq's oil has made it potentially one of the administration's biggest bargaining chips in negotiations to win backing from the U.N. Security Council and Western allies for President Bush's call for tough international action against Hussein. All five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China—have international oil companies with major stakes in a change of leadership in Baghdad.

"It's pretty straightforward," said former CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has been one of the leading advocates of forcing Hussein from power. "France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them." But he added:

"If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States, which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall.

Are you listening? Out there in America, are you listening?

Let me say that again, with reference to former CIA Director R. James Woolsey:

But he added: "If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States—

Hear that—

which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall.

Are we paying attention?

Representatives of many foreign oil concerns have been meeting with leaders of the Iraqi opposition to make their case for a future stake and to sound them out about their intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies from more than a dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

It is a lengthy article, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, let me call attention to an editorial in today's Charleston, WV, Gazette, titled, "Bush, Cheney won't stop."

And I read therefrom:

Although Iraq agreed to readmit U.N. weapons inspectors, President Bush and Vice President Cheney still are clamoring for U.S. military action to topple dictator Saddam Hussein.

The White House continues its mantra—

Now listen. This is the Charleston, WV, Gazette.

The White House continues its mantra that war is necessary because Saddam is "evil" and he's secretly making weapons of mass destruction. But this justification may be a smoke screen.

Are you listening? Are you listening, the people out there throughout this great land? Are you listening?

... this justification may be a smoke screen. Some observers say the administration's hidden motive is to gain control of Iraq's oil.

In a front-page Sunday report subtitled "U.S. Drillers Eye Huge Petroleum Pool," The Washington Post said America's oil industry—to which Bush and Cheney are closely tied—eagerly wants a "regime change" in