

the growing presence of temps at the plant is holding back their wage gains, while limiting their movement in the plant. Some employees say they have been stuck working nights because any open day-shift positions are quickly filled by temps.

"If you break down, they've got a new guy waiting at the door," said Roberts, who with his wife, another Toyota worker, clears a six-figure income. "You're creating a tug of war. There's no protection for either side."

In Georgetown, the divisions can show up in strange, some say demoralizing, ways.

Toyota is famous for the "kaizen"—continuous improvement—checks that it pays to workers who come up with suggestions that save money. Earlier this year, Hicks and Chris helped devise a change that cut two jobs from their small quadrant of the assembly line. The change meant more work for everyone, but it was more efficient. Toyota rewarded the idea by sending out \$500 checks to every member of the team, every full-time member, that is.

The two temps who came up with the suggestion got nothing. Their group leader did feel bad. He gave each of them a \$25 gift certificate to the Toyota company store.

Then a full-time worker slipped them both \$50.

"You guys got us this money," Chris recalled him saying. "Sorry I can't give you more."

Mr. KENNEDY. The article does track one slice of the workforce: temporary workers. Since January 2002, the nation has added 369,000 temporary positions, about half of the private-sector jobs created during that stretch.

This report says half of all the private sector jobs created under this Administration since January 2002 are temporary positions. These are jobs without benefits. You talk about health insurance or retirement? Those are virtually nonexistent.

This is what is happening in this country. It is amazing to me to hear the President talk about how the economy is growing and crow about the increased numbers of jobs that we had—96,000 this last month, which is not even enough to keep up with the growth of the population. And then we find a third of those jobs are Government jobs, a third are temporary jobs, and the other third are not paying very much.

I want to also mention that, as difficult as this is, those are figures that point out what happens to real people in their lives. But whatever happens to these individuals I have just mentioned pales in comparison to the kind of pain minorities and women are feeling; women, whose real income has declined, and minorities—Hispanics, African Americans—whose unemployment has increased dramatically.

I see the Senator from Maryland on his feet now. I am interested in his reaction to that hearing and to those figures.

Before I run out of time, I would also like him to address the subject of the foreign purchase of over half of the U.S. debt. Nearly \$2 trillion of the national debt is now owned by foreign holders. Recent figures show China and Japan owning \$1.3 trillion in U.S. Treasuries. I am concerned these for-

eign nations are basically buying up America. We know who has the whip in hand when you control the resources. One morning we will wake up and foreign countries will own America. If they control our economy, then they control our destiny. The American economy and American destiny ought to be in Americans hands.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that last point?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to.

Mr. SARBANES. The fact of the matter is, the tax cuts for the very wealthy, which is the centerpiece of the Bush economic plan, are being financed by borrowing overseas, primarily from China and Japan. That is what it comes down to. We do these excessive tax cuts, we run a deficit, and we have to finance the deficit. Where do they find the money to finance the deficit? They sell U.S. Government paper overseas, primarily to Japan and China. So we are borrowing money from overseas in order to finance these tax cuts.

It is bad enough to borrow internally, from our own people, in order to do this. But to go overseas and do it, as the Senator points out, and then give them this claim on American production on out into the future as far as one can see is absolutely irresponsible.

The Senator from Massachusetts made a very important point.

The President and his associates are busy out in the countryside trying to put the spin on the jobs figures. The fact is, the economy picked up 96,000 jobs last month. That is not enough to keep pace with the growth in population. This is the first administration since Herbert Hoover not to produce a net gain of jobs in the course of the administration. The Bush administration is down 800,000 jobs, a total of 1.6 million private sector jobs, and 2.7 million manufacturing jobs.

The last time you have an administration which failed to have a net gain in jobs in the course of its 4 years was 75 years ago in the administration of Herbert Hoover. This is a dismal job performance record. Yet the President is going around the country telling people we have turned the corner. The trouble is every time you go around the corner we are going in the wrong direction. That is the problem with the President's policies. He may have turned the corner, but the corner is taking us in the wrong direction.

Second, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, if you factor into the unemployment rate the people who have dropped out of seeking a job because they are so discouraged by the economic conditions they encounter, and people are working part time for economic reasons—namely, they want to work full time but they can't find a full time job, so they are working part time—if you include that in the unemployment figure as well, which is the most comprehensive measure of unemployment, the unemployment figure is 9.4 percent, coming up to 10 percent unemployed.

The final point I want to make is that unemployment benefits usually—and it is a very important point because I see many colleagues on the floor who have joined with the Senator from Massachusetts and myself to try to extend unemployment insurance benefits, and the Senator from Washington was very much involved in that effort and we welcome so strongly her leadership in it—usually are for 26 weeks. When we hit an economic downturn, we extend it because the job market doesn't pick up quickly enough to get people back to work. We usually extend it out to 39 weeks. The administration has resisted efforts to extend the payment period for unemployment insurance. We now have a record number of long-term unemployed.

This is the record even before the Bush administration of the long-term unemployed. It ran along here, and now it has shot up to almost 22 percent of those unemployed who have been long-term unemployed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in this article, besides the administration being against the increase in the minimum wage, they are against unemployment compensation and against overtime. In this report in 1982, there were 417,000 workers classified temporary. Today, there are 2.5 million. This is about equal to the number of manufacturing jobs lost in the past decade.

These are the statements that we have about how good the economy is.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is absolutely right. We are confronting a very serious economic situation for our workers. There is real anxiety—indeed even fear—in working America about what is going to happen to people in terms of their employment and how they support their families. But we are not producing jobs fast enough to put people back to work. Yet the administration won't support extending payments for unemployment insurance.

How are these people supposed to support their families? These are working people. By definition, you cannot draw unemployment insurance benefits unless you have a work record. You must have been working and have built up a working record in order to qualify. We are talking about working Americans. How do they support their families?

The President talks about 95,000 jobs as though it is some success. It is not a success. This is the only President in 75 years in that entire period of time who has not had a net gain of jobs during his administration.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. I see my time has expired. I thank my friend from Maryland for his excellent observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHRISTOPHER REEVE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, like millions of other Americans, I was

shocked and saddened to learn last evening and to learn more this morning of the death of Christopher Reeve. In Hollywood life, he played Superman. But in real life, Christopher Reeve was a super person, a truly wonderful individual who embodied the indomitable human spirit in a way that won the respect and admiration of people across the globe.

Christopher Reeve was a classic example of a person with a disability who is remembered most of all for his ability, not his disability—the abilities that he mobilized to become an extraordinarily effective advocate for stem cell research.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his eloquent and straightforward presentation of the arguments on behalf of embryonic stem cell research.

But I want to commend the memory of Christopher Reeve. He marshaled forces, he traveled all over this country at great expense, and at great cost to himself personally in terms of his own health, to marshal the forces necessary to promote embryonic stem cell research.

He spoke with passion and intelligence and conviction. Christopher Reeve offered hope—not a false or idle hope. He offered hope grounded in science and discovery, hope grounded in the promise in possibilities of embryonic stem cell research. Forty-two Nobel laureates—I think maybe many of them because Christopher Reeve called them on the phone and visited—came out in strong support of embryonic stem cell research.

Just yesterday there was a march here in Washington by families and survivors of those who had ALS, Lou Gehrig's Disease. One of those marchers was a staff person of mine whose father just passed away from ALS. She and her mother were both in that march yesterday.

Christopher Reeve's argument for stem cell research was compelling. It was beyond personal. Yes, he did speak once about his own personal spinal cord injury and stem cell research at Ohio State University in 2003 at a commencement address.

He said:

I come to know people of all ages and from all walks of life that I would otherwise never have even met. For all our differences, what we had in common was our disability and the desire to find a reason to hope. I was inspired by so many and gradually discovered that I had been given a job that would create urgency and a new direction in my life. I could do something to help.

Christopher Reeve really did do a lot to help.

Senator SPECTER as chairman and I as cochair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services held the first hearing on December 2, 1998, after Dr. Thompson of Wisconsin and Dr. Gerhart of Johns Hopkins isolated the first stem cells. I am proud that our subcommittee had 15 hearings on this issue. At more than one of those hear-

ings it was determined that we did have the authority to do stem cell research from embryos. That was determined. That was determined before August of 2001.

I also point out that Christopher Reeve very eloquently testified at one of those early hearings on the necessity of embryonic stem cell research. We decided that the Government did have the authority. It is the President's Executive order of August 9, 2001, that limited what we could do.

When the President says that he is the first President to authorize stem cell research, that is not so, as Senator KENNEDY pointed out. He is the first President to limit, severely restrict, what we could do in stem cell research. The President said all the stem cells that were derived prior to 8 p.m. on August 9, 2001, could be used. Anything after that could not be used.

I remember watching that address. I was in my home State of Iowa. I thought to myself, why 8 p.m.? Why not 8:05? How about 8:10? In other words, if someone derives a stem cell at 7:59, it is okay, but at 8:01, it is not. What kind of arbitrary restriction is this? Totally arbitrary.

Because of that, he said there would be 60 stem cell lines—and we know there are only 22, and as the Senator from Massachusetts said every single one of those is contaminated because they used mouse cells on which to grow. So their use in human treatments is highly unlikely, at best.

The fact is, embryonic stem cell research offers enormous potential to ease human suffering. That is why this person, Christopher Reeve, fought so hard. The promise of stem cell research gave Chris Reeve hope, just as it gives hope for those suffering from ALS, Parkinson's disease, and diabetes, and all of their families. It is giving my nephew, Kelly McQuaid, hope. He was injured in the military. He is now quadriplegic and has been for over 20 years. He has hope that this stem cell research will allow him to again walk one day, just as Chris Reeve hoped it would for him.

We know stem cells have worked in rats. It has been proven that rats with spinal cords that have been severed and reconnected with stem cells walk again. That has been done in rats. As I pointed out, we humans are 99.5 percent rats—I don't mean just us politicians, I am saying genomically, structurally, we are about 99 percent the same cells. If stem cells can get rats walking again, think of the hope it has for humans. Yet this President says no.

There are those who say we cannot destroy these embryos because it is life. This is something I have done before in my committee, and I did it once with Chris Reeve there. He liked it, so I will do it again in his memory. I have a pen and a blank piece of paper. I hold this up and I ask if anyone can see what I put on that piece of paper. What I put on that piece of paper is a dot, a little dot. That is the size of the em-

bryos we are taking the stem cells from—a dot you can barely see on a piece of paper.

People say that is life. Of course it is life. Every cell has life. All my skin cells have life. My hair cells have life. Sperm has life. Eggs have life. But they say we cannot destroy these for stem cell research. They equate that somehow with this human being right here. They equate this little dot that you can barely see with someone like Chris Reeve. This is what we are taking the stem cells from, that little dot.

A lot of people think when we talk about embryonic stem cell research that somehow we are destroying fetuses. They get this confused. So I point out it is as big as a dot on a piece of paper. We will equate that with this human or that dot with my nephew, Kelly McQuaid? This is the promise of stem cell research.

We already have over 400,000 of these little dots that you can barely see frozen in liquid nitrogen. They are left over from in vitro fertilization. Guess what happens, folks. They are being destroyed. The dots are in test tubes, frozen in liquid nitrogen. Every so often when the donors do not want them any longer—they had their children or they reached the age they do not want to have children—they can call up the in vitro clinic and say, We do not want those saved any longer, and the test tube is cleaned out and is washed down the sink. It is either that or use them for stem cell research.

That is why I wanted to pay homage to Chris Reeve's memory today. He was a great friend, a personal friend. I remember him coming to Iowa. My sympathies to Dana, his wonderful wife, and their family. But rest assured, we will prevail.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I come before the Senate today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Christopher Reeve.

I was lucky to be able to call Christopher Reeve a friend.

His passion for life and for improving the lives of all Americans serves an inspiration to all of us.

He may have played the character of Superman in the movies, but he lived the role of a superman through his life.

I consider myself quite fortunate that our paths crossed on many occasions, in Vermont, at his home in New York, and in the halls of Congress.

Chris was an outspoken advocate for the arts.

As the co-founder of the Congressional Arts Caucus and, for several years, the Chairman of the Senate Committee with jurisdiction over the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Chris and I shared the belief that Federal support for the arts was critical.

At a time when the NEA was under attack in 1995, I asked Chris to testify before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on the importance of the agency.

His testimony brought attention to the issue, and highlighted the role that

arts and education play in the lives of children.

To this day, I believe that his testimony and advocacy helped preserve the agency through very difficult times.

Later, I turned to Chris again for help, this time on the important issue of lifetime caps on health insurance policies.

In 1996, as the Congress was writing new laws governing the portability and availability of health care coverage, Chris helped me gather support for a proposal to raise the lifetime caps of health insurance policies.

Chris was an outspoken advocate in support of that proposal, and shared his own personal story concerning health insurance to raise awareness for the lifetime cap issue.

His courage and leadership brought that issue to the forefront of the Congressional debate.

His dedication to stem cell research was renowned.

His testimony before the Congress and advocacy for the issue—once again—put a human face on the possibilities that could emerge from stem cell research for those with spinal cord injuries and other diseases and afflictions.

Chris' commitment to bettering the lives of individuals with disabilities never ended.

In 2000, Chris traveled to Burlington, VT, at my request to speak before a disability conference.

It was his first visit back to Vermont since his accident.

He called the disability movement the last great civil rights movement, saying the primary obstacle for the disabled is other people's fear.

Chris said:

Changing the public's perception of people with disabilities takes time. It's about them getting over their fear. Imagining that it could be them.

And once they know that, once they can really sympathize, then you get change.

And then America lives up to its full potential.

And I think we're on that path.

Thanks to Christopher Reeve countless Americans will live to their full potential.

We will continue to work on his behalf on the issues he was so dedicated to.

I send my deepest condolences to Chris' wife, Dana, and their entire family.

They cared for Christopher with a love and kindness that was inspirational.

Dana herself was an inspiration to all of us. She understood the devotion and greatness of Chris. She helped Chris live out his desire to help the disabled.

I hope they are comforted with his memory, and the knowledge that their loss is shared by so many across this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is now recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his very eloquent presentation. I agree with him 100 percent. I also thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his presentation.

As the senior Senator from California, a lifelong Californian, I will make a few remarks about Chris Reeve.

I remember when I saw Chris Reeve in "Superman." He was 25 years old. He was amazing. We now learn he did some of his own stunts. And then what followed was the "5th of July," and I remember "Somewhere in Time." We saw this tall, handsome actor, seemingly invulnerable.

I remember the film footage when he went over that jump on a horse. We learned that he had severed a vertebra high in his neck which canceled out all speech and rendered him quadriplegic for the rest of his life.

As many know, it is rare that an individual survives more than 2 years with this form of injury. Yet he survived for 9 years. I remember listening to a CNN interview with Paula Zahn over stem cells. He said: When somebody lies still and doesn't move anything for a matter of days, cannot even scratch their nose, let them talk to me about stem cell research.

In fact, this is a catastrophic injury presenting him with a catastrophic problem. So many people suffer from many of these injuries and from catastrophic disease, all of which may well be helped if we go eagerly, enthusiastically, and scientifically into stem cell research. That is the challenge. Parkinson, diabetes, Alzheimer's, spinal cord injuries all can be helped.

Yet Christopher Reeve, who could not move, made amazing progress—not a recovery but progress—and would appear here before hearings and hold press conferences and urge us to move forward with a stem cell bill.

I had the pleasure of introducing the first stem cell bill in this Senate. There are five Members—the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY; the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN—who are cosponsors of the major stem cell bill. We will be back. We will reintroduce it as one of our first bills in January in this new session. I will be asking my colleagues to rename this bill the Christopher Reeve National Stem Cell Act.

I want all of America, through this bill, to know Chris Reeve's last 9 years on Earth were not, in fact, in vain, that we will produce a bill that will, in fact, put America on the scientific horizons of research for catastrophic and disabling diseases and injuries. If we do not, I believe other States will follow with what California is doing.

California has on the ballot a proposition. It is known as proposition 71. It would produce \$3 billion in bond funds to allow California to plunge ahead to produce stem cell research. Now, other States will follow if we do not move with a national bill. So I hope we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to change that by unanimous consent to 15 minutes and ask if the Chair would notify me when I have 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for what she said. This tax bill came about because we got into a fight with our trading partners over export subsidies. At the end of the fight, they won and we lost. An export subsidy that we had in the United States had to be taken off the books. So what was a minor facelift when it came to an export subsidy turned out, after our friends in the House and Senate got their hands on it, to be an extreme makeover of the Tax Code. Unfortunately, the American people, who could not afford the powerful lobbyists involved in writing this, ended up as the people with the sad faces.

So when we take a close look at what this bill did, what was supposed to be a quick and minor fix of the Tax Code blossomed into a huge giveaway of tax benefits and made some policy changes we are going to regret.

I have been fighting the tobacco companies as long as I have been in Congress but 15 years ago passed the law which banned smoking on airplanes. The passage of that law led to some very important things happening in the U.S. Government and across the board. But I mistakenly believed that the trend was on our side, that those of us who wanted to protect children from becoming addicted to tobacco really had the wind at our backs.

Well, we lost it in this conference committee because we put in the conference report a provision which the major tobacco company, Philip Morris/Altria, agreed on which said if we are going to buy out tobacco growers, then we are going to put FDA regulation in place so we can protect children from being sold tobacco products that lead to an addiction that can lead to disease or death.

It was a good, balanced bill, a bipartisan bill. Senator DEWINE, a Republican of Ohio, and Senator KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts, put together this FDA regulation. We sent it to conference and those conferees who put together this monstrous bill ripped it out.

Instead, they said, we are going to give billions of dollars to buy out tobacco growers but not one penny to protect children from the harm of tobacco products.

I will return next year, God willing, to renew this battle with my colleagues. We cannot give up on our children as this bill did. It is not the only thing wrong with the bill. It is the one that touches me personally and one about which I feel strongly.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. The bill that was passed by the Senate contained within it the provision that provided authority to the FDA to protect children; is that correct?

Mr. DURBIN. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. And that provision was then taken out in the conference with the House Members, stripped out of the bill; is that right?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Maryland is correct. What they took out of the bill was the authority of the Food and Drug Administration to list the ingredients on a tobacco package, to put on a warning label that really means something, as opposed to the meaningless warning labels that have been on for 30 or 40 years, and to establish standards and rules for selling tobacco products so children won't become addicted.

I have never met a parent who has said to me: I am so happy. I just learned my teenage daughter has started smoking.

I have never heard that said. There isn't a single one of us who has reared a child who ever wanted to hear they were going to take up smoking or cigarette tobacco. This bill established protections. Those protections were removed. Those tobacco lobbyists who have a big grin on their faces today, because we passed this bill by a big roll-call, should understand their children are at risk, too. The children of families across America are at risk as well.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me say a word, too, about Christopher Reeve. I woke up this morning in Chicago before flying here and heard the news, as did most Americans, about the death of Christopher Reeve at the age of 52. I saw him in the movies—we all did—"Superman" and others. He was quite a handsome young actor who attracted a lot of attention at the height of his career. Then about 9 years ago he was involved in an accident which left him a quadriplegic.

I remember the photos of Chris Reeve after this happened. There were photos of a man in a wheelchair on a ventilator who looked as if he was just hanging on to life by a thread. He hung on for 9 years, and he didn't just survive, he used his life and used it heroically.

Let me also say I thought so many times about his wife Dana and their family. Those of us who are married said we would stand by our mate for better or for worse, richer or poorer, in sickness and in health. You never quite know what that vow means until you see someone like Dana, the wife of Christopher Reeve, who stood with him, helped him every minute of every day so he could survive.

And he didn't just survive. He fought. What did he fight for? He fought for medical research so people just like him and others who would be victimized like him might have a fighting

chance in life. He came here to Capitol Hill and testified, held news conferences, traveled around the United States with the message.

Why is it important that we not just eulogize this brave man and the 9 years of his life where he showed such courage? Because the issue he was fighting for is an issue we will all get to vote for on November 2.

Christopher Reeve and many like him, such as Michael J. Fox, understand that embryonic stem cell research gives them hope, a chance to overcome quadriplegia, a chance to overcome Parkinson's disease, a chance for the millions of families who see their beautiful young son or daughter with juvenile diabetes, just a chance that the research will open the door to find a cure, really breakthrough scientific research involving tiny stem cells that you can only see under a microscope.

Why is this important? Because this administration, the Bush administration, has taken the position that the Federal Government must close the door to embryonic stem cell research and only limit it to a handful of these stem cell lines that were existing on August 2001 when President Bush announced he had in his own mind reached a compromise on this issue. It may have been a political compromise to President Bush, but it compromises the future for millions of Americans.

Some people argue it is a partisan issue: DURBIN, you're a Democrat criticizing a Republican President.

Listen closely: No one has ever suggested that Nancy Reagan is not a good Republican, and she stood up to fight for embryonic stem cell research. And ORRIN HATCH, a Republican Senator from Utah, has stood up to do the same, and ARLEN SPECTER, another Republican, has stood up to do the same. This is not a partisan issue.

The position we take on this issue is to take the politics out of science. We have an opportunity for Christopher Reeve and people such as him to give them hope and a chance that medical research is going to open doors and make lives better.

Some want this to be a debate on religion. There are some, by religious belief, who do not endorse embryonic stem cell research. We better take care if that is going to be the standard. We could be walking into a very dangerous area.

There are some, by religious belief, who don't believe in blood transfusions. So should we say at this point blood transfusions are immoral for all Americans because one religion or another does not agree they are necessary to prolong life?

There are some, by religious belief, who believe medical doctors should not be turned to but the power of prayer should cure your illness. Should we take that as a moral position for America and say that we cannot encourage medicine in America? I think not. So why in this area, when it comes to

medical research, are we going to close the doors that the Bush administration has to the hopes for Christopher Reeve and many like him, and for millions across America?

In just a few days, there will be a debate between President Bush and Senator JOHN KERRY—the last one—in Arizona, about the economy. I hope there is an opportunity for JOHN KERRY to point out these facts:

Forty-seven States under the Bush administration have had a loss of manufacturing jobs. I am sure this chart is hard to see on television. In Illinois we lost 135,800 manufacturing jobs in the last 4 years; almost 40,000 in Missouri; 23,000 plus in Iowa; 52,500 in Wisconsin; 152,000 in Pennsylvania; 164,000 manufacturing jobs lost under the Bush administration in Ohio; 10,000 in West Virginia. The list goes on and on for 47 States. These are the jobs we have lost.

Trust me, when these jobs are lost, they are not replaced with jobs that pay as much or that offer the same kind of benefits. These families are going to have a tough time getting back to where they were. Why has this happened? The Bush administration's economic policies have failed. Tax breaks for the wealthiest people in America have not given us the kind of economic boost that the President promised.

Look at what has happened in the Bush economy when it comes to American families' household income. It is down over \$1,500 since the President took office. We have lost ground. We have lost ground for families who get up and work hard every day to try to make ends meet.

Take a look at what happened with unemployment figures. The Senator from Maryland got up and told us we have just set a record of 24 straight months of long-term unemployment at record levels. We have never had that bad a period of time or that bad a stretch in modern economic history in America. It means you have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Look at the numbers that they have grown under the Bush administration, where out-of-work Americans are running out of unemployment benefits.

This President insists that he is not going to rest until every American has a job. This President is not going to get much rest because there are a lot of Americans who have lost jobs. Over 800,000 net jobs were lost under President Bush's administration, which is the lowest job creation number by any President of any political party in over 70 years. And this President is offering us 4 more years? I have to ask, as Senator KERRY did, can America take 4 more years of this?

This administration's approach to the economic problems in America is not taking care of business. Look what is happening to the workers who are working harder. Productivity is up 15 times between 2001 and 2004. Yet wages are stagnant and falling. The harder our people work in America, the less

they are paid. That is the American dream? Perhaps it is to President Bush but not to the families across America.

Meanwhile, how are corporate profits doing in the recession, the struggling economy? Very well, thank you. They are up 65 percent under the Bush administration, while workers' wages are going down. The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle-income folks are feeling the squeeze. That, unfortunately, is the reality of their tax policy.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. It is unparalleled in coming out of a recession that so much of the growth is going to profits and so little of the growth is going to wages. It is a stark contrast with what occurred as we tried to move out of previous recessions in the entire post-World War II period.

The point the Senator makes is extremely important. Productivity is up. The workers are producing, but they are not getting a return in their wages. The benefits are going heavily into corporate profits. The Senator is absolutely correct. And it is a marked departure with previous performance, where there was a much more equitable sharing of the economic benefits of the growth that was taking place, and the wage earner was doing better than under the circumstances we face today.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. In closing, the Senator from Maryland will speak when I finish and talk about the economic statistics, facts, and figures. That is the one thing we believe on this side of the aisle.

If this election is to be decided by facts and evidence, the American people will vote for a new vision of America, a stronger economy at home, and more respect for America around the world. But if we are going to let this campaign disintegrate in the last 3 weeks into sloganeering and name-calling, who knows what the outcome will be. We trust the facts and the evidence. This administration has failed to move this economy forward for working families. It has pushed a tax policy that not only doesn't help them, in many instances it penalizes them.

Look at what families are up against under the Bush administration. The cost of medical care and health insurance, up 59 percent; gasoline is up 38 percent; college tuition is up 38 percent; housing costs are up 27 percent. Even the cost of a bottle of milk is up 13 percent. When this President says in Arizona in the next debate that America is better off under his administration, he isn't feeling the pain families feel every single day when they try to make ends meet.

Mr. President, this election is going to be a historic turning point for Amer-

ica. We are either going to move toward 4 more years of the Bush administration, with economic policies that have taken a toll on the hardest working people in the world, or we are going to move forward with a new vision to help families have a better life for themselves and their children.

We are going to decide, when it comes to foreign policy, if we are going to continue to squander the reputation and good name that America has built up over many decades or whether we are going to move to a new level of respect for America around the world. The choice is in the hands of the voters on November 2.

I yield the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The Senator from Maryland is now recognized for up to 20 minutes under the previous consent order.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, on Friday the Bureau of Labor Statistics came out with the latest unemployment figures. I commend the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They are professionals. They bring us the figures. They do not try to put a spin on them. They just lay out the facts. That is a kind of unusual thing in our public discourse nowadays, I have to say. We do not seem to pay much attention to the facts anymore. It is all spin—spin, spin, spin, deception, misstatement, so forth and so on. But there are still professionals in various parts of our Government, and I simply at the outset commend them for sticking to the facts. Members of the Joint Economic Committee tried to draw the Commissioner and her associates into the spin efforts, and she resisted, as she should.

I wish to talk this afternoon briefly about some of the figures and the facts, and I will try to lay them out as best I can.

We produced last month 96,000 jobs—I say a mere 96,000 jobs because we need to produce about 140,000 jobs per month simply to stay abreast of the growth in population. So if we are producing fewer jobs than that, we are obviously slipping backward.

This performance of this administration should be a matter of very deep concern for people in the country. Back at the beginning of the year, the administration did have a couple of months of good, solid production, and I want to put that right up front because, as I said, I want to stay with the facts. But what has happened is over the course of the year, their job production has fallen very sharply, as this chart shows. We are now down to just below 100,000 jobs produced in the last month of this Bush administration.

The cumulative record of this administration over the course of the time it has been here has been a loss of 1.6 million private sector jobs. Private sector jobs are down 1.6 million. In total jobs, because we have had some uptick in

Government jobs, the administration is down 825,000 jobs over the course of its tenure. It is down 825,000 total jobs, 1.6 million private sector jobs, and 2.7 million jobs lost in manufacturing employment. Manufacturing employment is down 2,700,000 jobs.

This job performance—or more accurately put, lack of performance—is the worst in 75 years. We have to go all the way back to the administration of President Hoover to find another administration which lost jobs in the course of its tenure; in other words, failed to produce a net gain of jobs. Some administrations in the interim have done very well, others fairly well, others not so well. All have had a net gain in jobs except for this administration.

The unemployment rate which was reported on Friday as 5.4 percent does not tell the full story of the depth and breadth of unemployment which exists in the country. If we count in amongst the unemployed—and the Bureau of Labor Statistics keeps this index—if you count in people who have dropped out of looking for a job because they are so discouraged by how poor the labor market is and a very substantial number of people who are working part time for economic reasons—in other words, they want to work full time, but they cannot find a full-time job, so obviously in order to try to support their family, they take a part-time job, but they are seeking a full-time job—if you factor in that underemployment, and if you factor in the people who dropped out of the workforce in terms of seeking employment, we end up with an unemployment rate of 9.4 percent—9.4 percent. That is what we are confronting. And that rate, of course, is a consequence of failing to have a net gain in jobs over the course of this administration.

I was fascinated to watch the spin artists go out and try to spin this 96,000 figure into some big success. Quite to the contrary. It shows a serious shortfall in economic performance. And the thing that makes it an even deeper concern is the fact that the administration's performance over the course of this year in producing jobs has seriously weakened. In other words, if we go back to the beginning of this year, job creation has dropped markedly.

Some of the spin is to sort of say 9/11 did it all. They attribute it all to 9/11, but obviously this chart indicates to the contrary because we had some fair job production here, and then it has fallen. The cumulative impact of having that happen is, in fact, now to have an administration which does not have a positive job creation performance over the course of its tenure.

Now, we all know that everyone gets up on the Senate floor and they make long speeches about the best social program is a job. I agree with that. I doubt that there is anyone in this body who would disagree that the best social program is a job, but the jobs are not being produced.