

ETI, the 22 judicial nominations. We would really be rolling if that were the case. Unfortunately, it is April 1.

#### SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. With that, Mr. President, this morning there will be a period of morning business for up to 60 minutes, and that morning business will be followed by an additional 60 minutes of debate with regard to the cloture motion with respect to the welfare reauthorization bill. At the conclusion of that 60 minutes of debate time, we will proceed to a rollcall vote on invoking cloture on the committee substitute to H.R. 4. That is the welfare legislation.

As I stated in closing last night, if we invoke cloture on this bill, I hope we will be able to finish it this week. Over the last few days I had hoped we could reach an agreement to finish the bill in reasonable fashion, but because we were unable to reach a formal consent agreement, we will go forward with the procedural vote in hopes of bringing this bill to a conclusion. If we do invoke cloture, Senators will still be able to bring forward their amendments, and I believe we could finish the bill this week.

If cloture is not invoked, it will be clear that this legislation will be gridlocked by these unrelated matters and therefore will be difficult to finish.

We also continue to seek ways to finish and complete the JOBS bill, the FSC/ETI bill from last week. That bill has been held up as Members insist on offering amendments that have little to do with the underlying legislation.

Additional procedural votes will occur in relation to that bill as we try to find a way to get the FSC bill done.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, in order to facilitate the use of our time this morning, I ask unanimous consent that during the period for morning business the Republican-controlled time be divided in the following manner: Senator CORNYN, 5 minutes; Senator ENSIGN, 5 minutes; Senator THOMAS, 5 minutes; Senator SMITH, 10 minutes; Senator COCHRAN, 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I have a few comments to make in terms of an opening statement. I will be happy to turn to the Democratic leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I also have a statement I will make, but as I understand it, the first hour will be divided equally between the Republicans and Democrats. Is it my understanding the second one will also be divided equally in time?

Mr. FRIST. Debate for reauthorization.

Mr. DASCHLE. That is debate on the cloture vote itself?

Mr. FRIST. On cloture.

Mr. DASCHLE. I say I will make further comments after the distinguished majority leader has made his.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

#### JOBS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will be making my comments on leader time. We will have the hour of morning business as laid out in the unanimous consent for our side so people can plan their morning. My remarks will only be about 10 minutes or so.

Mr. President, I want to take a moment to comment on the Democrats' decision last week to filibuster the JOBS Act, the FSC/ETI and the Jumpstart JOBS bill. It is a bill that goes right at the heart of manufacturing job creation in this country. It is critical to our manufacturing jobs base. As has been pointed out again and again, it was developed in a strong, bipartisan fashion under the leadership of the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee. It is critically important. It has broad support, yet every Senate Democrat except Senator MILLER from Georgia voted to sustain the Democrat-led filibuster.

Since that time we tried to work out some sort of agreement so we could consider this bill and have debate on germane amendments, but every time we attempt to do so we are met with an increasing list of irrelevant, mainly political message amendments that the other side insists be a part of this bill. Last week a filibuster was open on the floor. This week, in a less obvious way, it continued by foot dragging.

What does a filibuster mean? What are the practical implications of this filibuster? It means leaving in place a Euro tax the European Union began imposing on March 1 last month against the U.S. manufacturers. The Europeans have been authorized by the WTO to impose \$4 billion in sanctions that began March 1—30 days ago. The tariff started at 5 percent of the \$4 billion authorized and will increase 1 percent on the first of every month thereafter.

Thus, in supporting this filibuster, whether it is the active filibuster last week or the more passive filibuster of this week, the Democrats are supporting the sanctions. Again, today being April 1st, it will kick up another 1 percent, another \$40 million increase, in those sanctions because of the delay.

If the other side of the aisle is not in favor of this JOBS bill, then what do they support? Let me look at some of the legislation that has been introduced and statements made in the Senate. As of late, a lot has been made about outsourcing—a lot of conversation, a lot of proposed amendments—regarding the whole issue of offshoring. Time and again, the Senate Democrats have introduced amendments, bills, and statements expressing grave concern over this issue.

The conversation has, unfortunately, been quite one-sided. When we look at the numbers—and increasingly people are looking at the numbers—we learn

foreigners outsource far more work to the United States than American companies actually send abroad.

Indeed, the value of insourcing, what is coming into the United States—including legal work, computer programming, banking, telecommunications, engineering, management consulting, other private services—was \$133 billion in 2003. Outsourcing of such private services was valued at \$77 billion and \$133 billion for insourcing.

When measuring outsourcing to insourcing, the United States posted a \$54 billion surplus last year in trade and private services with the rest of the world. Again, look at both sides of the equation.

Far from being bad for the economy as a whole, this balance of offshoring and insourcing creates a net additional value for the United States economy, lowering prices to consumers who are making purchases and, in effect, increasing their standard of living. Each dollar of cost that is outsourced creates \$1.46 of value globally. Of that \$1.46, the United States captures \$1.13 and the receiving country captures the 33 cents.

These numbers suggest, by the way I have described it, that efforts to restrict outsourcing will backfire by provoking a retaliation which is detrimental to our economy and our trading partners.

Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan captured the gist in these words on this issue: These alleged cures would make matters worse, rather than better. They would do little to create jobs. And if foreigners were to retaliate, we would surely lose jobs.

Where would the jobs be lost? Everywhere. The Census Bureau says in the year 2000, 6.4 million Americans were employed in jobs that were insourced by foreign companies operating in the United States. Mr. President, 223,000 of the jobs were in Massachusetts; 246,000 were in Michigan. Washington State had 104,000. Pennsylvania had 281,000. My home State of Tennessee had almost 149,000 insourced jobs, but that is less than half of the 307,000 jobs in Florida and well behind the 259,000 in Ohio.

When we talk about outsourcing, we need to remember there is another side of the equation, a side representing 6.4 million jobs. We cannot lose sight of that.

While we all agree the loss of any job to outsourcing is regrettable, we need to focus on the training, retraining, and education. If we look at the solutions offered by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we find them to be surprising and startling.

Senator KERRY has introduced S. 1873, requiring operators at call centers to disclose their physical location. Senator KERRY described this bill as being necessary to "address the growing problem of United States corporations moving hundreds of thousands of service sector jobs abroad."

I have to admit Senator KERRY's premise strikes me as a bit unusual. It

seems there should be some sort of assumption that if Americans discovered a foreigner was on the other end of that telephone, they would either hang up the telephone or otherwise lodge some sort of protest upon hearing that foreigner was in another country. The only way this bill would save jobs is if we assume Americans are so violently xenophobic we do not and would not tolerate even this modest level of international agreement.

Senator KERRY's legislation is indicative of the choice we face as a country. We can choose the path of freedom, where every individual and every company can do as he or she sees fit and trust that people are going to work hard on their own behalf, and in doing so promote the common good or we can choose a path of more Government, more Government mandates with less freedom, with less prosperity, and fewer jobs, one in which every time you call a company to see if they have an item in stock, the Federal Government will force you and the company to identify the exact longitude and latitude of the operator who is on the other end of that telephone call.

The reality is we compete today in a global economy. We cannot close our borders to the world. Some think we can retreat into economic isolationism, but we simply cannot. Times are different. We shouldn't. That, in many ways, given our world economy, would be a declaration of defeat.

We are the most innovative society in the world today. Our workers lead all others in the world in productivity. If we are allowed to compete on a fair playing field, United States manufacturers can and indeed will lead the world.

We had a chance last week to help U.S. manufacturers by repealing the Euro tax on our U.S. manufacturers. Unfortunately, we were met by obstruction on the other side. While I was disappointed at this outcome, recent history indicates that should not have been much of a surprise. If there has been one thing consistent over the last several months, it has been the Democrats' steadfast refusal toward legislation that would help reduce the cost of manufacturing in the United States. Every time we attempt to move legislation forward that addresses the concerns of manufacturing, we have been met by obstruction. With class action, with energy, with medical liability, to Workforce Investment Act, we have been blocked. It is either by filibuster or by objections going to conference.

Next month we are going to be addressing issues that I hope will bring some fairness and justice to certain challenges that we have today.

I have pointed out that we would like to address the issue of asbestos litigation reform. I look forward to hopefully being able to address that in a bipartisan way.

The loss of a few hundred thousand jobs per year to offshoring is a small part of the constant pace of job cre-

ation and destruction that goes on in the U.S. labor market. We need to address dislocation. We can do that with aggressive education and training.

But it is precisely because each job loss is painful that we need to focus on ways to stimulate employment generally rather than focusing on legislation to address a tiny percent of the population.

In closing, we need to keep our focus on proposals that look to the future to help companies create and keep new jobs. We cannot be focused on the past but really the present. We need to be looking ahead all the time.

As Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan stated earlier this month:

Time and again through our history, we have discovered that attempting merely to preserve the comfortable features of the present, rather than reaching for new levels of prosperity, is a sure path to stagnation.

We only need to look across the Atlantic to see the results of those policies of stagnation. Instead, Republicans will keep working for policies of growth and for innovation to help America compete and win in the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

#### SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the desire of the majority leader and our friends on the other side of the aisle in addressing many of these issues. He mentioned the JOBS bill, welfare reform reauthorization, and the importance of reaching some agreement on energy. I have indicated on several occasions that we are more than prepared to work through each one of these bills. We simply want to be heard on amendments about which we care a great deal.

I will not ask consent to do it this morning, but I would entertain a unanimous consent agreement to go to the energy bill today and work through the amendments. I think there would be a good debate. Ultimately, there could be a conclusive debate about the energy bill.

We will see what happens in our work with the House, which we have had to do now on several occasions. The same is true with the FSC/ETI bill. We would be prepared to go to the floor with a number of amendments.

People on the other side of the aisle, for whatever reason, have refused to allow us an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on protecting worker's overtime, on minimum wage, and on unemployment compensation.

There are other outsourcing amendments that we think ought to be debated. What better place to debate

them than on a bill that relates to international commerce.

It isn't our unwillingness to have a good debate; it is our unwillingness to be locked out of the process. Whether it is in conference or whether it is on the floor, we have been prevented closure on each of these bills. I am hopeful that over the course of the next 2 days we can reach some accommodation.

I have indicated that I thought we could finish the welfare bill by the end of next week. We will work to see that happens. But unfortunately, we are not at a point where any kind of procedural agreement has been reached to allow that to happen, either. I will continue to talk with the distinguished majority leader about ways in which to accommodate our concerns and his very understandable concerns about completing the work.

#### TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the House was scheduled to take up its version of the transportation bill yesterday.

At the eleventh hour—or rather at 7 a.m. this morning—the Rules Committee met and appears to have finally found a way to bring the bill to the House floor and allow for debate, although they will not allow a clear vote on a key amendment that would raise the level of investment in the bill.

Let me just say, this is astounding.

We have already gone 184 days with one temporary extension after another. These unnecessary delays have cost our Nation roughly 100,000 jobs.

State and local governments could not begin the contracting process, and employers couldn't plan ahead. As a result, there are 100,000 fewer Americans working today than there should be.

Unless we agree on a transportation bill before the end of April, when the current extension expires, tens of thousands more jobs will be lost.

Let us put this delay in perspective.

First, let us all remember who controls not only the House and Senate but the executive branch of our government—one party controls all three.

The President has claimed he was going to change the way government works. Well, he has everything he needs—control of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

And how has he done on changing the way government works? In the instance of our Nation's transportation infrastructure, he has steered us toward a real-life work stoppage.

It was 184 days ago that the law that governs our Nation's transportation infrastructure and all of the programs that deal with transportation expired.

We have been operating on temporary extensions to the law for 184 days.

Is the delay because Democrats have blocked a bill or used parliamentary tactics? No.

In fact, it wasn't until November that a bill was even reported by a Senate committee and not until February when we passed the bill in the Senate.