

while. But it was in trouble his last year in office. And during the 2000 campaign President Clinton and Vice President Gore spent a lot of time saying how wonderful the economy was and how much his Vice President, Mr. Gore, deserved credit for it, but, this just wasn't so. In fact, the economy had already begun to sink dramatically during President Clinton's last year in office.

For example, the NASDAQ exchange lost one-half of its value during the last year of President Clinton's tenure and before President Bush took office. When President Clinton was President, the economy was in trouble. Another fact is that during the third quarter of President Clinton's last year in office the economy experienced negative growth.

To compound the problem further, the first quarter President Bush inherited also experienced negative growth, even though the President hadn't been in office long enough to have this slowdown occur as the result of any of his policies. The fact is, President Bush inherited an economy from President Clinton that was already in trouble. There was no doubt about it. The numbers I have given are indisputable. President Bush's opponents want to ignore them and pretend that these facts did not happen. They want to promote the myth that President Bush is responsible for this economy, for the economic troubles we had, not that he inherited them.

But to his credit, President Bush has not whined or complained about the economic problems he inherited. Instead, he set about on a program to get our economy moving again by empowering the American people. He did this by allowing people to keep more of the money they earn instead of sending it to Washington to be spent by this gaggle in the Senate and the House. This President trusts the American people. In a nutshell his program is based on the premise that our economy functions best when we put more money into the hands of the people who earned it in the first place.

And the President's approach has created this growth we are now seeing. It resulted in 8.20-percent growth the third quarter of last year. It resulted in significant growth in the fourth quarter of last year. It is an approach that leads many people, such as Alan Greenspan, to predict the economy many sustain GDP growth of 5% this year. And it is an approach that has helped create the 300,000 new jobs we celebrate today.

Things are moving well. We want to see it continue. We want to see the unemployment numbers fall, and we want to see continued growth in productivity and jobs. In the long run, growth will determine whether we are successful as an economy and whether people will have jobs.

We hear all these things about China and Mexico being a threat to us, outsourcing and all these problems,

and we need to look at every single one of them and be very protective of jobs in America.

The President of the United States understands this. He understands that he is not president of the European Union. He is not president of the world. President Bush understands that he represents the United States of America. He is working every day to help our interests.

We have a lot to celebrate with these numbers today. They are really good. If we could maintain something close to that for the next 4, 5, or 6 months, we will feel a difference in income and revenue to the Government. We have 300,000 people now paying money to the Federal Government in taxes. One reason we have had a revenue shortage is because we have had less employment, so they are paying less taxes. If businesses are in a recession, they do not make a profit; the corporation does not pay a tax unless they make a profit.

Maybe we are back in the mood of growth and profitability and hiring that will make a difference not only in jobs for American citizens but maybe it will also make a difference for revenue to our Government and help us get this budget balanced again, which is something I feel very strongly about.

These tax reductions have been mischaracterized. Right now, we are dealing with it, as part of our budget process that we need to complete. We need to extend the child tax credit of \$1,000 per child for a working family in America today. The marriage penalty falls on working families and the expansion of the 10-percent bracket—in other words, people who are used to paying 15 percent income taxes—the lower income taxpayers, some pay 10 percent, the middle group pays 15 percent—more people will be paying at a lower rate. All of those are in doubt right now. We need to make that happen, allow the American people to keep more of their money, follow the great American tradition—not the European Socialist tradition—the American tradition of individual responsibility, lower taxes, free markets, less regulation, and we will continue to beat the world in economic growth and productivity.

I yield the floor.

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

#### ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Mr. CORZINE. Madam President, it is good news to have an increase in employment in America today. Everyone is pleased to see more jobs are coming into our economy and Democrats, as well as Republicans, are pleased to see more Americans are going to work.

But that said, working men and women, and everyone, has to understand numbers of 1 month do not indicate a change in whether one assesses economic policy working for average

Americans, for middle-class Americans, for moderate-income Americans, for those who are trying to make ends meet in our economy.

These good numbers we would like to see continued. We would like to see more Americans going to work, but the American people need to understand this number, this 1-month number, in the context of a whole 38 months of development of economic policy in this country, is a record that I believe, and I think many people would believe, has put enormous stress on the American people.

We are pleased with the job growth, but the fact is, we saw growth in the unemployed this month of about 184,000. We now have 8.4 million Americans unemployed in this economy. That is up substantially this month.

We have also seen the unemployment rate tick up about one-tenth of a percent. I heard some spinning about Senator KERRY saying 5.6 was pretty good in 1996. There is a difference when you come from 7.2 percent, which is where President Clinton's unemployment rate was when he came to office, going to 5.6—on the way, by the way, to 3.8 percent—than when we have a 5.6 or 5.7 percent rate, coming up from 4.2 percent, which is what the current administration inherited.

We have rising unemployment in this country, not declining. One month is a good thing to have happen, even a good quarter is a good thing to happen, but let's put it into the context of the 38 months of the stewardship of this administration's economic policies.

The fact is, we have had the worst record in 70 years, and it still stands. It has not been substantially altered by a 1-month performance in job growth in private sector jobs that we have seen since the Herbert Hoover years in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

The fact is, every other President from that point in time on—Roosevelt right through Clinton; including George Bush 1, Ronald Reagan, Carter—produced private sector jobs. And we have about a .7-percent decline in jobs under this administration in the private sector. We have lost about 2.6 million of those jobs, even after these numbers.

In fact, we have been producing more jobs in Government during the Presidency of someone who said they did not believe in Government—which is quite strange—relative to an emphasis on the private sector.

Again, I repeat, you have to look at this in the overall context. One month is good, and we are all pleased about that, but the fact is we have lost private sector jobs in this economy. It is a fact of which I think the American people have a real understanding.

Economic policy is something to analyze over a period of time, in context. It is not just a month. Remember, in the Clinton years, there were roughly 21 million jobs created—21 million jobs created—over that 8-year period. Right now, we have lost something in the

neighborhood of 2.5 to 2.6 million jobs over the term of this stewardship of the economy.

It is the context you have to think about, what kind of economic policy leads to sustained economic growth and sustained economic job creation, which is the end result that I think people will measure in their own lives—whether they have a job, whether they are working, whether they are actually able to take care of their families.

By the way, it is not just jobs; it is actually the earnings one gets on those jobs. One of the things that has been happening in our job market is, as people lose a job, and then they take another job, we have seen a 21-percent decline in the average wages of people who get reemployed.

So those factory workers in Edison, NJ, where our last Ford factory was closed—they go from a Ford manufacturing job to a service sector job that is, on average, 21 percent lower in real earnings than the job they had before. So they may be working but going into a Wal-Mart or going into hamburger flipping, which is not as good a job as the ones we are losing.

That is the problem in this economy, even though we might be seeing job growth. By the way, if you look at the actual numbers in this month's job creation, so many of them are in the service sector, where you are seeing this phenomenon happening, where there is a decline in the earnings of families and their purchasing power. They are losing their ability to go into the economy and have the strength to participate in the way they were before.

So it is not just the jobs; it is the quality of jobs that is at stake in the debate we have with regard to economic policy. So not only do we have a poor performance with regard to job creation, we have poor performance with regard to the quality and the earnings power that is associated with those jobs.

I think it is hard to hear some of the celebration and spinning that I have heard this morning on some of the television stations and from others who are focusing only on the good news of the 308,000 jobs created. That is great. How about the 184,000 people who lost their jobs? How about the 8.4 million people who are unemployed? How about the 2 million people who are on long-term unemployment in this country, who are detached or who have dropped out and are not looking for jobs? It is the highest number we have ever seen.

By the way, if you added that into the unemployment rate—the people who have stopped looking because they have given up hope looking for a job—the unemployment rate would be 7.2 percent. This is not just a single number. I know there is going to be a lot of focus on it, and that is a good thing. I

hope it sustains itself over a long period of time so we can start correcting this malaise we have in our jobs market around this country. And it is serious.

People know about outsourcing. They know about offshoring. They know about the fact that the minimum wage has not increased so that real earnings can grow for working men and women in America. There is a real problem.

In January 2001, we had about 700,000 long-term unemployed. Today, we have 2 million. You tell me whether that is a good stewardship of our economic policy and our jobs policy in this country. Where I come from that does not sound like a good performance.

I saw one of my esteemed colleagues from the other side of the aisle—I know he was trying to make a positive case—saying we have record employment at 138.4 million jobs in this country. That may be true, but last time I checked the population just keeps growing every month. Every month, the population keeps growing. If the employment rate does not go up, do you know what. What happens this week or what happened in this month's numbers is exactly what is taking place. We get rising unemployment, particularly when you add in all those people who have dropped out of the workforce. It is not that hard to do fractions. If you keep the base the same, and the numbers go up, you are going to get a changed number. And that is what is happening. It is hard for me to understand why we want to take victory laps when there are 8.4 million Americans without jobs.

Now, this is something we all hope turns and continues along the path. By the way, it is sure coming at a fairly serious price. The last time I checked, the President's own OMB Director was projecting we are going to have a \$540 billion budget deficit. I guess if you go out with a credit card and spend up a storm, you can get some activity going on in the marketplace. If you go to the malls and spend until you are in debt to the point where you cannot sustain it over a long period of time, you can get some economic stimulus, but that does not mean that is good economic policy. In fact, that means we are mortgaging our children's future so we can get results now. Funny, we want results about 6 months in front of an election, but we are spending in an uncontrolled manner, and almost everyone, on both sides of the aisle, is troubled. Spending and tax cuts and borrowing just make no sense, but they are getting some results in stimulating the economy. I do think we have a good thing going on with regard to the Federal Reserve. We have had the lowest interest rates now for 15, 16, 17 months—the lowest interest rates in 45 years. That actually does put some stimulus in the economy.

We could not do any more with regard to trying to stimulate. The problem is, we did not do it very efficiently. We put it in all at the top income brackets, and it sort of trickles down.

And that may create jobs. But I want to go back to what I think maybe is as important as anything that needs to be analyzed in the job market. When we trade manufacturing jobs, white collar technology jobs, for service sector jobs, what happens to the American people? Their standard of income goes down.

Madam President, \$44,570 is the average wage for a job that was lost in 2001. And the average wage today, when you get a new job, is \$35,410, according to this calculation. That is a decline of 21 percent. When you go from manufacturing and high-technology jobs to service jobs, you see a deterioration in the real earnings of the American people. That is happening. And we still have a major unemployment problem in this country: 8.4 million people, 2 million of whom are unemployed on a long-term basis. We have the longest average tenure on unemployment we have had in 20 years.

So, yes, it is a good thing that we saw 308,000 jobs created this month. It is a good thing that we are starting to see some pickup. But by my calculation—and by anyone's calculation—we still have the worst job performance record of any President since Herbert Hoover. Those are the facts. People can talk about the facts however they want. We have not performed for the American people in creating jobs and creating real earnings that will make a difference in their lives.

So I hope we do not start celebrating and spinning so much that we lose track of what the reality is for people in their own lives—certainly what is the reality for those people in Edison, NJ, who just had their Ford plant closed. I can tell you, it is happening all across my State. We have seen the elimination of high-quality jobs, and people are replacing them with those lower earning ones. I think we have serious issues to debate as we go through this campaign season. We ought to stay focused on the facts—both the number of jobs created and the quality of those jobs. I look forward to having greater discussion about these issues in the weeks and months ahead.

Thank you, Madam President.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
APRIL 5, 2004, AT 1 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 1 p.m., on Monday, April 5.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:24 a.m., adjourned until Monday, April 5, 2004, at 1 p.m.