

That is 2 million reasons to pass this bill this week.

Today and Thursday, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan is scheduled to deliver his monetary report to the Congress. Chairman Greenspan has expressed confidence that the economy will continue to grow and to grow more jobs. While he does his important work at the Fed, we must continue to do our work in this Chamber to bolster the economy and help create jobs. Lowering health costs, reducing the downward drag of frivolous lawsuits, ensuring affordable energy, cutting redtape, and opening new markets, all of these pro-growth policies will help keep America moving forward.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

EXPORTING U.S. JOBS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 2 days ago President Bush sent to Congress his annual report on the State of America's economy. Contained in that report is a statement that was quite remarkable. After presiding over the loss of 2.6 million jobs, after claiming for 3 years that stopping the job hemorrhage was one of their top priorities, the Bush administration now says that exporting American jobs to China and India and other low-wage nations is good for the American economy.

I read that, and I must have read it two or three times thinking there had to be a catch, thinking there had to be some caveat, there had to be some condition. But there is no condition. The statement from the report could not be more clear. This administration believes that exporting jobs to China and India and other low-wage nations is good for America's economy. They seem to want to turn a jobless recovery into a hopeless recovery.

The President's report is proof that there are those in this administration who simply do not understand what is happening to this economy and how deeply concerned people are about their economic future.

People who think shipping American jobs overseas is good for the economy need to talk to people such as Myra Bronstein. She is not a statistic. She is not an abstract concept on computer models.

Sometimes we focus so much on corporate stock earnings or the Dow Jones Industrial Average, we lose sight of the challenges that real Americans are actually facing. Myra Bronstein knows all about outsourcing. She has a degree in electronic engineering and 15 years of experience in the information technology industry.

Four years ago, she left a good job with AT&T in New Jersey to take a new job with a software development company called Watchmark Corpora-

tion in Bellevue, WA. She was one of about 20 software testers at Watchmark.

One Friday last April, Myra came to work. She and other software testers were called into a meeting. They were told that they were being replaced by workers in India, that their jobs would be gone as they finished training their replacements, and that if they refused to train the new workers they would be ineligible for severance pay, unemployment insurance, or health insurance through COBRA.

Then they were told that the new workers were flying in over the weekend and would be there on Monday. Most of her coworkers just had to train one new person. Because Myra Bronstein was working on the highest priority projects, she actually had to train two replacements. The whole while she was trying frantically to figure out where she was going to find a new job in the midst of the "dot-com" bust and a jobless recovery.

Myra Bronstein is not alone. According to a new national survey that is just being released today, nearly one in four information technology workers said his or her company has offshored jobs. Incredibly, almost one in five reported they themselves had lost a job after training a foreign worker. Ninety-three percent—nearly all—expressed concerns about the impact of offshoring jobs on the IT industry and how it would impact their communities, the economy, and this country. One-third of the workers surveyed said the trend toward outsourcing and offshoring jobs is contributing to layoffs. And more than half said it was pushing down wages and benefits.

When textile manufacturing jobs started to move offshore in the 1980s, workers in those industries were told that the change was good for America's economy. They were told that all they had to do was to learn some new skills, train for some "new economy," and they could get better paying jobs in the technology and service industries.

Workers held up their end of the deal. They got the training. Many did get jobs in the computer and IT industries, in health care and financial services, and other so-called new industries. Now these new jobs are being shipped overseas.

We are offshoring America's future. We are exporting some of our Nation's most promising research and development jobs. These are the jobs that support middle-class families. They are the jobs that enable people to own their own homes and put their kids through college.

Sixty-eight percent of IT workers have a college degree or higher. Half have annual salaries between \$75,000 and \$125,000. Their jobs are being offshored to people who will earn less than \$10,000.

This is not just happening in Seattle or Silicon Valley. It is happening in Sioux Falls and St. Louis and cities and towns all across America. Now the

Bush administration tells us that exporting American jobs is actually good for the economy.

Shipping good jobs overseas may boost the quarterly earnings of some companies. It may make some CEOs look smart and make some quick profit for some investors. But how can it be good for the economy to export America's best jobs? How can it be good for the economy to offshore the jobs that support middle-class families and sustain strong communities? How can exporting jobs create opportunities for Americans?

It is not just the jobs that get outsourced. When American companies ship jobs offshore, they also send tax returns, medical records, credit card numbers, financial statements, and all kinds of other sensitive and confidential consumer information.

America has lost 2.6 million jobs on this administration's watch. That is more jobs than the last 11 administrations put together. Nine million Americans are now out of work. Long-term unemployment is at a 20-year high.

Eighty-thousand workers are exhausting their unemployment benefits every week because Republican leaders refuse to support extending the Federal emergency unemployment benefits.

The Economic Policy Institute recently found that in 48 States jobs are shifting from higher paying to lower paying industries.

In his State of the Union Message, President Bush said he understood, finally, that we have a jobs problem in America. He promised his administration would do more to help people find and train for jobs of the future.

A few days later, a professor from the University of Texas wrote an op-ed in the Washington Post about what she said was a model job training program in Austin. Many of the students at the center do not have the advantages that Myra Bronstein and many other IT workers have. They do not have graduate degrees. What they do have is a fierce desire to make a better life for themselves and their children. Many of them have two jobs. They catch a bus to their classes, where they learn about computer programming and spreadsheets and other supposedly marketable skills.

The professor wrote that one woman who showed her proudly how she "uses MapQuest.com to get directions to the houses that she cleans on her hands and knees, 7 days a week, 12 hours a day, for a pittance," was just lucky to have a job at all.

She wrote:

Before they learned these skills, the trainees thought that it was their lack of computer skills that prevented them from getting good information-age jobs. They thought something was wrong with them. Now they know something is wrong with our job market.

There is something wrong with the job market, and the Bush administration's cavalier endorsement of shipping American jobs overseas can only make

matters worse. The administration owes the American people an explanation and an apology. More than that, they owe this Nation a plan that will actually create jobs, not export them to China, to India, or other low-wage countries but to create jobs here.

I ask the President to renounce this report from his economic advisers and assure all Americans that the Federal Government will not be taking steps to export these jobs overseas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my leader time not be taken from the morning business allocated to the Democratic side.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time, so much as remains for the majority leader, will be reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, and the final 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The Democratic leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the leader a question under leader time, not under morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leader's time has expired.

Mr. DASCHLE. I inform the Senator from Illinois, through the Chair, that we still have a half hour of morning business time allocated. We can use that time. I will take such time as may be required to respond to the Senator's question.

Mr. DURBIN. I will make my question very brief.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. DURBIN. I commend the leader for his statement this morning and ask him the following: If the Bush administration is now telling us that tax cuts for the wealthy are good for America, if they are now telling us that outsourcing jobs from the United States to other countries is good for America, and they are now cutting overtime pay for American workers and refusing to give unemployed workers in our country the benefits they need to keep their families together, I would like to ask the Senator from South Dakota and our leader on the Democratic side if he

believes this is the right economic policy to move America forward out of this recession and into prosperity?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would simply say that if you judge how good an economy is by the number of jobs created, this policy has been a failure. If you judge economic policy by the kind of fiscal position we now hold—we have a \$600 billion deficit and a \$3.5 trillion debt; a \$9 trillion swing as a result of the tax cuts—this policy is a failure. If you judge by how one pays and rewards work rather than wealth, by this administration's position on overtime, this position and policy is a failure.

I think as we debate the economic circumstances we face in this country these failures ought to be front and center because they are the focus of every American family today.

Ms. STABENOW. Will the leader yield for a question as well?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on behalf of the men and women of Michigan I thank the Democratic leader for his comments this morning. We read headlines every single day of jobs being lost to other countries, outsourcing, plants that are leaving. It is clear to me we have an administration more focused on wealth than valuing work, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois indicated, with a whole series of policies that do not reward work.

I wonder if the leader might comment on the fact this is a race to the bottom. What they are saying to Americans is they should work for \$2.50 an hour or \$1 an hour or instead of being a computer programmer here, earning \$50,000 a year, if you earn \$15,000 a year, maybe we won't outsource your job. Isn't this a way to eliminate the middle class? How do they, in fact, purchase the cars and the refrigerators and computers and have the quality of life they want, send their children to college, be able to afford a quality of life as Americans, if this is a race to the bottom?

Would the leader agree this is now a race to the bottom and a threat to the middle class and their way of life?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I respond to the Senator from Michigan by saying she has characterized this situation very accurately. It is a race to the bottom.

I had a conversation not long ago with a worker at a grocery store chain who was commenting that they are currently in negotiations with this particular chain. He noted over the last 30 years, as negotiations have been evolving, at every juncture, all through the 30 years, the question was: How can we make improvements; how can we improve wages; how can we improve benefits; how can we continue to stay abreast of the current fiscal and financial challenges every family faces? That was the goal, to advance the benefits, the wages, to take into account the dramatic changes in their own circumstances.

He said for the first time in 30 years, their only goal this time is to hold on to what they have so the company doesn't take away benefits, the company doesn't take away wages.

He said: Those on the other side are arguing, we are going to take away some of your wages and some of your benefits because that is what is happening with the competition. In order to be competitive, we have to reduce your wages and reduce your benefits.

I will not accept that for this country. We can't possibly accept the fact we have to move backward. If we are a progressive society, we have to recognize these families have to continue to move forward with regard to their benefits and wages or, you are absolutely right, we will have a race to the bottom, a disparity between those at the top, who get the tax cuts the Senator from Illinois referenced, and those at the bottom, who get not only no tax cuts but now are losing their jobs, benefits and wages, and their overtime. What is that going to do to this country? We are going to have the biggest chasm in all of our history soon between those at the top and those at the bottom. That is unacceptable.

I thank the Senator for her question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce how much time is left for morning business on this side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-four minutes 37 seconds.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader announced today the tax cuts were working. My question to him and everyone within the sound of my voice would be: Working for whom? As has been indicated, we have staggering deficits. We have a staggering debt that was not there when this man took the office of President a little more than 3 years ago.

I have been reading a book the last couple days, "The Price of Loyalty," by Ron Suskind and Paul O'Neill. In that book, quite clearly, Paul O'Neill was extremely concerned about the deficits and brought it up at a Cabinet meeting. He was cut off very quickly by Vice President CHENEY, saying: President Reagan proved that tax cuts are good and that deficits don't matter.

I believe deficits do matter. I believe we have a situation developing that is going to cause untold misery and harm, as indicated by the budget we have been given today. We will talk about that during the next few weeks as the budget negotiations and debate go forward.

I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I thank the assistant majority leader for yielding me 10 minutes in morning business. I rise to follow up on what the Democratic leader was talking about in