

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

terms of the statement of the chairman of the President's economic advisers saying: Outsourcing of jobs in this country is a good thing.

I read the followup comments by White House spokeswoman Claire Buchan, who said: The President's view is that American workers are the best workers in the world and he is committed to free and fair trade. He is committed to a level playing field.

That all sounds very nice, but is it level when you have a worker in China making 61 cents an hour and a worker in America making \$12 or \$13, \$14 an hour? What kind of a level playing field is that? As the leader said, this is a race to the bottom.

You can always find someone someone who is lower down on the totem pole, who is more hungry, more destitute, willing to work for less than you. If that is what we are looking for, we might as well go back to slavery.

If you want to talk about efficiency, that is what they are saying: When a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than to provide it domestically. That has to do with efficiency, they said.

Efficiency? Is that what we as human beings are now looked upon, as a machine, how efficient a machine we are or is there more to life than that.

When I hear words like that, I say people have some sterile view of economics that counts people as just so many cogs in a wheel or so many units we can depreciate, use up and throw out on the trash heap after a while. It disturbs me greatly, the positions of these people in making such statements.

I recognize free trade or fair trade is good for everyone as long as it does not lower people's standard of living but tends to raise people up to ours. That is what we ought to be involved in—not lowering our standard of living to others but trying to help them raise theirs.

Couple that with this dance of the administration that outsourcing jobs, shipping jobs overseas is good, somehow good for our country, with the budget we have now in front of us and what it spells is a disaster for this country and especially for our young people.

We have had the first recovery from a recession in modern time. There are still about 3 million jobs lost out there. This budget continues on that way. We have tax cuts for the wealthy. It does not create jobs. We have this proposal to eliminate overtime pay Senator DURBIN brought up. Now we are going to create jobs in India and China and places such as that by outsourcing all of our jobs.

Then you look at the budget, and the budget we have will continue deficits as far as the eye can see. It will increase deficits. What that means is we are now going to be paying a debt tax. As this administration increases the national debt, they increase the share

of the Federal budget that goes to pay the interest on the debt. So every dollar we spend on interest is a dollar we are not spending on education or construction or health care, rebuilding our economy. This is the hidden tax in Mr. Bush's budget. He says he wants tax cuts, mostly for the wealthy. He wants to make them permanent. That will cost us another \$1 trillion. But what about the hidden tax, the debt tax that is going to be put upon our workers and our children to pay the huge interest charges on this national debt that is running up?

Right now interest payments are about \$4,367 a year for a family of four.

By 2010, because of these huge budget deficits, this debt tax rises to more than \$8,000 for a family of four. That is just the interest every year. That means every family of four in America will be paying about \$8,000 a year in additional taxes just to pay the interest on the national debt. Again, this is a formula for utter disaster.

The baby boomers are on the verge of retirement—1946 being the first year of the baby boomers. They will retire basically at 65, so that brings us to the year 2011. When they start retiring, we will be in the hole with huge budget deficits. President Clinton set us on the right track to reach 2010 with zero national debt, in great fiscal shape to begin to finance the baby boomers' retirement and their health care. That inheritance from President Clinton, being on the right track and erasing the total national debt, has been squandered—squandered by tax cuts for the wealthy, squandered by the outsourcing of jobs to other countries, and destroying jobs in America. So we are going to reach 2010 with a crushing debt burden, higher interest rates, a weaker economy, and the baby boomers just retiring.

We know we are mortgaging our future, stealing from the next generation. Why? So that the wealthiest can have a tax cut of \$155,000 a year. This is not wise and it is not fair. The consequences are going to hit us right now, not just in the year 2001. Just look at the budget. It shortchanges No Child Left Behind by \$7 billion. The budget cuts funding for local police by \$1.7 billion. It cuts funding for firefighters by \$800 million.

There you have the essence of the Bush economic plan: huge tax cuts for the rich, skyrocketing deficits and debt, cuts in programs that serve children and working Americans, and outsourcing of our jobs to other countries, thus reducing the overall income of middle-class Americans.

It is time for the Senate to come together and demand a change of course, demand fiscal sanity, fiscal integrity, and a change in our economic program. I believe this is the single biggest test we face in the year ahead. Quite frankly, I believe President Bush is out of control in demanding even more tax cuts. The House of Representatives basically will do whatever the White

House says. So I say to my colleagues it is up to us.

Quite frankly, if the Senate doesn't step in and provide some adult supervision in Washington, then nobody will, and we will, in fact, march down this path of huge deficits, bigger and bigger deficits, higher debt, more interest payments on the debt, and the increasing outsourcing of our jobs to other countries. It is time to stop this downward spiral. I believe only we in the Senate can do it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

#### PROTECTING THE TROOPS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last night a group of Senators went out for dinner at Walter Reed Hospital with the soldiers who have returned from Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are undergoing important medical treatment and rebuilding their lives and strength to return to their families, and some to return to service to our country. These are our best. These men and women with whom we had the good fortune to eat dinner last night are really some of the finest people you could ever meet. They have given more to this country than any of us will ever give, and they have done it with a sense of loyalty and a sense of patriotism that all of us admire.

As I talked to these soldiers and asked them about their experience, I asked them about their injuries: What happened when you were in Iraq?

The story that comes back more often than not is that these soldiers—many of them—were in Humvee vehicles, which is our modern jeep, traveling in Baghdad and other cities and localities in Iraq, when their vehicle was struck by a rocket-propelled grenade or a homemade bomb that was detonated. Many of them were seriously injured. One brave soldier from South Dakota lost his right arm. The Army captain in the next Humvee was killed, and he believes he was lucky to escape alive. I asked him what Congress could do to help.

He said: We are getting good medical treatment, and our families are being treated fine. But can you do something about those Humvees? The Humvee doesn't have armor plating on the sides, armored doors to protect us and other soldiers.

You think to yourself, of the billions of dollars we have spent in Iraq, we don't have armored doors on the Humvees so that these soldiers can come home safely?

I asked the Secretary of the Army: What is this problem? He came back to me and reported that there are 8,400 Humvees in Iraq that don't have armored doors. The soldiers, last night, said they would improvise. They would get sheets of steel and cut them and place them on the sides of the Humvees