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