

a cycle of dependency, a cycle of hopelessness and Government sanction, Government approval.

The story begins in the fall of 1968 when Eulalia Rivera left Puerto Rico and came to the Columbia Housing Project in Dorchester, an inner-city Boston neighborhood. Within weeks after arriving in Massachusetts, Eulalia went on welfare to support herself and her family. Her first check, instead of providing a solid foundation on which to build, became a milestone in her life, marking the first leg of a journey which has not ended to this day. "I remember the first check," Eulalia told a reporter for the Boston Globe. "It was for \$75 a month back then." The checks have never stopped and the hope has never grown.

Eulalia never left the housing project where she first lived, and in this place she raised 17 children, 14 of whom were still living as adults. Her daughter, Clarabel, has abused her son. Of these 17 children, almost none graduated from high school, and they have produced 74 grandchildren, many of whom entered the welfare system themselves.

As you can see on this chart, these are the children of Eulalia, and virtually all of them receive at least one form of welfare benefit: SSI, due to suffering from a nervous condition, also collects \$120 a month in food stamps; another child receives: Medicaid, subsidized housing, AFDC, food stamps; this child receives Medicaid, subsidized housing. Here is Medicaid, subsidized housing, food stamps, SSDI; food stamps, SSDI, AFDC. It just goes on in each of these cases. AFDC, SSI, Medicaid, subsidized housing, food stamps; AFDC, SSDI; AFDC.

This is the story of the intergenerational web, the lack of hope. Fifteen great-grandchildren now comprise the fourth generation of this welfare setting. The type of benefits received by the extended family are the alphabet soup of acronyms—all perfectly legal, and just as perfectly destructive to the human spirit. Many of Eulalia's descendents are considered disabled due to a medical condition diagnosed as anxiety attacks. SSI pays these individuals a monthly check in lieu of the jobs they are unable to perform. While interviewing Clarabel's family to find the motivation behind the tragedy of her son's abuse, a Boston Globe reporter found that the cycle continues, noting several school-aged children at home watching MTV at 1:30 in the afternoon.

Theirs is a family that has given up hope of finding jobs or receiving an education, a family caught in a system which rewards illegitimacy and discourages work. Their lives revolve around a monthly check, a dangerous public housing project, and empty dreams.

In the words of Robert Coard, director of the antipoverty agency Action for Boston Community Development:

This family is a classic example of a poverty-stricken class. They are the ones who have given up.

The tragedy of this story is perhaps most evident in Clarabel Rivera Ventura's life. At the time she abused Ernesto, she was 26 years old and pregnant, a mother of six, by five different fathers. Even her family is not sure about the identities of these men. "Oh, wow," her brother Juan told the Globe, "I have no idea." Eulalia gave the same answer. "I don't even know who they are."

A young woman caught up in the overwhelming system, Clarabel Ventura had no hope, no education, no prospects, and her will to improve her lot in life sapped by every check she received. Perhaps she looked to drugs as a way out.

Neighbors said that Clarabel sold food stamps and even the family's washing machine to get money to purchase crack—shouting at and striking her children in frustration, neglecting the needs of the children in order to serve her own addiction. Reportedly, Clarabel would send her children out alone after midnight to beg for money, cigarettes, and food from other residents in their housing project. Finally, something snapped. In a rage, Clarabel plunged 4-year-old Ernesto's arm into boiling water, severely burning him. It was nearly 3 weeks before she sought medical treatment for the wounds. When paramedics finally arrived on the scene, they found Ernesto in a back room on a bare mattress, smeared with his own blood and excrement. His mother, he said, had abused him because she was mad.

Government-sponsored poverty has a face, it has a soul, it has feelings and a body that can be hurt. Every day, children just like Ernesto suffer in an environment which Washington has created. They have no say. They cannot vote, they cannot read, they often are barely old enough to talk. But they pay the price of Washington's arrogant demand that the entire country run a welfare system in accordance with the bureaucrats' dictates.

The fact that welfare needs a major overhaul is beyond debate. Washington's one-size-fits-all bureaucratic micromanaged welfare system has failed, and failed miserably. Unfortunately, President Clinton's solution is nothing more than 1988 revisited, rearranging the deck chairs on the Welfare *Titanic*, just as Washington has done in prior attempts at reformation.

In 1988, Washington reformed welfare. The result has been an increase in spending for welfare programs of over 40 percent. We have more children in poverty today than when the war on poverty began. If there is anything we have learned, it is that no one solution from Washington has worked in the past or will work in the future.

We have a mandate from the American people to tackle the welfare issue head on. If Congress is going to be serious, we need to do more than reform the welfare system. We need to replace it. First, because one-size-fits-none, we need to stop the system as we now

know it. We need to transfer to the States, in a significant way, the opportunity to craft real solutions. Bringing the States, under the guise of waiving, to Washington, DC to gain the stamp of approval from this failed system is the wrong way of doing business and must be curtailed.

Second, Government and dollars alone will not solve the problem. We need to bring in nongovernmental, charitable organizations, and citizens to be a part of the solution.

Finally, let me say that as we debate welfare reform in the days to come, and as we confront the issue in the U.S. Senate, we have to understand that this is not just a debate about numbers. This is a debate about families, about human beings, where despair has come and hope is gone. We need to involve ourselves as communities and citizens. We need to disengage from the idea that Washington knows all and knows best. We need to make available to the people of this country the opportunity to tailor solutions to this challenge in State and local arenas.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the time.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the pending business is the State Department revitalization?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2025

(Purpose: To withhold \$3,500,000 from the "International Conferences and Contingencies" Account if the State Department expended funds for the World Conference on Women while Harry Wu was being detained in China)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2025.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 81, line 3, add the following:

(c) FURTHER CONDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Fiscal year 1996, in (a), \$3,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State certifies to the appropriate congressional committees, with respect to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women being held in Beijing, that no funds available to the Department of State were obligated or expended for United States participation in the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women while Harry Wu, a United States citizen, was detained by the People's Republic of China.

(2) If the Secretary of State cannot make the certification in Section 301 (c)(1), the withheld funds shall be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this is for funding for international conferences. S. 908 is an important piece of legislation. It provides for a massive reinvention of our foreign affairs bureaucracies. Because of this, I am fearful that many of my colleagues on the other side, in fact, maybe all of my colleagues, will not let us complete action on this bill.

Chairman HELMS and the subcommittee Chairperson SNOWE deserves credit for bringing this landmark bill to the floor. I signed a letter in support of this earlier today, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. DOLE. I signed the letter, along with Senator HELMS and Senator SNOWE.

Regardless of what happens on the cloture vote tomorrow, there is an issue we should address today: The United States plan to attend the fourth U.N. Conference on Women, scheduled for September in Beijing, China. My amendment would withhold \$3.5 million—50 percent of the total account—unless the Secretary of State certifies no United States funds were expended to finance a United States delegation to the women's conference while Harry Wu is detained in China.

As you know, since June 19, Harry Wu has been detained in China. Consular access to him, guaranteed under the terms of our 1982 agreement with China, was originally delayed. Last week, a suspicious tape was released by Beijing with Harry Wu confessing that his past exposes on human rights abuses in China were untrue. On July 9, Harry Wu was charged with offenses which could carry the death penalty. In light of his years of experience in the Chinese gulag, there is ample reason to fear for Harry Wu's safety.

Our relationship with China is at a crucial crossroads. We have many disputes with Beijing including trade, proliferation, human rights, and Taiwan. We must, however, choose our course of action carefully. As Dr. Henry Kissinger said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this month. "The danger of the existing rollercoaster toward confrontation to the United States and China is incalculable." I share Dr. Kissinger's concern over the dangers of a full-scale confrontation.

However, the most fundamental duty of a government is to protect the rights of its citizens—and Harry Wu is an American citizen. I urge the Chinese to release him. No improvement in relations will be possible as long as he is detained.

Mr. President, there are many problems with the fourth U.N. Conference on Women. I share the view recently

expressed by Senator KASSEBAUM and Congressman HAMILTON on U.N. conferences:

The United Nations is in Peril of becoming little more than a road show traveling from conference to conference. If an issue is serious, a conference will not solve it; if it is not serious, a conference is a waste of time.

In my view, the United States should stay away from any U.N. conference with goals and agendas which do nothing to promote American interests—whether they are held in Beijing, Brussels, or Boston.

There are many reasons to stay away from the U.N. Women's Conference—from the systematic exclusion of certain nongovernment organizations to the irony of holding a human rights conference in a country with a poor human rights record. The tilt toward anti-Americanism and radicalism—always present in lowest common denominator U.N. conferences—was particularly pronounced for the Women's Conference. There was even a controversy over the definition of gender in the preparatory meetings of the conference.

There should be no doubt that China will use the Women's Conference to enhance its prestige and international image. It is our view that the United States should not be a party to what will surely be a propaganda exercise as long as Harry Wu is detained. It would be wrong to attend a human rights conference when an American citizen is unjustly detained.

We should be realistic. The administration can use already appropriated funds to go to Beijing. We cannot stop that today. However, we can make our position clear. For the administration, the choice in this amendment is simple—stay away from the Women's Conference while Harry Wu is detained or lose 50 percent of your ability to fund such conferences in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

#### EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, July 26, 1995.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Six weeks ago, with the support of every Republican member, the Foreign Relations Committee passed S. 908, the Foreign Relations Revitalization Act. This legislation is the first authorization measure to reach the Senate floor within budget targets, fulfilling the mandate the American people gave us last November. This bill is a promise kept: Money is saved, bureaucracy eliminated, and the ability of our nation to conduct foreign relations enhanced.

This reorganization of the U.S. foreign policy apparatus saves \$3.66 billion over four years. A similar measure has already passed the House. Three agencies, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Agency for International Development and the United States Information Agency are abolished and their functions rolled into the Department of State.

The core functions of these agencies are not lost. Despite propagandizing to the contrary, independent broadcasting is protected; arms control and non-proliferation will be strengthened; and assistance programs which support national interests will be liberated from a convoluted AID bureaucracy. This

consolidation plan has been endorsed by five former U.S. Secretaries of State: Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Alexander Haig, James Baker and Lawrence Eagleburger. And as Henry Kissinger recently said, if given a truth serum, Secretary Christopher would endorse it too.

There is, however, an alternative to this reorganization plan. It is called the status quo.

Earlier this year, Secretary of State Christopher suggested a similar reorganization of the foreign affairs structure of this country, only to be beaten back by Washington bureaucrats protecting their fiefdoms. Attempts to engage the Clinton Administration were rebuffed consistently; repeated offers to find common ground have been rejected or ignored. The Administration has offered no alternatives and no savings.

President Clinton's second budget calls for a 20 percent cut in all non-defense accounts. S. 908 delivers on that call. But there is only one way to meet budget targets and still preserve the core elements of U.S. international operations: Consolidation of our foreign affairs agencies.

This should not be a partisan battle. A vote to sacrifice desk jobs for programs that support U.S. national security and humanitarian goals should be an easy one. But the Administration and the Democrats cannot accept that sacrifice, which means partisanship may rule the day. Their plan, detailed in an AID memo, is to "derail, delay and obfuscate" the process. Let us move this bill quickly, defeat efforts to preserve the bureaucratic status quo, and prove that we, at least, are serious about cutting spending. We need your vote.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE,  
OLYMPIA SNOWE,  
JESSE HELMS.

AMENDMENT NO. 2026 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2025

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, of course I support Senator DOLE's amendment. Before I discuss it, I have a second-degree amendment to the Dole amendment at the desk, which I ask be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], proposes an amendment numbered 2026 to amendment No. 2025.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the pending amendment, add the following:

#### SEC. . UNITED NATIONS DIPLOMATIC DEBTS.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 in section 201 and section 301, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State reports to the Congress:

(1) the names of diplomatic personnel accredited to the United Nations or foreign missions to the United Nations, which have accrued overdue debts to businesses and individuals in the United States; and

(2) that the United Nations Secretary General is cooperating fully with the United States or taking effective steps on his own, including publishing the names of debtors, to resolve overdue debts owed by diplomats and missions accredited to the United Nations.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as I indicated, I am a cosponsor of Senator DOLE's amendment which is an excellent amendment. It encourages the administration to do what it already should have done: make a strong protest to the Chinese over the arrest and

detention of the American citizen and friend of many of us in the Congress, Harry Wu.

Just 2 weeks ago, Mr. President, I met with Harry Wu's wife in my office. Jing Lee is a lovely person. She said privately, and then again on the lawn of the White House, the United States should refrain from sending a delegation to the United Nations Fourth Conference on Women in Beijing until Harry Wu is released safely. She asked, ever so insightfully, "Why would the United States wish to confer international recognition and legitimacy on the Chinese Government at a time when it is holding an American citizen in captivity?"

Over the weekend, the newspaper ran articles showing that the President is considering meeting with the Chinese premier in this area of détente, as Secretary of State Christopher is now referring to it. After the President goes through with that meeting, and Harry Wu is not released, then we absolutely have no business sending any Americans over to that conference in Beijing.

If the truth be known, the Beijing women's conference is fraught with problems from top to bottom, starting with the city in which it is being held. Taking a paltry \$3.5 million away from one account in the State Department is, in the short-term, the best way the Senate has to send a signal in support for Harry Wu's release.

I might inquire of the majority leader, does the Senator seek the yeas and nays on his amendment?

Mr. DOLE. I will seek the yeas and nays, and I think the Senator will seek the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

Mr. HELMS. I will seek the yeas and nays after the Senator.

Mr. DOLE. If I could speak to the second-degree amendment. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I see on his desk a story that appeared in the Washington Times, and that is the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, there are many problems in the U.N. system but today's front page story in the Washington Times is another outrageous example of the lack of accountability in the United Nations. More than \$9 million in overdue debts have been accumulated by foreign diplomats and foreign missions in New York. Bills for landlords, hospitals, banks, stores, and restaurants all go unpaid while the diplomats hide behind the U.N. blue flag.

The U.N. Secretary General issued a report recognizing the problem was serious. For example, some missions have not paid rent for 2 years; property owners were in danger of losing properties but diplomatic tenants cannot be evicted. The Secretary General, however, refused to name names. Instead, he suggested a working group to study the problem. I think we all know how to solve the problem. Don't form yet another layer of bloated bureaucracy—just get the bills paid.

This second-degree amendment offered by Senator HELMS is very simple. It withholds \$20 million—roughly double the amount owed by deadbeat diplomats—until the Secretary of State certifies two things: First, the identities to the deadbeat diplomats by name; and second, that the U.N. Secretary General is addressing the problem and getting debts paid.

The money we appropriate for the United Nations is not an entitlement. And, yes, the administration may have committed our Government to more money that we are willing to appropriate. But Congress does not have to sit by while the United Nations provides cover for deadbeat diplomats getting special treatment.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support the second-degree amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, let me begin by saying to the distinguished majority leader that I hope it might be possible to set this aside temporarily, simply because we have a couple of Senators who have amendments, or at least desire consideration, with respect to Harry Wu. It may not bear directly on this, but it think it would bear on the debate.

Mr. DOLE. We could set them aside with the understanding somewhere around 6 or 6:30 we would have a vote. We would not want to set them aside and have someone say we will never vote on them.

Mr. KERRY. We will be glad to.

The majority leader is about to leave, I suppose, but let me say that I think there is not any issue in the U.S. Senate about how we feel about Harry Wu's detainment. I think there are probably 5 or 6, or, I do not know, maybe 100 different ideas here about how we might properly signal our disaffection, anger, frustration over it. I am genuinely not convinced that the way to do it is deny us participation in a conference that highlights human rights. It seems to me, when you measure the U.S. record against every other country in the world, we are the leader on human rights. It has been the United States, among all of the industrial countries, that has tried to assert human rights as a part of our foreign policy and also as a part of our efforts to do business in other parts of the world.

I think it is fair to say that many of our allies—many of our closest allies, our best friends in the international arena—have been very slow to come to the level of international concern for human rights that we have tried to exhibit in public policy.

For the United States to take an action that willfully deprives us of our own voice in the international arena, seems to me to be a very shortsighted, shoot-yourself-in-the-foot, try-to-conduct-diplomacy-with-one-foot-

nailed-to-the-floor approach. It just does not make sense.

In many ways, I suspect that China is apprehensive about the holding of this conference in Beijing. This cannot, in the midst of their transition, be a very stable time for them to have thousands of women from around the world descending on their capital, with all of the media from the world attendant, all listening to comparative analyses of the rights that are afforded to citizens in each of those present countries. If we just step up and take ourselves out of the picture, what we are doing is denying ourselves our own role of leadership. We are denying ourselves a voice at the conference. I suspect we are playing right into the hands of those who would love to have a low-key, noncontroversial, nonconfrontational, nonsubstantive conference. If you want to have that, then let us come to the floor of the Senate and deny American women, who have been preparing for this for years—literally—the right to go to Beijing and hold up the record of the Chinese on human rights for all the world to see.

It just does not make sense. I would be in favor of coming to the floor and finding a means, as President Clinton has exhibited a willingness to do, to try to do something that puts teeth in the policy, and that literally matters more. To pick the women's conference and suggest that somehow that matters in a major way to the Chinese leadership is to misread China and, I think, to misread opportunity.

President Clinton, I read today, has already said he is not willing to sit down and meet with the President of China unless Harry Wu is free. There are many other ways for us to come to the floor and leverage Harry Wu's freedom, and we ought to. We ought to do that. But it seems to me this is one of the weakest and most tangential of the ways of doing it.

For those who want to read mischief into this amendment, it is not hard to do that. There are a lot of people who have never approved of U.S. participation in the women's conference. There are people who tried to stop participation at the Nairobi conference, if I recall correctly. There are people who have objected to the notion that we would get together and talk about family planning and other such issues important to women or women's rights.

So I rather suspect there is more to this amendment than Harry Wu's freedom. If Harry Wu's freedom is really what this amendment is about, then we can find a much more forceful and intelligent way of putting that issue before the U.S. Senate. But to deny ourselves, as I say, our own participation as a leader in human rights and an opportunity to go to Beijing and hold up for all the world to see the degree to which China is lacking with respect to that, I think is just a very weak and negligible, unimportant way to approach this particular issue. I hope colleagues will recognize that there are

other amendments which will afford them the opportunity to vote on some legitimate and important way of signaling our displeasure with the detention of Harry Wu. I do not think this is the method. I hope there will be more said on that as we go down the road.

I reserve further time to speak on that as we progress. I see other colleagues are here on the floor, so I will yield the floor for now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise as an original cosponsor of the amendment that has been offered by the Senate majority leader. I speak today as one of, I think, the Senate's strongest advocates of the U.N. Conference on Women. But it is precisely because of the conference's importance that I support the distinguished majority leader's amendment to call on the President, really, in essence, not to send an official delegation to that conference until Harry Wu is released.

Frankly, this is what it is all about. It is about Harry Wu. And it is also about principle and at what point do we stand up and support principle.

As we debate this issue, we are really speaking about one of our most courageous citizens, who continues to be unjustly incarcerated in China. Today, Chinese authorities are violating his most fundamental human rights and are threatening his very life with a trumped-up charge of espionage, which, in China, is a capital crime.

We face a critical juncture in our relations with the People's Republic of China. Given China's gross violation of Harry Wu's rights and privileges as an American, I certainly cannot support this country's participation in the women's human rights conference that is set to get underway on September 4. What kind of message does it send? That is exactly what China wants. China wants to have it both ways. They want to be able to have Harry Wu in prison and, at the same time, as their backdrop will be this human rights conference. It is a conference on women and it is a conference on human rights. I have been very much a supporter of that conference.

So I hope no one will question my motivations as to why I am supporting this amendment, and I am a cosponsor. Because at some point I believe you have to support principle. Yes, sometimes this is discomfoting. Some people say this is just what China wants. I hardly believe that.

China wants to be able to do that in spite of keeping Harry Wu in prison. They want to be able to have credibility and look at the international community as having their human rights conference in China in spite of the fact they have grossly violated Harry Wu's rights.

That is what this is all about. And what kind of message will we be sending? I know everybody is in a quandary as to what to do, understandably so. But sometimes you finally meet the

bottom line, and you say, "We cannot do it." No, the First Lady should not attend the conference. But we should not send an American delegation. That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. KERRY. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Ms. SNOWE. I would like to finish my statement.

I think that it would be simply wrong because of the issue of Harry Wu's rights. What he has attempted to do is to have the tragedies exposed, the gross violations of human rights that have occurred in China. He has risked his life. I think we ought to learn from that.

I would like to quote for you from his book "Bitter Wind." It was published in 1994. In discussing his decision to return to China in 1991 to film his famed exposé, "The China Secret Prison Facilities," he wrote in 1991:

I married, and for the first time I found deep personal happiness. But just 4 months later I arranged to travel back to China. Outside China much was known about the Nazi concentration camps and about the Soviet gulag, but almost no information was available about the carefully developed system of forced labor that had kept millions of Chinese citizens incarcerated in brutal and dehumanizing conditions, frequently without sentence or trial. Returning to China meant risking my own rearrest and reimprisonment. Perhaps I would once again disappear. Even though I had wanted to forget the suffering of the past after arriving in the United States and had wanted to heal the wounds in my heart, the 19 years of sorrow would not stop returning to my mind. I could not forget those who still suffer inside the camps. If I did not undertake this task, I asked, who would? I felt a responsibility not just to disclose but to publicize the truth about the Communist Party's mechanism of control. Whatever the risk to me, whatever the discomfort of telling my story, each time I revisited my past, I hoped it would be the last time. But I had decided that my experiences belong not only to me and not only to China's history, they belonged to humanity.

Well, Harry Wu is an American. He belongs not only to us, not only to those he left behind to China's gulag, but he also belongs to humanity. And that is why we have to take every necessary step possible to get Harry Wu released.

When it comes to the conference, yes, there are a number of important issues. I have been a supporter of all the previous conferences, and I have been engaged in providing input on the development of the agenda. But I think there is a time that we have to make certain decisions as a country.

There was great reluctance to have this conference in Beijing because of obvious reasons—the country's severe restrictions on human rights and most basic freedoms of speech and press. We also know what China has done to governmental organizations. They have basically placed their conference about 75 miles away from Beijing with a great deal of confusion and restrictions upon accreditation of the various representatives who are seeking to go to that conference, as well, which will

occur a week before the conference on women.

So there have been a number of attempts to encroach on the ability of those people who want to attend, and certainly their ability to participate in the conference, in making it obviously very difficult.

But above and beyond everything else is looking at what Harry Wu represents and what he has done. Frankly, I just cannot imagine China as a backdrop for this conference at a time in which Harry Wu is in prison.

So I think it is important to take this step. It is one that I do not take lightly. I gave it a great deal of thought. But I think that we can do no less in making a very strong statement about how we feel as a nation toward China's treatment toward one of our citizens, but to anyone.

So that is why I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KERRY. I wonder why the Senator does not feel that—recognizing the fact that the United Nations and the United States signed off on the location, and the location issue is sort of behind us—why the Senator would not feel that having an American presence there which, on a daily basis, raised the issue of Harry Wu before the conference, which required the conference to deal with Harry Wu's detention, which used this platform as a means of underscoring, would not be stronger than simply denying ourselves our own presence.

It will not stop the conference. The conference will go on. Everyone else will be there. And they will not raise this issue necessarily as vociferously and as passionately as we might.

So why would we not be better off directing our delegation to raise it on a daily basis and pass a resolution from this conference with respect to Harry Wu?

Ms. SNOWE. I say to the Senator that I happen to think we have different opinions on the subject, but I happen to think that this will enhance China's credibility in the international community to hold this conference. Frankly, I think China would find it very difficult if the conference was not held in Beijing. I think that happens to be a stronger statement, in my opinion, than holding the conference—and certainly China would view it and interpret it as suggesting that in spite of what they have done, they are still holding this conference in this country. Mind you, Beijing was on the list as the next country in line to hold the conference. There was reluctance even at that point at the United Nations to hold that conference in Beijing for the reasons that we all know. Now, this has happened.

I just frankly do not feel that it would be appropriate for this country to send our delegation there talking

about the very important issues but at the same time sending the message that we are still going to talk about these issues in spite of the fact that Harry Wu is in prison.

Mr. KERRY. But my question is why not send them there to talk about Harry Wu?

Ms. SNOWE. They have an agenda. I have a letter here.

Mr. KERRY. They can talk about Harry Wu. The conference is going to happen. The Senator keeps talking as if we are not participating.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Senator asked a question. Let the Senator from Maine respond.

Ms. SNOWE. Harry Wu is an American citizen. So, therefore, we have an obligation or responsibility to make those determinations as a country. I agree that is important, too.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. SNOWE. May I finish my statement? It is important for the United States to make that decision. I think it is that important, frankly, to say something about human rights. To hold a conference in a country which has violated in the worst way the human rights of an American citizen. I think that we have to stand up and be counted. It is not easy because there are many important issues on that agenda which are very important to women throughout the country. I have been a leader on those issues on international human rights for women. I put a number of provisions in the State Department authorizing bill last year on this very subject. I feel very strongly about it.

I feel very strongly about it. But I also feel very strongly about what China has done to Harry Wu.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes.

Mr. KERRY. I would say to the Senator, Mr. President, there is nobody here who does not feel strongly about what they have done to Harry Wu. This is not a debate about whether Harry Wu should be left to be a prisoner or not. This is a question of what is the most efficient—

Mr. HELMS. The Senator is not asking a question.

Mr. KERRY. Does the Senator from North Carolina want me to stop—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine has yielded for a question.

Mr. KERRY. I was in the midst, I thought, Mr. President, of asking a question.

I ask the Senator if she does not realize from the writings of Harry Wu and the risks that Mr. Wu has been willing to take that he would probably prefer that this conference took place and that it raised the issues with the United States there to raise them? And I wonder if she has thought about whether or not Harry Wu would rather have the delegation be present.

Ms. SNOWE. I think Harry Wu would want the United States to stand up for

him, and I happen to think—again, I cannot say what Harry Wu would think, but I think that China would feel very much slighted as well as insulted in the international community if the American delegation did not go to this conference; in fact, if the conference was not held at all. I think the international community should make that decision.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Ms. SNOWE. Harry Wu has given his life to expose the unspeakable crimes that not only he endured in China's prisons but what others are enduring. I think it is a slap in the face what China has done to the United States. But it is more than that. It is what they have done to an individual. And I think that we have to stand up. I would like the international community to stand up and say, no, we will hold the conference someplace else. It is inconvenient to change the location of this conference, but we are going to do it.

What kind of message would that send to China? It is obvious they want to have it both ways. Look what they did, what they released recently in a tape with Harry Wu.

Mr. KERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. SNOWE. They want to be able to show that they are evenhanded and fair.

I would be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. HELMS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Does the Senator remember my mentioning to her the visit I had with Mrs. Harry Wu, in which she asked that the U.S. delegation not be present? Does the Senator recall that meeting, that she came to my office and made that request herself? Does the Senator recall that?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes, I do, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HELMS. It is made a matter of record at this point.

Ms. SNOWE. I think that that would answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, my question to the Senator again is, when the United States takes a step unilaterally, we tend to confuse our capacity to send a message. And I ask the Senator, would she not think that if this were, indeed—this Senator would agree that if a conference as a whole were not held there or were moved, that would, indeed, be of significant implication, that that would have an impact.

Would we not be better off passing a resolution which sought a multilateral response rather than one that simply denies our own voice?

I ask the Senator, would she not then think it a better idea to find a stronger way to try to send a message?

My point is merely that this really deprives us of something and does not have the full impact. I would join the Senator if she wanted to try to change the whole location or if she suggested we should engage in a multilateral effort to see that the conference did it.

That would be a slap in the face of China.

Ms. SNOWE. I certainly would not be opposed to a multilateral response, but at the same time it should not preclude our position in terms of what we think is important for this country in the final analysis. I do not think that prevents the United States from seeking a multilateral approach in changing the site of the conference. If the other countries do not agree, then I do not think that it should prevent us from doing what we think is right.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, clearly we are not going to be prevented from what we think is right. The question is whether we can find a strong and forcible best means of sending this message. I simply ask the Senator whether or not that or a number of other methods I might add might not strike more at something meaningful to China than taking away the single, strongest human rights voice in the world from a conference that they are trying to frustrate anyway? This plays right into their hands.

The reason it has been moved, the reason that there are so many difficulties with accreditation is that the leadership fears this conference. And here we are coming along and adding to that.

I ask the Senator why we strike in a way that somehow nails our own foot to the floor rather than theirs?

Ms. SNOWE. I would answer the Senator by saying that it is remarkably striking that China sought to do what it did in face of the fact it very much wanted to have the conference. That is why I happen to believe that precluding our delegation from attending the conference or even having the conference there, sure, that would be the best of all worlds, but we cannot depend upon that response in the final analysis. We certainly should encourage it and prevail upon other countries. And I do not say that we should take that as a position as well. But I do not think we should then say we are going to attend the conference if we cannot change the site of that conference.

I just happen to think it is amazing that China would do this in light of the fact it very much wanted to have the conference. It was very eager to host that conference. And there was a question as to whether or not to even host that conference in Beijing to begin with, let alone before all this developed. But I think it makes a mockery of the very purpose of that conference.

That is what I happen to believe. And I feel very strongly about the issues which are on that agenda to empower women throughout the world on a host of issues that I have worked on personally. But I also think we have to stand up and be counted. There is always a reason why we cannot do something—well, it is better for us. This is what China wants.

We have heard that before, but it has not stopped China.

Has it stopped China? No. It has not stopped China from doing a number of

things recently that certainly have been an affront to our policies and what we stand for. And at what point do we demand something in return when it comes to human rights? I just happen to think the conference should not go on, no. But I certainly do not think that we should attend that conference.

That is what I happen to think. That is what I think happens to be the strongest message and that is why I am supporting this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NICKLES). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, changing the venue on the Beijing conference is an absolute impossibility, and I am sure my well-informed colleague from Massachusetts knows that. At this point, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished majority leader that the strongest means of sending a message from the United States is to do it unilaterally because we really do not have any other choice.

Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's second-degree amendment to the majority leader's underlying amendment.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will not be long in discussing my amendment. I thought about it when I read the Washington Times this morning and saw the headline, "U.N.'s Deadbeat Diplomats Owe Millions." Then the subhead says, "African Nations Ring Up Largest Debts to New York Shops, Banks, and Lenders."

In that, Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali said in a report to the Committee on Relations with the Host Country, and I quote him:

Non-payment of just debts reflects badly on the entire diplomatic community and tarnishes the image of the United Nations itself.

Then the Washington Times went on to say:

The topic is so sensitive around the United Nations that, until recently, the problem was not publicly mentioned. But the secrecy and inaction have allowed the debt to grow to \$9 million from the previous balance of just \$1.1 million in 1990; it swelled by nearly \$2 million in the past half-year alone.

I ask unanimous consent that this entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, in general, the pending second-degree amendment to the Dole amendment addresses the debt owed to the United States, or to private enterprises of our country, by deadbeat U.N. diplomats who just do not pay their bills. They owe over \$9 million for late payments or failure to pay at all on rent and everything else imaginable that these deadbeats have purchased or contracted for.

That reminds me of an amendment that I offered last year that required diplomats right here in the District of Columbia, as well as other places, to pay up on the parking fines owed to the District of Columbia. I am proud to say that it worked because they were in deep, deep trouble if they did not pay.

This amendment is just about the same. It sheds sunshine on those diplomats who choose to ignore paying their just debts, as Boutros Boutros-Ghali described it in his statement as quoted in the newspaper this morning.

I think that the publicity may embarrass these people into paying these bills. If not, this second-degree amendment to the Dole amendment will certainly prompt their attention. Since the Secretary General has refused to identify any of the diplomats or the missions that owe money, it is up to the U.S. Congress to urge him to do so in a very forceful way. If this provision is adopted, as I hope it will be, the deadbeats in the United Nations will be known by one and all, and they will be embarrassed into paying their bills.

The yeas and nays have not been obtained on either amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HELMS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there appears not to be a sufficient second.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Dole amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to it being in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the first-degree amendment? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Times, July 31, 1995]  
U.N.'S DEADBEAT DIPLOMATS OWE MILLIONS  
AFRICAN NATIONS RING UP LARGEST DEBTS TO  
NEW YORK SHOPS, BANKS, LANDLORDS

(By Catherine Toups)

NEW YORK.—If the peace-keeping failures of Bosnia and Somalia haven't brought enough shame on the United Nations, U.N. officials fear that deadbeat diplomats will.

Hiding behind the shield of diplomatic immunity, diplomats and missions posted to the United Nations have accrued more than \$9 million in debts to U.S. banks, landlords, hospitals, hotels, utility companies and merchants in New York City, according to a U.N. report.

And while the trickle-down economic boost of housing U.N. headquarters enriches New York City by about \$1 billion each year, diplomats are finding less of a welcome from landlords, hospitals and banks that are growing increasingly reluctant to do business with diplomats, U.N. officials said.

"The problem of diplomatic indebtedness is a matter of significant concern," Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali said in a report to the Committee on Relations With the Host Country.

"Non-payment of just debts reflects badly on the entire diplomatic community and tarnishes the image of the United Nations itself."

The topic is so sensitive around the United Nations that, until recently, the problem was not publicly mentioned. But the secrecy and inaction have allowed the debt to grow to \$9 million from just \$1.1 million in 1990; it swelled by nearly \$2 million in the past half-year alone.

Finally, at the insistence of the U.S. mission and the city of New York, the size of the debt is now public. But the names of the offending diplomats and missions are not.

Even in Mr. Boutros-Ghali's smoldering report, in which he scolds diplomats for not paying their bills and urges a "working group on indebtedness" to come up with solutions, he does not mention a single country or diplomat by name.

Mr. Boutros-Ghali also omitted the name of a prominent bank that he said will no longer make loans to diplomats or missions, and he did not identify real estate agents who say they are reluctant to deal with diplomats.

Mr. Boutros-Ghali's report said 31 missions alone account for 83 percent of it. The debts range from \$200 to more than \$1.9 million, he said. About 40 percent is owed to banks, 40 percent to landlords and the rest to merchants.

"Some missions had not paid rent for two years or more," Mr. Boutros-Ghali said. "And a number of residential landlords had either lost their property or were at risk of losing it because diplomatic tenants, who could not be evicted, would neither pay their rent nor leave the property."

Sources familiar with the issue say the top debtor missions are Sierra Leone, Congo, Zaire, Liberia and the Central African Republic.

"The vast majority of the 184 missions in New York and their over 1,800 diplomats honor their obligations," the secretary-general said.

Political and economic instability back home is part of the problem, the U.N. chief said in his report. But he also blamed some of the debt on bad fiscal management of missions and individual diplomats.

There is a certain irony to the United Nations scolding deadbeat diplomats. The world body itself is far from solvent because of member nations that fail to pay assessments in full or on time (the United States is first on that list).

The organization already owes more than \$800 million to troop-contributing nations for peacekeeping operations, a debt that is expected to reach \$1 billion by the end of the year.

The United Nations has also been accused of mismanagement and waste throughout its history, leading to periodic reforms, including several in the past year.

Several diplomats on the Committee on Relations With the Host Country, which handles problems between missions and the United States, have argued against making a public issue of diplomatic indebtedness for fear it will spark hostility against the diplomatic community.

A December 1993 New York Times article about delinquent parking tickets by diplomats prompted hundreds of complaints from New York residents who said diplomats don't deserve the privileges they have.

Russian delegates on the committee lobbied against publishing the names of deadbeat diplomats and missions, saying the

problem is a private matter between the United States and the debtors.

"It would politicize the problem and would not help to solve it," said Sergei Ordzhonikidze of the Russian mission. "In diplomacy, it is important to be discreet."

Mr. Boutros-Ghali has asked the "working group on indebtedness" to look into several options to resolve the problem.

Ideas included creating an "emergency" fund, establishing group health insurance programs, giving debtors, short-term jobs at the Secretariat to earn extra money and creating information programs alerting missions to the high costs of living in New York.

But giving jobs to diplomats in "acute distress" financially was deemed unworkable and the idea of an emergency fund was also rejected. A representative of France on the committee suggested that for the cast-strapped United Nations to create a document publicizing the names of individual debtors and debt-ridden mission might be too political and "should be avoided."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Carolina, I think he is correct to bring this question of debt before the U.S. Senate. I think it is an important issue. The question is whether we should not withhold the amount of money commensurate with what the debt is reported to be rather than more than twice that amount, because we already have arrearages on peacekeeping, a significant amount of financial issues.

I respectfully suggest that it may be possible, let us say, with a \$10 million figure, to leverage the same response, which I suspect the Secretary of State would be willing to try to elicit as rapidly as possible, rather than withholding twice the amount of money. I wonder if he would consider modifying it to that effect.

Mr. HELMS. I will say to the Senator, of course I cannot, save by unanimous consent, modify the amendment, but if he wishes to offer such an amendment by unanimous consent, I will certainly agree to it.

Mr. KERRY. I think we can amend it by unanimous consent.

Mr. HELMS. Of course. Yes. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the amendment to be proposed under unanimous consent previously discussed is certainly agreeable with me, and I hope the Senator will offer it.

AMENDMENT NO. 2026, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second-degree amendment of the Senator from North Carolina be modified to read \$10 million. I send it to the desk.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before it is reported, this presumes that the Senator from Massachusetts has agreed

that we shall have a vote on these two amendments this evening.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I cannot personally agree to that at this point in time.

Mr. HELMS. I am not asking you to agree for the Senate, the Democrats in the Senate, I am asking if that means that you are in favor of it.

Mr. KERRY. I do not have a problem with a vote, but others do at this moment. I have to represent them as the manager. I am representing that I cannot agree at this point in time to have the vote this evening.

Mr. HELMS. May I ask the Senator, is this what we should expect for important legislation which is before the Senate—

Mr. KERRY. I think the Senator knows—

Mr. HELMS. Let me finish my question. This has been the experience on every piece of legislation we have had.

Mr. KERRY. Let me interrupt my friend. I may save him—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will Senators please yield? The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. HELMS. All the people all over the country, the American people, are wondering why the Senate is so far behind the House in the conduct of legislation. The answer to that is, and somebody needs to say it, that there is a deliberate determination to forbid, delay, or obfuscate every piece of legislation that has been brought up. And I want to know before the clerk reports this modification whether we can expect the vote this evening on the Dole amendment and the Helms second-degree amendment as modified? I want an answer to that, and I suggest the absence of a quorum while the Democrats discuss that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask my friend to withhold.

Mr. HELMS. No, I will not. I want to know whether we are going to have a vote this evening or whether it is going to be held up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we could have saved this entire exchange and quorum call if I had been permitted to simply say to my friend 4 minutes ago that the issue is not whether we will have a vote; the only question, as is normal in the Senate, is the timing. But because I was precluded from saying that, in order that the country can get a message about how we can never pass anything here, we get into these tangles. I wanted to only say to my friend the issue is when, not whether.

I do not know when every Senator will be back. Some are with the Presi-

dent. Some are with the National Governors Association. As soon as they get back from a day's work elsewhere in the country, they will be available to vote. That is normal procedure in the Senate.

My No. 2 response is that this Senator remembers last year very well. I will never forget it as long as I am in the U.S. Senate and privileged to be here. Vote after vote, bill after bill was brought forward in good faith, and it was stopped dead in its tracks by a conscious gridlock policy. So I am never going to stand here and hear any colleague on the other side talk about the delay or the problems of proceeding forward.

Every good-faith effort of Senator Mitchell to move the Senate forward was frustrated, and everybody knows that. Piece of legislation after piece of legislation that passed here went over to the House and came back—dead, dead, dead. So I am not going to hear anybody talk about a legitimate delay effort in the first 2 hours to legislate on this bill. If there is, we will sit here in quorum call for several days. Let us agree to that. That is just unfounded, uncalled for, unnecessary, and I think, frankly, out of order in the first hour and a half of this effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification pending at the desk?

Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2026), as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the pending amendment, add the following:

**SEC. . UNITED NATIONS DIPLOMATIC DEBTS.**

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1996 in section 201 and section 301, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of State reports to the Congress:

(1) the names of diplomatic personnel accredited to the United Nations or foreign missions to the United Nations, which have accrued overdue debts to businesses and individuals in the United States; and

(2) that the United Nations Secretary General is cooperating fully with the United States or taking effective steps on his own, including publishing the names of debtors, to resolve overdue debts owed by diplomats and missions accredited to the United Nations.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, tomorrow in Brunei, the Secretary of State is going to meet with Chinese foreign minister Qian Qichen to discuss a very serious rift between China and the United States which has been brewing for some time and which has more



recently erupted over the visit of President Lee of Taiwan to the United States.

My colleagues, I think, are fully aware of the importance of the China-American relationship. In my view, it is the single most bilateral relationship the United States has.

Whether that characterization is correct, it is clear, Mr. President, that China is the key to Asia. It is the largest country, one of the fastest growing in the world. If our relationship with China and Asia is secure, then our relationship with Asia, for the most part, is secure.

If that relationship begins to spiral downward, as it has in recent months, then it portends terrible things for the United States—terrible things not only for our bilateral relationship, but for peace in the world.

Now, Mr. President, the problem with one of these relationships, when it begins to go sour, as our relationship with the People's Republic of China has begun to do, it begins to get a momentum of its own; portent of evil becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, tempers become frayed, pride gets in the way, insults—whether intended or unintended—are imagined in every bit of conduct. Sometimes the downward spiral can get out of control.

Mr. President, this is a very, very serious matter, our relationship with China. It has been written about by people from both sides of the aisle, whether in Congress or out of Congress.

This meeting in Brunei is, therefore, a vitally, vitally important meeting. I have high hopes that from this meeting we can at least begin a process that will relieve our relationship with the People's Republic of China. Our relationship with the People's Republic of China is much broader and much more difficult than the detention of one American citizen, Harry Wu.

While we all are very concerned about that, Mr. President, the solution to that problem will not solve the whole relationship. It is a much, much, by many orders of magnitude, bigger problem than the problem of Harry Wu, as important as that may be.

Mr. President, I can think of nothing more unwise to do than to start legislating or making expressions about the Harry Wu situation on the eve of the meeting between our Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China.

I believe, Mr. President, that both the United States and the People's Republic of China are trying to find ways to get this relationship back on track; trying to find ways, consistent with the principles of both countries, consistent with our long-held commitment to human rights, consistent with the importance of this relationship, consistent with China's determination that its "one China policy" be maintained as it has from the time of the Shanghai communique up to, I believe, the present day.

I believe both parties, both the United States and the People's Republic of

China, are searching for the way to bring that relationship back together. To do so takes diplomacy that is most subtle and requiring the greatest degree of expertise of any kind of relationship we have. It does, in fact, deal with not only fundamental interests of both countries, but the pride, the feeling, the emotion contained on both sides of the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. President, I hope we will let this diplomacy, so vital to the basic interests of this country, play out and not try to sour the atmosphere in which that relationship will take place.

I believe that, if we enact this amendment, as easy as it sounds in its terms, as innocent as it sounds from the way it is written up, I believe the adoption of this kind of amendment would really sour the atmosphere, would be poking the People's Republic of China in the eye to make it much more difficult for our Secretary of State and the Chinese Foreign Minister to get this relationship back together.

I repeat, Mr. President, I believe this relationship is the most important bilateral relationship that this country has. China will, shortly after the turn of the century, be the largest economy in the world. It is the largest country in the world. Its power, both economically and in a military way, is growing every day. The latter, alarmingly so.

If we can just somehow get our relationship back together, reassure the Chinese that we are not trying to contain them, as some people in the United States say, if we can reassure them that our relationship will be one of friendship, consistent with our strong commitment to human rights, but nevertheless a relationship of friendship, I believe it is in the vital interests of the United States for that to take place. I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that we will not adopt the Dole amendment this evening or at any time until the Brunei conference is completed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Louisiana. I think that Harry Wu has been treated in a dreadful manner. We all agree with that.

Of even greater importance is the relationship with China. I am reminded of the fact that the War of Jenkins' Ear, the 7-year war, started after such an incident. This could be such an incident.

The important thing is that we get on with our relationship with China and normalize our relations there.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senator from Louisiana for their comments.

Let me clarify to colleagues that this amendment does not, per se, prohibit the delegation from going. What it does is penalize, to the tune of \$3.5 million, the account from which that conference participation would be paid, or other conferences would be paid, if, in fact, the President goes ahead and sends them.

So, in effect, it is a vote by the Senate as to whether or not we believe we ought to or ought not. There is punishment in it for the President choosing to exercise his constitutional prerogatives with respect to this. It does not, per se, prevent the President from doing so.

That does not mean that we should not, nevertheless, oppose this amendment by virtue of the fact that there are stronger ways to send this message.

I think it is very, very important to understand that opposition to this particular chosen method does not signal any kind of latitude with respect to Harry Wu. It does not signal anything other than our disapproval for that situation. In fact, there may, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested, be far more effective ways to not only work his release but to deal with a host of other issues which we share with China.

In the last few months, we have been going down a road that is defined largely by our mutual misinterpretation of each other to a certain degree.

If there is any lesson that we should have learned in the last 20 years, I think it is that we are not going to unilaterally, through some very public confrontational method, alter an immediate event in China. It does not work that way. It has not worked that way along the course.

It is usually when we work a fairly fine-tuned, and over the course of a longer period of time, strategy that is very much interfaced with personal relationships and personal respect that we begin to make the most progress. Every time we step out of that, we seem to take steps backward. I think there are many ways to affect Harry Wu's status. We ought to pursue every single one of them.

To suggest that when they have already separated the nongovernmental organizations from the main U.N. conference in Beijing, and they have done that specifically to deny the capacity of the nongovernmental organizations to follow the events closely or have a major impact on them, it is clear they are already in a damage control mode.

They are trying to manage this conference in a way that minimizes particularly the capacity of American participation to have an impact.

I respectfully suggest that to have American participation leveraging Harry Wu's status, as well as the other issues, poses a far greater challenge to their ability to manage the news and the output and events than our nonparticipation.

If the conference is going to take place anyway and we are simply going to say we are not going to do this out of protest, we not only minimize our voice but we also set into place a series of events that the Senator from Louisiana has talked to, which will have a whole bunch of collateral downsides. I do not think it is smart foreign policy. I do not think it accomplishes the goal we are setting out to accomplish.



Mr. President, I ask my friend from North Carolina if we could temporarily set aside the pending amendment for further business?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two pending amendments be very temporarily laid aside, in order that we can call up the managers' amendment, which is numbered 1914, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1914

(Purpose: To make the "manager's" amendments to the bill)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 1914.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as I understand it, I say to my colleague, Senator KERRY, everything has been agreed to except the Jordan drawdown, is that correct?

I ask that be eliminated from this temporarily—and it may be reinserted at a later time by unanimous consent.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 619 be stricken from the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that modification? The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1914) as modified, is as follows:

Beginning on page 11, strike line 14 and all that follows through line 4 on page 12.

On page 13, strike lines 6 through 12 and insert the following:

**SEC. 121. LEASE-PURCHASE OF OVERSEAS PROPERTY.**

(a) AUTHORITY FOR LEASE-PURCHASE.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary is authorized to acquire by lease-purchase such properties as are described in subsection (b), if—

(1) the Secretary of State, and  
(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,

certify and notify the appropriate committees of Congress that the lease-purchase arrangement will result in a net cost savings to the Federal government when compared to a lease, a direct purchase, or direct construction of comparable property.

(b) LOCATIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—The authority granted in subsection (a) may be exercised only—

(1) to acquire appropriate housing for Department of State personnel stationed

abroad and for the acquisition of other facilities, in locations in which the United States has a diplomatic mission; and

(2) during fiscal years 1996 through 1999.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING.—Funds for lease-purchase arrangements made pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available from amounts appropriated under the authority of section 111(a)(3) (relating to the Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" account).

Beginning on page 18, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 2 on page 21 and insert the following:

**SEC. —. DIPLOMATIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROGRAM OFFICE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office (hereafter in this section referred to as "DTS-PO") has made significant enhancements to upgrade the worldwide DTS network with high speed, high capacity circuitry as well as improvements at United States embassies and consulates to enhance utilization of the network.

(2) Notwithstanding the improvements that the DTS-PO has made to the DTS network, the current management structure needs to be strengthened to provide a clearly delineated, accountable management authority for the DTS-PO and the DTS network.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—No later than three months after the date of enactment of this Act, the two agencies providing the greatest funding to DTS-PO shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress—

(1) a DTS-PO management plan—

(A) setting forth the organization, mission and functions of each major element of the DTS-PO; and

(B) designating an entity at each overseas post, or providing a mechanism for the designation of such an entity, which will be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the DTS-PO operations; and

(2) a DTS-PO strategic plan containing—

(A) future customer requirements, validated by the DTS customer organizations;

(B) a system configuration for the DTS network which will meet the future telecommunications needs of the DTS customer agencies;

(C) a funding profile to achieve the system configuration for the DTS network;

(D) a transition strategy to move to the system configuration for the DTS network;

(E) a reimbursement plan to cover the direct and indirect costs of operating the DTS network; and

(F) an allocation of funds to cover the costs projected to be incurred by each of the agencies or other entities utilizing DTS to maintain DTS, to upgrade DTS, and to provide for future demands for DTS.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Beginning on page 47, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 49, line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(ii) As used in this subparagraph:

"(I) CONFISCATED.—The term "confiscated" refers to—

"(aa) the nationalization, expropriation, or other seizure of ownership or control of property, on or after January 1, 1959—

"(AA) without the property having been returned or adequate and effective compensation provided or in violation of the law

of the place where the property was situated when the confiscation occurred; or

"(BB) without the claim to the property having been settled pursuant to an international claims settlement agreement or other recognized settlement procedure; or

"(bb) the repudiation of, the default on, or the failure to pay, on or after January 1, 1959—

"(AA) a debt by any enterprise which has been confiscated;

"(BB) a debt which is a charge on property confiscated; or

"(CC) a debt incurred in satisfaction or settlement of a confiscated property claim.

"(II) PROPERTY.—The term "property" means any property, whether real, personal, or mixed, and any present, future, or contingent right or security of other interest therein, including any leasehold interest.

"(III) TRAFFIC.—The term "traffic" means that a person knowingly and intentionally—

"(aa) sells, transfers, distributes, dispenses, brokers, manages, or otherwise disposes of confiscated property, or purchases, leases, receives, obtains control of, manages, uses, or otherwise acquires an interest in confiscated property;

"(bb) engages in a commercial activity using or otherwise benefitting from a confiscated property; or

"(cc) causes, directs, participates in, or profits from, activities of another person described in subclause (aa) or (bb), or otherwise engages in the activities described in subclause (aa) or (bb)

without the authorization of the national of the United States who holds a claim to the property.

On page 50, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—(1) The United States Embassy in each country shall provide to the Secretary of State a report listing those foreign nationals who have confiscated, converted, or trafficked in property the claim to which is held by a United States national and in which the confiscation claim has not been fully resolved.

(2) Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of those foreign nationals who—

(A) have confiscated, converted, or trafficked in property the claim to which is held by a United States national and in which the confiscation claim has not been fully resolved; and

(B) have been excluded from entry into the United States.

On page 58, line 10, insert "and" after "operations";

On page 58, strike lines 13 through 15.

On page 58, line 8, insert "relevant" after "all".

On page 59, line 9, strike "has provided, and".

On page 59, beginning on line 19, strike "for" and all that follows through "thereafter," on line 20 and insert "under this Act for each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999".

On page 104, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following new sections:

**SEC. 420. MANSFIELD FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.**

Section 253(4)(B) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6102(4)(B)) is amended by striking "certain" and inserting the following: "under criteria established by the Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs, certain allowances and benefits not to exceed the amount of equivalent".

**SEC. 421. DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY FILM ENTITLED "THE FRAGILE RING OF LIFE".**

Notwithstanding section 208 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987 (22 U.S.C. 1461-1(a)) and the second sentence of section 501 of the United States Information and Education Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461), the Director of the United States Information Agency may make available for distribution within the United States the documentary entitled "The Fragile Ring of Life", a film about coral reefs around the world.

On page 107, strike lines 3 through 6.

On page 107, line 7, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 107, line 11, strike "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 107, line 15, strike "(6)" and insert "(5)".

On page 107, line 20, strike "(7)" and insert "(6)".

On page 107, line 22, strike "(8)" and insert "(7)".

On page 112, strike lines 19 through 22.

On page 112, line 23, strike "(7)" and insert "(6)".

On page 118, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 11 on page 121.

On page 124, after line 20, insert the following:

**SEC. 618. MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT OF 1995.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Palestine Liberation Organization (in this section referred to as the "PLO") has recognized the State of Israel's right to exist in peace and security; accepted United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338; committed itself to the peace process and peaceful coexistence with Israel, free from violence and all other acts which endanger peace and stability; and assumed responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance, prevent violations, and discipline violators;

(2) Israel has recognized the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people;

(3) Israel and the PLO signed a Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements (in this section referred to as the "Declaration of Principles") on September 13, 1993, at the White House;

(4) Israel and the PLO signed an Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho Area (in this section referred to as the "Gaza-Jericho Agreement") on May 4, 1994, which established a Palestinian Authority for the Gaza and Jericho areas;

(5) Israel and the PLO signed an Agreement on Preparatory Transfer of Powers and Responsibilities (in this section referred to as the "Early Empowerment Agreement") on August 29, 1994, which provided for the transfer to the Palestinian Authority of certain powers and responsibilities in the West Bank outside of the Jericho Area;

(6) under the terms of the Declaration of Principles, the Gaza-Jericho Agreement and the Early Empowerment Agreement, the powers and responsibilities of the Palestinian Authority are to be assumed by an elected Palestinian Council with jurisdiction in the West Bank and Gaza Strip in accordance with the Interim Agreement to be concluded between Israel and the PLO;

(7) permanent status negotiations relating to the West Bank and Gaza Strip are scheduled to begin by May 1996;

(8) the Congress has, since the conclusion of the Declaration of Principles and the PLO's renunciation of terrorism, provided authorities to the President to suspend cer-

tain statutory restrictions relating to the PLO, subject to Presidential certifications that the PLO has continued to abide by commitments made in and in connection with or resulting from the good faith implementation of, the Declaration of Principles;

(9) the PLO commitments relevant to Presidential certifications have included commitments to renounce and condemn terrorism, to submit to the Palestinian National Council for formal approval the necessary changes to those articles of the Palestinian Covenant which call for Israel's destruction, and to prevent acts of terrorism and hostilities against Israel; and

(10) the President, in exercising the authorities described in paragraph (8), has certified to the Congress on four occasions that the PLO was abiding by its relevant commitments.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that although the PLO has recently shown improvement in its efforts to fulfill its commitments, the PLO must do far more to demonstrate an irrevocable denunciation of terrorism and ensure a peaceful settlement of the Middle East dispute, and in particular the PLO must—

(1) submit to the Palestine National Council for formal approval the necessary changes to those articles of the Palestinian National Covenant which call for Israel's destruction;

(2) make greater efforts to preempt acts of terror, to discipline violators, and to contribute to stemming the violence that has resulted in the deaths of 123 Israeli citizens since the signing of the Declaration of Principles;

(3) prohibit participation in its activities and in the Palestinian Authority and its successors by any groups or individuals which continue to promote and commit acts of terrorism;

(4) cease all anti-Israel rhetoric, which potentially undermines the peace process;

(5) confiscate all unlicensed weapons and restrict the issuance of licenses to those with legitimate need;

(6) transfer any person, and cooperate in transfer proceedings relating to any person, accused by Israel of acts of terrorism; and

(7) respect civil liberties, human rights and democratic norms.

(d) **AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND CERTAIN PROVISIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and for 18 months thereafter the President may suspend for a period of not more than 6 months at a time any provision of law specified in paragraph (4). Any such suspension shall cease to be effective after 6 months, or at such earlier date as the President may specify.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—

(A) **CONSULTATIONS.**—Prior to each exercise of the authority provided in paragraph (1) or certification pursuant to paragraph (3), the President shall consult with the relevant congressional committees. The President may not exercise that authority to make such certification until 30 days after a written policy justification is submitted to the relevant congressional committees.

(B) **PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION.**—The President may exercise the authority provided in paragraph (1) only if the President certifies to the relevant congressional committees each time he exercises such authority that—

(i) it is in the national interest of the United States to exercise such authority;

(ii) the PLO continues to comply with all the commitments described in subparagraph (D); and

(iii) funds provided pursuant to the exercise of this authority and the authorities

under section 583(a) of Public Law 103-236 and section 3(a) of Public Law 103-125 have been used for the purposes for which they were intended.

(C) **REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUING PLO COMPLIANCE.**—

(i) The President shall ensure that PLO performance is continuously monitored, and if the President at any time determines that the PLO has not continued to comply with all the commitments described in subparagraph (D), he shall so notify the appropriate congressional committees. Any suspension under paragraph (1) of a provision of law specified in paragraph (4) shall cease to be effective.

(ii) Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, if the President on the basis of the continuous monitoring of the PLO's performance determines that the PLO is not complying with the requirements described in paragraph (3), he shall so notify the appropriate congressional committees and no assistance shall be provided pursuant to the exercise by the President of the authority provided by paragraph (1) until such time as the President makes the certification provided for in paragraph (3).

(D) **PLO COMMITMENTS DESCRIBED.**—The commitments referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C)(i) are the commitments made by the PLO—

(i) in its letter of September 9, 1993, to the Prime Minister of Israel and in its letter of September 9, 1993, to the Foreign Minister of Norway to—

(I) recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security;

(II) accept United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338;

(III) renounce the use of terrorism and other acts of violence;

(IV) assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance, prevent violations, and discipline violators;

(V) call upon the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip to take part in the steps leading to the normalization of life, rejecting violence and terrorism, and contributing to peace and stability; and

(VI) submit to the Palestine National Council for formal approval the necessary changes to the Palestinian National Covenant eliminating calls for Israel's destruction; and

(ii) in, and resulting from, the good faith implementation of the Declaration of Principles, including good faith implementation of subsequent agreements with Israel, with particular attention to the objective of preventing terrorism, as reflected in the provisions of the Gaza-Jericho Agreement concerning—

(I) prevention of acts of terrorism and legal measures against terrorists;

(II) abstention from and prevention of incitement, including hostile propaganda;

(III) operation of armed forces other than the Palestinian Police;

(IV) possession, manufacture, sale, acquisition, or importation of weapons;

(V) employment of police who have been convicted of serious crimes or have been found to be actively involved in terrorist activities subsequent to their employment;

(VI) transfers to Israel of individuals suspected of, charged with, or convicted of an offense that falls within Israeli criminal jurisdiction;

(VII) cooperation with the Government of Israel in criminal matters, including cooperation in the conduct of investigations; and

(VIII) exercise of powers and responsibilities under the agreement with due regard to internationally accepted norms and principles of human rights and the rule of law.

(E) POLICY JUSTIFICATION.—As part of the President's written policy justification to be submitted to the relevant congressional committees pursuant to subparagraph (A), the President shall report on—

(i) the manner in which the PLO has complied with the commitments specified in subparagraph (D), including responses to individual acts of terrorism and violence, actions to discipline perpetrators of terror and violence, and actions to preempt acts of terror and violence;

(ii) the extent to which the PLO has fulfilled the requirements specified in paragraph (3);

(iii) actions that the PLO has taken with regard to the Arab League boycott of Israel;

(iv) the status and activities of the PLO office in the United States; and

(v) the status of United States and international assistance efforts in the areas subject to jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority or its successors.

(3) REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUED PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE.—Six months after the date of enactment of this Act, no assistance shall be provided pursuant to the exercise by the President of the authority provided by paragraph (1), unless and until the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that—

(A) if the Palestinian Council has been elected and assumed its responsibilities, the Council has, within a reasonable time, effectively disavowed the articles of the Palestine National Covenant which call for Israel's destruction, unless the necessary changes to the Covenant have already been submitted to the Palestine National Council for formal approval;

(B) the PLO has exercised its authority resolutely to establish the necessary enforcement institution, including laws, police, and a judicial system, for apprehending, prosecuting, convicting, and imprisoning terrorists;

(C) the PLO has limited participation in the Palestinian Authority and its successors to individuals and groups in accordance with the terms that may be agreed with Israel;

(D) the PLO has not provided any financial or material assistance or training to any group, whether or not affiliated with the PLO to carry out actions inconsistent with the Declaration of Principles, particularly acts of terrorism against Israel;

(E) the PLO has cooperated in good faith with Israeli authorities in the preemption of acts of terrorism and in the apprehension and trial of perpetrators of terrorist acts in Israel, territories controlled by Israel, and all areas subject to jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority and its successors; and

(F) the PLO has exercised its authority resolutely to enact and implement laws requiring the disarming of civilians not specifically licensed to possess or carry weapons.

(4) PROVISIONS THAT MAY BE SUSPENDED.—The provisions that may be suspended under the authority of paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) Section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2227) as it applies with respect to the PLO or entities associated with it.

(B) Section 114 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (22 U.S.C. 287e note) as it applies with respect to the PLO or entities associated with it.

(C) Section 1003 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5202).

(D) Section 37 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act (22 U.S.C. 286W) as it applies to the granting to the PLO of observer status or other official status at any meeting spon-

sored by or associated with International Monetary Fund. As used in this subparagraph, the term "other official status" does not include membership in the International Monetary Fund.

(5) RELEVANT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—As used in this subsection, the term "relevant congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Beginning on page 172, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 5 on page 173 and insert the following:

**SEC. 1110. PROCEDURES FOR COORDINATION OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL AT OVERSEAS POSTS.**

(a) AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c)(1) In carrying out subsection (b), the head of each department, agency, or other entity of the executive branch of Government shall ensure that, in coordination with the Department of State, the approval of the chief of mission to a foreign country is sought on any proposed change in the size, composition, or mandate of employees of the respective department, agency, or entity (other than employees under the command of a United States area military commander) if the employees are performing duties in that country.

"(2) In seeking the approval of the chief of mission under paragraph (1), the head of a department, agency, or other entity of the executive branch of Government shall comply with the procedures set forth in National Security Decision Directive Number 38, as in effect on June 2, 1982, and the implementing guidelines issued thereunder.

"(d) The Secretary of State, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, may accord diplomatic titles, privileges, and immunities to employees of the executive branch of Government who are performing duties in a foreign country."

(b) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES FOR COORDINATION.—(1) The President shall conduct a review of the procedures contained in National Security Decision Directive Number 38, as in effect on June 2, 1982, and the practices in implementation of those procedures, to determine whether the procedures and practices have been effective to enhance significantly the coordination among the several departments, agencies, and entities of the executive branch of Government represented in foreign countries.

(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a report containing the findings of the review conducted under paragraph (1), together with any recommendations for legislation as the President may determine to be necessary.

On page 208, strike lines 8 through 11 and insert the following:

**SEC. 1327. MIKE MANSFIELD FELLOWSHIPS.**

Part C of title II of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking "Director of the United States Information Agency" each place it

appears and inserting "Secretary of State"; and

(2) by striking "United States Information Agency" each place it appears and inserting "Department of State".

Beginning on page 216, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 22 on page 217 and insert the following:

**SEC. 1501. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED NATIONS REFORM.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the 50th anniversary of the United Nations provides an important opportunity for a comprehensive review of the strengths and weaknesses of the United Nations and for the identification and implementation of changes in the United Nations that would improve its ability to discharge effectively the objectives of the United Nations set forth in the United Nations Charter;

(2) the structure of the United Nations system, which has evolved over 50 years, should be subject to a comprehensive review in order to identify the changes to the system that will best serve the interests of the United States and of the international community;

(3) the United States, as the strongest member state of the United Nations, should lead this comprehensive review;

(4) reforms that produce a smaller, more focused, more efficient United Nations with clearly defined missions are in the interest of the United States and of the United Nations;

(5) the United States should develop a unified position in support of reforms at the United Nations that are broadly supported by both the legislative branch and the executive branch;

(6) the need for reform of the United Nations is urgent; and

(7) the failure to develop and implement promptly a strategic reorganization of the United Nations will result in a continued diminution of the relevance of the United Nations to United States foreign policy and to international politics generally.

**SEC. 1502. UNITED NATIONS REORGANIZATION PLAN.**

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—The President shall submit to Congress, together with the budget submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1997, a plan recommending a strategic reorganization of the United Nations.

(b) REQUIREMENT RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT.—The President shall develop the plan in consultation with Congress.

(c) PLAN ELEMENTS.—The plan should include the elements described in section 1503 and such other recommendations as may be necessary to achieve the efficient, cost-effective conduct of the responsibilities of the United Nations.

**SEC. 1503. CONTENTS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN.**

It is the sense of the Congress that the reorganization plan required by section 1502(a) should—

(1) constitute a comprehensive statement of United States policy toward reform of the United Nations;

(2) set forth an agenda to implement the reforms set forth in the plan in a timely manner;

(3) include specific proposals to achieve—

(A) a substantial reduction in the number of agencies within the United Nations system, including proposals to consolidate, abolish, or restructure mechanisms for financing agencies of the United Nations that have a low priority;

(B) the identification and strengthening of the core agencies of the United Nations system that most directly serve the objectives of the United Nations set forth in the United Nations Charter;

(C) the increased cooperation, and the elimination of duplication, among United Nations agencies and programs consistent with the principle of a unitary United Nations;

(D) the consolidation of the United Nations technical cooperation activities between the United Nations Headquarters and the offices of the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, including the merger of the technical cooperation functions of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF), and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM);

(E) the consolidation of the United Nations emergency response mechanism by merging the emergency functions of relevant United Nations agencies, including the United Nations Children's Fund, the World Food Program, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

(F) a substantial reduction in, or elimination of, the cost and number of international conferences sponsored by the United Nations;

(G) a significant strengthening of the administrative and management capabilities of the Secretary General of the United Nations, including a cessation of the practice of reserving top Secretariat posts for citizens of particular countries;

(H) a significant increase in the openness to the public of the budget decision-making procedures of the United Nations; and

(I) the establishment of a truly independent inspector general at the United Nations;

(4) include proposals to coordinate and implement proposals for reform of the United Nations such as those proposals set forth in the communique of the 21st annual summit of the Heads of State and Government of the seven major industrialized nations and the President of the European Commission at Halifax, Nova Scotia, dated June 15-17, 1995; and

(4) include proposals for amendments to the United Nations Charter that would promote the efficiency, focus, and cost-effectiveness of the United Nations and the ability of the United Nations to achieve the objectives of the United Nations set forth in the United Nations Charter.

On page 218, line 15, "\$30,000,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000,000".

On page 251, below line 22, add the following:

(g) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR BUDGET PURPOSES.**—(1) In addition to any other payments which an agency referred to in subsection (b) is required to make under section 4(a)(1) of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-226; 108 Stat. 114; 5 U.S.C. 8331 note), each such agency shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 9 percent of final basic pay of each employee of the agency—

(A) who, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, retires under section 8336(d)(2) of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) to whom a voluntary separation incentive payment is paid under this section by such agency based on that retirement.

(2) In addition to any other payments which an agency referred to in subsection (b) is required to make under section 4(b)(1) of such Act in fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, each such agency shall remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Civil Service

Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 0.5 percent of the basic pay of each employee of the agency who, as of March 31 of such fiscal year, is subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the head of an agency referred to in subsection (b) may not pay voluntary separation incentive payments under this section unless sufficient funds are available in the Foreign Affairs Reorganization Transition Fund to cover the cost of such payments and the amount of the remittances required of the agency under paragraphs (1) and (2).

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I want to make the record clear. The Jordan drawdown was not eliminated even temporarily at my request, but in order to facilitate the approval of the rest of the amendment 1914. So the RECORD will show that—I having said that.

I urge the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment as modified?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are going to try to work out the differences that still exist on section 619, and at some later date we may pull it up.

We are in agreement with respect to the rest of the amendment.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have a committee amendment at the desk referred to as the "manager's amendment." I understand there are no objections to this amendment and that the modifications are acceptable to the ranking member of the committee, Senator PELL. This amendment has several parts and is designed to address three issues:

First, reservations and jurisdictional concerns expressed by other Senate committees, chairmen, and ranking members;

Second; provisions objectionable to the Administration; and

Third, technical and conforming amendments to the bill, many of which were "unofficially" requested by this administration.

The amendment includes: The Middle East Peace Facilitation Act extension, a repeal of the two prison labor provisions in the bill that will satisfy Finance Committee concerns, two changes that will satisfy the budget scorekeepers on the Budget Committee, and a few other small provisions.

I urge the amendment be adopted since there are no known objections to this amendment. I hope there will be additional amendments in agreement as we proceed on debate of the measure.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1914), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERRY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1977

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the two amendments and to call up the amendment that I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I listened to our colleagues who are dealing with the measure that is at hand, and I certainly hope we will have an opportunity to dispose of those amendments in a timely fashion. I also expect to at least have an opportunity to see a disposition of the amendment which I am offering this evening on this particular piece of legislation.

I am aware, very much, that I have offered an amendment in the first-degree and it can be seconded. I am also aware, as my colleague from North Carolina was pointing out, that we are very hopeful of being able to avoid parliamentary gymnastics and to be able to get a vote on different measures that come before the Senate. I expect he will have an opportunity to get a vote on his amendment and I certainly hope to have an opportunity to have a vote on mine as well.

Mr. President, the amendment I am offering is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that calls for us to debate and vote on raising the minimum wage sometime before the end of this session of Congress.

It does not endorse any particular outcome. It does not say that we should pass S. 413, the bill Senator DASCHLE introduced in behalf of the President, or vote to raise the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour, though I strongly believe that we should. Rather, the amendment says only that the Senate should take up the issue, that we should debate it, and vote one way or the other rather than sweeping this issue under the rug and ignoring the 12 million American workers who would get a raise if the President's bill were enacted.

The appropriate level for the minimum wage is a critical issue both for the millions of low-wage workers who are directly affected by it and for the economy as a whole. Income inequality is a growing problem in the United States, and the declining purchasing power of the minimum wage is an important factor in this problem.

Mr. President, I will review for the Senate some of the most recent information that has been developed and reported in our national news magazines, as well as some of the historic trends that justify action by this particular amendment, which effectively will do for the Senate what was done earlier this year on the issue involving the gifts measure before the Senate where our colleagues got a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that we were going to vote on the gifts issue and on the lobbying legislation.

Really as a result of a good deal of focus and attention by Members who

are interested in these issues, these measures were brought up and in a remarkable sense of comity were worked out and action was taken which I think all of us think was very, very important. And we are very hopeful—I and the others who will be supporting this measure—that we will have an opportunity to do what we did some years ago in 1989–1990 when we had a Republican President and two Democratic Congresses and, initially, reservations by the Republican President. We worked on this measure. We saw the coming together of a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. That was signed into law, and was the last increase in the minimum wage, which took effect in 1991.

Now, with a Republican Senate, a Republican House and a Democratic President, we are very hopeful that we will be able to take action that will result in making this minimum wage really an American wage, a family wage, a living wage.

That is why I am hopeful that this resolution, which says that we will address this issue prior to the end of the Congress without making a definition as to what that particular amount would be, nonetheless would reflect the sense of this body, Republican and Democrat alike, because Republicans have historically worked with us to get an increase in the minimum wage.

Historically, increases in the minimum wage were signed by Republican Presidents and were sometimes supported by the Republican leadership—and we would certainly hope on an issue of fundamental fairness, fundamental justice, that we could develop that kind of comity on this resolution and then ultimately on the matter that comes before us.

Mr. President, the reason for offering this measure now is because of the scheduling reality. We will be in session two more weeks prior to the August recess. We will be back. The leader has announced that we will be addressing the welfare issue in the latter part of this week. We have a defense authorization, a defense appropriations bill, and there would not be the opportunity to have a debate and discussion on this measure, although I think it is an issue that has been addressed time and time again by the membership. It is not one that the Members are unfamiliar with. But, nonetheless, I think it is important to take just a brief period of time, whatever time the membership wants, so that we can address this issue and give an opportunity for the Members to go on record about whether we as an institution, as a Congress, should go back and address this issue as we have done on seven other occasions when we have seen an increase in the minimum wage, which is the wage for working families that work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, and try to provide food for their families, a roof for their children, to pay the mortgage, and to have some sense of hope and optimism for the future.

Mr. President, this chart reflects what happened to the incomes of families in this country from 1950 to 1978. I know that there will be those who will say, "Well, there were variations for this period of time." We may have the opportunity to come back and address that issue. We will address any of the other issues that are brought up in the course of this debate. But this is a pretty good summation, even with the rise and the fall of various recessions. And I will have other charts that will show in more careful, actual detail what happened during this period of time with the setbacks and the advances in terms of real family income.

But when you come right down to it, for close to a 30-year period—and we segment each of the incomes for the different parts of our society, dividing them into five different segments—what this chart reflects very clearly is that real family income by quintile, which is the five different segments, all went up together. The ones on the bottom, 20 percent of the family income, rose the most, rose 138 percent. Those in the second lowest went up 98 percent; the middle, some 106 percent; the fourth, 111 percent; and the top 20 percent went up to close to 100 percent.

This chart says that we developed in this country, and the American economy responded, in such a way that the income for families during this period of time, which included the increases in the minimum wage as well as other economic factors, all went along and grew together. We all made progress together, and we did it in ways that were pretty equitable in terms of the distribution of where our families were.

This, I think, is the real indication of where the country was moving as an economy. It included other forces beyond the minimum wage. But as my next chart will show, the minimum wage kept pace during this period of time to be a livable wage. It has only been in the last 10 to 12 years where there has been a serious decline in the purchasing power of the minimum wage.

Over here, we go now from 1978—this chart over here, 1979 to 1993—and it is effectively the same chart, divided again by quintile, and this chart reflects what has been happening from effectively 1979 to 1993, real family income growth by quintile.

Here we see the bottom 20 percent, those at the lower level of the economic ladder, they are not increasing. There are no blue marks here. It is increasing red marks. Their purchasing power has declined by some 17 percent during the period where there has been some very important real growth. The next 20 percent has declined by 8 percent, the middle some 3 percent, the fourth quarter has gone up 5 percent, and the largest increase has been with the wealthiest individuals.

This is a profile about what is happening in our country over a period of time in terms of real economic growth per family income.

Mr. President, it is a reminder about where we are and where we have been and where we are going.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) proposes an amendment numbered 1977.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

**SEC. .**

It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the current economic recovery has generated record profits for industry, but hourly wages have grown at a below average rate;

(2) the minimum wage has not been raised since April 1, 1991, and has lost more than 10% of its purchasing power since then;

(3) the average minimum wage worker provides 50% of her family's weekly earnings;

(4) nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults, and 60% are women;

(5) a full-time, year-round worker who is paid the minimum wage earns \$8,500 a year, less than a poverty level income for a family of two;

(6) there are 4.7 million Americans who usually work full-time but who are, nevertheless, in poverty, and 4.2 million families live in poverty despite having one or more members in the labor force for at least half the year;

(7) the 30% decline in the value of the minimum wage since 1979 has contributed to Americans' growing income inequality and to the fact that 97% of the growth in household income has accrued to the wealthiest 20%;

(8) legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour was introduced on February 14, 1995, but has not been debated by the Senate; and

(9) the Senate should debate and vote on whether to raise the minimum wage before the end of the first session of the 104th Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I indicated on the previous chart, we saw what was happening for the 30 years between 1950 and effectively 1980, and then in the last 13 years, about how we as a country in terms of our economy are effectively growing apart. Now we see the minimum wage no longer lifts families out of poverty.

Take that, and you go right back to 1960 and see what has happened now from the 1980's, which is effectively this chart over here, what has been going on up to 1995. This is effectively the red line, the minimum wage line, and the darker line is the poverty line that goes right across here on constant dollars.

Here you find that during the period of the 1960's, the 1970's, the minimum wage was just above what the poverty wage was; that is, it was a livable wage. One family could receive the minimum wage and also have a sense of respect and dignity and know that they

could effectively make it in America without being in poverty, and without being, as I will mention, a recipient of many of what we call the support systems, the safety net programs. That is an interesting sidebar to this whole issue and I will come back to that in just a minute.

Then we saw how the minimum wage effectively stayed even in the 1970's and 1980's and then gradually declined and continued to decline all the way to 1990. And this blip here was the increase in the minimum wage when President Bush in a bipartisan effort signed the minimum wage. And now we have sunk right back to where we were in 1990.

We have to ask ourselves, what is it about these working families, 12 million of whom would be affected by the increase in the minimum wage that had been supported by the President and introduced in legislation by Senator DASCHLE? What is it we are saying to them? We are saying that we effectively do not value their work; we do not respect the fact that you are prepared to go out and work 40 hours a week to try to raise your children, to try to have a sense of dignity at the time we have been seeing the expansion and the explosion in terms of the profit in our economy.

Mr. President, I have in my hand Business Week of July 10. This is not the product of someone who has been a long-time fighter for the working poor, although I take great pride in the fact that I have been for the increased minimum wage. This is Business Week magazine. This parallels two other studies, which I will refer to. This is Business Week. I will include the relevant parts in the RECORD.

This is what the cover story of Business Week, July 17, points out: "Productivity and profits are up a lot. Paychecks aren't. Is the economy changing?"

It goes on:

Four years into a recovery, companies are flourishing and joblessness is low, yet pay is inching up more slowly than the prior four recoveries.

Then it continues:

Four years into a recovery, profits are at a 45-year high

A 45-year high in terms of profits for American companies and corporations, 45-year high.

Unemployment remains relatively low, and the weak dollar has put foreign rivals on the defensive.

The fact is since this President has been elected, there has been a creation of some 8 million jobs in the period of the last 2 to 3 years, but those have not been the high-paying, good-wage, good-benefit jobs that I think most of us have associated with employment in terms of the strongest industrial country and strongest economy in the world.

This is how Business Week continues in its article:

Yet U.S. companies continue to drive down costs as if the economy still were in a tail-

spin. Many are tearing up pay systems and job structures, replacing them with new ones that slice wage rates, slice raises and subcontract work to lower-paying suppliers. The result seems to defy the law of supply and demand. While companies prosper, inflation-adjusted wages and benefits are climbing at less than half the pace of the previous expansion.

Then it continues:

Today even the incomes of many white collar employees are sliding and labor's share has slumped to levels last seen 30 years ago despite substantial productivity growth. These trends have been dragging down the economy through the recovery.

Then it continues:

But how long must we wait for productivity gains to boost living standards?

What we are talking about here are living standards. We are talking about families being able to educate their children. We are talking about families being able to try to meet some of the needs of their parents, who are going to feel the pressures in terms of the Medicare cuts. We are talking about families being able to afford the mortgage and to be able to enjoy their own future with some degree of security. Now, this is what is happening.

But how long must we wait for productivity gains to boost living standards? At this point in previous business cycles gains from increased efficiencies would already have started to wind their way through the economy. But after closely tracking each other for decades, wage gains are now lagging behind productivity growth.

We might have to talk about that in the Chamber, but all you have to do is ask any working family what has been happening to their real income over the period of the last 15 years. Dramatic change, and it has been a downward one.

The combination of subpar pay gains and fewer wage earners has already bitten deeply into pocketbooks. Per capita disposable personal income has crawled along at 1.5 percent a year over inflation in this recovery, half the average of prior ones.

What this article is pointing out is generally we have had recessions in other periods of time in the last 40 or 50 years, but what is happening now is even though there is the creation of additional jobs, the income is not there for those new workers. And one of the principal reasons for the fact it is not there is because we have not met our responsibilities of trying to make sure that work pays in our country, that men and women who are prepared to work, will work, are able to receive that livable wage.

"Sooner or later," the article continues, "the promise of this economic strategy has to be fulfilled for the majority of Americans. The sight of bulging corporate coffers coexisting with continuous stagnation in American's living standards could become politically untenable."

Mr. President, as we have seen in other parts of the magazine, we can say, well, what is happening to the stock market? That has been going up. But we know who participates in the

stock markets—certainly not those who for the most part are in middle incomes. Once again, here it is going up through the roof. So corporate profits and CEO salaries have been going up through the roof, the stock markets are going up through the roof, and the minimum wage has been in a continuing and constant decline.

Mr. President, all we are saying is that we are entitled to try to bring that minimum wage back on up to make sure that American families who want to work and can work are going to be able to provide for themselves.

Mr. President, I will take just a moment or two of the Senate's time to review with the Senate an historical analysis of what has happened when we have had an increase in the minimum wage, because we are going to hear a lot of voices out here about we cannot afford an increase in the minimum wage because it is going to cost jobs; we cannot afford to raise the minimum wage because there is going to be inflation.

Well, the fact is that is great rhetoric. I took the time, after the last debate we had in the late 1980's, and just reread the debate during the 1930's, 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's, and you could just substitute the names because the speeches were virtually identical, with everyone saying we just cannot afford to do it; we are just beginning to make the economy go and here you are going to go out there and try to undermine our economy with an increase in the minimum wage. They said it last time. We increased it in 1990, and we have seen since 1992 the growth of 8 million jobs.

Mr. President, I will take just a few more moments. I see my colleagues waiting. I would just like to point out what has happened historically with the minimum wage because we will have study after study after study after study out here. And I will include some of the most recent studies that I think have been so compelling. There will be others who will try to flyspeck those studies, the study particularly with regard to New Jersey, which is a very interesting and a very positive one. But the one thing you have to recognize is the historical analysis of the increase in the minimum wage. This is history. This is what has happened. This is not some study by one of these organizations for the various industries that have been historically opposed to any increase in the minimum wage. This is the historical analysis of what has happened to our economy on the issue of employment when we have seen the increase in the minimum wage. This is what we have seen. It goes back to 1949 when the minimum wage rose from 40 cents to 75 cents; unemployment decreased.

In 1955, unemployment decreased from 4.4 to 4.1 percent.

From 1961 to 1963, from \$1 to \$1.25; unemployment decreased from 6.7 to 5.5 percent.

From 1967 to 1968, \$1.25 to \$1.60; unemployment decreased from 3.8 percent to 3.5 percent.

During the seventies, 1974 to 1976, 655,000 new jobs, despite the recession; retail employment increased 5.2 percent. They are the principal ones opposed to any kind of increases.

From 1978 to 1981, employment increased by 8 million jobs, including 1.4 million retail jobs. You go from \$2.30 to \$3.35 in 1990, \$3.35 to \$4.25, despite the severe recession from 1988 to 1992.

We had it up in my part of the country, New England. With 4 percent of the Nation's population, we lost 20 percent of the Nation's jobs; 20 percent of the Nation's jobs we lost. We are beginning to come back. The tragedy is, those are not nearly as good jobs as they should be. But despite the severe recessions that we had, we have seen the dramatic growth of these jobs.

Mr. President, this is the record. Not only on the question of the minimum wage and what has happened to employment, but also with respect to inflation—these are the two arguments that they use.

We will hear later on how it is going to be harmful to black teenagers. We are about a couple hours away until somebody brings that argument out. These are the standard arguments.

I see my two colleagues. Go back and read the history on these things. You see the same old arguments that come up.

What has happened on the question of inflation is that we have seen, with the increase of 1949, an increase of 1 percent; in the sixties, less than .3 of 1 percent; stability here; from 1974 to 1976 inflation actually decreased; then it increased marginally and then decreased; and then from 1990 to 1991, it decreased from 5.4 to 4.2 percent.

So, Mr. President, I know that there are those who are going to come out here and argue with the Business Week analysis in terms of what has been happening in America: Companies and corporations where the profits are going up, the stock market is going up, their productivity increasing. The one thing they ought to recognize, which in Business Week is clear as can be, and is something every worker understands, is that real purchasing power for workers is going down.

I hope that our colleagues will not use those worn-out old arguments about the problems that we are facing in inflation and the problems that we are going to be facing in terms of unemployment, because the record, which is the most important record—and that is the historic record—just does not justify it. We have demonstrated and seen this, Mr. President, and we believe that now is the time to make sure that men and women who are out there working, and working hard, trying to make ends meet, trying to bring up a family are going to be able to experience some hope and opportunity.

Finally, Mr. President, one point that I want to mention on this chart

for all of our Members—and we do not come to this consideration very frequently—if you start paying the American people a livable wage, do you know what happens? They lose their eligibility for support systems. Do you know what that means? That means the general taxpayer pays less, that they do not have to support the various support programs, which are the WIC Program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, fuel oil programs, other kinds of support programs. You pay the American workers, who are working and trying to pay for their own living, and they lose their eligibility for those support programs and that saves billions of dollars—billions of dollars.

Who pays for those billions of dollars? It is the workers. This makes sense if you are for deficit reduction, if you want to lower the tax program on workers because if they pay the minimum wage, they lose their eligibility and you begin to save the billions of dollars.

This makes sense. It makes sense as a matter of decency and fairness, as part of our commitment that has been there for some 50 years, where we are going to honor work and say to men and women who want to work, can work, and will work that they ought to have an American wage that says that they can provide for their family and for their future, that they are going to be able to educate their children.

That has been true all the way through the forties, fifties, sixties, all the way through the seventies, and it has only been in the recent years that we have seen this abdication of responsibility to working families.

Right in the face of this, Mr. President, are the various reports—I have colleagues on the floor now—but I will review the Bureau of Labor Statistics report from just last week, and another very, very important study that reaches this very same conclusion.

These workers are entitled to be a part of the American system. They have been left out and left behind. We have to ask ourselves who will speak for them. At other times, we have come together, Democrats and Republicans alike, in order to make sure that those families that want to work can work, are proud to work, are playing by the rules, trying to bring up their children, are going to be able to live in some dignity. That is what the increase in the minimum wage is about.

We invite our colleagues to support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution so that families will know that we are serious in making sure that for working families, work pays in America and that we honor work.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, if I may follow immediately on what Senator KENNEDY just talked about, this Friday we are going to be taking up welfare reform. Ninety-five percent of what we

hear about as welfare reform is not welfare reform. It is just moving the boxes around, shifting responsibility to States and doing some things like that. Real welfare reform has to deal with the problem of jobs and the problem of poverty, and this is an issue that deals with the problem of poverty.

Why do we have this distribution problem in our society today? I think there are three basic reasons. One is people are not as well prepared as they should be. As Secretary of Labor Bob Reich says over and over—and he is right on this—if you are well prepared, technology is your friend; if you are not well prepared, technology is your enemy.

A second reason we do not have the distribution factor that we should have in our society today is that labor union membership is dramatically lower in our country than any other Western industrialized democracy. George Shultz, former Secretary of State and former Secretary of Labor under Republican administrations, made a speech in which he said all of us, management and labor and everybody, ought to be concerned about the low percentage of workers belonging to labor unions. It is not a healthy thing for our society. If you exclude the governmental unions, it is down to 11.8 percent. That is a factor.

But a third factor in the distribution matter is the minimum wage. We simply have not kept up with the inflation factor, and it is a problem.

In addition to the factors that Senator KENNEDY mentioned, where we save money in terms of AFDC and that sort of thing, the earned income tax credit, we have 11 million Americans who will benefit from increasing the minimum wage 45 cents a year for 2 years, a total of 90 cents, and many of them will not get as much money on the earned income tax credit. So there will be a dollar savings, in very real terms, for the Federal Government.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. SIMON. I am pleased to yield to my colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see my friend from Minnesota here, as well. Does the Senator understand what it is about the institution, the Congress, that says that we are going to refuse to have any increase in the minimum wage or even to consider it, and we are cutting back on the earned-income tax credit that benefits only the individual workers that make some \$26,000 a year or less?

What is it about this institution that says that workers who are making less than \$26,000, including the earned-income tax credit, ought to have their taxes increased, and yet we refuse to grant an increase in the minimum wage when we have a historic low, and at the same time we are talking about tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals, who are at the top levels of our economy, who are right up here and giving them, for the most part, a \$245 billion tax reduction? Does the Senator find



some difficulty in understanding why that series of policy decisions would make sense for working families in this country?

Mr. SIMON. Well, in response to that question, which is an extremely important question for the American people, obviously it does not make sense. It is a response that grows out of something—and I know the Senator from Massachusetts feels very strong about this—it grows out of something that we ought to deal with, but we duck in Congress—that is, our system of financing campaigns. I join the Senator from Minnesota, and I applaud him for his leadership on what we did on gifts and limiting on the lobbyists. But, frankly, that is 1 percent of the reform we need. Ninety-nine percent of the reform is on our system of financing campaigns.

If you have 20 individuals who are very wealthy in this country, who wanted some modest change in the law, who sent a \$1,000 campaign contribution to every Member of the U.S. Senate, I have an idea—unless it was an egregious request—that request would receive very sympathetic attention. We have 11 million people who will benefit by an increase in the minimum wage, who, because of their situation, cannot give a campaign contribution to anyone, and we are reluctant to respond. I hope we will.

Let me just add for the benefit of the Presiding Officer—and I see my friend from Kansas on the floor here, too—the last time we increased the minimum wage, it passed 89-8 in the Senate, with 36 Republicans voting for it. This should not be a partisan thing. We ought to improve the lot of people who are really struggling. Are we going to be sensitive to that? I think that is the fundamental question. Are we going to be sensitive to people who really are struggling in our society? I hope we come up with the right answer.

I am pleased to have the Senator from Massachusetts offering this amendment, and what he is really calling on us to do is prod our consciences a little bit, do what we ought to do for the people in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Minnesota, who are just eking out an existence, who do not know how they are going to make the next rental payment, or how they are going to feed their family, until they get paid on Friday. These are people we have to be concerned about. They do not make big campaign contributions to us. But that is what we ought to be here for. Those are the people we ought to be here for.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his remarks. I have said it to him many times, I am going to really miss him. I think he has been a real conscience of the Senate, and I think people admire the Senator from Illinois not only because of his integrity but because of the way he treats each and every Senator with real respect and sensitivity. He cares a lot about people,

and that is what this debate is really about. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

I ask unanimous consent that I be included as an original cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, as I understand this amendment, it simply urges the Senate, asks the Senate to take the position that we will indeed take up and debate legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage, at least by the end of the Congress. Am I correct, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts? Is that essentially it?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Well, Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a most reasonable and important amendment. Despite the increases that went into effect in 1990 and 1991, the current minimum wage is not a working wage. It is still a poverty wage. At \$4.25 an hour, a person working 40 hours a week at the minimum wage earns just \$170 a week. That is before taxes and Social Security are deducted.

Mr. President, in Minnesota when you talk to people in cafes, I think really probably more than any other single issue, or set of issues, the focus is on what I would call basic economic justice questions. People really feel the squeeze that the Senator from Massachusetts has talked about. And really since the decade of the seventies, the bottom 70 percent has lost ground. When you talk to people and you ask people what are the issues you care most about, what people say over and over again is, "I care about being able to have a decent job that I can support myself and my family on." Mr. President, that is what we are talking about. Right now, at \$4.25 an hour, you can work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and you still are not even up to the poverty level.

So there are many, many people—we are talking about 11 million people—plus who would benefit from this. I think it is a fundamental economic justice issue.

Mr. President, one popular misconception—and the Senator from Massachusetts may have covered this earlier, but I want to in my brief time—and I will only speak for about 5 minutes, I say to my colleague from Kansas—a popular misconception is that the minimum wage is basically paid to teenagers who flip burgers in their spare time. But less than one in three minimum wage workers are teenagers. In fact, nearly 50 percent of those who receive minimum wage are adults that are 25 years of age or older.

It is simply impossible to support yourself or to support your family. The minimum wage is not a working wage. We had a bipartisan consensus, at least up until recent history, that we would make a minimum wage a working wage. But when you look at this, if there ever was some action that we

should take as a Senate in this Congress, it would be action to raise this minimum wage so that people can make a decent living, so that people could support themselves, so that people can support their families.

Mr. President, if the truism—and I know the chair has been involved in welfare reform—is that the best welfare program is a job, and what we want to do is move from welfare to workfare, I would argue that the best welfare reform is a job that pays a living wage. That means a minimum wage that can lift families out of poverty and thereby make a huge difference.

Right now, if we are going to go to welfare reform—because I think it could be reformatory if we stay on the present course, just punishing children and single parents, mainly women. But if we are going to move toward real welfare reform, the problem we all have—and we all know about this—is all too often by the time a mother—because it is usually the mother, and I wish more fathers would accept responsibility for taking care of children when marriages do not work out well.

All too often what happens for that welfare mother is that by the time she takes a job, and now has to pay for child care—and, like any parent, she wants this not to be custodial but good child-developmental child care—by the time she loses Medicaid assistance and has a job that does not pay but \$4.25 an hour or \$5 an hour, she is worse off.

The Washington Post had a really splendid series of articles about this very problem.

It seems to me on matters of basic economic justice, on what it is that people care the most about, the Senator from Massachusetts is absolutely on the mark. We ought to make a commitment. I think that is all he is asking for Members to do. As I understand the amendment, we do not even have a specific wage. It is not a specific proposal, but an amendment that says that this Senate goes on record, making a commitment that by the end of this Congress, we will at least take up and debate a minimum wage bill.

I ask the Senator, is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

If the Senator would yield for a moment, I listened with interest to his statistics. He is providing a real service to the Senate in outlining the actual income and age of minimum wage earners in 1993.

I am wondering if the Senator's figures are basically in agreement with this chart, the source of which is the Economic Policy Institute, that says 57.6 percent of the minimum wage earners in 1993 were below-average-income adults; then there is below-average-income teens, effectively 14 percent; above average income, 11 percent for teens; 17 percent for above-average-income adults.

The idea, as I understood the Senator, was that this increase really reaches the working families who are

trying to make ends meet and the ones that are prepared to work the long and hard hours. If it does reach some teenagers, it is basically reaching teenagers who are from families with family incomes which are lower than the poverty line as well. Actually, it is a pretty targeted program.

I think the Senator might agree with me that the minimum wage has a greater elevating effect on the incomes with single individuals or married couples, but the earned income tax credit has the greatest impact on families with a number of children.

I ask the Senator, as a professor of economy, whether he would agree that, therefore, doing something about both is really reaching, in many respects, our fellow Americans who are trying to make ends meet—some with larger families, some of them either individuals or just a couple maybe with one child, I think that is the breaking point—but are trying to make ends meet and they are at the lower rung of the economic ladder and have been ones that have seen their real income decline most dramatically in recent times.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will respond to the Senator and then yield the floor to my colleague from Kansas who is anxious to speak.

I respond to the Senator from Massachusetts in two different ways. First of all, I say to my colleague, as a strategy of welfare reform or as a targeted strategy to reduce poverty and have more economic opportunity, and for that matter, as a targeted strategy to move toward a middle class or as a targeted strategy to reduce violence, I do not think there is any question that it is the key. That is what we have to focus on.

I say to my colleague, my understanding is that, roughly speaking, in poll after poll, 70 to 75 percent of the population agree. When we have a broad consensus in our country that we ought to raise the minimum wage, we ought to make it a working wage, it is all a part of economic opportunity, it is extremely important to this country, then it seems to me the Senator from Massachusetts does everyone a real service by saying, "Let's go on record making it clear that indeed we will address this problem. We will have some positive legislative initiatives in this area."

Again, I am proud to be an original cosponsor. I hope that this amendment receives widespread support. It should. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I agree that Congress should increase the minimum wage standard. I have voted for minimum wage increases in the past and I will vote for reasonable minimum wage increases in the future.

The minimum wage, established in 1938 by the Fair Labor Standards Act, has been raised 17 times. From 1938 to 1974, the wage was raised from 25 cents to \$2 per hour. The last two increases took place in 1990 when the wage level

was set at \$3.80 and then again in 1991 when it was raised to its current level. I voted both for final passage and the conference report of the wage increases of 1990 and 1991. If the minimum wage had kept pace with the Consumer Price Index, the current level would be \$6.85 today.

I want to work in a bipartisan fashion with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in passing the minimum wage, but I feel the schedule of the Senate is best left in the care of the majority leader in his preparation of the schedule of the Senate.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, and to support efforts to raise the minimum wage.

In recent weeks I have read articles and newspaper editorials concerned about wage stagnation. While profits are up, wages are down. Raising the minimum wage represents the least this Congress can do. Our failure to act to raise the minimum wage will only add to the problem of stagnant wages. No excuse about not being able to fit this issue in our agenda will satisfy workers who are just looking for a break.

The bill that is being proposed will raise the minimum wage from its current rate of \$4.25 per hour to \$4.75 next year and \$5.15 per hour in the second year. If we fail to raise the minimum wage beyond the current \$4.25 an hour, the buying power of workers earning the minimum will be at its lowest level since 1955—1955. How many people here would be satisfied with 1955 wages?

There are those who will argue that the minimum wage doesn't really help families or adult workers, but that is not what the facts tell us. The facts are that over 60 percent of workers receiving the minimum wage are adults. And over one-third of minimum wage earners are the only wage earners in their families.

Mr. President, far too many workers are losing ground. Far too many people are working longer and working harder, but their checks are getting smaller. Far too many of our actions this year have ignored the average wage earner. How can we justify keeping the minimum wage at \$4.25 an hour in the same year we decide to cut the earned income tax credit? If Congress opposes an increase in the minimum wage and votes to cut this tax credit how can we expect people to get ahead? How can we expect some of these struggling families to stay off the very public assistance programs, which ironically, some Members are trying to cut or eliminate?

It is time we returned to the bipartisan support this issue once had. It is time we returned to the spirit of 1989 when only eight Members of the Senate voted against increasing the minimum wage. Let's make a commitment to working men and women all across the country and tell them that hard work will be rewarded and that they can get

ahead. Making \$5.15 an hour won't make anyone rich, but it may give some people a fair shake.

Mr. KERRY. The Senator from Kansas has been waiting. And I just need 60 seconds. I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for once again raising for the Senate an important issue.

I simply underscore—I think I am correct, and the Senator may be able to confirm this—in the 1960's and 1970's, the minimum wage permitted people in this country to be able to earn just at poverty level; but because of the diminishment of earnings in the United States over the course of the last 13 years particularly, minimum wage now produces only 70 percent of the poverty level in income.

So the country traditionally has paid a minimum wage that at least promised to keep people at poverty level. Today, it is at 70 percent of poverty level, at a time when we all know it is an awful lot harder without the sufficient skills to be able to break out.

Not only do we have the same kinds of antipoverty or rising tide jobs that lift you, you have a much greater difficulty, but you are much lower in the purchasing power that you have from whatever the minimum wage gives you.

I think it underscores the purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY. If I could take a moment of time, the Senator is quite correct.

I want to just point out what we have not gotten into in the debate, and that is what is happening to the chief executives of major corporations.

More than 500 were paid over \$1 million, according to a Business Week survey of 742 companies. Chief executives have been getting substantial pay in recent years. Mr. President, in 1994 executive salaries increased 10 percent, while workers' wages rose 2.6 percent.

In many cases, the total pay went down because they did not cash in their stock options since the stock market was not at its peak. The \$2.9 million average pay of 1994 was 54 percent higher than the \$1.9 million average they received 5 years ago. The executives' pay has been skyrocketing, yet the workers' pay is down.

I am not interested, in this debate, to try and take away from those that are trying to expand and make a great success in terms of companies or corporations, but it seems to me to be relevant, in terms of a society, about people working. Those in the white collar are working hard but the blue collar are working hard, too, and they are the ones that are left out and left behind.

We are not making this point just with regard to blue-collar workers. The same thing has happened to the white collar. That is quite a different story. It is worth considering in the total context of debate.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Senator from Kansas for her forbearance.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise not to debate the pros and cons about whether we should increase the

minimum wage. The bill currently before the Senate is the State Department reorganization bill of 1995, a very important piece of legislation.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is a sense of the Senate that we should debate and vote on whether to raise the minimum wage before the end of the first session of the 104th Congress.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that minimum wage legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, of which I am chairman and the Senator from Massachusetts is ranking member.

I believe it is important to hold hearings on this issue in our committee. The minimum wage is just one part of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That Act is a comprehensive piece of legislation which covers everything from child labor laws to overtime laws. I think it is one that needs extensive and thorough review and hearings. It is a very important piece of legislation. The minimum wage is just one part of that.

Congress has not conducted a serious oversight of the entire statute for several decades. I believe it is of fundamental importance and the responsibility of our committee to do so. Clearly, the law needs to be brought up to date to reflect significant changes in the workplace over the last 50 years.

I am committed to holding hearings in the Labor Committee to review all aspects of the FLSA, including the minimum wage. I think it is premature, however, to be bound by this sense-of-the-Senate amendment and have it viewed as a debate on whether one is for or against an increase in the minimum wage. That is not what this debate is about.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts, as the ranking member, knows that our committee has had a very full agenda. There are a number of important issues we have been working on, including health care, job training, FDA and OSHA reform, and several reauthorization bills which have to be completed this year.

Unfortunately, I think, despite the importance of FLSA reform, the schedule has just not permitted us to hold hearings yet. Hearings that I think we need to have and should have and, as I have said before and I will say again, I am committed to holding.

I would remind my colleagues that the Senator from Massachusetts, now the ranking member, was chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee for the last 2 years. There was no real sense of urgency at that time, when my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle were in the majority, to address this issue. I really have to wonder why, all of a sudden, on this State Department reorganization legislation, the Senator has offered a sense of the Senate which could be interpreted, I think wrongly, as a vote for or against an increase in the minimum wage.

For that reason I think this is not the time or the place to have this type of debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2029 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1977

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for himself and Mrs. KASSEBAUM, proposes an amendment numbered 2029 to amendment No. 1977.

Strike all after the word "that" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "that the Senate should debate and vote on comprehensive welfare reform before the end of the first session of the 104th Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator KASSEBAUM, the chairman of the Labor Committee, for her statement. I hope people heard her statement.

Also, I will mention the reason why I offered this second-degree amendment. The second-degree amendment says Congress should take up and consider and vote on comprehensive welfare reform before the end of this year. I think that is a very high priority. Maybe I think it is a higher priority than increasing the minimum wage, because I happen to believe increasing the minimum wage will cost jobs.

The Senator from Kansas, as chairman of the Labor Committee, said she will have a hearing on minimum wage. I might mention, that is more than our friends on the other side did. The sponsor of this amendment, when he was chairman of the Labor Committee for the last 2 years, I do not believe they had hearings on increasing the minimum wage. I know, if my memory serves me correctly, Senator Mitchell, when he was majority leader the last 2 years, they did not pull up legislation on the floor of the Senate to increase the minimum wage.

Now they offer an amendment to this bill, the State Department authorization bill, and the amendment says we should consider and take up and vote on increasing the minimum wage.

No. 1, that is an amendment that has nothing to do with the State Department authorization. It is kind of saying: We were running the Senate for a number of years and it was not a high enough priority for us to do it then, but now we want to do it while Republicans are controlling the Senate. I disagree. Senator DOLE is the majority leader. He is the one who sets up the agenda of the Senate, not the Senator from Massachusetts.

So I have offered an amendment in the second degree. It says Congress should take up welfare reform. I think that is important. I know the majority leader thinks that is important. I

think the majority leader should set the agenda of the Senate.

So I compliment my friend from Kansas. I appreciate her cosponsoring this amendment. I hope people will place this amendment as a higher priority.

I will mention, actually, probably neither amendment should be on this bill. We should be considering the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. We ought to be voting on it. I will say we ought to be voting on it in 15 minutes, because this entire body, by the majority leader, was told we will have votes not before 6 o'clock. For us to take up nongermane amendments, for us to debate a lot of things and not take up the legislation pending, I think is irresponsible. We have a lot of work to do. A lot of us would like to keep most of the August recess. We would like to spend a little time in our States and with our families.

So I think it is important for us to pass this bill. I know the Senator from North Carolina urges us to do so. We have a couple of amendments that are pending. There are a couple of amendments we have the yeas and nays ordered on. I hope we will vote on those. I hope we will vote on those tonight.

We have a lot of other amendments, very, very important amendments, that we may be dealing with, talking about reorganizing the State Department, abolishing agencies, restructuring—I compliment the sponsors of the bill before us. It is very substantive legislation.

We have also heard some in the administration say, "Let's not let this pass. Let's allow it to be slowed down." I regret that. But I think we should take up the legislation. I think the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts needed to be amended, so I have offered an amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it.

Again, I repeat, what this amendment is, it says Congress should take up before the end of this year comprehensive welfare reform. I know the President of the United States spoke to the Governors and he urged we have welfare reform. I know the Senate majority leader spoke to the Governors today and he said we should have welfare reform. So, hopefully, Congress will work out its difference and we will pass a bipartisan welfare reform bill this year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I guess I am somewhat amused by the notion that the way to solve the problem of an amendment that is somehow not appropriate on this bill is to amend that amendment with an amendment that is not appropriate to this bill. The logic of that does not quite sit. But, on the other hand, we all want welfare reform. So I think it is perfectly appropriate, now that the precedent is set, for us to follow suit with other amendments.

We will be happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not think there is any further debate on it, so we could proceed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2029) was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2030 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1977

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to the amendment of Senator KENNEDY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] proposes an amendment numbered 2030 to amendment No. 1977.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

**SEC. .**

It is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) the current economic recovery has generated record profits for industry, but hourly wages have grown at a below average rate;

(2) the minimum wage has not been raised since April 1, 1991, and has lost more than 10% of its purchasing power since then;

(3) the average minimum wage worker provides 50% of her family's weekly earnings;

(4) nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults, and 60% are women;

(5) a full-time, year-round worker who is paid the minimum wage earns \$8,500 a year, less than a poverty level income for a family of two;

(6) there are 4.7 million Americans who usually work full-time but who are, nevertheless, in poverty, and 4.2 million families live in poverty despite having one or more members in the labor force for at least half the year;

(7) the 30% decline in the value of the minimum wage since 1979 has contributed to Americans' growing income inequality and to the fact that 97% of the growth in household income has accrued to the wealthiest 20%;

(8) legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour was introduced on February 14, 1995, but has not been debated by the Senate; and

(9) the Senate should debate and vote on whether to raise the minimum wage before the end of the first session of the 104th Congress.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this simply puts us back in the parliamentary position we were in. We have now agreed we ought to have welfare debated before the end of the session. The issue before us is still whether or not we ought to have the minimum wage debated before the end of the session.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague. I will

be glad to be a cosponsor of the amendment of the Senator, but I am not going to make that request at the present time.

I just say, Mr. President, as the Senator from Kansas knows very well, this legislation for the increase in the minimum wage was introduced in February. There has been a very full agenda for the committee. I have enjoyed very much the opportunity to work closely with Senator KASSEBAUM and our Republican colleagues. But it is a reflection of priorities. It has been the judgment of that committee to set other matters as priorities. I think at some time this should have had a hearing and we have an opportunity to address this issue at this time.

Mr. President, the amendment I am offering is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that calls for us to debate and vote on raising the minimum wage some time before the end of this session of Congress. It does not endorse any particular outcome; it does not say we should pass S. 413, the bill Senator DASCHLE introduced on behalf of the President, or vote to raise the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour—though I strongly believe we should.

Rather, the amendment says only that the Senate should take up the issue, debate it, and vote one way or the other, rather than sweeping this issue under the rug and ignoring the 12 million American workers who would get a raise if the President's bill were enacted.

The appropriate level for the minimum wage is a critical issue, both for the millions of low-wage workers who are directly affected by it and for the economy as a whole. Income inequality is a growing problem in the United States, and the declining purchasing power of the minimum wage is an important factor in the problem.

Since 1979, 97 percent of the growth in real household income has gone to the wealthiest 20 percent, while the remaining 3 percent of the growth in household income has been shared by the other 80 percent of Americans. The real family income of the bottom 60 percent of Americans has declined since 1979, while the real income of the top 20 percent of families grew 18 percent.

Part of the decline in income for the middle and lower middle class has been caused by the decline in the purchasing power of the minimum wage, which has fallen almost 30 percent since 1979, and more than 10 percent since it was last raised in 1991. As a nation, we are getting farther and farther away from the concept that work should pay, that a full-time, year-round worker should be able to keep her family out of poverty.

Today, a nurse's aide, janitor, or child care worker who makes the minimum wage earns just \$8,500 for 50 weeks of work at 40 hours a week—falling more than \$6,000 short of the poverty threshold for a family of four.

There is an old saying that, "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer."

But that should not be our national economic policy. The Senate should vote on raising the minimum wage because it is immoral and destructive to have one out of every nine families with a full-time worker living under the poverty line—without enough money to feed and clothe their children and keep a roof over their heads.

The rich in America are getting richer: the value of the stock market has increased more than 400 percent since 1982. But almost everyone else, and the working poor especially, are getting poorer. Real wages have declined, on average, 15 percent since 1982.

Business Week magazine, in a recent cover story called, "The Wage Squeeze," argues that "weak wage growth is sapping demand" and "dragging down the economy throughout the recovery." Even though corporate profits are at record highs and unemployment has been falling steadily for three years, hourly pay and per capita income have lagged far behind the average recovery.

Raising the minimum wage will not, by itself, reverse the growing income inequality that threatens our economic future. But it would be a step in the right direction. If we increased the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour, 11 million hard working people would get a raise.

I have heard all of the arguments against the minimum wage, and none of them has any merit. For years, it was argued that raising the minimum wage was bad for the people who got the raise because a significant number of them would lose their jobs.

Well, year after year, we had minimum wage increases, and the economy continued to add jobs by the millions.

Then it was claimed that teenagers would lose their jobs if the minimum wage went up. But when economists stopped quoting from their textbooks and studied the actual, real world data, they found that their theories were wrong—even teenage unemployment is not significantly affected by raising the minimum wage.

First, Princeton's David Card and Alan Krueger, then Harvard's Larry Katz and Bill Spriggs of the Joint Economic Committee, found that businesses adjusted to minimum wage increases in various ways, such as increasing prices, but they did not respond by cutting their workforce. In some cases, they actually added workers.

How is this possible? Why did demand for these workers not go down as their cost went up? The obvious answer is that their work was so undervalued at the minimum wage that their employment was still a major benefit for employers after the minimum wage was raised. And that is the situation today. The minimum wage is so low that the work done by the employees who earn the minimum wage is undervalued and underpriced.

Raising the minimum wage is no likelier to cause job losses today than

it was when the last increase was made in 1991. We have added more than 7 million net new jobs since then, and the minimum wage is a smaller fraction of the national average wage, and lower in real terms, than it was in 1991. In other words, the minimum wage is even more underpriced now than it was in 1991, and the employment effects of raising it should be even less.

Now that the old argument about job losses has been disproved, the Republicans have come up with a new argument, the exact opposite of the old one: raising the minimum wage is wrong, because it leads teenagers to drop out of school and go to work. The research supporting this new theory is flawed. The data does not support it so opponents of the minimum wage will be forced to stretch their imaginations to come up with new arguments.

For years, Republicans have claimed that the minimum wage is really no help to poor families because only teenagers work for the minimum wage. But according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 63 percent of minimum wage earners are adults over the age of 20.

Republicans have also argued that there are better ways to help the poor, such as the earned income tax credit. Now, however, Republican support for the EITC has begun to erode. They voted overwhelmingly for a budget plan that assumes a \$21 billion cut in the EITC over 7 years, which will raise taxes on 14 million low income workers.

They oppose helping the working poor with a minimum wage increase; they vote to cut back the EITC; but they are rushing ahead with plans to give the wealthiest people in our society a lavish tax cut. It is no wonder we are growing apart as a nation when so much energy is expended to help those who do not need it, while pushing down the families at the bottom of the economic ladder.

The growing Republican opposition to the earned income tax credit is based on its budget impact—its cost to the Federal Government. The same concerns should lead them to support a minimum wage increase, since it will save the Federal Government more than a billion dollars over 5 years.

By moving millions of workers out of poverty, an increase in the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour would save more than \$600 million in AFDC expenditures, more than \$350 million in Medicaid costs, and almost \$300 million in food stamps, over five years. Raising the minimum wage is the fair thing to do. It is also the cost-effective thing to do.

Three out of five minimum wage workers are women, and most of them make important contributions to their families' income, while they also shoulder the responsibility for cooking meals, cleaning the house, and getting their kids to day care. The average minimum wage worker brings home 51 percent of her family's weekly earnings.

The Senate should debate and vote on raising the minimum wage because it is a way to help make life a little brighter for the people who struggle to make ends meet, who believe in the American dream of working hard in order to get ahead, but who have been finding themselves slipping behind no matter how much harder they try.

I have met with many people who work for the minimum wage—especially young adults with families to raise—and their lives are hard. Typically, the husband works 30 to 35 hours a week at \$4.25 an hour for a pizza chain, including split shifts and evenings. His wife works 40 hours a week at similar wages. She staggers her work hours, so that either she or her husband can always be at home to take care of their two infants. Neither has health care coverage, and they cannot afford child care.

So, between the two of them, they work all day long, rarely able to spend time together. They despair about saving to send their children to college because both of them are still paying off the loans they took out for the 1 year of college they attended. These bright, hard-working young Americans with high school educations and dreams of higher education and attainment. But they are barely scraping by because the law allows their work to be undervalued and underpaid.

Senator DASCHLE introduced the President's bill on February 16, more than 5 months ago. Yet the bill has not had a hearing and is not on the calendar for floor consideration. With each additional month that passes, the value and purchasing power of the minimum wage declines still more, and the lives of those who earn it are made harder.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment and commit itself to voting on legislation to raise the minimum wage before the end of this session of Congress.

I want to just reiterate a few items I think have made this matter more timely. One is the various conclusions that are being reached now in Business Week magazine on the issue of wages. I will also have printed in the RECORD the very significant June 25 story in the New York Times. It starts out: "Productivity Is All, But It Doesn't Pay Well." This is by Keith Bradsher. It points out:

It is a principle as old as capitalism and the antithesis of Marxism: workers should reap according to their labors. Yet over the last six years, compensation for American workers seems to have stagnated even as they have worked ever more efficiently and produced ever more goods.

The trend is especially striking because it breaks one of the most enduring patterns in American economic history. Workers have fairly consistently collected about two-thirds of the nation's economic output in the form of wages, salaries and benefits. Owners of capital, like stocks or bonds or small businesses, have collected the other third, in the form of dividends, profits and investment gains.

"It is remarkable how constant labor's share has been over the last 150 years," said

Lawrence Katz, a former chief economist at the Labor Department. "This is one of the strongest regularities of advanced economies."

Wages and salaries and benefits actually climbed slightly faster than productivity for a while in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Productivity moved ahead a little faster than compensation during the late 1970's, and through much of the 1980's. But it seems the real gap opened after that.

The strongest evidence so far that the workers are receiving less of the fruits of their labors came last week, when the Labor Department revised its estimate of wage and compensation growth. After adjusting for inflation, average wages and salaries apparently fell 2.3 percent over the 12-month period that ended in March. Productivity rose 2.1 percent during the same period.

That is what happened in June. This is what is happening in July. Talking about the timeliness of this particular measure, now is the time. Now is the time.

Then the story goes on.

Include fringe benefits, and the current numbers look even worse for wage-earners. Overall compensation fell 3 percent in the 12-month period through March, as companies and State and local governments provided fewer health benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 25, 1995]

PRODUCTIVITY IS ALL, BUT IT DOESN'T PAY WELL

(By Keith Bradsher)

It is a principle as old as capitalism and the antithesis of Marxism: workers should reap according to their labors. Yet over the last six years, compensation for American workers seems to have stagnated even as they have worked ever more efficiently and produced ever more goods.

The trend is especially striking because it breaks one of the most enduring patterns in American economic history. Workers have fairly consistently collected about two-thirds of the nation's economic output in the form of wages, salaries and benefits. Owners of capital, like stocks or bonds or small businesses, have collected the other third, in the form of dividends, profits and investment gains.

"It is remarkable how constant labor's share has been over the last 150 years," said Lawrence Katz, a former chief economist at the Labor Department. "This is one of the strongest regularities of advanced economies."

Wages and salaries and benefits actually climbed slightly faster than productivity for a while in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Productivity moved ahead a little faster than compensation during the late 1970's and through much of the 1980's. But it seems that the real gap opened after that.

The strongest evidence so far that workers are receiving less of the fruits of their labors came last week, when the Labor Department revised its estimates of wage and compensation growth. After adjusting for inflation, average wages and salaries apparently fell 2.3 percent over the 12-month period that ended in March. Productivity rose 2.1 percent during the same period.

Include fringe benefits, and the current numbers look even worse for the wage-earners. Overall compensation fell 3 percent in

the 12-month period through March, as companies and state and local governments provided fewer health care benefits.

The drop has provoked a profusion of historical comparisons. "A high-capital income society is no longer a middle-income society but something reminiscent of the Gilded Age," said Bradford DeLong, a former deputy assistant secretary of the Treasury \*\*\*.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would be glad to entertain a consent request. Is that the desire of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HELMS. I want to get back to what we were talking about, the bill, if the Senator will allow us. I think he has made his point about what he thinks we ought to do. I thought that was the majority leader's responsibility.

Will the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I was informed that the Senator was prepared to make a consent request and I was prepared to have that consideration. But I will not take much more time. I will make some brief comments. I was attempting to try and accommodate the Senator.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a moment just for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving my right, Mr. President, I yield for a consent request.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on amendment No. 2026, the Helms amendment, at 6:45 this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. KERRY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I put in the RECORD the New York Times article.

I want to just mention another article that was in the Washington Post of today, "U.S. Finds Productivity, but Not Pay, Is Rising."

The government yesterday confirmed what most workers already knew: In terms of their pay, Americans are just treading water.

The Labor Department reported that wages and benefits in private industry increased 2.8 percent over the last year. It was the smallest advance since the department began calculating its employment cost index in 1981 and reflected the low level of inflation and the inability of workers to wrest pay raises from employers in an increasingly competitive economy.

Adjusted for inflation, the compensation measure shows a slight 0.2 percent decline over the past 12 months in spite of robust gains in worker productivity and record levels of corporate profits.

All of these studies are showing—Business Week, the Washington Post, the New York Times, all within the past several weeks making the point that we are experiencing record profits in the stock market, record profits in corporations, declining wages in terms of workers in the minimum wage, and the family wage, which is now down to where it was in 1989 which is the last time it was increased.

We were talking briefly out here with our friend and colleague from Kansas saying, "Why now?" The interesting point about "Why now?" is we have finally gotten to the bottom of where we were in 1989. We have gotten to that point in the last several weeks. At that time, a Republican President said enough is enough. At that time, the President and a broad bipartisan group said that workers that were receiving only about 70 percent of the real purchasing power of the minimum wage should at least get some bump. They got some bump during the 1989–1991 period. But we have no recognition from the other side that there is a problem. We do not hear our colleagues on the other side saying, let us get about the business and let us try to find some common ground, let us try to see if we cannot make a difference on it.

So, Mr. President, we believe that this is a timely matter, that the Senate should go on record as our friends from Minnesota and Illinois pointed out. All this is saying is that we will go on record before the end of the session in terms of the increase in the minimum wage.

Really the proposal that Senator DASCHLE had was a bare bones program which would not even move back up, barely move us back up to where increases were in 1990. The Daschle program brings up back here, not where it was in the period for some 15 years but only brings us back to where it was under a Republican President; not asking an awful lot. We are not out here demanding that we get a vote to bring it all the way back up here, although I believe that is justified. The Daschle proposal would move this red line right back up to where it was when it was signed by a Republican.

This does not seem to me to be such a radical proposal to demand to say, "Oh, my goodness, we cannot possibly gain the time, have an opportunity to debate those issues out on the floor of the Senate. There are too many other matters." I think we could get some time to debate the importance of that particular measure that makes a difference to 12 million of our fellow citizens.

We did not spend a lot of time when we were taking away some of the OSHA protection for those workers. We did not take a lot of time when we were taking away the mine safety protection for those workers. We did not even have the hearings over there in the Human Resources Committee. We did not take much time on that when we were talking about safety. Now we hear, "Oh, my goodness." If we are going to just bring back the minimum wage to some extent to make it a little more respectable for working families to have children, and 60 percent to 65 percent of the minimum wage workers are women in our society and are having difficulty making ends meet, we are suddenly saying, "Oh, no. We cannot be prepared to support this resolution that will just say that by the end

of this Congress we will consider it on the floor of the U.S. Senate."

That is what effectively we are hearing from the other side, that we have too many other matters. I would be glad to be a cosponsor of Senator NICKLES' amendment dealing with welfare reform. But what is so difficult about working on the income too for working families? We did not spend much time when the budget came back. When they had the reductions in the earned income tax credit for working families in that budget proposal that is \$4 trillion in terms of tax expenditures and they put \$21 billion in additional taxes on working families making less than \$26,000. They were raising the taxes on these working families.

All we are saying here is, "Can we not find between now and the time that we close down this business maybe a day, maybe a few hours, maybe on a Friday afternoon, maybe on a Saturday, on something that will make a difference to those 12 million Americans?" We are prepared to stay here and debate this on a Friday afternoon or a Saturday and set the time for a vote. What do you think those families are thinking tonight? "We do not have the time to debate this issue. We do not have the time in August, in September, in October to spend a few hours and consider this on the basis of the merit. We do not have time for that."

Mr. President, I think they understand about who has time for them and who does not have time for them. I know Mr. Armey on the other side said, "We will not have an increase in the minimum wage. We do not care. It will just not pass."

All we are saying is in the next 3 months give us a few hours to debate it. If you are so sure of your side over there, if you are so sure of your facts, if you are so sure that there is going to be inflation and lost jobs, why not agree to debate it? Why not agree to it? Why not say, OK. Just let us go ahead and give us a time to vote? We did it on the question of gifts. We did it on lobbying. We got votes on those. Those were important measures. But somehow when it comes down to paying working families a livable wage, we will not do it.

Mr. President, we will have an opportunity to do it because this issue is not going to go away. We will hear people moaning and groaning about, as I have heard for years and years and years, about, Oh, well, we did not go through the committee of jurisdiction. That is always such a wonderful argument to use when you differ with something. But then you come right out here at any other time, if you have the votes you can get these matters up. Well, we may not have the votes to carry this resolution, but we are going to keep after it. I know that this institution over a period of time will have the votes because it is right, it is fair, and it is the decent thing to do. It rewards

work, and it is a responsibility I think that we have to our fellow citizens.

So if they say, no, we are too busy doing other matters; we are too busy, we cannot find the time to do this, that is a message to the American people. I do not think it will stand because it is wrong.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Who seeks recognition?

Mr. KENNEDY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote at 6:45 this evening, Senator KASSEBAUM be recognized, and the time prior to a motion to table the Kennedy amendment be limited to 5 minutes to be divided between Senators KASSEBAUM and KENNEDY, and that at the conclusion of that time, Senator KASSEBAUM be recognized to move to table the Kennedy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AND LOBBYING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this evening, my colleague from Wyoming and I come to the floor to discuss with the Senate what we believe to be a very important issue. It has come to our attention in the last several days that in a letter directed to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management in each of our States across the Nation, coming from the Acting Director, Mr. Dombeck, a letter goes to them instructing them to engage in an outreach informational program about a pending piece of legislation before the U.S. Senate.

If this is true, and in the manner in which it has been done, it appears that this Acting Director of BLM, who is a civil servant unconfirmed, may have acted in a way as to have violated the law of this country.

I say so because it is very, very clear that section 303 of the 1995 Interior Appropriations Act states,

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public sup-

port or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

The directive sent to the State directors of BLM, instructing them to perform in certain ways, was about the pending rangeland reform, or the Public Rangeland Management Act that is now pending before the Senate. This instruction went out prior to the committee's action, prior to the markup and the passing out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, this legislation. It is a detailed, instructive act.

Since that time, we have seen op-ed pieces, public comments, interviews, and actions taken by State Directors of the BLM and/or their public information personnel.

While we are not sure that this constitutes a violation of the act, it clearly appears at this moment, at least to this Senator, that a public information, if not a political campaign was launched to spread what is now misinformation about a pending piece of legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memo that I have obtained from the Acting Director, going to the States, which outlines a complete campaign of information directed at a pending piece of legislation before the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 5, 1995.

To: State Directors, Attention: External Affairs Chiefs.  
From: Acting Director, Bureau of Land Management.  
Subject: Healthy Rangelands Communication Plan.

Thank you for your excellent work over the past year promoting BLM's efforts to improve the health of the public rangelands. I believe that our approach to collaborative public rangeland management best serves the people and the lands entrusted to our stewardship.

In order to further promote our approach, we have developed and attached a rangeland communication plan which I expect each state to implement over the next three weeks. The July communication's plan focuses on three areas: Resource Advisory Councils (RACs), Inreach, and Outreach.

I commend your efforts during the RAC Domination process. By now you should be working with your Governors to recommend nominations for the Secretary's approval. These should be submitted to the Washington Office by July 14.

In terms of "inreach", during July I want you to make sure that all BLM staff have the opportunity to review our briefing materials and agency testimony on the differences between the Livestock Grazing Act and BLM's cooperative relations and grazing administration rules.

Our primary focus for July is "outreach". The outreach section of the communications plan identifies basic minimum tasks that I expect the State Directors and State External Affairs Chiefs to accomplish during July. Feel free to expand or enhance these tasks as appropriate. The differences between BLM's collaborative approach to public rangeland management and the one presently under discussion in Congress are dramatic. We have an obligation to make our constituents aware of these differences.

Barry Rose (208/384-3393) of Idaho's Lower Snake River Ecosystem Office and Chris Wood (202/208-7013) of the Washington Office will continue to serve as field and headquarters coordinators for rangeland communication issues. Please provide Tony Garrett, Director of Public Affairs for the Washington Office with an status update on implementation of the communication plan each week during the external affairs conference call.

Barry Rose and Chris Wood will discuss the communication's plan with you at the conference call this afternoon. Thanks for your continued efforts.

TEN WAYS THE LGA UNDERMINES MULTIPLE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

	Section
Severely limits public involvement in public land management: Says only grazing permittee/lessee, adjacent landowners, advisory councils, and States may participate in development of grazing plans. Does not provide for direct participation by all others who are affected by grazing decisions or value public lands—including hikers, campers, miners, oil companies, Indian tribes .....	121(a)
Specifies that only permittee/lessee may protest or appeal a grazing decision. All other citizens could be excluded from taking an active role in the appeals process .....	162 164(a)(1)
On-the-ground grazing management would be exempt from the National Environmental Policy Act. The effects of grazing on the human environment would not be analyzed in a public forum or subject to public scrutiny .....	106(d)(2)
Restricts the ability of resource managers to address environmental concerns: Could result in at least 23 years of monitoring, appeals, and other delays before management actions that protect resource health can be implemented .....	114, 104, 123, 164
Terms and conditions of a lease would be limited to grazing specific issues (kind, number, season of use, periods of use, allotments to be used, and amount of use) unless provided for by allotment management plan terms and conditions or the LGA .....	136(a)(b)
Terms and conditions of a lease/permit would no longer normally be used to provide for other uses and values such as winter forage for deer and elk, nesting habitat for game birds, water sources for wild horses and burros, water quality, or healthy riparian areas .....	114(d), 164(b1)
Even emergency decisions are subject to suspension upon appeal. No provisions to put decisions in immediate effect .....	114(d), 164(b1)
Moves public land management away from a tradition of "multiple use": Broadly exempts livestock grazing from oversight, appeal, management, and enforcement requirements that apply to other public land users ....	106, 121, 123, 136
The definition of livestock "carrying capacity" would allow livestock stocking rates to the point that grazing does not "induce permanent damage to vegetation or related resources" (emphasis in <i>italics</i> ) .....	104(21)
Monitoring and inspection may not occur unless the livestock operator has been invited and allowed to participate. This compromises BLM's ability to conduct trespass investigations and allows the uncooperative operator "veto power" over needed monitoring .....	114, 123, 141(b)
Requires that grazing violations are "knowingly and willfully" committed—this places a nearly impossible burden of proof on managers and makes ignorance an acceptable excuse for violations .....	141(b1)

RANGELANDS COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

Category	Task	Lead	When
Resource Advisory Councils.	Review nominations with Govs., forward to Headquarters. Assist National Training Ctr. with RAC orientation package and training materials.	SDs/External Affairs Chiefs. Rose .....	July 14. Draft package due July 31.
Inreach .....	Ensure that all offices have briefing materials on final rules and Livestock Grazing Act (LGA)	B. Johns .....	July 14.
Outreach .....	Respond to mis-information.	External Affairs Chiefs.	Within 5 days of receipt.