

Senators from California in a very, very difficult position.

So I hope we can move this Presidio on its own. Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE both agree—they both cosponsor this bill—that it could be moved in a moment by a unanimous-consent request. Let us not load it down with a bill that has serious, serious problems.

I hope we can get to the point where this is truly a celebration for the people of California, that we can have our bill, have it stand alone, and take up the controversial matters independently.

I thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KENNEDY. I think there was a unanimous consent request that was made by the Republican leader on how we are going to use morning business. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Each Senator is allowed to speak up to 5 minutes with the exception of Senator REID of Nevada and Senator DORGAN of North Dakota, who each have 15 minutes reserved.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am asking whether the consent request went after 11 o'clock. I think the Senator from Mississippi requested it for some of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BRADLEY of New Jersey and Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts are authorized to speak up to 5 minutes at this point.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BRADLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete this. I do not think it will be longer than 5 minutes, but if it is, it will be a minute or two, and I prefer not to be interrupted.

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

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address a few of the points that were made yesterday by the distinguished Senators from Utah on the underlying wilderness bill. First, there is the assertion that S. 884, that we are now dealing with, had been fixed, particularly that the release language had been fixed, been modified.

It has been modified somewhat, I think, to reflect the debate in the Energy Committee but despite all the changes the amended version just drops the requirement that the released lands shall be managed for "nonwilderness multiple purposes" and substitutes a full range of uses—not much

difference. However, the amendment still says that the lands released "shall not be managed for the purpose of protecting their suitability for wilderness designation."

The previous version of the bill as reported out was a kind of belt and suspenders approach to release. It had two protections against further wilderness designation. The revised version still leaves the belt even though the suspenders have been removed. It still remains an unprecedented provision in wilderness bills.

Next, the protected areas. Is it fair to say that almost 20 million acres have been released and can now be exploited? The distinguished Senator from Utah questioned whether you could say that, but both versions of the bill as reported and as amended find that all public lands in the State of Utah administered by the BLM have been adequately studied for wilderness designation. This eliminates further consideration of approximately 20 million acres.

There are other problems which I will not get into at this stage, but I would like to just focus on the acreage where the distinguished Senators from Utah have asserted that plenty of land in the Kaiparowits Plateau and other areas, plenty of land has already been protected—125,000 acres in Kaiparowits and 110,000 in Dirty Devil Canyon—but the point is what is not protected. There are about 525,000 acres in Kaiparowits that were in the House bill and 152,000 acres in the Dirty Devil area. So the question is not what is protected but what is not protected, particularly on the Kaiparowits Plateau.

The proponents of the bill have basically constantly referred to the House bill which is 5.7 million acres. I am not pushing 5.7 million acres. I have not introduced a bill that advocates 5.7 million acres, nor has any such bill been introduced. I am simply concerned that 2 million acres is far too little to protect out of 22 million acres of BLM land. I am concerned that all the remaining land would be permanently released from consideration as wilderness. But once again I am not saying that 5.7 is the right number. Keep in mind that it is 3.2 million acres that are currently protected as wilderness.

Also, the Senators from Utah should recognize that if the Utah wilderness bill does not pass or is vetoed, the result will not be that 5.7 million acres are protected. Instead, for the time being, the 3.2 million will remain protected for study and a new recommendation will have to be developed.

Third, there is the assertion that acreage is an issue for Utah to resolve. I would argue that acreage is far from the only issue here. In fact, there are many other issues that should be of great concern to other Senators and to other taxpayers.

As to the hard release language, as I said, the belt is still there even though

the suspenders have been removed. The land exchange provision should be of concern to taxpayers since the State is going to likely give up land of little value in exchange for very valuable Federal land on which they will want to mine coal, according to the Assistant Secretary. The exceptions to traditional wilderness rules for motor vehicle, also to water rights language, all are very ominous precedents.

And finally there is the assertion that there was nothing wrong with the BLM inventory process. The distinguished Senator from Utah basically said that this was not the case, and he quoted Jim Parker, a former Utah BLM State director, to support the assertion that the BLM's inventory was not seriously flawed. Mr. Parker has made statements supporting the BLM wilderness inventory and has been cited as an expert. However, Mr. Parker did not work on the BLM in Utah during the inventory but was living in Washington, DC, at the time.

I think it should be clear what the BLM's position is on this bill. Yesterday, I received a letter from Bob Armstrong, the Assistant Secretary of Lands, Minerals and Management, that supports the view that the BLM officials recognize the Utah BLM process was in fact flawed. Mr. Armstrong says:

I am told by professional career staff at all levels of the organization that the Utah wilderness process was the most controversial, and perhaps the most political, in the entire BLM wilderness process.

The letter goes on to state:

It is the position of the BLM that far too little land is protected under this bill and too much land is released for development. In short, no one should be claiming the support of the Bureau of Land Management and its professional staff—

No one should be claiming BLM support—for S. 884.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Armstrong be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1996.

Hon. BILL BRADLEY
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BRADLEY: I understand you will shortly be considering whether to include S. 884, the "Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995," in an omnibus package of parks legislation. I would like to clarify the record with respect to the position of the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of the Interior on the subject of the acreage covered in this bill.

In 1991, President Bush forwarded his recommendation that 1.9 million acres of Utah lands be immediately protected as wilderness. The Congress did not act on that recommendation and President Clinton did not adopt it when he came into office. Interestingly, President Bush did not support the "hard release" of the rest of Utah's lands, as is proposed in this bill, and neither does the Clinton Administration.

Last July, Deputy Assistant Secretary Sylvia Baca testified before the Senate regarding the numerous problems with this legislation. She testified that the Bush proposal of 1.9 million acres is "inadequate to protect Utah's great wilderness resources." In fact, S. 884 would remove protections for some 300,000 acres recommended for wilderness by President Bush.

Nevertheless, some supporters of the legislation have repeatedly sought to portray the position of the previous Administration as that held by the Bureau of Land Management, or to claim that "field professionals" independently and objectively formulated the previous Administration's position. This is not the case. I am told by professional career staff at all levels of the organization that the Utah wilderness process was the most controversial, and perhaps the most political, in the entire BLM wilderness process.

It is the position of the Bureau of Land Management that far too little land is protected under this bill and too much land is released for development. In short, no one should be claiming the support of the Bureau and its professional staff for S. 884.

We have reviewed the most recent changes proposed by the bill sponsors and find that the same basic problems exist: too little designated, too much opened to development, unprecedented "hard release" language, reduced protections inside wilderness, and unprecedented land exchange language. The Secretary has indicated—most recently in a March 15, 1996, letter to Senator Murkowski—that he would recommend the President veto legislation carrying the text of S. 884. It continues to be my hope that the core problems of this bill can be fixed so the President receives legislation he can sign.

Sincerely,

BOB ARMSTRONG,
Assistant Secretary,
Land and Minerals Management.

Mr. BRADLEY. I remind my colleagues that there are 33 titles to this bill. I personally would have no objection to moving almost all 33, and we already have a veto threat in the form of a letter from the Secretary, and yesterday also we have a statement of administration policy from the Executive Office of the President also being very clear on that issue.

I hope we will be able to recognize that this Utah wilderness bill is far from complete and that there are many things that need to be done before it could be thought to be a true wilderness bill.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1995—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to and considered original text for the purpose of further amendment. I further ask unanimous consent Senators have until the hour of 5 p.m. today in order to file first-degree amendments, in accordance with rule XXII.

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

Mr. LOTT. For the information of my colleagues, this now allows the pending

substitute amendment offered by Senator MURKOWSKI to be amendable in two degrees. Also, as a reminder, a cloture vote will occur on that substitute tomorrow morning under the provisions of rule XXII.

Senators have until the hour of 5 today in order to file first-degree amendments to the substitute. I thank my colleagues. We have worked with the Democratic leadership in getting this agreement.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. I now ask there be a period for morning business until the hour of 12:30, with the time between now and 12:30 equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. 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. LOTT. I renew my unanimous consent request.

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

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just as a matter of a point of information, on yesterday when there was the announcement of the Republican leader, which is on page S. 2839, in the Program, Mr. LOTT said, "For the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume the Presidio legislation tomorrow morning with the understanding that Senator DASCHLE or his designee will be prepared to offer an amendment at 10:30."

I am his designee, and I was prepared to offer the amendment at 10:30. The amendment I was going to offer was the increase in the minimum wage. I was offering it for myself, my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, Senator WELLSTONE, and others.

This was not in order, I want to make it very clear. So it was not consent, but it was an understanding about the way we were going to proceed. Now, as a result of our indication to try to get a debate on the increase on the minimum wage, and hopefully some action on the minimum wage, we have been put into this holding pattern to effectively deny us that opportunity for debate and discussion about increasing the wages for working families, some 13 million working families in this country.

What we are being faced with is another procedural effort by our Republican friends to deny the Senate taking action on this issue. This is a similar kind of avoidance by the Senate that we saw on July 31, when we voted 48 to 49 on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution; again on October 27, 1995, 51-48 to override a budget point of order on the issue on the minimum wage, raised by my colleague, Senator KERRY.

We had a hearing on this issue on December 14, 1995. We have not had the markup. We have not reported anything out. We were prepared to debate this issue, which is of such fundamental importance and fairness to working families in this country. Now we are caught up in a procedural situation where we are, at least at this time, foreclosed from being able to offer it.

I can even foresee the possibilities where that will continue in the afternoon, as we are coming down to the line for a cloture motion to be voted on tomorrow, where those, under the current situation, under the right of recognition, will be able to offer an amendment and then offer another amendment right on top of that and virtually foreclose our opportunity to speak for working families, the 13 million working families who have not experienced any increase since 1991 and have seen the real value of that minimum wage deteriorate by some 40 percent.

So we are seeing the commitment of our Republican friends, and Republican leadership, which cannot be separated from the Republican who is on the ballot out in the State of California, Senator DOLE, as well as the Republican leadership, saying on the issue of worker fairness, we are not even going to permit you to vote on that or address that on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We are going to use all the parliamentary means of denying working families the chance to get any kind of increase in that minimum wage.

At a time when CEO salaries have gone up 23 percent and we are having record profits in 1995; again, 1991, of 23 percent—we are refusing to permit the Senate of the United States to even address this issue, to vote on this issue—an issue which will mean some \$1,800 for working families. This is an issue which will affect 13 million working families. It will be the equivalent of a year's tuition in a 2-year college; 9 months of groceries, 8 months of utilities for working families. We are seeing, at a time when the disparity between the wealthiest workers and families and poorest families has been growing and growing and growing, the small, modest step to try to do something for working families, families that work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, trying to make it—we are seeing we are effectively being closed out. You cannot interpret the kinds of actions we have heard here this morning to be anything else.

Mr. President, I want to point out, because I am on limited time on this