

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 to 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

morning hour—hopefully we will have additional time during the debate going before the break—this has not been a partisan issue, historically. There have only been two Presidents, Presidents Reagan and Ford—they are the only two Republican Presidents who have not supported an increase in the minimum wage. President Eisenhower supported it, President Nixon supported it, President Bush supported it. The last time we had an increase, Republicans supported it. BOB DOLE supported it. NEWT GINGRICH supported it.

At that time, we had a Democratic Congress and a Republican President. Now we have Republican Congress and a Democratic President. And we ask: Why? Why is it that we cannot, at least, debate this issue? And why is it that we cannot afford to provide working families with a livable wage?

Mr. President, I hope we are not going to hear our Republican friends talk about their concern for working families in this country when something that we can do, here on the floor of the U.S. Senate today, and the House of Representatives can do in a matter of hours, that can make a difference to the lives and well-being of those—that we are being denied the opportunity to face this issue, to debate the issue, to talk about the issue, to take on the issues which have been raised against the increase—the questions of inflation, the question of job loss.

All of those issues which we have debated and discussed at other times, we are prepared today, with our colleagues, to debate those here. But we are back at a situation where those who lay the agenda out for the American people in the U.S. Senate, absolutely refuse to give the American working families the opportunity to be heard on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, as we have said before, Senator KERRY, Senator WELLSTONE and others have said before, this issue is not going away. This issue is not going away. We have seen the parliamentary maneuvers to deny us an opportunity to take action. We have seen that before. We know it is out there again today.

I do not understand what it is. Yes, I could understand. It is, again, the power of special financial interests, the special interests that just refuse to let working families in this country be treated fairly, equitably, and decently. Finally, this is an issue about women, since 70 percent of all of those who get the minimum wage are women, and it is an issue about children, whether they are going to grow up in households that are going to be decently fed and clothed, and in a setting which is humane and decent. This is not just an issue about men. It is an issue about women and it is an issue about children. It is an issue about families. We will not be silenced and we will not be denied. We are going to continue to press this. I am absolutely convinced

that the working families in this country will be heard and we will have a successful vote.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, for his leadership in this effort, and Senator WELLSTONE and others who believe that the moment has really come for us to confront the reality of the rhetoric in Washington that talks about worker anxiety, that pays lip service to addressing the problem of downsizing and to the problem of the transformation in the American workplace.

Countless Senators, on both sides of the aisle, have come to the floor on many different occasions and talked about the difficulties that the American worker faces today.

In the Republican primaries, it became a major issue as Pat Buchanan focused on the anger that is coming out of those workers who work harder and harder and harder, play by the rules, pay their taxes, try to make ends meet, teach their kids, and yet they cannot get ahead.

We have an opportunity in the U.S. Senate to ratify what the Senate has already expressed. Fifty-one U.S. Senators already voted last year, saying they want to vote on a proposal to increase the minimum wage. The minimum wage is worth less now than it was when those 51 Senators who voted said we need to raise it.

The Republican majority has the opportunity to set the agenda of the Senate and, to some degree, thereby, the agenda of the country. As my colleague from Massachusetts said, this is their statement about their agenda. Their agenda is to not even let the U.S. Senate debate this and have an up-or-down vote on whether or not a majority of the U.S. Senate thinks it is time to raise the minimum wage.

Increasing the minimum wage is not a great breaking of new ground in this country. In 1938, we passed a minimum wage and set it at 25 cents. In 1938, we came to a consensus in America that we ought to pay people a minimum base standard of living by which they ought to be able to work and achieve the American dream. Every year since 1938, when that wage dipped below because of inflation and changes in the marketplace, we raised the minimum wage. Democrat and Republican alike joined together to raise the minimum wage. The last time we raised it was 1989, and I think there were something like 86 or 89 votes in the U.S. Senate to raise it to the current level of \$4.25.

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

Mr. KERRY. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder, given the bipartisan support since 1938, can the Senator answer the question for me, what would be the basis now for the opposition of the majority leader,

Senator DOLE, and others in preventing us from even having this amendment out on the floor and having an up-or-down vote? Does the Senator have any idea, given this bipartisan support, given how important it is to working families, given the fact we have heard the majority leader campaign around the country about the importance of working families and fairness, what would be the basis of opposition to our having this amendment on the floor and having this debate? Does the Senator have any idea?

Mr. KERRY. I must confess to the Senator from Minnesota, I do not understand that. I cannot understand why Senator DOLE, who previously voted to raise the minimum wage, would not want to raise the minimum wage above what soon will be a 40-year low in purchasing power. The minimum wage in this country soon will be at a 40-year low. The poverty level in America is \$12,500 for a family of three. It is \$15,150 for a family of four. On a minimum wage, you can earn \$8,500, three-quarters the level of poverty for a family of three, and only about half the poverty level for a family of four.

I honestly do not know why the Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, the nominee-to-be of the Republican Party, would not want to see the minimum wage raised, particularly since he has previously joined in the bipartisan effort to try to do that. I do not have an answer. Maybe my colleague has an answer.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If I can ask one other question, because I am trying to understand the disconnect between politics in Washington today where at least for the moment you have a Presidential candidate, the majority leader, who does not seem to want us to have a debate on this versus what we hear back in our States.

In Massachusetts, as you visit with families and spend time in communities, do you find that people talk a lot about the importance of jobs, of decent wages and raising the minimum wage? Is this an issue that you hear about all the time from people you represent?

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to my friend from Minnesota, when you talk to working people in Massachusetts and when you talk to almost anybody—white-collar workers, people who have good jobs in our high-technology economy, people who are part of our financial services industry, which is one of the strongest in the Nation—I would say 80 percent of the people believe that workers at the bottom rung of the economic ladder ought to be able to secure income from their work that is at least equal to the poverty level. That is all we are asking for here.

As an example, to answer your question specifically, a fellow named Neil Donovan, who runs something called Project Impact, which is a Massachusetts organization that puts homeless people into jobs, has said that a job placement at the minimum wage is, in

fact, a recipe for failure. That is the experience of someone who runs a homeless shelter and wants to help those in the shelter to move toward self-sufficiency.

Why is that? I can tell you, using as examples people who live in homeless shelters. There is a fellow about whom I have talked recently who lost his job. He is now in a homeless shelter. Four months ago, he found a new job. He is working as a stock clerk, doing errands in a small operation. He is working at the minimum wage, and at the end of the week, he brings home \$132.50. He proudly brings this \$132.50 back to the homeless shelter in which he still lives, because even the full \$132.50 is too little to be able to pay for the smallest, cheapest studio apartment in the city of Boston.

That amount does not begin to pay for health care. If you are a parent of a young child, it does not pay for day care. It does not pay the food bills for the month, after you have paid for the rent. We are talking about fundamental subsistence here.

Corporations have seen their revenues increase 12 percent or more, but the total personal income of the country as a whole, taking all incomes into account, has only gone up 2 percent. And we know that even this increase was not evenly distributed across the income spectrum. The incomes that increased were mostly at the upper level.

Here in the Congress we have a lot of people earning 10 times the poverty level. Ten times the poverty level we earn in the U.S. Congress, and the Republican leadership of the U.S. Senate is unwilling to raise the income level for those who are working at three-quarters of the poverty level and one-tenth of the salary of Senators.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Might I ask the Senator two more questions?

Mr. KERRY. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. So what the Senator is saying is that right now, \$4.25 an hour, what happens is that with a family, you have somebody working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year and still not making poverty wages.

If we were to raise this minimum wage in the amendment we want to offer, I think the senior Senator from Massachusetts said this would be an additional \$1,800. I know what this means to a family in Minnesota, but for a working family in Massachusetts, what does that mean? What does \$1,800 mean?

Let us talk in real people terms so that people understand this is not some party strategy, this is about people's lives, and we think this is critically important to do. As of the moment, we cannot even get our colleagues on the other side to debate. What does this mean to people in Massachusetts?

Mr. KERRY. To a family in Massachusetts, say a single parent with two kids, that spends about 60 bucks a week on groceries, this means a difference of 7 months groceries. What we are talking about is 7 months of food

for the adult who is the combination breadwinner and parent and the two children. Obviously, if you can buy the 7 months of groceries, you then may also be able to move some of the money you had been spending on food to pay the heating bill, pay the rent, pay the utilities, or, if you are lucky enough to own a home, pay the mortgage. But, of course, you are very unlikely to own a home if the family's income depends on a minimum-wage job.

But there are many Americans who are hampered in what jobs they can get because they do not have transportation. Often that is the difference—being able to travel by some means from home to a job. An increase in the minimum wage easily could enable a worker to afford transportation, maybe a \$3,000 used car, so you can travel beyond the confines of an area where there are not a lot of jobs, and find a better job.

There are many people with whom I talk in Massachusetts who are limited in their ability to get a decent job by their inability to be able to get to the job. As we are seeing more and more reductions in transit subsidies, bus routes are being cut, the fares are going up. People are actually written out of jobs because they cannot get to them.

But let me just make one further point to my colleague, and then I will yield the floor to him. All of this is not really that complicated. You hear the same arguments every time. Oh, if you raise the minimum wage, all those kids in the work force or who want to come into the work force are going to be denied jobs. But the truth is, we are not talking about kids. We are talking about adults. More than 70 percent of the people working on minimum wage are adults. More than two-thirds of them are women. These are working families that are affected here.

The argument is made that, oh, we are going to lose jobs if we raise that minimum wage. Well, there are at least 12 studies, several of them in the last couple of years, that refute that argument. A couple of these studies were done in New Jersey because New Jersey raised its minimum wage. You heard all the same arguments about New Jersey. And New Jersey experienced an increase in jobs.

Can anyone look around America in any year in which we have raised the minimum wage and say that doing so held us back—that it hurt our economy or cost us jobs? Can you look around this country and suggest that we have not created more jobs and raised people's incomes while we provided that income floor which guaranteed that American workers are not going to be exploited?

Mr. President, let us be honest about the history of what happened in our Nation. Go back and read the "Grapes of Wrath." Go back through the history of the labor movement. Are we going to pretend that the gains for America's workers came spontane-

ously? Did they come out of the goodness of the hearts of managers or owners of the coal mines or the steel mills or the railroads of this Nation? No.

Everybody knows the sacrifices that the labor movement had to make, and that people lost their lives. People were shut out, people were starved, people were hit over the head, knees were broken. People were killed because workers had to fight for the right to be able to get a decent wage. There was even a time, believe it or not—how amazing—when people had to strike because they thought that they should not work more than 8 hours a day. Remember the exploitation of child labor? Remember the various diseases, the inhumane working conditions?

So through the years we have reached a point in America where we thought we had a fundamental understanding about what was fair. Now you have people working at the minimum wage who are earning only three-quarters or half the level of poverty for their families. And we have a party that believes that those of us elected to try to make these choices in Washington should not have the right on the floor of the Senate to have an up-or-down vote on a proposal to increase that minimum wage. It is very simple. In this body, 51 votes is the measure of what we do. In this case, 51 votes is the measure of whether Americans working at the minimum wage will receive a raise.

The chief executive officers of this country have not had a hard time getting raises. When 40,000 people are laid off at AT&T, the stock goes up and the chief executive can walk away with millions of dollars in additional compensation. What happens to those workers who were the victims of the downsizing? Well, maybe they have a skill level where they will break into another job. But for those people at the very bottom rung of the ladder, they are not going to have a chance to reach the next rung, or even to stay on the bottom rung, unless we lift their living standard and give them a raise.

When one examines the ratio of salaries of chief executive officers to salaries of their companies' wage earners, the ratio has moved from 50 to 1, where it remained for decades in this country, to over several hundred to one today. It just seems incomprehensible to me, Mr. President, that we should be even debating whether we should give the workers on the bottom rung of the ladder a raise, especially when the purchasing power of their current wage is at a 40-year low. That is what this is all about. I hope that our colleagues will join with us in our traditional bipartisan approach on this issue and raise the minimum wage in this country.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

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

## PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Paul Mazur during the duration of the debate on this bill.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to thank both my colleagues from Massachusetts. Let me just get back to basics. This amendment that I thought we were going to lay down this morning is simple and straightforward. It would increase the minimum wage, the Federal minimum wage from the current \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour over the next 2 years. That is all. Mr. President, 90 cents over 2 years, no indexing to adjust for the cost of living, no other things to complicate the debate.

A straightforward proposition—raise the Federal minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour for working families in our country, to \$5.15 an hour over 2 years, and 90 cents over 2 years. For some reason my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, at least as of this morning, do not want us to be able to lay this amendment out on the floor of the Senate and have the debate and vote for it up or down.

I would just say to my colleagues, that this is simple, this is straightforward. My colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, talked about CEO salaries. Let me just be blunt. The U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate sure as heck voted themselves a huge raise, an increase from about \$100,000 a few years ago to \$130,000 a year. I heard my colleagues tell me that, you know, you have kids in college and there is additional expenses and all of the rest.

Fair enough. But if the U.S. Senate can vote for a salary increase from \$100,000 to \$130,000 a year—and the House took the action earlier—do you not think it is about time we are willing to raise the minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour over 2 years? Do you not think it is about time that we would be willing to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents over 2 years?

Mr. President, I do not know what the majority leader plans on doing. But it does seem to me that we have now reached the point where regardless of the strategies and regardless of whatever parliamentary ruling there might be, it is going to be very difficult for Senators to essentially finesse this issue. Because while we are putting off the debate, at least for the moment, there are many Americans who have to live with this minimum wage. We are putting the debate off on the minimum wage this morning, while many Americans have to live with it. For 200,000 working people and their families in Minnesota, this is an extremely important issue.

Later on, Mr. President, when we get to the debate, I will talk about people.

I do not want it to be abstract. But let me just tell you, whether it is a single parent working or whether it is two parents working, this debate about the minimum wage, this effort to raise the minimum wage, is absolutely key toward providing people with a ladder to get into the middle class. This is a fundamental economic justice question. I will just say one more time, I came to the floor about 10:30. I thought we had an understanding that we would go forward with this amendment.

My hope is that after the caucuses meet at lunch we will be able to do so, that we will be able to lay down our amendment, that we will have debate on this amendment, and that Senators will be accountable, Democrats and Republicans alike. Because I will tell you; in Minnesota, the cafe discussion is whether or not your children are going to be able to find jobs at a decent wage. The cafe discussion is whether or not you can pay your mortgage payment or whether you can pay your rent. The cafe discussion is whether you can afford to send your kids to college. The cafe discussion is on the economic squeeze that families feel.

The vast majority of people in Minnesota and the vast majority of people all across this country want to see us take action on this.

I say one more time, the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives did not seem to have any problem in voting ourselves a huge pay increase. Do you not think it is about time we vote for a pay increase for working families in this country, and set some kind of decent, humane, compassionate minimum wage floor for working men and women and their children?

That is what this is about. I do not think anybody is going to be able to hide from this debate. I do not think there is going to be any way of maneuvering around this debate. I am just speaking for myself. I am not even speaking for my two colleagues from Massachusetts. But I intend to be a part of this effort to introduce this amendment over and over and over again.

You cannot duck. You cannot hide. It is an important economic issue. It is an important economic opportunity issue. It is all about working men and women and their children. It is all about economic justice. It is all about fairness. And it is time we get serious about these kinds of issues in the U.S. Senate. I hope this afternoon after lunch we will have the opportunity to lay down our amendment and then we will have this debate. Then we will have a positive, affirmative vote for working men, women, and children in the State of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know the time is divided. I am just wondering—I want to have a few more

moments for a statement I want to make between now and 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts, his side has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will yield myself 3½ minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, why we wanted to have the opportunity to address this issue is because, as this chart shows, between 1979 and 1993, this shows what has happened to real family income during this period of time.

This body is familiar with what happened before 1979 from the postwar period from 1949 up to 1979. Virtually each of these columns all moved up together up to about 100 percent improvement in the family income growth. Virtually at every level of the economy everyone moved up together. We have gone through that in other debates on the minimum wage and we may have a chance, if there is a challenge to this, to go into that in some greater detail.

But what we have now seen is 1979–93, the bottom fifth of the population has seen a real loss of 17 percent. I am always interested in how we evaluate what has happened in the median, where the median is. If you take the median as for the highest wages and the highest profits and the highest growth of the wealthiest families and the least you come out somewhere in the middle.

But the fact of the matter is that is not a good indication of what is happening to those on the bottom rung of the ladder. They are the ones that have fallen furthest behind from 1990 to 1993. This is the group which would be most affected and most helped and assisted with the increase in the minimum wage. It would be modest. It amounts to about \$3.4 billion that would go to that particular group.

We will hear a lot about this is very inflationary. That is \$3.4 billion in a \$5 trillion economy. That is \$3.4 billion in a \$5 trillion economy. And they are going to talk about, well, it is inflation and it is going to set off all of the economy? This demonstrates what is out there in terms of our colleagues who are working in America.

The ones that are being affected by the minimum wage, as has been pointed out, are the ones that are working full time, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year. This chart shows what the real minimum wage is. That is in the purchasing power. This continues to go. It will be the lowest it was since 1989.

In 1989, as has been pointed out in this debate, at that level, of Republicans and Democrats, there were only nine Members of the U.S. Senate in 1989 that voted against it. And 32 Members of the Republican Party voted for this increase. George Bush voted for that increase. Effectively we are right back down to—BOB DOLE voted for the increase. We are right back to that level now. Plus, I think most would understand that the economy is stronger

today than it was at that particular time.

Mr. President, this chart shows what is happening. The Dow-Jones average, inflation adjusted, goes right up through the roof. Here it is. It breaks through the roof. This is what is happening with the stock market, the Dow-Jones average, right up through the roof. The real minimum wage, inflation adjusted, the small increase here with the 90-cent increase, right back down again. And what we are talking about with this amendment would be a 90-cent increase over the next 2 years.

Mr. President, as has been pointed out, these are the individuals who are affected—16 to 19 years is 31 percent; over 20 years of age, 70 percent. We are talking about adults; 70 percent of the individuals are over 20 years of age.

Mr. President, this is an indication, again, as I mentioned briefly, about who in our society is going to be impacted. Men represent 40 percent of the wage earners from \$4.25 to \$5.14. These are the wage earners that would be impacted by this increase. Again, 60 percent would be women. Many of them are single women. Many of them have children. That is why I believe that this is not just—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself the final 30 seconds.

Is not just a workers' issue; it is a women's issue and a child's issue.

Mr. President, we will have the opportunity to go on and show about what the impact has been on inflation and employment since the end of World War II. We are glad to debate this issue, to take on issues and go through them and let the Senate vote its will.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we will have that opportunity when the legislation is going to come up under what was agreed to last evening to be recognized. We will offer this amendment. We hope that we will be able to work out an agreeable format so that we can have a real debate on the issue and then have a final vote, find out who is on the side of working families in this country.

My time has expired. I understand the remaining time will be available to the Members of the other party and we will be back here at 2:15 to continue this debate.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I did not come to the floor for the purpose of discussing this issue, but having listened to this discussion, I do want to remark on the bizarre nature of an argument which emphasized so strongly the outrage of the last three Senators in not being permitted to debate an issue which they were, of course, debating, on which they will place an amendment, when each of those three Senators has been visibly engaged in the last 4 weeks in preventing the Sen-

ate from voting on an appropriations bill for the District of Columbia with all of the positive impact that has on poor people, law enforcement, and education in the District, and by foolishly engaging at the same time in filibustering an attempt to bring to conclusion—to extend and bring to conclusion—the Whitewater investigation. We have not been permitted to debate these issues on their merits or to vote on their merits. For the life of me, I do not understand how that differs from the objection they are making today, particularly since they will, of course, be able to bring up such an amendment and have a debate on it.

I also point out, they neglected to state that all of their examples relate to some 10 or 15 percent, a very small percentage, of minimum-wage people who are the primary supporters for their families, and that a proposal that would obviously benefit that small handful of people will have a terribly damaging effect on first jobs for teenager and welfare recipients attempting to build new lives and living for themselves.

The compassion for those people, at the beginning of their careers, seem to be remarkably absent in the debate we have heard so far.

#### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE IS A BAD IDEA

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to some of the statements that were made by our colleagues from Massachusetts, who said we should increase the minimum wage. I will make a couple of editorial comments because I do not know that we need to debate it at this time, but I feel a need to respond to some of the statements made on the floor of the Senate.

The implication was that if we do not increase the minimum wage, we do not care about low-income people. I find that to be offensive. That attempts to show that maybe those of us who oppose raising the minimum wage are not only insensitive, but we do not care about poor people or something. I disagree with that. Maybe we should turn that argument around. Maybe those of us who care more about poor people should increase the minimum wage to \$10, \$15, or \$20 an hour. I would like for everybody in America to make \$20 an hour. But is the proper way to do it to pass a law that says it is against the law for you to have a job if you do not make that? That is what our colleagues from Massachusetts are doing. They want to offer an amendment that says it is against the law for you to have a job unless it pays \$5.15 an hour. They do not care if the job is in rural Missouri or Oklahoma. Maybe every job in Massachusetts pays that much. I do not care if the State of Massachusetts passes a minimum wage law for any figure. That is their prerogative. But to pass a law that makes it effective in my State and all across the country and says it is against the Fed-

eral law to have a job that pays less than \$5.15, I think is a serious mistake.

Who does it hurt? I think it would hurt the very people they propose to help. It would be telling a lot of people who are low income, who have a job that maybe does not pay much, it pays minimum wage—by definition, that is not much, but at least they have a job—and we are going to say, unless that job pays at least \$5.15 an hour, we do not think you should have that job. As a matter of fact, it is against the law, against the Federal law for you to have a job unless it pays that amount. I totally disagree with that.

I just have to say that I do not understand the effort made to have this amendment on this bill. We have a lands bill up. We have a bill that deals with Presidio, deals with the land exchange in Oklahoma and Arkansas, and we have a bill dealing with Utah wilderness. It is a complicated bill. I compliment my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, for his leadership on this bill.

What does the minimum wage amendment have to do with this bill? Nothing—except for politics. I will say it has something to do with politics. My colleagues said that we have not had an increase in the minimum wage since 1989—7 years. Wait a minute. The Democrats were in control of the Senate and the House and the White House in the years 1993 and 1994. Why did they not have the bill on the floor then? The majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, at that time could have brought it up. But he did not. Why? Well, they were trying to have a big increase in the minimum wage because they wanted to mandate a very expensive health care plan on America. Maybe they figured they could not do both. They controlled the agenda. The Senator from Massachusetts could have offered that amendment, and he did not do it. We did not have a vote in 1993 and 1994 when President Clinton and the Democrats were in control. But we are having one today.

I noticed a coincidence in today's paper, the Washington Post. The headline is, "AFL-CIO Endorses Clinton, Approves \$35 Million Political Program." They want to enact their agenda. This is on their agenda. My colleagues talked about special interests. I would say this is a pretty big special interest. I would say that all of their members make more than minimum wage. Maybe all of them do. There are a lot of people in rural Missouri or rural Oklahoma making minimum wage, and if you increase the minimum wage by a certain amount, you are going to be putting some people out of work. I do not know who, but I know there are some. I have been in rural areas that have grocery stores that are striving to stay alive because they had a big company come in, like Wal-Mart or somebody, a big competitor.

Yes, they were paying \$4.50 an hour or whatever the amount would be, and they are not making any money. But if