

a debate a lot like the one we are hearing today.

We like to think that Delaware is a special place, Mr. President, and in many ways it is. But it is also a lot like the rest of the country. We have big businesses and small, we have world-class high-technology businesses in chemicals and pharmaceuticals, a cutting-edge financial service sector and—a lot of my colleagues are surprised when I tell them this—a major agricultural sector.

With that kind of diversity, I think Delaware has something to teach the rest of the country. We are, after all, the first State to ratify the Constitution, so we think our example is worth following.

The proposal we adopted in Delaware is much like the one before the Senate today. The proposal before us today would call for a two-step increase in the minimum wage, from the current \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15. In Delaware, we also chose a two-step increase, from \$4.25 to \$5.00.

In my State, that increase will directly affect over 30,000 Delawareans and their families, 9.5 percent of the work force, just a little below the national average of 11.5 percent who currently work for the minimum wage.

So Delaware is like the rest of the country, Mr. President, just a little bit ahead of everybody else when it comes to addressing the problem of stagnant family incomes in general and the shrinking value of the minimum wage in particular.

And that is what I would like to talk about today, Mr. President—the puzzle of why, in a growing economy, with rising productivity and rising profits, a full-time job for hard-working adults has failed to provide a rising standard of living.

The minimum wage itself provides one important illustration of this disturbing trend. Since 1991, the last time we raised the minimum wage—with a bipartisan majority, Mr. President, and signed into law by President Bush—the real spending power of the minimum wage has dropped nearly 50 cents.

If we fail to raise the minimum wage, it will drop to a 40-year low when this year is over. Right now, you can put in a full 40-hour workweek, 52 weeks a year, and take home just \$8,840, just three-quarters of the poverty level for a family of three.

For those families, with a full-time worker, the current minimum wage is not even the minimum they need to stay out of poverty. That is something we cannot forget as we search for ways to convince more people to stay off of welfare and to turn away from crime.

There are, unfortunately, other examples of the declining rewards of hard work for so many American families.

It is not just those wage earners who are working to keep themselves and their families out of poverty who have seen their incomes stuck, who are running as fast as they can just to keep from falling further behind.

Mr. President, the median wage—the real middle income statistically speaking—is actually 5 percent less this year than it was in 1979. This is happening in an economy that has been growing at about 2.5 percent over the same time.

Where has all that growth been going? Who has gained from the growth in the economy? Between 1977 and 1992, the lowest 20 percent of American families saw their incomes drop 17 percent. But the top 20 percent enjoyed a 28-percent increase, and the top 1 percent saw their incomes shoot up 91 percent—virtually doubling.

So there has been growth, Mr. President, but the distribution of that growth among working families has been increasingly unequal.

Now, I for one do not think that human nature has changed all that much in the last 20 to 25 years. I do not think the richest 1 percent are suddenly twice as smart as they used to be, or that workers at the other end of the scale decided to become less productive.

Something else is going on, Mr. President, something more fundamental and far reaching than a simple business cycle, perhaps something we have seen only a couple of times before in our Nation's economic history. There is a lot of evidence that the economy no longer functions the way it used to, that it no longer provides the stable, middle-income jobs that built America's middle class after World War II.

As someone who has put his faith in the free enterprise system, Mr. President, I am inclined to see these changes as part of the way this system works—changing markets, changing products, changing skills have always been a key feature of the American economy.

But while Americans have a strong tolerance—even an appetite—for the dynamic shifts that characterize our economic system, they have an equally strong sense of fairness. Americans expect that hard work will be rewarded—not with riches, maybe, but certainly with a little security and a little comfort.

For far too many Americans, Mr. President, our system is providing far too much of those dynamic changes and far too little fairness.

I don't want my colleagues to forget that the absolute, bedrock requirement of our democratic system is the belief by the majority of our people that they are being treated fairly. Because this is not just a free enterprise economy, Mr. President, that we have here in America. We are blessed to have a system of popular government that provides and protects the property rights that are the foundation of our economy.

Take away that sense of fairness, take away the sense that at the end of the day, there is some justice in the way our capitalist democracy works, and people can start looking at other systems, other answers. The unhappy

history of this century provides too many examples for us to blithely dismiss this problem.

It is not too much to say that the real bottom line that we have to keep our eyes on is on the balance sheet of fairness. No amount of national wealth can buy that sense of fairness, no list of statistics can substitute for it.

As an optimist, Mr. President, I do not believe we are facing an insurmountable crisis. In fact, by my reading, a large part of our history has been a pretty successful search for ways to balance the changing demands of a dynamic economy with the unchanging demand for some basic fairness, for some simple justice, in the way we reward work.

We can make work pay, and make work a realistic alternative to the wasteful choices of welfare or crime, that will surely cost us more than the modest minimum wage bill before us today.

So I urge my colleagues to follow the lead of my State of Delaware. Restore some of the historical value of the minimum wage, some of the justice that is the real bottom line in America.

#### EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of former Senator Edmund Muskie. He was a very productive Member of this body and he made great contributions to its deliberations and to the welfare of our Nation. I admired him very much.

I first came to know Ed Muskie when he was Governor of Maine and a delegate to our party's national conventions. I always found him to be a person of great common sense and practicality, traits that reflected his years of experience in the Maine State Legislature and before that as a city official in Waterville.

He was always a highly effective advocate for the interests of New England, and in that role as in other aspects of his wide ranging Senate career, he was capable of displaying his sense of righteous indignation in the interests of producing results.

Perhaps his greatest and most lasting contribution was his work in securing enactment of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and his subsequent service as the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here his practical vision saw the need for a consolidated legislative budget that coordinated and reconciled legislative appropriations with executive spending.

Ed Muskie's Senate career came to a sudden and surprising conclusion with his elevation to the office of Secretary of State in the Carter administration at the height of the Iraq crisis in 1980. It was a measure of Senator Muskie's stature in the Senate and in the Nation that President Carter turned to him at a time when circumstances called for a steady and authoritative hand.

It was a fitting climax to a career of exceptionally distinguished public service.

I join my colleagues in honoring the memory of Edmund Muskie and I extend my sympathy to his wife Jane, family and many associates in Maine and across the country.

#### ED MUSKIE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a colleague and friend of mine who has just recently passed away. To those of us who were here during the sixties and seventies, Edmund Muskie was more than a fellow legislator, he was a model of what a Senator should be. He was well liked and respected by all, and he listened to his constituents closely, and he effected change on their behalf.

To put it simply, Ed Muskie was the best. Today, with all the talk about the Government being too big, and all the public scorn for the establishment, it is easy to lose sight of the optimism that used to be a driving force of politics. Senator Muskie embodied that optimism; He looked upon government as an opportunity, as a solution to problems. Characteristically, he acted on these beliefs to get things done. He led the demand for fiscal responsibility. As the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee in 1974, he virtually created the budget process. He will also be remembered as a great environmental legislator. The Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act: these were not a part of Muskie's political agenda due to pressure from lobbyists or special interest groups. They were things that he believed were necessary, and so he made them happen.

I knew Ed Muskie long before I came to the Senate, and he always felt things keenly. I used to joke with him about what I called his righteous indignation, but I always respected the moral conviction and strength that lay behind it. Senator Muskie detested the influence of lobbies and partisanship, and what they were doing to politics. He was in government to do a good job, not to play games. He was—and in this city, this is a great compliment—a man who got things done. The principles that he lived by came through in his work, whether as a Senator, a Secretary of State or as a lawyer and statesman. He knew the importance of character and of listening to the voter.

In 1970, Senator Muskie gave a memorable speech in which he said: "There are only two kinds of politics. They are not radical and reactionary, or conservative and liberal, or even Democratic and Republican. They are only the politics of fear and the politics of trust." As we head into another election year and another century, these are words to remember. Ed Muskie was a champion of the politics of trust. We will remember him fondly.

#### EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, few who ever served in this body have been as

universally mourned as those of us from both sides of the aisle who knew him will mourn our former colleague, Ed Muskie, who died here in Washington early this morning.

The reports already circulating on the news wire services and the obituaries that will appear in tomorrow's newspapers, all will make much, and rightly so, out of his long and distinguished service as a public man.

Few men or women in our history have contributed so much to the Nation as Ed Muskie did as a U.S. Senator for 21 years and as Secretary of State; few have contributed as much to their native State as Ed Muskie did as a member of the Maine House of Representatives and as Governor of the State he loved so much; and few have contributed as much to one of the major political parties as Ed Muskie did to the Democratic Party, which he served as a Vice Presidential candidate in 1968 and as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

It is fitting that, upon his death just 2 days before his 82d birthday, Americans should be reminded of his long and faithful public service and leadership—but those of us who knew and served with Ed Muskie will remember him more familiarly as a man of principle, as a powerful personality, and, most of all, as our good friend.

One thing that I learned very quickly, serving with him on the Budget Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, was that while he exhibited the gravitas—the character and substance—that might be expected of a man whose full given name was Edmund Sixtus Muskie, he was a very human, very good-humored man—most of the time—who was most comfortable simply as Ed Muskie, and who if he was your friend was your friend for life.

It is true that his good humor would sometimes momentarily desert him—he had a temper that verged on the volcanic, and he was capable of weeping public tears over an insult to the wife whom he loved—but those moments occurred, for the most part, because Ed Muskie never believed that a career in politics obliged his head to divorce his heart; despite a powerful intellect that won him a law degree, a Phi Beta Kappa key and a long, successful career both in law and in politics, he never believed that political feelings must somehow be set aside.

He was passionate about his politics—he believed the work we do here is important to improving the lives of Americans—and he believed that what he felt was as important to achieving that end as what he thought.

But though Ed Muskie sometimes wore his heart unashamedly on his sleeve, he was also very much a Yankee, very much a man of Maine, who put great stock in getting things done, and getting them done at the right price.

By that I am not referring so much to his chairmanship of the Budget

Committee—although he certainly exerted a strong hand at that helm, often to the dismay of bureaucrats throughout the land and not infrequently to Senate colleagues who failed to make a strong enough case for their favorite program—no, for him, getting things done at the right price meant achieving that meld of idealism and realism which we often say a democratic system of Government requires but which few of us ever achieve with the grace and consistency of an Ed Muskie.

The people of Maine understood that as well as we did here in the Senate, and he understood and loved them, as well.

I remember him saying one time, "in Maine, we tend not to speak unless we think we can improve upon the silence."

Out of his wisdom, out of his passion, out of his drive to get things done, Ed Muskie often spoke up for Maine and for America—and we need only feel the silence of his passing gather about us now to know how much he improved upon it during a long and accomplished life.

In the words of William Shakespeare, "he was a man, take him for all in all, [we] shall not look upon his like again."

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MUSKIE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this morning we were sad to learn of the passing of one of our most distinguished former colleagues, Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine.

Ed Muskie served our Nation in many ways. He was a soldier. A Governor. The first chairman of the Budget Committee. The Secretary of State. The Democratic Party's candidate for Vice President.

He also was responsible, in large part, for one of the most positive and profound legislative achievements of postwar America: the passage of the environmental laws of the 1970's, to clean up our Nation's air, water, and waste.

Remember what things were like 25 years ago. We had experienced decades of industrial growth without environmental protection. Lead in the air caused brain damage in children. Toxic waste dumps all across the country caused cancer. The Cuyahoga River even caught fire.

Something had to be done. And, as chairman of the Environmental Protection Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Ed Muskie saw that it was. He worked tirelessly to create bipartisan support for landmark environmental laws.

The Clean Water Act, requiring rivers and streams to be fishable and swimmable; the Clean Air Act, cutting emissions from cars and factories; the Safe Drinking Water Act; the Endangered Species Act.

These laws are not perfect. But, on the whole, they have been remarkably successful. Our air is cleaner. Lead