

There are all kinds of advantages in doing this in a proper way. We know that. Apparently, a lot of Republican colleagues share that view because the last time we voted in 1989, 89 Senators supported the increase in the minimum wage. A Republican President signed it into law indicating that he endorsed the principle of a guaranteed and fair minimum wage.

The time has come to show that same bipartisanship and to do it again. A recent Gallup poll said that 77 percent of the American people think that we ought to do it again. Sixty-three percent of Republicans think that we ought to do it again.

This is not a "new mandate." This is not something that we have just dreamed up. This is something we have been doing for decades and decades with the realization you have to start somewhere. The U.S. Conference of Mayors just sent us all a letter that makes it very clear that they endorse an increase in the minimum wage. These are government leaders at the most local level telling us that they see what this does; they know that if we get people off welfare, they can reduce the cost of government. The way to do it is with a minimum wage that works.

So, Mr. President, there are those who say we are somehow encumbering the process. So be it. If there is no other way to ensure that we get a vote on the minimum wage, we have no other choice but to do it this way.

We have all agreed that we will hold off on offering this as an amendment to any other piece of legislation if we can simply get a timeframe within which this can be debated, when we can consider it in a way that gives us a commitment to vote on a minimum wage.

The ultimate irony is that the majority is asking people making \$4.25 an hour to wait until the majority figures out a way to cut their Medicare benefits before they allow them a 45-cent increase. Republicans—at least some of them—are prepared to wage a war on working families.

Two days ago, we saw that they are willing to go to any length to avoid a vote and to face a choice. We saw a 4-hour quorum call, a motion to recommit, a recess in one of the biggest weeks of the year, and talk of an unfunded mandates points of order.

Mr. President, never have so few done so much to deny so little to so many.

Working Americans are not going to be fooled. Our Republican colleagues cannot have it both ways. They express newfound concern for workers in a campaign but then manufacture reasons to oppose them when it is real.

If you oppose the minimum wage, as the House majority leader does, then vote against this. But if you believe that 12 million people—many the sole earners for their families—deserve an increase, then vote for it.

The time to face up to that choice is what this is all about. It is what we were elected to do. Let us do it this afternoon.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. If I have time available, I will be happy to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask the Democrat leader. Is it not so that 51 Senators have already gone on record in favor of raising the minimum wage?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct. We have seen a number of Republicans as well as Democrats—in fact, almost unanimously the Democrats and many Republicans have indicated their support in votes taken earlier last year.

So clearly we have a majority vote in the Senate in support of an increase in the minimum wage.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will my leader agree that these parliamentary maneuvers are really meant to delay, put off, postpone, block an up-or-down vote even though the majority of Senators support such an increase?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield, if I have any time.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask the Senator from South Dakota, correct me if I am wrong, but when the Democrats were in control of the Senate and the House in 1993 and 1994 and you had Bill Clinton in the White House, if this is so urgent, why did not you bring it to the floor any time during those 2 years? Is there any reason why it was not brought to the floor at that time?

Mr. DASCHLE. The answer is very simple. Obviously, if we could put some sort of cost of living adjustment in the minimum wage we would do so. We would do so today. We would do so any time. Obviously that is not possible. So we have to revisit the issue from time to time. The average length of time between increases of the minimum wage is 6 or 7 years. You cannot do it the first couple of years. We know that. As much as we would like to, we recognize the limitations of increasing the minimum wage. But over a period of time, you finally have to come to the conclusion that, if you cannot do it in 2 years, if you cannot do it in 3 years, at least you have to do it in 5 years.

That is really what this is all about—a recognition that we could not do it before but we ought to do it now—now that we have reached a purchasing power level that approaches the lowest in history.

So certainly the Senator from Oklahoma recognizes, as all of us do, that this is the time to face up to the facts and adjust this minimum wage as we know we must.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. DASCHLE. My time has expired. I appreciate the indulgence of the President.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen seconds.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think we have just witnessed a preview of the course of the Senate action from here on until the elections. It is going to be crass political attacks against the Republican Presidential nominee, BOB DOLE. Nothing meaningful is going to get done in this body, and that is simply too bad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. WARNER pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2854, the farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

#### YEAS—74

Abraham	Ford	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bennett	Graham	Murkowski
Biden	Gramm	Murray
Bingaman	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Boxer	Gregg	Pell
Bradley	Hatch	Pressler
Breaux	Hatfield	Robb
Brown	Heflin	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Simon
Coats	Inouye	Simpson
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Cohen	Johnston	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Leahy	Thompson
Dole	Lieberman	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Lugar	Wyden
Feinstein	Mack	

## NAYS—26

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Bryan	Glenn	McCain
Bumpers	Harkin	Mikulski
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	

So the conference report was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

### PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Kennedy amendment No. 3573.

Edward M. Kennedy, Paul Wellstone, Joe Biden, J.J. Exon, Chuck Robb, Carol Moseley-Braun, Christopher Dodd, Bryon L. Dorgan, Claiborne Pell, Kent Conrad, John F. Kerry, Ron Wyden, David Pryor, Russell D. Feingold, Paul Sarbanes, Patrick Leahy, Dianne Feinstein, Frank R. Lautenberg.

## VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are ordered under rule XXII.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—55 yeas, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

## YEAS—55

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Hatfield	Pell
Bradley	Heflin	Pryor
Breaux	Hollings	Reid
Bryan	Inouye	Robb
Bumpers	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Johnston	Roth
Cohen	Kennedy	Santorum
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
Dodd	Lautenberg	Specter
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Exon	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lieberman	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

## NAYS—45

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Gorton	McCain
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Brown	Grams	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Campbell	Gregg	Pressler
Chafee	Hatch	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thompson
Dole	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

### FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 1561, the State Department Authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1561), a bill to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of March 8, 1996.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, 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. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call off the quorum call for 5 minutes to speak as in morning business.

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

### NO GIFT BAN EXEMPTION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today in the Washington Post, and yesterday in the Congress Daily, there were some articles suggesting that Senator MCCONNELL, Chair of the Senate Ethics Committee, was talking about a blanket exemption on the gift ban—and there may be changes to this,

and I hope so—for the upcoming political conventions in San Diego and in Chicago.

Mr. President, I want to speak very briefly—and I suspect that I speak on behalf of other colleagues, Senator MCCAIN from Arizona, Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator LEVIN—after more than 2½ years of negotiations and several hard-fought battles, just as the ink is drying, for a major change like this to be proposed, I think would be a serious breach of faith with the people in our country.

Mr. President, a friend and former Senator, Eugene McCarthy, who, by the way, will be 80 this weekend, has joked with me about being a “Calvinist” on congressional gift rules, but the reason many of us Senators worked very hard on this reform is that we want people to have more confidence and more trust and more faith in the political process. I just want to say that I really think if there is any kind of blanket exemption here, it would be a terrible mistake.

I can see the headlines now: “Members of Congress Take a Holiday from New Ethics Rule;” or “Pressed By Special Interests, Members Backslide to Provide Access;” or another headline, “Safe Harbor From Ethics Rules Members Let Their Hair Down at the Conventions.”

Mr. President, I just want to make it clear to colleagues that we would be making a terrible mistake. It is one thing if there are specific issues that have to be resolved, specific problems where maybe there could be minor clarifications. I say just maybe because I think this gift ban legislation is very reasonable.

But, quite frankly, people do not want to see us go into these conventions and having special interests pay for our hotels or having them pay for various kinds of outings or having them pay for fancy dinners. It is just simply out of the question, Mr. President.

We have a \$50 limit on a gift. You can take one up to \$50. I say if somebody is thinking about eating more than \$50 worth of shrimp at a gathering, this is becoming more a health care issue, not an issue of gift reform.

I do not mean to be just talking about this with a twinkle in my eye, but I want to say to colleagues, I do not know what was intended by these comments, but those who worked very hard on this certainly would be out on the floor. If there was any broad or blanket exemption, we would oppose it with all our might. And, more importantly, people in this country would not stand for it.

Mr. President, let me just say one more time: The ink is barely dried on these new gift rules, and some are now proposing to relax them. All of a sudden we hear about possible exemptions from the gift rules while Members are at the conventions. For Democrats and Republicans alike—let me be bipartisan—it would be a huge mistake to go