

that has occurred since the 1970's especially among women.

While some claim a moderate increase in the minimum wage will cost jobs, leading economists find little evidence of loss of employment. Instead, they find that a ripple effect could expand the impact beyond the immediate minimum wage work force. Some workers in low-wage jobs who currently earn more than the minimum wage may see an increase in their earnings as minimum wages rise.

As the richest nation on Earth, our minimum wage should be a living wage. But it isn't close. When a father or mother works full-time, 40 hours a week, year-round, they should be able to lift their family out of poverty.

The current minimum wage is actually about \$2 an hour less than what a family of four needs to live above the poverty line. At \$4.25 an hour, you earn \$680 a month, gross. That is \$8,160 per year.

Adults who support their families would be the prime beneficiaries of our proposal to raise the minimum wage. Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage earners are adults and more than one-third are the sole breadwinners. Nearly 60 percent of the full-time minimum wage earners are women. Often these are women bringing home the family's only paycheck.

In 32 States over 10 percent of the work force would benefit directly from an increase in the minimum wage. In Michigan, 324,000 workers, almost 12 percent of the work force are making the minimum wage. Some 435,000 workers earn less than \$5.15 per hour.

Mr. President, the bottom line is work should pay, and the current minimum wage is not enough to live on. The minimum wage is a floor beneath which no one should fall. But we should make sure that standing on the floor, a person can reach the table. A full-time minimum wage job should provide a minimum standard of living in addition to giving workers the dignity that comes with a paycheck. Hard-working Americans deserve a fair deal.

Mr. President, it is ironic that many who are the strongest line-item veto proponents and who, last year, indeed were proposing a version of line-item veto which would have caused bills to be carved up into hundreds of separate bills for the President's signature or veto, now are trying to do the reverse. They are taking clearly unrelated matters and lumping them together while blocking important relevant amendments. We need to get on with the business of the Nation. We should address the gas tax proposal, the minimum wage increase, and the other matters before the Senate in separate bills, allow Senators to propose their amendments, debate the issues, vote, and send legislation to the President for his signature or veto. The only reason this is being wrapped up in one big package and hamstrung it with parliamentary entanglements, is Presidential politics. I predict it will not benefit those who

concocted the strategy. Our Nation deserves better.

Mr. President, I did want to spend a few minutes this morning pointing out some of the difficulties that I think will be created if we pass this underlying bill without criteria being established, without a Senate committee report, without a requirement that fees be reasonable, without a limit on the amount of the authorization here, the obligation of the Federal Treasury. There are some precedents that are being set here if we pass this bill as is, which should not be set without further deliberation by the Senate because of the implications to the Treasury of thousands of people who have been indicted who are either then acquitted or whose cases are dismissed who might also be able to make claims under the precedent that could arguably be set by this bill.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative 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.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 2202

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate H.R. 2202, the illegal immigration reform bill, so that the Senate's actions of yesterday, requesting the conference and appointing conferees, can be executed.

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

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move the Senate now recess under the previous order until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

The motion was agreed to, and, at 2:15 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JEFFORDS).

WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the clerk will report the cloture 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 Dole amendment, No. 3961:

Bob Dole, Trent Lott, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, R.F. Bennett, Mark Hatfield, Ben N. Campbell, Spencer Abraham, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Don Nickles, Chuck Grassley, Conrad Burns, John Ashcroft, Jim Inhofe, P. Gramm, W.V. Roth, Jr.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 3961 shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—43

Akaka	Ford	Mikulski
Bingaman	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Graham	Moynihan
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Heflin	Nunn
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Simon
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Exon	Leahy	Wyden
Feingold	Levin	
Feinstein	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—3

Biden	Kerrey	Pell
-------	--------	------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 43. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now

be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

Mrs. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1756 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1755 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Iowa.

REDUCING THE GASOLINE TAX

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, even though we are in morning business, I want to address the issue that was on the floor prior to the vote that we just had. That vote on cloture was our attempt, on the majority side, to stop a filibuster and to get to a vote on reducing the gasoline tax by 4.3 cents.

Once again we have run up against the minority's unwillingness to allow us to have a vote on President Clinton's gas tax. We know it would pass overwhelmingly. The President has already said he would sign it. It seems to me it is something we ought to do.

We had 54 votes—I think that is 53 Republicans and one Democrat vote—to stop debate so we could get to a vote on final passage. We would have more than 51 votes to pass it. So it would pass, but we needed six more votes from the Democratic side to make cloture happen. We did not get them. So we are at a standstill here on this piece of legislation. It is needlessly being held up, and those holding it up are needlessly causing the taxpayers of this country, those people who drive cars, to pay more tax while the price of gasoline continues at a very high level. Consequently, I hope we can bring the repeal of President Clinton's gas tax to a vote. I particularly would like to repeal it because the repeal is something that can be passed very quickly. We know that this is true because it is something that the President said he would sign.

We Republicans strongly feel that President Clinton's gas tax should be repealed because we, en bloc, voted against President Clinton's tax bill of 1993. We knew it was the biggest tax hike in the history of the country, and we felt it would do harm to the economy. We are finding out that it is doing harm to the economy. Even

though we have had a recovery, we could have created 3 million more jobs in this recovery, compared to other recoveries, had President Clinton not increased taxes. These are jobs that are not being created because of the dampener on the economy that the biggest tax increase in the history of the country has given us, of which the 4-cent gas tax increase was a major part.

I thank the majority leader for calling this bill up that repeals the Clinton gas tax, and for his bringing it to the immediate attention of the Senate.

If I can begin by way of conclusion, I believe the Senate should join the House Committee on Ways and Means in passing a swift repeal of the Clinton gas tax increase of 1993. In 1993 the Committee on Ways and Means, then controlled by Democrats, estimated what this bill would cost the drivers of the various States. They figured what they think it would cost my Iowans, based on the assumption that Iowans drive 12,396 miles per year. I think that this estimate is probably a number that is smaller than what Iowans truly drive. I do not think these estimates by the economists for the Ways and Means Committee include the fact that farmers and many other people in rural America have to drive long distances, not only for their business, but also to get their kids to school and back home every day and all the other things associated with a family. I think the 12,396 miles that was estimated by the Committee on Ways and Means in 1993 is probably too small.

Nonetheless, the Committee went on to say that if you take that 12,396 miles that Iowans would drive on average per automobile, and multiply that times the Clinton gasoline tax increase of 4.3 cents, it is going to cost Iowans an extra \$26.66 per year to drive a car. That is assuming a one-driver family. Most families are two-driver families and then would expend twice that amount of money at \$53.32.

I think families with children have better use for their \$53.32 fuel tax expense than funding the President's big spending habits that were part of his 1993 budget and tax increase. For example, \$53.32 for the average family would buy any of the following items in a typical Iowa farm town: 24 gallons of milk at \$2.15 a gallon, 67 pounds of apples at 79 cents a pound, 71 cans of tomato soup at 75 cents a can, 14 boxes of breakfast cereal at \$3.69 a box, 44 dozen eggs at \$1.19 a dozen, 53 loaves of bread at 99 cents a loaf, 60 pounds of hot dogs at 89 cents a pound, and 106 boxes of macaroni and cheese at 50 cents a box.

Alternately, if a family wants to have summer activity for children, \$53.32 will buy either three unlimited summer children's passes at the swimming pool or two activity fees for the youth little league baseball program.

These are real opportunity costs affecting real families in my State because we have this gas tax increase that has been a damper on the economy and families. Because Iowa fami-

lies have been paying the Clinton fuel tax for all of 1993 and all of 1994, you must readily see that President Clinton has denied these families some of these necessities. He has done so, not only once, but he has done it twice.

Now, in 1996, Iowa families desperately need Congress to repeal the President's 1993 fuel tax increase. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which speaks for a lot of people in rural America, agrees with the need for the repeal of the tax. The American Farm Bureau notes that President Clinton's gas tax increase is the first time in which fuel taxes have ever been used for anything other than transportation funding.

The highway trust funds are important to farmers because Iowa farmers need someone to improve rural bridges and roads, not only for getting a family back and forth to town, but also to get their inputs into their farming operations as well as the grain and other products that they produce to market. We find in our State that many of our roads and bridges used by farmers do not currently meet safety engineering standards.

If we need to have a gas tax, then I say let it be spent on roads and highways and bridges to move people. It is a user fee. It ought to be used for that purpose.

This 4.3-cent gas tax increase in 1993 went into the general fund. As Senator ASHCROFT, of Missouri, said better than any of us can say, it is a Clinton gas tax increase paid for by people going to work. It goes into a fund that is going to go to programs for those people that do not go to work.

If we are going to tax working people 4 more cents for gas, it ought to go into the road fund so that it is going for the people that are using the roads. So if we take this 4 cents out, and President Clinton still feels that this money ought to be spent on some of these programs with the general fund as their source of revenue, then the President should agree to cut spending elsewhere in the budget rather than taking money that ought to go to build better roads, safer roads, and safer bridges. But his act of 1993 does not build any roads or bridges with his fuel tax.

So the President had an opportunity to cut spending when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. I like to remind people that because some are cynical about Congress' ability to pass legislation to balance the budget that the Republican Congress succeeded in doing it.

Mr. President, if I am running out of time, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that I went over time, but I will make this last point.

The President in December vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. This