

that is, but to the millions of Americans who watch these proceedings, the omnibus bill is, in one word, a mess. It is that bill where we stick everything in at the end that we didn't have time to finish. We end up with a bill a foot thick and weighs 30 pounds, with 3,000 to 5,000 pages. Nobody in this body can read it all because we don't have the time before we have to vote on it. That is how we get in trouble. We vote to pass it through as a last-minute emergency. When we go home, people say: Why did you vote to give money to that frivolous thing on page 2,403? And we don't even know why we voted for it, which is why it is so important to get the bills through one by one.

Let me mention a little bit about the Treasury and general government bill as it is going to come to the floor, if we can get an agreement. I don't think there is anybody in this body who doesn't know that we have a sieve, not a border, between the U.S. and Canada and the U.S. and Mexico. Our customs people are severely understaffed and underfunded. If you want to stop drugs at the border, the money to do that is in this bill. We need to do that. The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas we started about 8 years ago expanded to about 44 States and many cities. That is the agency that coordinates reduction of drug use and trafficking among our local law enforcement, State law enforcement, and Federal law enforcement.

If you want to reduce drug trafficking, the money is in this bill. We also have upkeep and maintenance for Federal buildings. A number of them nationwide are in disrepair, as everybody knows. We have to put money into making sure the buildings are sound, safe, and fireproof. We are not doing that very well. The money to do that is in this bill, too. If you want to reduce drug violence, the money to do that is in this bill. We know this is a very important year for the Secret Service. They are being asked to do more in an election year, with limited resources. The money to do that is also in this bill.

In fact, as all of us know, there are many, many requests by individual Senators in all of these bills. I was going through the list on our bill. We have 13 pages of requests by individual Senators for money in this bill. It is rather surprising to me that some of the Senators who are opposing bringing this bill to the floor are the ones who asked for money to be put in the bill in the first place. It is similar to when we consider the so-called pay raise and people demagog it, the thing passes, and they quietly pocket the money and leave. We have the same situation with this bill. A lot of people have very important programs in this bill. Again, there are 13 pages of things Senators want in this bill.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a program which I believe deserves the support of the Senate—the Gang Resist-

ance Education and Training or GREAT Program. GREAT is administered by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, in partnership with State and local law enforcement.

Unfortunately, gang activity has increased in our country in recent years. ATF has developed a program to give our children the tools they need to be able to resist the temptation to belong to a gang.

The GREAT program is eight years old, and has grown from a pilot program in Arizona to classrooms all over the United States—and in Puerto Rico, Canada, and overseas military bases. ATF estimates that about 2 million students have received GREAT training.

GREAT was designed to provide gang prevention and antiviolence instruction to children in a classroom setting. ATF trains local law enforcement officers to teach these classes, and provides grants to their offices to help pay for their time.

This program is having a positive effect on student activities and behaviors, and is deterring them from involvement in gangs. A side benefit is that the graduates seem to be doing a better job of communicating with their parents and teachers, and getting better grades.

For the third year in a row, the Administration is requesting only 10 million dollars for grants for the GREAT program. For the last two years, Congress felt that wasn't enough to fund the many requests for help from State and local law enforcement and provided 13 million dollars for GREAT grants. 10 million dollars still isn't enough. I urge my colleagues to support the effort of the Committee to again provide 13 million dollars for grants to State and local law enforcement for this worthwhile and effective program.

I hope my colleagues will reach some consensus and allow us to move forward. It is an extremely important bill, and I certainly urge our leadership to try to get this to the floor.

With that, I yield the floor.

£

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SLAIN CAPITOL POLICE OFFICERS JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:40 having arrived, the Senate will now observe a moment of silence in honor of Capitol Police Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson, who were killed in the line of duty in the Capitol two years ago today.

[Moment of silence]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senate for honoring the two dedicated police officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I have one further comment. Both of these officers put their lives on the line, as all of our Capitol Police offi-

cers do and, indeed, officers in law enforcement across the country. J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson were personal friends to many of us. I used to be a policeman years ago, as some of my colleagues know. I collect shoulder patches, which are pretty easy to get. Most police organizations will send them to you if you like to collect them. John had a collection and we used to trade shoulder patches. If he had two of a patch I didn't have, or if I had two of one he didn't have, we would trade back and forth.

When you talk about the Capitol Police, they are not just uniforms; these are real people with real lives and real families.

Both of them left a wife and children, as the Presiding Officer knows. It has been 2 years, but they are still fresh in my mind—and that is a tragedy.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I understand we are in morning business; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there a limitation on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, Senators may speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

£

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, we have recently witnessed another example of the indifference of Members of Congress to the needs of hard-working, low-wage American workers. While our minimum wage bill still languishes, Members of Congress are raising their own pay yet again. Congress has cut the taxes of the wealthiest Americans, but the Republican leadership still insists on doing nothing for those at the bottom of the economic ladder. It is an outrage that Congress would raise its own pay but not the minimum wage.

Over the past decade, in spite of the recent prosperity, the average inflation-adjusted income of the poorest fifth of Americans rose by only 1 percent, while the average inflation-adjusted income of the richest 5 percent rose by 27 percent.

The Republican Congress just passed an estate tax repeal that provides 100 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans and 91 percent

of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent. The Republican marriage tax penalty bill passed last week is also heavily tilted to benefit only the wealthy. Members of this Republican Congress are quick to find time to increase their own salaries and cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, but they cannot find the time to pass an increase in the minimum wage to benefit those hard-working, low-wage Americans.

These low-income working families deserve a raise. Their pay has been frozen for 3 years, and our Democratic proposal will increase the minimum wage by 50 cents this year and another 50 cents next year. The Republican leadership is doing all it can to prevent this fair increase, but this issue will not go away, and we will continue to offer our minimum wage amendment to bills on the floor again and again at every opportunity until we pass it and send it to the President for his signature.

In recent months, a bipartisan House voted by a solid majority to increase the minimum wage by \$1 over 2 years, and many of our Senate colleagues have also supported an increase: 50 cents now and 50 cents a year from now.

The American people agree that the minimum wage should be increased. The time is now to give America's hard-working families the raise they so desperately need and deserve. It is unconscionable for the Republican leadership to vote themselves a pay raise yet again, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and then deny workers at the bottom of the economic ladder a fair pay increase. Our Democratic proposal offers workers the minimum wage raise they need and deserve: No tricks, no poison pills, no tax breaks for the wealthy, and we have bipartisan support for this increase.

The issue is a priority. The Senate should act on a fair minimum wage bill, and we should act as soon as possible. It is wrong for the Senate to continue to block this long overdue act of simple justice for working families.

This chart shows the real value of the minimum wage. It is from 1968 up to the year 2001. If we were to take the real value and use constant dollars, the minimum wage would be \$7.66, if we were to have the same purchasing power as we had in 1968.

We have seen the minimum wage decline over these years, particularly in recent years. Without an increase, it will be valued at \$4.90. If we were to have the increase of 50 cents and 50 cents, the purchasing power would only be \$5.85, which is still below what it was for over 12 years. That is all we are asking: Let's bring it up by 50 cents this year and 50 cents next year. Even though that would be \$6.15, it represents \$5.85 of purchasing power in constant dollars.

What we are seeing is that it is almost \$2 lower than what the minimum wage was in 1968. This is against the situation, if one looks over this par-

ticular chart, that working families are living in poverty. If one looks at what has happened, again in constant dollars, of where the minimum wage has been going in recent years in adjusted inflation dollars, then one sees where the poverty line has been going in recent years.

We are finding out now that since 1988, minimum wage workers are working, in many instances, longer, harder, more jobs, and are sinking deeper and deeper into poverty.

This is against the background of the last 10 days where we gave over \$1.5 trillion—a huge amount in estate taxes, the majority of which goes to the highest income individuals, and \$300 billion to the wealthiest individuals in marriage tax penalty relief. Then last week, the House of Representatives voted themselves a \$3,800 pay increase. That represents what a minimum wage worker would make in 2 years. They voted themselves that in 1 year.

This is where we have seen America's poorest families are getting poorer. The bottom fifth of the families are right at the edge where they have been from 1979 to 1999, 20 years, working harder, working longer, and their benefit from the economic expansion is virtually nonexistent. The middle fifth has gone up 5 percent, and the top fifth of families has gone up 30 percent.

These are the men and women who are the backbone of the whole economic expansion. Yet they are the ones who are experiencing almost crumbs in advancing their quality of life and their lifestyle.

Last week, we saw all this happening in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives increased their pay by \$3,800 a year. As I mentioned, if our minimum wage amendment is passed, it works out to be less than \$2000.

Even if we give the increase in the minimum wage, minimum wage workers in 2 years will make half of what the pay increase will be for Members of Congress.

That is not bad enough, but Congressman DELAY was asked by a columnist, Mark Shields:

Can you and Dick Arme and others who voted for that pay raise or cost-of-living increase defend voting against an increase in the minimum wage?

Mr. DELAY said:

Well, Mark, we don't work for minimum wage. . . .

How dismissive can one be? Evidently, Members of Congress, their children, and their lives are more important than workers who are working hard as children's aides in the Head Start Program, or working in nursing homes taking care of seniors.

These are men and women who have a great sense of dignity and pride in their work, working, in many instances, two or three jobs.

Mr. DELAY says:

[W]e don't work for minimum wage. Members of Congress represent 250 million people. . . .

How dismissive: We are more important.

I defy that. These are men and women who are working, and working hard, and who have a sense of dignity and a sense of pride in the work they do. They are teachers' aides. They are children's aides, working in child care programs. They work in nursing homes. They work in the buildings across this country in order to make the buildings clean for American industry.

This is basically a women's issue because the great majority of minimum wage workers are women. It is a children's issue because millions of the women who are working at the minimum wage have children, and their lives are all being affected by this. It is a civil rights issue because great numbers of the minimum wage workers are men and women of color. And most profoundly, it is a fairness issue, where we hear so many speeches here in the Senate saying: We honor work. We want Americans who want to work.

Here are men and women, who are working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, trying to make ends meet, trying to bring up children, trying to pay for rent because they don't have the income in order to purchase a house, trying to put food on the table, and trying to spend some time with their families.

It is an interesting fact, American workers now spend 22 hours less per week with their children. Why? Because they have to work at more jobs, and to work longer at their jobs. So it is a family issue.

Of all the times we listen to statements about family values and fairness in our society, we are crying crocodile tears, evidently, because we heard last week that people who have estates over \$100 million should not be taxed twice. Even if you scored \$100 million, we are still going to provide more tax breaks. We refuse to even permit a vote on an increase in the minimum wage here in the Senate, while we are going out and increasing our own salary, and doing it in a contemptuous way to these men and women. Shame on this body.

We are going to bring this up. We have heard a lot about: This is not relevant. Is it going to be fair to bring this up? We are going to be told that we do not set the agenda in the Senate.

I can just tell you, there are men and women who have struggled, and struggled mightily, and are struggling today. They deserve the increase. These arguments about inflation are out the window. Every economic indicator has demonstrated that the last two increases have had no impact in any way in terms of inflation. The idea that we are going to have lost jobs is absolutely preposterous. Every economic study has indicated the same. We have responded to those arguments.

This is a fairness issue. It is a decency issue. It is about our fellow citizens. It is about work. It is about families. It is about children. It is about

women. It is about fairness in civil rights. We are going to continue to pursue this item. We are going to pursue it this week and the 4 weeks when we return in September. We are going to continue to pursue it until we have justice for these workers.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

f

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN OUR NATION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, on several occasions I have risen before this body to address the crisis associated with energy in our Nation today. We have all experienced the high price of gasoline. We have seen a slight reduction of late, but I want to assure my colleagues that that situation is temporary, at best.

The rationale for that is understandable if one considers the fact that we are currently consuming just about an amount equal to the productive capacity of our industry to supply gasoline. There are many good reasons for this. One is that we haven't built a new refinery in this country for almost 10 years now. We have closed about 37 refineries in the United States in the last decade and, as a consequence of our increased dependence on imported oil, we have lost a good deal of our leverage because currently about 56 percent of the oil we consume in this country is imported. Most of that comes from the Mideast. As a consequence, we have become more dependent on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The fastest-growing supply of oil now coming into the United States is from Iraq. That is rather curious. A lot of people forget that in 1991 we fought a war over there. We lost 147 lives. We had nearly 427 wounded. We had a number taken prisoner. Yet Saddam Hussein is the one we are looking toward now.

I think the American public should be aware that it is pretty difficult to define just what the energy policy of the Clinton-Gore administration has been. We have seen their policy with regard to the nuclear industry, which provides about 20 percent of the power generated in this country, and they have said no to storing high-level nuclear waste. We are one vote short of a veto override on that matter. We have not been able to generate that last vote. So it is clear that the administration has said no to the nuclear industry, as far as expanding its contribution to energy in this country.

As we look to hydroelectric, we have seen a policy which suggests that perhaps some of the dams out West should

be taken down, with no consideration for the realization that there is a tradeoff associated with that. If you take those dams down, you are taking the tonnage that is moved by barge and putting it on the highways. The implication of that is significant. It is estimated that as many as 700,000 trucks per year would have to go on the highways to replace the current cargo capacity of barges that would be lost.

If we take away nuclear and go to hydro, oil is certainly something we are looking toward other nations to provide, as opposed to developing the resources here in the continental United States, in the overthrust belt of Colorado, Wyoming, and other areas, and where there is oil in my State of Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, Texas, and other States. It is my understanding that the administration has withdrawn about 64 percent of the public land in the overthrust belt, which is in the Rocky Mountain areas, excluding them from the development of energy resources. The potential for coal, of course, is significant. There are no new coal plants being built in this country. The cost of permitting is such that we find they are uneconomical. The emphasis seems to be on natural gas. But if we look to the last 6 months, we have seen natural gas prices go from about \$2.16 to over \$4 for delivery later this winter.

The crisis associated with our energy policy, or lack of an energy policy, is real in every field of energy resources. Emphasis is placed by the administration to some extent on renewables. While we all support renewables, it is fair to say that renewables only constitute about 40 percent of our energy consumption, even though we have spent about \$70 billion in subsidies in this area. While they have a potential, surely they are not at the forefront nor are they capable at this time of relieving our dependence on conventional energy sources.

As we look at our policies today, I think there is confusion in the minds of Americans as they reflect on the statements of their political leaders and the policies they pursue. It is very easy to be confused.

I would like to share some examples with my colleagues.

If we go back to our Vice President, AL GORE, in his book "Earth in the Balance," AL GORE, the environmentalist, wrote that "higher taxes on fossil fuel . . . is one of the logical first steps in changing our policies in a manner consistent with a more responsible approach to the environment."

All of us are obviously concerned over the health of our environment. We want to have a responsible approach associated with the environment. Nevertheless, the idea that raising the price of gasoline is good for the American economy and good for the American people is pretty hard to sell to the American public at this time when gasoline prices, depending on where we are in the country, range anywhere from \$1.75 to \$1.95 or higher.

I think it is fair to say that perhaps the Vice President overlooks the reality that Americans live long distances from their jobs because they prefer to do so. We are a mobile society. As we are confronted with higher energy prices, obviously it not only affects our pocketbooks, but it affects inflation rates.

At about the same time that the Clinton/Gore administration was talking about conservation, the Vice President was casting a tie-breaking vote in the Senate to raise gasoline taxes—we all remember that—and the Environmental Protection Agency determined that more expensive "reformulated gasoline" needed to be sold in many areas of the country.

I am not arguing the merits of that—other than to report that before my committee on Energy and Natural Resources, one of the principals of the Environmental Protection Agency advised us that they are now required under the Clean Air Act to have nine different types of reformulated gasoline in this country.

That meant our refiners had to batch the gasoline additives, they had to transport it separately, they had to store it separately. Obviously, all of that has a significant cost for the taxpayer. According to a memorandum from the Department of Energy and the Congressional Research Service, EPA's gasoline requirements balkanized markets, strained supplies, and raised prices.

Since the policies of the administration were so effective in raising the prices, one might expect the Vice President to be pleased. But confronted with angry consumers on the campaign trail, the Vice President suggests that refiners and oil companies are to blame. A lot of finger-pointing is going on around here.

Let me refer to an article that appeared in the Washington Times of July 19. This is an editorial covering a memorandum that came from the Clinton Energy Department suggesting that the Department was indeed aware that the administration's own regulations pertaining to so-called "reformulated" gasoline, rather than the oil industry gouging, were primarily responsible for the increased price of motor fuels.

The reformulated gas—RFG—rule, which stipulated that refiners mix different types of gasoline for different localities, has made it impossible, or at least very difficult, to take advantage of the economies of scale in production and distribution that heretofore have helped keep U.S. energy prices stable and low.

Their memo, which was sent June 5—a full week before the administration began to blame the oil industry for raising fuel prices—states that the RFG reformulated gasoline rule was a major reason for the price spike, delaying claims made by the administration that they couldn't see any reason other than blind greed for the change in per-gallon gasoline prices.