

be and pine away about not being President. And he didn't spend the rest of his life whining about the fact that he didn't get re-elected. He just went to work. Jimmy Carter did the same thing. He said, okay, what did I care about as President where I can still have an impact? What are the needs of the world? What can I do that won't be done if I don't do it? And he went out there and did it. And, you know, I admire that. I mean, that's what we're all supposed to do. When you've been President, you have received the greatest gift, if you love public service, that anyone could ever get. So, I just feel like you owe it the rest of your life to try to give it back.

PETER JENNINGS: What do you want to do, most of all?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Just what I'm doing. I want to be a servant. I'm going to obviously, over time, broaden the sphere of my foundation work. We are working with five African countries, virtually the whole Caribbean, India, China. Money shouldn't determine who lives and who dies from AIDS. That's what I'd like to do now because I think there are more lives on the line. And I believe we can do more to have people feel better about America and about the West, by helping keep people alive.

PETER JENNINGS: Why did you choose AIDS?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: It's the most maddening of all problems. That's why. One in four people will die of AIDS, TB, malaria and infection. AIDS is 100 percent preventable. There's medicine that prevents mother to child transmission for pregnant women. There's medicine that for most healthy people, can turn it from a death sentence into chronic illness. And yet, there's 6.2 million people who desperately need the medicine. Over 40 million people infected. It's madness. So, this is something where I just figure the system's broken. And this is something a former President ought to do. Just go in there and try to put it together. And that's what I'm doing.

PETER JENNINGS: Bill Clinton is hugely popular in other parts of the world. Often regarded by countries as an honorary citizen and treated like a rock star. He has that particular touch with people in all walks of life. We also talked for a minute or two, about potential new leadership at home.

PETER JENNINGS: If Senator Clinton runs for the presidency, will you be her chief political adviser?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Oh, I don't know. First, I don't know if she's going to run. I think she wants to run for re-election. I have no idea if she's gonna run for president.

PETER JENNINGS: Really?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: If she did, I would do whatever she asks me to do. You know, I think of all the people I've ever known in public life, she has the best combination of mind and heart, of management skills and compassion. I think she's very tough-minded. She has strengths I don't have. And I think she's learned a lot from me over the years about the things that I was good at that she needed to get better at. But, you know, she's got a mind of her own and she's going to make up her own mind in due course. I have no idea what she's going to do.

PETER JENNINGS: This has been a very tiring time for the President. After we saw him, everyone wanted to know how was his recovery going.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: As far as I know I'm doing well. I'm walking an hour a day. Up hills, vigorously. I still get tired easily. I haven't recovered my stamina. But everybody who's done this says I will.

PETER JENNINGS: No interview with President Clinton is complete without a lit-

tle bit of trivia. You were, after all, the pop culture President. So, I'd be grateful if you'd give me maybe one-liners on the following subjects. The last movie you saw.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: "Ray." It's unbelievable. I knew Ray Charles and I talked to him a couple weeks before he died. I liked him very much. And I love music, as you know. It's a fabulous movie.

PETER JENNINGS: Your favorite singer now.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: I like Tony Bennett. I like Bono. I like Barbara Streisand. I like Judy Collins. I like Sheryl Crow. I love Aretha Franklin.

PETER JENNINGS: The Presidential perk you most miss.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Working in the Oval Office. It's the best work space on earth.

PETER JENNINGS: Your favorite food now.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Turkey or vegetarian chili.

PETER JENNINGS: And the one you most miss?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Steak.

PETER JENNINGS: The country you'd like to live in, if it were not here.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Probably Ireland.

PETER JENNINGS: You want to be a mystery writer at some point in your life, I gather?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: I'd like to write one book that was kind of frivolous. A Dylan mystery.

PETER JENNINGS: So, write the first line of the mystery novel.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: The President's aide was found dead on a street in Southeast Washington from unnatural causes.

PETER JENNINGS: And the very last one. A living person, not already encountered, who you'd most like to meet?

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Someone I have never met? I would like to meet the new President of Kenya. Because he abolished school fees for poor children and a million extra children showed up at school. I think that that's something that's likely to affect more lives positively than almost anything any other political leader will do this year.

PETER JENNINGS: Thank you, sir.

FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON: Thanks.

#### THE 108TH CONGRESS AND MISSED OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as the 108th Congress draws to a close, it is time to reflect on a number of opportunities to support working families that this Congress missed.

American workers are the backbone of our economy. They have built this country, brick by brick and industry by industry. Too many of them have seen their factories closed and their jobs shipped overseas due to bad tax policy and dismal trade agreements. As the Senate meets today, families around our country are struggling to make ends meet in a sluggish economy. This Congress has missed opportunity after opportunity to support these families.

As consumer and health care prices continue to rise and families must make difficult decisions about what to buy and what to go without, the 108th

Congress will adjourn without even considering an increase in the Federal minimum wage. Congress last voted to increase the minimum wage 8 years ago, to the current level of \$5.15. The Congressional Research Service notes that the Federal minimum wage would have had to have been raised to \$8.49 in February of this year to equal the purchasing power that it had in February of 1968. Increases in the minimum wage have not kept up with inflation or with rising consumer prices, and workers earning minimum wage are struggling to make ends meet, often working two or more jobs. And many of these jobs do not provide basic benefits such as health insurance and paid sick leave. To that end, I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) that would require certain employers to provide paid sick leave benefits, and I look forward to continuing to support this and other legislation to support working families when the 109th Congress convenes next year.

This Congress did little to help workers who are scraping by and who, too often, have to choose between their jobs and their families. And for those laid-off workers who have been unable to find family-supporting employment in these tough economic times, this Congress has done even less.

For the second year in a row, Members of Congress will go home for the holidays without acting on legislation to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program. Many unemployed workers who are actively seeking employment have simply been unable to find jobs, and are relying on unemployment benefits and related programs to support themselves and their families. I regret that, despite the support of a bipartisan majority in the Senate for extending these important benefits, a minority of members have used Senate budget rules to block passage of this important extension. And I am stunned that, despite bipartisan support for extending these important benefits in both the Senate and the House, Congress will adjourn for the year without sending an extension to the President.

In addition, this Congress has built upon the regrettable record of the 107th Congress with respect to undermining basic worker protections. Members of the House and of the Senate have gone on record a total of six times in opposition to the Bush administration's overtime rule. This rule, which will rob millions of hard-working Americans of the overtime pay that they deserve, went into effect on August 23, despite bipartisan opposition in Congress. And for the third time, the administration has saved this ill-conceived rule by issuing a veto threat against legislation containing a provision to block that rule. I commend the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) for his leadership on this issue, and I will continue to support efforts to roll back the harmful provisions of this rule.

This Congress also missed a number of opportunities to ensure that good-paying jobs stay in this country. The bill that was recently enacted in response to a World Trade Organization ruling against the foreign sales corporation and extraterritorial income provisions in our tax code presented Congress with an opportunity to restructure our tax code in a way that supports domestic manufacturers and their employees. Sadly, while the measure did provide some help to domestic manufacturers, the bill that was signed into law missed this opportunity in many respects. Congress should act at the next opportunity to close down the tax provisions in this law that actually provide incentives for corporations to move facilities overseas.

I was also disappointed that the final Omnibus bill that the Senate is expected to take up soon did not include provisions approved by the Senate responding to the disturbing trend of the outsourcing of American jobs. These provisions would have prohibited Federal funding from being used to support the outsourcing of goods and services contracts that are entered into by the Federal Government, or by the States if those contracts are being supported by Federal dollars. With this bill, Congress could have supported American workers by ensuring that taxpayer money is not used to encourage companies to relocate American jobs. Because of the deletion of this outsourcing provision, we missed an opportunity for the Federal Government to set a strong example of buying its goods and services from American companies that use American workers.

All told, the 108th Congress provided little support, and too much harm, to working families, and the examples that I have cited are just the tip of the iceberg of missed opportunities in this area. Congress can and should do more to ensure that workers and their families have a decent standard of living, including access to affordable health care, child care, and housing. We should also do more to strengthen job training and education, including expanding access to higher education.

I fervently hope that the 109th Congress will reject the antiworker tone of the past two Congresses and will make every effort to support the working men and women and their families who we have been elected to represent. I intend to continue to work hard to ensure that their voices are heard here in the Senate.

#### NORTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WILD HERITAGE ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Northern California Coastal Wild Heritage Act has been included in the Senate amendment to H.R. 620. I, along with my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, are the sponsors of the Senate companion measure, S. 738. I would like to thank

Senator DOMENICI, the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and Senator BINGAMAN, the Ranking Democratic Member, for working with us to achieve passage of this very important legislation. I would like to enter into a colloquy with Senators FEINSTEIN, DOMENICI and BINGAMAN to clarify our intent behind some of the wilderness management provisions in the bill.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The first issue I would like to address concerns horsepacking into wilderness. I want to make sure horsepackers can keep using these wilderness areas. I recognize that the wilderness areas created by this act are currently enjoyed by hikers, people on horseback, hunters and anglers. In addition, many visitors are serviced by commercial outfitters using horses as pack animals. I believe horsepacking is an important use of wilderness, and I know it is a use that was well established in wilderness prior to the passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964. Unlike some other units of the National Wilderness Preservation System, the areas designated by this act are not heavily used by horses at this time. While fully recognizing the responsibilities of the land managers to monitor visitor use and respond appropriately to any resource damage that may result from overuse, I believe that current levels of horsepacking use in these areas are consistent with wilderness designation. Do my colleagues agree?

Mrs. BOXER. I fully concur, and I thank my colleague for raising this issue. I would like to ask the chairman and ranking Democratic member whether they share our view that the designation of these areas as wilderness does not preclude their continued use by horsepackers, subject to the agency's management discretion to protect area resources.

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the Senator from California.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I likewise agree.

Mr. DOMENICI. We are all in agreement on this issue.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. In working through the bill, the Forest Service stressed a need to develop a plan to restore the late successional reserve LSR forest of the Sanhedrin wilderness area. We agreed that wilderness designation could be fully compatible with such restoration treatments.

I agree with the Forest Service observation that this area has been altered by human influences, including the suppression of natural burning. As the Forest Service develops its plan in accordance with this act and with the goal of LSR restoration, I believe the old growth characteristics of the LSR are a primary value of the wilderness. I also believe that the Forest Service can achieve its goal of LSR restoration in accordance with this act and the Forest Service manual direction on wilderness. The relevant portion of the manual, FSM 2323.35a states:

Manipulation of Wildlife Habitat. The objective of all projects must be to perpetuate

the wilderness resource; projects must be necessary to sustain a primary value of a given wilderness or to perpetuate a federally listed threatened or endangered species. To qualify for approval by the Chief, habitat manipulation projects must satisfy the following criteria:

The condition needing change is a result of abnormal human influence.

The project can be accomplished with assurance that there will be no serious or lasting damage to wilderness values.

There is reasonable assurances that the project will accomplish the desired objectives.

Do my colleagues share my views that treatments to promote old growth in the Sanhedrin LSR are fully consistent with this act?

Mr. DOMENICI. I agree with the senior Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I agree as well.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I, too, share this understanding of the bill.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Some people have voiced concerns about hunting and fishing in wilderness areas. I want to make perfectly clear that nothing in this bill alters the fact that the State of California retains jurisdiction of wildlife management in these wilderness areas which includes the issuance of hunting and fishing licenses.

Mrs. BOXER. I fully concur.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I likewise agree.

Mr. DOMENICI. We all seem to be in agreement on this issue as well.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would like to raise one other issue. Since the enactment of the King Range Act in 1970, property owners Linda Smith Franklin and Mary Smith Etter have been granted access to their land by the Bureau of Land Management via the Smith-Etter Road. This legislation has designated the Smith-Etter Road as providing access to private property owners and their invitees. It is my understanding that nothing in this act should in any way alter the access currently granted to Franklin and Etter under existing policies. I believe that Franklin and Etter should continue to receive the access that they currently enjoy.

On the subject of fire suppression in this same area, I note that this act provides the land management agencies with the necessary flexibility to conduct fire suppression activities to protect human life and property. For example, in the King Range Honeydew fire in 2003, which resulted in 14,000 acres of fire damage in the King Range Conservation Area, the Bureau of Land Management authorized a fire truck and a 3-member crew to be stationed at the bottom of Telegraph Ridge, within a four mile range of the Franklin property in order to allow easy, quick access to the Franklin property in the event that fire suppression activities were warranted. As a result, firefighters were able to fend off the fire and prevent damage to the Franklin property. It is my understanding that nothing in this Act would prevent BLM from continuing this practice when so warranted by fire danger.

Do my colleagues share my understanding of these access and fire suppression issues in the King Range?