treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–329. A resolution adopted by the Orange County Legislative Delegation of the Legislature of the State of Florida relative to the former Orlando Naval Training Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM–330. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Crossville, Tennessee relative to the Obed River; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–331. A resolution adopted by the Alaska Federation of Natives, Inc. relative to the Artic Council; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–332. A resolution adopted by the Tennessee Great Smoky Mountains Park Commission relative to the Foothills Parkway; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–333. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 304

Whereas, Over the past 111 years, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, a Pittsburgh institution, has developed into a major national and international force in the fields of nuclear development, power generation, manufacturing and research, having helped create America's nuclear naval fleet and establishing worldwide leadership in the commercial nuclear power fields; and

Whereas, More than 7,000 people in western Pennsylvania are employed by Westinghouse Electric Corporation, and thousands of other jobs are affected by the spin-off effects of Westinghouse Electric Corporation's business enterprises; and

Whereas, On December 1, 1997, Westinghouse Electric Corporation is changing its name to CBS Corporation and moving its headquarters from Pittsburgh to New York City; and

Whereas, Westinghouse Electric Corporation has announced the sale of its non-nuclear power generation business, which had $2.2 billion in sales last year, to its former competitor, Siemens AG, a German company, for $1.53 billion; and

Whereas, Westinghouse Electric Corporation has announced plans to sell its commercial nuclear power business, and the leading bidders are expected to be Siemens AG of Germany; Framatome SA, partially owned by the French government; or the Swedish/Swiss-owned ASEA Brown Boveri; and

Whereas, The sale of the Westinghouse nuclear and non-nuclear business divisions to foreign-owned companies could have an impact on the military preparedness of the United States; and

Whereas, The elimination of such a leading company in the domestic energy market may serve to restrict that market and stifle free market trade, thereby having a detrimental impact on American consumers and suppliers; and

Whereas, The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice each have the authority to examine the antitrust implications of the proposed Westinghouse Electric Corporation sale of its nuclear and non-nuclear business holdings; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to direct both the FTC and the Department of Justice to examine the proposed actions of Westinghouse Electric Corporation to determine whether the sales would stifle competition, significantly raise consumer and supplier prices or detrimentally impact suppliers of the nuclear and non-nuclear power generation market; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JEFFORDS, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1237. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to further improve the safety and health of working environments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 105–159).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COVERDELL (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to raise the 15 percent income tax bracket into middle class income levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FAIRCLOTH:

S. 1570. A bill to limit the amount of attorneys' fees that may be paid on behalf of States and other plaintiffs under the tobacco settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1571. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. REID, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 1572. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from promulgating certain regulations relating to Indian gaming activities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1574. A bill to prohibit the cloning of humans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. COVERDELL (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MACK, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. FRIST, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. GRAMS):

S. 1575. A bill to rename the Washington National Airport located in the District of Columbia and Virginia as the ''Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport''; read the first time.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 164. A resolution informing the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 165. A resolution informing the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. Res. 166. A resolution recognizing the outstanding achievements of the Denver Broncos in winning Super Bowl XXXII; considered and agreed to.

S. Res. 167. A resolution recognizing the outstanding achievement of the Denver Bronco's quarterback, John Elway, in the victory of the Denver Broncos in Super Bowl XXXII; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. MACK):

S. Res. 168. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Education, States, and local education agencies should spend a greater percentage of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BOND, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 169. A resolution to designate February 3, 1998, as ''Four Chaplains Day''; considered and agreed to.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COVERDELL (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to raise the 15 percent income tax bracket into middle class income levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1998

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Middle Class Tax Relief Act of 1998. Last year, this Congress passed historic legislation: the Balanced Budget Act providing the first balanced budget in nearly thirty years, and the Taxpayer Relief Act providing tax relief for the first time in sixteen years. As a result, faith in the Nation's economy is strong, and we are seeing the results of that faith.

Now is the time for us to consider sweeping middle class tax relief. This tax relief proposal accomplishes several goals. First, it directs the vast majority of the relief to those who feel the tax squeeze the most: middle-income taxpayers.

Second, because it is across-the-board relief, every middle class taxpayers wins. Every American earning $25,000 taxable income or more would see relief. Estimates by the Tax Foundation show that approximately 25 million taxpayers would see tax relief this

year with two-thirds earning less than $75,000 annually.

Third, it provides significant marriage penalty relief without adding complexity to the tax code.

Fourth, this is one of the very few proposals that is also entirely consistent with the long-term goal of a flatter, simpler tax code.

My proposal, the Middle Class Tax Relief Act, achieves these goals by raising the roof on the 15% individual income tax bracket. In other words, it returns middle class taxpayers to the lowest individual income bracket. Married couples with taxable income of $70,000 or less would be taxed at the 15% tax bracket, an increase over the 1998 threshold of $42,350. The threshold for heads of households would be $52,600, an increase over the current threshold of $33,950. Finally, the thresholds for single workers would be set at $35,000, an increase over the current threshold of $25,350.

In the coming weeks, a great deal of discussion will focus on providing the American people with the tax relief they need and deserve, and how that is to be accomplished. There are a number of proposals providing tax relief, some of which I am a supporter. However, I believe the Middle Class Tax Relief Act will be successful ultimately because it is actually achievable during this Congress. I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort.

---

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1571. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age; to the Committee on Finance.

THE SENIOR CITIZEN'S FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the ''Senior Citizen's Freedom to Work Act.'' This bill would fully repeal the erroneous Social Security earnings limit.

Since coming to the Senate in 1987, I have been working to eliminate the discriminatory and unfair Earnings Test.

I am pleased that in 1996, Congress passed and President Clinton signed into law my bill, the Senior Citizens Right to Work Act. This legislation took a step in the right direction by increasing the earning threshold for senior citizens from $11,520 to $30,000 by the year 2000. Now it is time to eliminate the unjust Earnings Test in its entirety.

Most Americans are shocked and appalled when they discover that older Americans are penalized for working. Nobody should be penalized for working or discouraged from engaging in work. Yet, this is exactly what the Social Security Earnings Test does to our nation's senior citizens. The Social Security Earnings Test punishes Americans between the ages of 65 and 70 for their attempts to remain productive after retirement.

The Social Security Earnings Test mandates that for every $3 earned by a retiree over the established limit, $19,999.92 in 1998, the retiree loses $1 in Social Security benefits. This is clearly age discrimination, and it is very wrong. Due to this cap on earnings, our senior citizens, many of whom exist on fixed, low-incomes, are burdened with a 33.3 percent tax on their earned income. When this is combined with Federal, State, local and other Social Security taxes, it amounts to an outrageous 55 to 65 percent tax bite and even higher. This earnings limit is punitive and serves as a tremendous disincentive to work. An individual who is struggling to make ends meet on approximately $19,000 a year should not be faced with an effective marginal tax rate which exceeds 55 percent.

The Social Security Earnings Test is a relic of the Great Depression, designed to move older people out of the workforce and create employment for younger individuals. This is an archaic policy and should no longer be our goal because our nation's labor pool is shrinking. Many senior citizens can make a significant contribution, and often their knowledge and experience compliments or exceeds that of younger employees. Tens of millions of Americans are over the age of 65, and together they have over a billion years of cumulative work experience. These individuals have valuable experience to offer our society, and we need them.

In addition, experts predict a labor shortage when the ''baby boom'' generation ages, and it is evident that employers will have to develop new sources of income as our elderly population continues to grow much faster than the number of workers entering the workforce. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ''retaining older workers is a priority in labor intensive industries, and will become even more critical as we approach the year 2000.'' To me it seems counterproductive and foolish to keep willing, diligent workers out of the American workforce. Our country must continue to support pro-work, not pro-welfare policies.

More importantly, many of the older Americans penalized by the earnings test need to work in order to cover their basic expenses; health care, housing and food. Many seniors do not have significant savings or a private pension. For this reason, low-income workers are particularly hard-hit by the earnings test.

It is important to note that wealthy seniors, who have lucrative investments, stocks, and substantial savings are not affected by the earnings limits. Their supplemental ''unearned'' income is not subject to the earnings threshold. The earnings limit only affects seniors who must work and depend on their earned income for survival.

Finally, let me stress that repealing the burdensome and unfair earnings test would not jeopardize the solvency of the Social Security funds. Opponents who claim otherwise are engaging in cruel scare tactics. It is important to remember that the Social Security benefits which working seniors are losing due to the earnings test penalty are benefits they have rightfully earned by contributing to the system throughout their working years before retiring. These are benefits which they should not be losing because they are trying to survive by supplementing their Social Security income. Furthermore, certain studies indicate that repealing the earnings test would result in a net increase of $140 million in federal revenue.

Mr. President, there is no compelling justification for denying economic opportunity to an individual on the basis of age. It is quite evident that the earnings test is outdated, unjust and discriminatory. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which would eliminate this egregious law.

---

By Mr. BRYAN (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. REID, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 1572. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from promulgating certain regulations relating to Indian gaming activities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

GAMING ACTIVITIES LEGISLATION

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, Senators ENZI, REID and I are today introducing legislation to stop the Interior Department from moving forward with regulations that in my view trample on States rights and invade the province of Governors and State legislators to determine what kinds of gaming activities will occur in their States. This proposed regulation flies in the face of the intent of Congress.

I must say I am disappointed we are forced to take this step and would hope that the Secretary of the Interior would reconsider his ill-advised action. Last week the Secretary of Interior proposed rules that would allow the Interior Department to be the sole arbiter in the compacting process as to what kinds of gaming activities can be conducted on Native American lands. This is being done over the strong objections of the Nation's Governors and the Nation's Attorneys General, as well as the intent of Congress.

I believe that in so doing, the Secretary is overstepping his authority and is making a grave mistake. In what I consider particularly convoluted logic, the Department has asserted that because the courts have struck down certain provisions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, referred to as IGRA, that they can step in and decide on their own what gaming activities States must allow tribes to engage in.

I think by way of background, Mr. President, it may be helpful to share with my colleagues the basis of the underlying legislation as it relates to Native American gaming activities. In 1988, the Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and in so doing, tribal gaming activities were and are divided into three categories,

with class I being reserved as traditional Indian games, class II being bingo-type games, and class III being casino-type games. Now, with respect to class III gaming, under the law, States and tribal governments negotiate a compact as to what type of games are to be permitted, if any, within class III.

Under recent court decisions, Governors are required to negotiate with tribes only on gaming activity that is permitted by law in that State. For instance, Hawaii and Utah prohibit all forms of gaming, and therefore their respective Governors are not required to negotiate with tribes for any types of gaming activity. In Nevada, where we permit all forms of casino gaming, that is class III gaming, the State is required to enter into a compact with tribes allowing them to engage in all forms of gaming, and indeed without conflict or controversy five such compacts have been entered into.

The Secretary has chosen, however, to put his own legal interpretation of what types of gaming activities must be put on the negotiating table. This so-called ''scope of gaming'' issue was fought out in the courts and decided in favor of Governors in the Rumsey case. The Rumsey case held that Governors are not forced to negotiate other gaming activities that are not permitted in the State in general.

The Secretary appears to be trying to circumvent this decision and would force States, for example, that would allow a lottery and require them to negotiate with Indian tribes to make slot machines available, even though slot machines are illegal in that State. Given this clearly skewed legal interpretation, it seems to me that the Governors' fears are well-founded.

The Department holds the position of fiduciary and trust obligation to the tribes and is an acknowledged advocate for tribal interests. The Department is taking the position that it should be the sole arbiter between the interest of the State and tribes in negotiating what form and scope of gaming should be permitted when it clearly has a bias in favor of one of the parties.

It is no wonder the Governors said in their December 5 letter to President Clinton that they will actively oppose any independent assertion by the Secretary of his power to authorize tribal governments to operate class III gaming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the December 5, 1997, letter addressed to the President by the Western Governors' Association, signed by its chairman, Governor Knowles of Alaska, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,
*Denver, CO, December 5, 1997.*

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
*President of the United States,*
*The White House, Washington, DC*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is the understanding of the Western Governor's Association that the Secretary of Interior has proposed a rule-making on Indian Gaming that would usurp the Governors authority to enter into compact negotiations on gaming with Indian tribes. States have repeatedly voiced their concerns about the Secretary's desire a promulgate this rule. On October 10, a letter was sent by the National Governors' Association Chairman and Vice Chairman to the Secretary of Interior on this rule-making proposal.

It is evident that the states' concerns have gone unheard or at least have not been responded to by the Secretary. As a former Governor, you can appreciate how troubling it is when a cabinet member fails to consider or enter into a dialogue with us about state's legitimate concerns.

The Secretary is using the Seminole Tribe of Florida vs. Florida decision by the Supreme Court to inappropriately expand his authority. The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) established a procedure whereby decisions could be made when a state and tribe were unable to agree to the terms of a compact. Before the Secretary is authorized to provide a compact to a tribe under IGRA, the courts must first make a finding of bad faith on the part of the state. When the Supreme Court stuck down the portion of IGRA that permitted tribes to sue states in Federal Court, it eliminated the mechanism for arriving at a finding of bad faith by the court. It would be inappropriate for the Secretary to now take the authority to render a finding of bad faith and then to authorize a gaming compact to a tribe over the objections of a state. Moreover, the Secretary's action contradicts the clear intent of Congress as embodied in the final Interior conference report that you signed, which imposes a one-year moratorium on imposition of a procedure that would result in tribal Class III gaming in the absence of a tribal-state compact as required by law.

As the National Governors' Association policy states ''nothing remains in the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act or any other law that endows the Secretary with the authority to independently create such a process. The Governors will actively oppose any independent assertion by the Secretary of the power to authorize tribal governments to operate Class III Gaming. State and tribal governments are best qualified to craft agreements on the scope and conduct of Class III Gaming under IGRA.'' Furthermore, under the duties of the office, the Secretary has a special legal relationship to Native Americans, and it would be impossible for him to be objective in making decisions settling compact differences between states and tribes—in effect the Secretary becomes a self-appointed judge and jury.

There are difficult issues, and we understand the Secretary intepretating his role as advocate for Native Americans. However, Governors have Constitutional responsibilities to all of the people of our states. Based on these responsibilities we are compelled to tell you that the Secretary started down an unproductive path when we concluded that the Interior Department should become the sole arbiter in the compact process.

We urge you to find a resolution to the conflicts between the states and tribes that is more appropriate than that initiated by the Secretary. The Western Governors Association stands ready to participate in such an effort.

Sincerely,

TOM KNOWLES,
*Governor of Alaska,*
*Chairman.*

Mr. BRYAN. The Governors have repeatedly called the Secretary's proposal an inappropriate expansion of his authorities. Governors of the State in the process of negotiating a gaming compact with tribes will be severely disadvantaged by this proposal. Tribes will be much better off letting the Secretary of the Interior decide their fate—believing they can get a better deal from a person who is an acknowledged advocate for their interests and indeed encourages gaming as a means of generating tribal revenues.

The Department asserts the States must be acting in bad faith for the Secretary to strip the States of their rights. Of course, the Secretary is the judge and jury over whether the States, in fact, are negotiating in bad faith. To make matters even worse and to heighten the concerns the Governors have, the Department has informed us that they would consider the actions of Governor Wilson of California to be negotiating in bad faith because he refuses to negotiate with any tribe that persists in operating illegal games on tribal reservations. As Governor Wilson has indicated, he has a simple rule: If it is legal under State law, all can do it; if it is not legal under State law, no one can do it. The Governor wants the tribes to cease and desist illegal gaming activities before he will negotiate a compact or legal game, and the Interior Department would consider that bad faith.

Now, that situation is not peculiar to California alone. Let me cite an example, if I may, Mr. President, in a letter addressed to the Honorable Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, July 1, 1996, on behalf of the National Governors' Association. I quote a single paragraph from that letter. It arises out of the situation that occurred in the State of Florida.

The factual situation underlying the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Seminole is an example of typical tribal-State conflict over IGRA implementation. Florida refused to negotiate with the Seminole Tribe over the operation of slot machines. Slot machines are prohibited by Florida law, and state voters have rejected three referenda to legalize such devices, as well as other casino-style games. The state's public policy and the preference of Florida citizens with respect to this type of gambling activity could not be clearer. Yet the Seminole Tribe proceeded to take the state to court on the grounds that Florida had failed to negotiate in good faith, even though the state was merely negotiating within the limits of state law and state public policy on gambling.

Again, under the proposed regulation, the Interior Department would interpret the Florida situation as being one of bad faith and therefore the Interior Department could step in—in effect, supersede the negotiations and the position taken by Florida's Governor in response to voter preference and public policy in the State of Florida—and to negotiate a compact that could conceivably allow a full range of casino gaming activity contrary to the public policy of that State.

Mr. President, I am personally offended that the Department has chosen to proceed with rulemaking in clear violation of the intent of Congress.

Members will recall that Senator ENZI and I attached language to the Interior appropriations bill which imposes a moratorium on the Department implementing such a rule. The language reads: ''During fiscal year 1998, the Secretary may not expend any funds made available under this act to review or approve any initial tribal-State compact for class III gaming entered into on or after the day of the enactment of this act, except for a compact which has been approved in accordance with IGRA and State law.'' That contemplates the negotiating process between Governors and the tribal governments, as I indicated previously.

Nevertheless, the Department has chosen to ignore our intent and to proceed with putting this process in place, which Congress has clearly said it doesn't want. Since the Department has chosen to ignore the clear intent of Congress, we are forced to stop this power grab once again through the legislative process.

I might note over 100 compacts between States and tribes for class III gaming have been successfully negotiated. As I pointed out previously, five of those compacts are in place in Nevada. In only a handful of States has the compacting process failed. I believe the failure can be attributed to the unwillingness of Federal prosecutors to close down illegal tribal gaming operations. Tribes running illegal operations have no incentive to reach an agreement with States as long as they face no consequences for their illegal gaming activities.

In California alone, tribes are operating 14,000 illegal slot machines. It is not clear to me why the Secretary of Interior feels the need to stack the deck even further against the interests of those States who do not favor, as a matter of public policy, slot machines in their States.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Secretary will reconsider this ill-advised proposal. If not, we will work with the Nation's Governors and Nation's attorneys general on this legislation to block the emasculation of States' rights.

This bill is introduced by myself, Senator ENZI, and Senator REID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

---

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. TORRICELLI and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1573. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the Federal minimum wage; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT OF 1998

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators WELLSTONE, MIKULSKI, MOSELEY-BRAUN, KERRY, TORRICELLI, BOXER, and myself, I am introducing the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 1998, a bill to raise the minimum wage in three annual increases of 50 cents each in the next three years, to bring the minimum wage from its current level of $5.15 an hour today to $6.65 an hour on September 1 in the year 2000. Congressmen BONIOR and GEPHARDT are introducing identical legislation in the House of Representatives.

After the third year, the legislation calls for the minimum wage to be indexed, so that it will rise automatically as the cost of living increases. Working Americans should not have to depend on the whim of Congress each election year to determine whether they are paid a fair minimum wage.

In 1996, after a hard-fought battle in the last Congress, we raised the minimum wage, and the economy continued to grow. The scare tactics about lost jobs proved to be as false as they are self-serving. A recent study by the Economic Policy Institute documents that ''the sky hasn't fallen'' as a result of the last increase.

Raising the minimum wage does not cause job loss for teenagers, adults, men, women, African-Americans, Latinos, or anyone else. Certainly, the 12 million Americans who would benefit from this legislation deserve the increase.

We know who these workers are. Sixty percent are women. Nearly three-quarters are adults. Half of those who would benefit from this bill work full-time. Over 80 percent of them work at least 20 hours a week. They are teachers' aides and child care providers. They are single heads of households with children. They are people who clean office buildings in countless communities across the country. Working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, minimum wage workers earn $10,712 a year—$2,600 below the poverty level for a family of three.

No one who works for a living should have to live in poverty. In good conscience, we cannot continue to proclaim or celebrate the Nation's current prosperity while consigning millions who have jobs to live in continuing poverty.

The value of the minimum wage still lags far behind inflation. To have the purchasing power that it had in 1968, the minimum wage today would have to be $7.33 an hour instead of the current level of $5.15 an hour. That fact is a measure of how far we have not just fallen short, but actually fallen back, in giving low-income workers their fair share of our extraordinary economic growth.

In the past 30 years, the stock market, adjusted for inflation, has gone up by 115 percent, while the purchasing power of the minimum wage has gone down by 30 percent. Lavish end-of-the-year bonuses were recently distributed on Wall Street—but not to the working families on Main Street, who actually created the wealth in the first place.

Americans understand that those on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder deserve a raise. Seventy-six percent of those surveyed in the January 21 ABC-Washington Post poll said they supported increasing the minimum wage.

Seventy-seven percent of those surveyed by Peter Hart Research earlier this month specifically supported a three-year, $1.50 increase.

The American people understand the unfairness of requiring working families to subsist on a sub-poverty minimum wage. Across the country, soup kitchens, food pantries and homeless shelters are increasingly serving the working poor, not just the unemployed. In 1996, according to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, 38 percent of those seeking emergency food aid held jobs—up from 23 percent in 1994. Low-paying jobs are the most frequently cited cause of hunger. Officials in 67 percent of the cities cited this factor.

I look forward to the early enactment of this legislation. Twelve million working Americans deserve a helping hand. No one who works for a living should have to live in poverty.

Mr. President, we have had the opportunity, since the minimum wage was increased in the last two years, to test the validity of the principal argument in opposition to this bill. We will hear this claim again this year on the floor of the U.S. Senate, and that is, that this adds to the problems of inflation. Yet, we have had virtually no inflation over these last 18 months.

We will also hear that raising the minimum wage will cause the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. I can already hear the same tired, old arguments we have heard every time this body has debated an increase in the minimum wage—an estimate that we will lose anywhere from 200,000 to 300,000 to 400,000 jobs. Those were the statements made the last time we debated this issue on the floor of the Senate. And our good Republican friends in the House of Representatives said there was absolutely no way that their body was going to consider an increase in the minimum wage, and there was strong opposition over here among the Republican leadership in the Senate even to giving us an opportunity to vote on this measure. It was only after lengthy efforts that we were able actually to gain a vote and to develop bipartisan support for the minimum wage. Ultimately, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives responded after we added significant tax reductions for businesses to the legislation.

Mr. President, if we do not take action now to increase the minimum wage, then the progress we made in the last two years is gradually going to deteriorate. Even with a three-year increase of 50 cents, 50 cents, and 50 cents, by the third year the about 40 cents of the value of that $1.50 would have dissipated because of inflation. We are talking about working families who are trying to make it in this country, who have played an important role

in this whole economic expansion. But those at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder have not gotten their fair share of the extraordinary prosperity that we are experiencing under President Clinton's leadership.

So I don't understand why there is such opposition to the very modest increases that we are talking about, that even if implemented will hardly permit workers to provide for their families and be out of poverty. As a result of the 1996 welfare reform legislation, many, many more people were thrown into poverty. In many instances, they are not going to get the health care or the day care that they need, depending on a particular State's rules in this regard. But there will be millions of Americans who will be out there in the job market without the health care for their children that Medicaid would have provided or child care coverage that welfare benefits would have provided.

What we are asking is that at least we pay them a livable wage. I don't think a single parent, with $10,000 or $12,000, is going to have the kind of child care that any of us would understand or respect. Yesterday, I was in Dorchester, Massachusetts, meeting with parents about an after school program, which has been in effect for a number of years. It's going to be expanded. The mayor of Boston calls it the 2-to-6 program, and is trying to make available, in all parts of Boston, after-school programs for children. It is a very ambitious program. We have seen our Republican Governor indicate that he is supporting the after-school program. I listened to the parents who were out there, who talked about what happens after their children are 12 years old. The State of Massachusetts has a program that provides modest support for this kind of program for children up to 12 years old, but cuts it off there. Parents with tears in their eyes were saying, ''We work hard trying to provide for our families, and we just can't make it. Our children are going home and staying in an empty house in the afternoon.'' They pray that they are not going to get themselves in trouble, that the worst thing that will happen to them is they will just watch television. It might cost those parents $5 or $10 a week, maybe $20 a month to be able to have an after-school program. I expect that any single mom getting an increase in the minimum wage wouldn't think that much of a problem. That is happening in many communities in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the 10 minutes allocated to the Senator have expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent for 4 more minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we will have a chance to debate this issue. It is not one that should take a great deal of time to review. We have been through this debate time and time again. It hasn't got the complexities of many of the proposals the President will be talking about tonight. It is basic and fundamental. Every Member of this body has addressed this issue and voted on it one way or the other. It is going to be really a reflection of our values.

Finally, Mr. President, by not increasing the minimum wage, we leave many workers so poor that they are eligible for government assistance programs, such as food stamps. These programs are being paid for by other workers' taxes. In effect, these employees are subsidizing the businesses that aren't paying a fair wage. I think that is wrong.

We will have a chance to review the latest economic information available. We have to address that issue. We understand it. Some of us believe that Americans who work hard and play by the rules ought to be able to get a livable wage as a matter of principle. To achieve that goal, we have to address the impact on inflation and job loss. We will make that argument and we will make it with a great deal of enthusiasm. Two articles from the Wall Street Journal show that the increase in the minimum wage did not cause job loss or increase inflation. I will include those articles in the RECORD at the appropriate place following my remarks. Here was the newspaper that opposed it hammer and tong the last time we had the increase. I do not suggest that they are going to editorialize in favor of it this time. But, nonetheless, the various studies have shown that there is no evidence that modest increases in the minimum wage would harm the economy or cause job loss.

Mr. President, I don't know what will be in the President's State of the Union speech tonight. There are some reports that he will indicate support for an increase in the minimum wage. And if he does I hope that our Chambers will show support for that proposal because I know it will make all the difference in the world for millions of Americans and their families. Increasing the minimum wage will allow them to look to the future with a greater sense of hope.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have a couple of questions that I may want to put to my colleague in just a moment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts touched on two concerns that I want to speak about for a brief period of time. The Senator mentioned welfare. Earlier when I was speaking I didn't talk about the welfare bill. But I want the Senator to know that as we see the reports that this has been a huge success because there are 4 million fewer people receiving welfare assistance, I think there has been a lot of confusion. Welfare reform doesn't mean that there are fewer people on welfare. It doesn't mean you reduce the number of people receiving assistance. It means you reduce poverty. That is what it is about. It works if you are reducing the poverty for these families which are 90 percent women and children.

When I have been traveling around the country it is heartbreaking. The Senator talks about after school. There are 3- and 4-year olds home alone right now. That should not be the case because mothers are told to work. There are also preschoolers who are in very ad hoc arrangements with a relative for this week or that week, then somebody else the next week. We don't have affordable child care. In East LA in Los Angeles there is a waiting list of 30,000 for affordable child care. The President will be speaking about that tonight. Mr. President, there are first- and second-graders.

I met a woman in Los Angeles who broke down crying because she is so scared because her first-grader goes home alone—she is at work—to a very dangerous housing project, and is told to lock the door, and take no phone calls. There are children who don't play outside right now.

So when the Senator from Massachusetts talked about child care, I just want to emphasize the fact that welfare reform only means reduction of poverty. It means that children are in safe places receiving good child care. That is not happening.

Mr. President, I also want to point out that there are too many mothers who in our community colleges who are now told, ''You cannot pursue your education. You have to work.'' The job is $5.15, and if the minimum wage isn't higher one year later they will be worse off.

I am going to have an amendment for student deferment for those mothers because that is toward economic self-sufficiency, and another amendment that is going to require States to provide to Health and Human Services the data in 6 months as to how many families are moving toward economic self-sufficiency because you just can't eliminate people from assistance and cut off assistance if people do not have the jobs and decent wages.

Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator this question. The Senator from Massachusetts was speaking to an issue that I hear about everywhere I go, and it sounds like the President is going to be speaking to it, which is that I think people in our country believe that if you play by the rules of the game and you work 40 hours a week or thereabouts 52 weeks a year you ought not to be poor in America. That is what this is about. The last time we had a debate on the minimum wage the Senator from Massachusetts just insisted that the Senate would address

this issue. Does the Senator intend to make this such a precise priority for his work that one way or another all Senators are going to be voting on this? Are we going to have it on the floor of the Senate? Are we going to have the debate? Are we going to have a vote on it so all Senators can be held accountable to working families, or not?

Mr. KENNEDY. Absolutely, Senator. We will vote on this issue, and the earlier the better as far as I am concerned, so that minimum wage earners can continue the progress that they have made during the last 2 years. We will vote on this measure. I think that those who are opposed to it will give the Senate the opportunity to vote on it—at least I certainly hope they will. But the Senator is quite correct. We will vote on it one way or the other, and I think we take to heart that Congressman GEPHARDT, Congressman BONIOR and others have an identical bill. They are strongly committed. As Senators remember, there is a more complicated rule process over in the House of Representatives. But there is no reason in the world that we in the Senate cannot have an opportunity to vote on that measure and attach it to legislation and send it over to the House. We will do that and continue to do it until we are successful.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am an original cosponsor. I am pleased to hear that because that is part of what I am here for as a Senator.

Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts one final question. We don't just look at polls. But does the Senator have, in terms of what people in the country have been saying about raising the minimum wage 50 cents a year over the next 3 years—and we index it after that—is there broad public support that is a matter of simple elementary judgment?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. It is interesting that studies from this month show even greater support for the increase than we saw when we began this debate in the last Congress. Most Americans understand that we have had this extraordinary prosperity for millions of Americans over the period of the last 6 years. Most Americans understand that it has been working families who have made a difference. Those families include minimum wage earners—teachers' aides, who work in classrooms; health care aides, who work in nursing homes; and people who clean office buildings in communities across the country. Those men and women work hard, and they take pride in their work. Many of them have children, and we all know how hard it is to try to raise a family on $5.15 an hour. All those workers ask is to be treated fairly.

One of the most startling developments in the last few years is the number of working families who are using soup kitchens, food pantries and homeless shelters in cities across the country. The U.S. Conference of Mayors released a study showing that in 1996, 38% of those seeking emergency food aid are working—not unemployed. This is up from 23% in 1994. And, officials in two-thirds of the cities cited low wages as a primary reason for hunger. I don't know whether the Senator has this problem in rural communities in his region of the Nation. But in urban areas, almost 40 percent of those seeking emergency food aid are working, and they still can't make it.

All we are saying is that if you are working you shouldn't have to go to a soup kitchen. When you are working, you shouldn't have to bring your children to a soup kitchen in order to be fed. The minimum wage is designed to prevent such problems. It has been a part of the fabric of our society since the late 1930's, and it has been something which has had bipartisan support in the past. We are hopeful that it will have bipartisan support this time. Ultimately we will have it. But it had bipartisan support under President Bush, and President Nixon supported the increase as well. And Republicans in this body have supported it, too.

Many of our colleagues are constantly talking about the importance of rewarding work in our society. But when you have people who are able-bodied, who want to work, and who have jobs—there is something wrong if they can't make it on their own. There is something wrong if we do not try to address that problem.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have one final question.

The people who contribute don't have a lot. They are not the heavy hitters. They are not the ones always here in Washington to lobby us.

How does the Senator think we could win this fight?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator makes a good point because the organizations, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, the National Restaurant Association and others are out there already trying to discourage people from supporting this program. We will have a chance to deal with their arguments when we see what has actually happened in terms of the expansion of the restaurant industry and employment among restaurant workers. The Senator is no less interested in expanded employment or adequate income for restaurant workers than I am, and they still have done better with our modest increases in the past, and they will in the future.

I want to ask if the Senator will agree with me on one other proposition. We will hear during the debate that at least a quarter of these are teenagers who are making the minimum wage. In my State, tuition at the University of Massachusetts in Boston costs $4297. These students are still 18 and 19 years old. They are teenagers, and many of them are working. These students need the money.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it is my time. I ask unanimous consent to have 4 more minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Many of their parents never went to college. These are teenagers. These students are trying to earn enough to buy their books and maybe attend an athletic event once in a while or be able to pay in order to rent athletic equipment. These students—and yes, they are teenagers—are working long and hard, and they deserve the increase, too.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the Senator asked about Minnesota. Just two final points.

One, I was speaking on the floor earlier and I said that I think most families are focused on how you earn a decent living and how you give your children the care you know they need and deserve. I think the minimum wage bill is an important step in that direction along with whatever we can do on affordable child care and health care. That is the key to family income in this country.

I spoke earlier about the record of inequality. Secretary Reich had a very important piece in the New York Times about it. But now we see, Mr. President, a merger with education because, as a matter of fact, I say to my colleagues and my friend from Massachusetts what I find when I travel around Minnesota—and I was a college teacher for 20 years—is that many students are taking 6 years to graduate and not 4 years because now students are working on the average of 25 or 30 hours a week at two minimum-wage jobs.

So we now are talking about a piece of legislation that speaks to the issue of how families can have more income and also how students can afford their higher education. Many of these students are 18 and 19. But let's not trivialize the teen part. They are young women and young men who are working hard to be able to go to school. You had better believe that this minimum wage bill is really of critical importance to these young people as to whether or not they are going to be able to complete their education and do well financially.

So the Senator is absolutely correct. There is the strongest correlation to education and affordable education which I think all of us agree is an absolutely crucial issue.

Mr. President, today I am co-sponsoring a bill introduced by my colleague and friend Senator TED KENNEDY, cosponsored by a number of others, a measure which I consider to be one of the most important items we can pass and enact this year—the ''American Family Fair Minimum Wage Act of 1998.'' Our bill would increase the minimum wage by 50 cents a year during each of the next three years. After that, it would index further increases in the minimum wage to increases in the cost of living.

This 3-year increase of $1.50—raising the federal minimum wage to $6.65/hour by September 1 of the year 2000, and

pegging it to inflation in succeeding years—is the most immediate and practical step we can take to deliver to American working families a message of economic justice and principle. The message is this: if you work hard and play by the rules in America, you should not live in poverty. Unfortunately, that is not necessarily the case today for many working Americans with families. We need to address that problem.

Full time work at minimum wage generates an income of approximately $10,700 a year. That's $2,600 below the poverty line for a family of three in this country. Minimum wage is not a living wage in America today. Even after the most recent increase, the federal minimum wage is worth far less in real dollars than it was in the 1960s and 1970s.

Remember, the minimum wage disproportionately affects women. Sixty percent of those earning the minimum wage are women. Teachers' aides, child care providers, service-sector employees—some of the hardest working people in America, performing crucial tasks. Many of these women are single heads of households with child. One of the quickest ways we as a Congress could take a step toward real gender equity with regard to pay would be to pass an increase in the minimum wage and send it to the President. I am sure he will sign it. That would immediately improve the economic situation of millions of working women, many with families.

Increasing the minimum wage will benefit those who need it most in America—adults, women, working families. Seventy-five percent of those currently receiving minimum wage workers are adults; 60 percent are women; 50 percent work more than 35 hours a week; 82 percent work at least 20 hours a week.

Look at a few numbers which tell a story.

The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities recently released a report showing that income inequality grew in 48 of 50 states since the late 1970s. The decline in real incomes of the poorest one-fifth of families with children in America averaged 21 percent, or $2,500.

Since 1968, the stock market, adjusted for inflation, grew by 115 percent while the purchasing power of the minimum wage declined by 30 percent.

To reflect the purchasing power it maintained in 1968, today's minimum wage would have to be at $7.33/hour, not $5.15. So even a carefully charted increase to $6.65/hour will not make up the entire difference, but it will put us back on a road to responsibly representing our constituents.

For nearly the last two decades, the bottom 20 percent of income earners in this country haven't experienced growth like most Americans. Instead, they have lost 9 percent in real family income growth, while the top 20 percent have gained more than 26 percent.

Our bill is about justice. In recent weeks and months, I have traveled around this country: East and South Central Los Angeles, Baltimore, Chicago, the Mississippi Delta, Appalachia, as well as in my home state of Minnesota. I have repeatedly seen the struggles of hard working, dedicated people who want to improve their lives, but they can't find jobs that will pay them a livable wage.

Now increasing the minimum wage will not compromise the economy and it will not harm the falling unemployment rate. Consider that in September 1996, just one month prior to the minimum wage increase from $4.25 to $4.75, the national unemployment rate was at 5.2 percent. By December 1997, two months after the second annual increase to $5.15, the U.S. unemployment rate fell to 4.2 percent. And retail trade jobs, where a disproportionate amount of low wage workers are employed, increased slightly. Job opportunities in this country are not compromised by this legislation. In fact, the very importance and value of job opportunities to all Americans is exactly what is enforced by this legislation.

Today's economy continues to perform well. Yet the minimum wage—part of that same economy—has progressively fallen back. In 1996, we started to pave the right path to justice by increasing the minimum wage, but more must be done.

So I stand in support as the first cosponsor of this bill and urge Democrats and Republicans alike to support Senator KENNEDY's initiative and to support the American workforce by passing the Family Fair Minimum Wage Act of 1998. Thank you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for 2 final minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this chart here illustrates very clearly the purchasing power of the minimum wage since 1959. All of these figures are in 1997 dollars, adjusted for inflation. In 1968 the real value of the minimum wage was $7.33. In 1995 it was down to $4.32 an hour. In the 1996 legislation, we added two additional steps. On September 1, 1997, the second step took effect, raising the minimum wage's value to $5.15 an hour. If we do nothing, by the year 2000, it will be $4.66 an hour. Our legislation proposes that it go up to $6.18, in three steps. Again, this is the what the minimum wage will buy in 1997 dollars, if our legislation becomes law. Even that increase will leave minimum wage earners below where they were in the 1960s and 1970s. The legislation is a very modest step forward, and I believe that working families have earned it.

I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles that I mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS ALTER MINIMUM-WAGE VIEW—NEW DATA SHOW SMALL INCREASE DOESN'T COST JOBS

(By David Wessel)

WASHINGTON.—Revisiting their own controversial research, a pair of prominent economists concluded that better data support their original assertion: Raising the minimum wage moderately doesn't cost jobs.

In the new work, David Card of the University of California at Berkeley and Alan Krueger of Princeton University used reports filed by employers and collated by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Their earlier work, an influential element in Democrats' successful campaign to lift the minimum wage, relied on a telephone survey of employers that their critics attacked.

With the new data, the economists looked at fast-food employment in New Jersey and Pennsylvania at two key points: first, after an 80-cent-an-hour increase in New Jersey's minimum wage in April 1992 that didn't affect workers in Pennsylvania and, second, after an October 1996 50-cent increase in the federal minimum wage to $4.75. The federal increase only affected Pennsylvania because New Jersey's minimum wage was above the federal level.

LITTLE OR NO EFFECT

''The New Jersey (1992) minimum wage increase had either no effect, or a small positive effect, on fast-food industry employment in New Jersey vis-a-vis eastern Pennsylvania,'' the economists conclude. Between February and November 1992, fast-food employment grew by 3% in New Jersey but fell by between 1% and 3% in eastern Pennsylvania. What's more, after the October 1996 wage boost that affected only Pennsylvania, fast-food employment rose more sharply in that state than New Jersey. Between December 1995 and December 1996, fast-food employment grew by 11% in eastern Pennsylvania counties and by 2% in New Jersey.

The argument by Mr. Card and Mr. Krueger, a former chief economist in the Clinton Labor Department, challenged the conventional wisdom among mainstream economists that raising the price of workers' labor meant employers would buy less of it. The Clinton administration embraced it. House Speaker Newt Gingrich derided it as ''spurious'' and House Majority Leader Richard Armey, an economist, called it ''counterintuitive.'' Several big-name economists dismissed it.

The details of the analysis and data drew fire first from an employers' group, the Employment Policy Institute, that gathered data of its own to refute it. Later, economists David Neumark of Michigan State University and William Wascher of the Federal Reserve Board supplemented EPI's data with data of their own and argued that fast-food payrolls did what economic textbooks predicted; grew more slowly in New Jersey than in Pennsylvania after the 1992 New Jersey wage increase.

REMAINS UNPERSUADED

Mr. Wascher isn't persuaded by the new data. ''We never found very strong negative effects of the minimum wage on fast-food establishments,'' he said yesterday. ''We speculated these franchise agreements are very restrictive and that the bigger effects might be at mom-and-pop establishments.'' He said BLS data for all eating and drinking establishments, not just fast-food outlets, show that payrolls in New Jersey generally rise more than those in Pennsylvania between February and November, but that the difference was smaller in 1992 when the New Jersey minimum wage was raised than in 1991 or 1993.

The new Card-Krueger work, to be published shortly as a working paper by Princeton, hasn't been widely circulated yet among

their critics. The authors acknowledge that their data don't tell whether employers facing higher minimum wages reduce the average hours per worker; the figures only count how many people were employed.

Despite assertions from employer groups and many mainstream economists that lifting the minimum wage would reduce the number of jobs available to young and unskilled workers and increase unemployment, the recent strength of the economy has pushed the jobless rate down. Retailers and other employers of low-wage workers are complaining more about labor shortages than wage increases.

The federal minimum wage was lifted to $5.15 an hour on Sept. 1, 1997.

---

CHICKEN FEED: MINIMUM WAGE IS UP, BUT A FAST-FOOD CHAIN NOTICES LITTLE IMPACT—ECONOMIC BOOM LIFTS PROFIT; FIRM'S MAIN PROBLEM IS HIRING, RETAINING PEOPLE—PRESSURES ON JOB ARE RISING

(By Bernard Wysocki Jr.)

FALLS CHURCH, VA.—The minimum wage was a hot issue 18 months ago, pitting business against labor, Republicans against Democrats.

In April 1996, David Rosenstein, a fast-food entrepreneur, staunchly opposed a proposed two-step rise to $5.15 an hour as ''a bad idea.'' The middle managers at his 13 Popeyes Chicken & Biscuits restaurants didn't know how they would cope.

How times have changed.

Today, despite the now-higher minimum wage, Mr. Rosenstein's restaurants are prospering. Operating profits are up 11% from last year on a 10% rise in sales, which are running at a $14 million annual clip. He recently raised prices. He has opened a new store. And in a sign of boom times, he knocked out a wall and doubled the size of his spacious office.

''The economy is good. Business is good,'' says the 49-year-old Mr. Rosenstein, whose restaurants are franchisees of Atlanta-based AFC Enterprises. What about that minimum-wage increase? ''I think we saw it in more dire terms than it worked out,'' he says.

FEW PROTESTS

Indeed, the minimum-wage increase has turned into one of the nonevents of 1997, thanks mostly to the economy's continuing strength. Low-wage Americans—nearly 10 million workers, by some estimates—got a raise. But amid the current prosperity, hardly anybody noticed. So, when the second step, a 40-cent-an-hour raise, kicked in seven weeks ago, on Sept. 1, few cheered, but even fewer protested.

Critics had argued that higher wages would squeeze profits because employers, beset by competitors, couldn't raise prices. Nationwide, it is hard to generalize about that. But Mr. Rosenstein recently raised nearly every price on his menu—biscuits went up 20% and the average item 5%—with hardly a peep from customers. ''I'm surprised, very surprised,'' says Kenneth Hahn, the chain's director of operations.

Others had warned that raising the minimum wage would create inflated pay demands by those making slightly above-minimum wages. Not here. Work crews at Mr. Rosenstein's Virginia stores were averaging $5.54 an hour in 1996 and get only $5.60 today—a raise of 1%.

And although some academics say higher wages draw better-skilled teenagers out of school and into the workplace, displacing lower-skilled people, the Popeyes managers see nothing of the kind. If anything, their talent pool is weakening, drained by the booming economy.

COLLATERAL DAMAGE

Even though Mr. Rosenstein's worst fears weren't realized, lots of other things have happened in the past 18 months.

A tour of these Popeyes stores and conversations with the fry cooks and biscuit makers, the store supervisors and managers indicate that while the minimum-wage issue has retreated to the back burner of American politics, the big issues now are, in a sense, the collateral damage of the economic boom; intensified competition, a scarcity of good workers, high staff turnover and job burnout.

The wage increase itself has had major impact at only one outlet, at the Popeyes store on Rhode Island Avenue in the District of Columbia. There, the local hourly minimum is set at $1 over the federal minimum, and on Sept. 1, the district's minimum went to $6.15. Managers have cut back hours and piled more work on employees. Mr. Rosenstein says the operating profits at this one outlet fell to $34,000 for the 12 months ended Aug. 31 from $46,000 a year earlier.

ESCAPING TO MARYLAND

And so, when his Metropolitan Restaurant Management Co. looked for expansion sites in and around Washington, he went across the line into Maryland and opened there, largely to escape the $6.15 wage.

As several U.S. cities propose a so-called living wage, with minimums higher than the federal one, opponents such as the employer-backed Employment Policies Institute in Washington argue that low-wage employers will shun higher-wage locales. There may be something to that, as shown by Mr. Rosenstein's unwillingness to open another store in the high-wage district.

The really gut issue facing his company, however, is intensified competition. That may seem ironic: Its financial results are good, and the price increases have held. But on the darker side, the managers and the workers alike say that, on a day-to-day operating basis, the competitive environment has become tougher.

Back in the spring of 1996, Mohammed Isah, who manages the Popeyes store on City Line Avenue in West Philadelphia, fretted about the impending wage increase and wondered where the extra productivity he would need would come from. He vowed to scale back part-timers' hours and increase their workloads.

And he did. Sitting at one of his tables, Mr. Isah, once a bank manager in his native Nigeria, nods in the direction of a middle-age employee sweeping the floor. When the wage went up on Sept. 1 he halved her hours. Meantime, full-timers have taken up that slack. Nowadays, one person sets up the registers, then starts the biscuits, then does assorted odd tasks before business picks up at lunch time. Mr. Isah freely concedes that people are working twice as hard for their modest raise.

Yet the increased minimum wage isn't what is really driving Mr. Isah's hardball productivity drive. A few months ago, a Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet opened just a half-mile down City Line Avenue. Even the Popeyes managers agree that it's quite a site for a fast-food place: a renovated old home with fireplaces, walls sconces and a winding staircase.

When Kentucky Fried Chicken opened, Mr. Isah's sales declined. Although some business has now returned, his sales are running 2% below 1996 levels, and his operating profit is down 10%. His bosses say he is a good, hard-working manager, but the harsh business environment is putting pressure on him and his staff. ''You have people doing two or three people's jobs. Eventually, it gets to them,'' he says, and they are burning out from overwork. Turnover is rising as good people search for jobs elsewhere. Looking ahead, he sees more problems. He even has a written list of his concerns: Morale will drop. Quality of work will fall. Dependability will wane. Absenteeism will rise.

RISK OF VICIOUS CIRCLE

The Popeyes managers know that trimming staff can be self-defeating, and they haven't eliminated any full-time positions in the past 18 months. If hours drop, service declines, and sales and profit can suffer. A vicious circle can develop.

Mr. Rosenstein's New Castle, Del., outlet along busy Route 13 is gripped by more competition—not only for business but also for talent. The store manager there left the company earlier this year to run a Boston Market outlet. The Popeyes chain, which pays its store managers $30,000 to $45,000 a year, couldn't match the Boston Market pay, Frank Williams, the district manager, says. Outer managers had to pitch in until a replacement was found.

As the store suffered from patchwork management, business faltered. In addition, crew hours were cut back, and cleanliness suffered. That's the sort of thing that really rankles Mr. Williams, and, on a recent day, he was sitting in the New Castle restaurant, drawing up a long list of tasks for his store manager.

Popeyes managers are in a bind. They can push their people only so far, especially in an economy with so many job opportunities. They need to keep their employees. In the more prosperous locations, such as the Popeyes in Rockville, Md., an acute labor shortage keeps pushing up the work crews' pay. In April 1996, it averaged $6.01 an hour; today, it averages $6.42 Managers there say the increase has nothing to do with federal law and everything to do with supply and demand.

''My senior fry cook, he makes $8.75 an hour,'' says Mohsen Eghtesadi, district manager for Metropolitan's two Maryland restaurants. He waves his hand toward the Rockville Pike, a busy commercial strip. ''Look at all these sit-down restaurants opening up. They can pay $10 an hour, $12 an hour. For us to keep good employees, we really have to increase their pay.''

''It's a chicken war,'' Mr. Eghtesadi says. He adds, with a wry smile, ''And we are chicken warriors.''

MUCH COMPETITION FOR STAFF

His problems are just a tiny example of the sharper competition for talent. With much of the economy thriving, the national unemployment rate has dropped below 5%. In the fast-food business, expansion-minded chains need experienced supervisors and managers. Even good fry cooks, earning $8 an hour or so, are constantly vulnerable to raids by other chains.

Mr. Hahn, the director of operations, spends far more time these days weeding out the losers among job candidates. The chain does extensive background checks on all supervisors and puts managerial candidates through a series of psychological pencil-and-paper tests. The Popeyes bosses try to find candidates whose profiles match those of their successful store managers. Matchups have become rare.

At entry-level employment, more applicants are young women looking for jobs as part of the welfare-to-work movement. With fast-food employers inundated by welfare recipients, the minimum-wage issue takes a back seat to other concerns.

Seven weeks ago, Sharie Ross got a raise to $5.15 an hour, serving up fast food at the New Castle outlet, up from the $5-an-hour minimum in Delaware. She hardly noticed because, as a welfare-to-work employee, her main worry is the gradual loss of her welfare benefits.

''I still get food stamps; that's $98 a month,'' says Ms. Ross, 20. But when she started work five months ago, the state of Delaware picked up the cost of day care for her two children. To her, keeping that $200-a-month subsidy is more important than a few cents an hour in extra pay.

Yet a booming economy can mask all sorts of operating difficulties. That is true in many businesses, and it is true at Mr. Rosenstein's fried-chicken empire. One rule of thumb: If sales growth continues, all the other problems are manageable. In the past 18 months, sales at many of Mr. Rosenstein's stores have grown at double digits—and have surprised him. ''You budget for a 2% or 3% rise. To budget for a 10% rise is, well, irresponsible,'' he says.

But in his Prince William County, Va., stores, sales are booming. He pulls out his sales projections—$3,751,000 this year, up more than 10%. His hourly wage costs are up 7%, mostly because hours worked are up 6%. His projected 1997 profit at these stores is $270,000, up from $234,000 last year.

Mr. Rosenstein thinks his company will continue to be prosperous if the economy keeps booming. But, he adds, ''If there's a downturn, it's going to be nasty.''

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1573

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Fair Minimum Wage Act of 1998''.

**SEC. 2. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE.**

(a) WAGE.—Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) except as otherwise provided in this section, not less than—

''(A) $5.65 an hour during the year beginning on September 1, 1998;

''(B) $6.15 an hour during the year beginning on September 1, 1999;

''(C) $6.65 an hour during the year beginning on September 1, 2000; and

''(D) beginning on September 1, 2001, $6.65 an hour, as adjusted by the Secretary on each September 1 to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers during the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on September 1, 1998.

---

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1574. A bill to prohibit the cloning of humans; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit the cloning of humans. This act would further extend last year's efforts by last year's law which banned federal funding of human cloning. Under my bill, there would be an outright ban on human cloning, whether publicly or privately funded.

The scientific term for human cloning is ''human somatic cell nuclear transfer.'' That is what my bill would ban. My bill would not undermine or stifle scientific research in the area of genetics that promises to combat and cure disease in humans. This research includes the cloning of animals and human cells other than embryo cells.

I am not a scientist and do not wish to insert myself in the process of scientific research and advances, from which we all benefit. However, when science crosses over the boundary of what is ethically and morally appropriate research, I have an obligation to respond on behalf of myself and my constituents. Congress—and its lawmaking authority—is the only mechanism available to address the issue of human cloning and assert the will of the American people that it not go forward.

We have a responsibility to protect the moral and ethical foundation upon which this country was built. In recognizing that responsibility, both the Senate and House committees with jurisdiction have carefully looked at the implications of moving forward with legislation to ban human cloning. They have tapped the experts in the science of genetics and have confirmed what we as laymen believe—the cloning of humans is morally unacceptable and scientifically dangerous.

During a March 12, 1997, House Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology hearing, the National Bioethics Advisory Commission testified that there is sufficient cause to warrant legislation because a developing child would be subject to undue harm as a result of current unscientifically plausible technology. In summarizing the Commission's report before the Subcommittee, its Chairman, Dr. Harold T. Shapiro, noted that this deficiency in the technology was coupled with far-reaching concern that human cloning is not deemed morally acceptable by society as a whole.

A final hearing was held July 22, 1997, during which Dr. Hessell Bouma, a professor of biology, said it best. The transcript states that ''he stressed the uniqueness, freedom, and respect intrinsic to human life. Cloning, Dr. Bouma testified, is in direct violation of all three, and therefore should be prohibited by law.''

Mr. President, I don't think any of us can argue with that.

I would like to urge my colleagues to take swift action and impose a ban on human cloning. We are all aware of the activities in Chicago to move forward with a human cloning experiment, so time is of the essence. I would ask that we work together over the coming weeks to pass a bill to prevent this and future efforts to wrongly clone humans.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1574

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Human Cloning Prohibition Act''.

**SEC. 2. FINDING.**

Congress finds that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to the nation to prohibit the cloning of humans.

**SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON HUMAN CLONING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

(1) clone a human being; or

(2) conduct research for the purpose of cloning a human being or otherwise creating a human embryo.

(b) FEDERAL FUNDS.—No Federal funds may be obligated or expended to knowingly conduct or support any project of research the purpose of which is to clone a human being or otherwise create a human embryo.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in subsection (a), the terms ''clone'' and ''cloning'' mean the practice of creating or attempting to create a human being by transferring the nucleus from a human cell from whatever source into a human egg cell from which the nucleus has been removed for the purpose of, or to implant, the resulting product to initiate a pregnancy that could result in the birth of a human being.

**SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) CIVIL PENALTIES.—Whoever is found to be in violation of section 2 shall be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for each such violation.

(b) INELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—A individual found to be in violation of section 2 shall not be eligible to receive any Federal funding for research regardless of the type of research being conducted for a period of 5-years after such violation.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 322

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, A bill to amend the Agricultural market Transition Act to repeal the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact provision.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the official language of the Government of the United States.

S. 412

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 412, A bill to provide for a national standard to prohibit the operation of motor vehicles by intoxicated individuals.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal the provisions of the Acts that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain small businesses from the mandatory electronic fund transfer system.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, A bill to permit an individual to be treated by a health care practitioner with any method of medical treatment such individual requests, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, A bill to amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Restoration Study Report.

S. 769

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 769, A bill to amend the provisions of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 to expand the public's right to know about toxic chemical use and release, to promote pollution prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 836

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 836, A bill to offer small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses.

S. 887

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 887, A bill to establish in the National Service the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program, and for other purposes.

S. 943

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 943, A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the application of the Act popularly known as the ''Death on the High Seas Act'' to aviation accidents.

S. 1021

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1021, A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that consideration may not be denied to 5, United States Code, to provide that consideration may not be denied to preference eligibles applying for certain positions in the competitive service, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, A bill to enhance the rights and protections for victims of crime.

S. 1104

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1104, A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make corrections in maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

S. 1141

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1141, A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to take into account newly developed renewable energy-based fuels and to equalize alternative fuel vehicle acquisition incentives to increase the flexibility of controlled fleet owners and operators, and for other purposes.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. ASCHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1215, A bill to prohibit spending Federal education funds on national testing.

S. 1222

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1222, A bill to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1237

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1237, A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to further improve the safety and health of working environments, and for other purposes.

S. 1244

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1244, A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to protect certain charitable contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 1260

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1260, A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to limit the conduct of securities class actions under State law, and for other purposes.

S. 1293

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1293, A bill to improve the performance outcomes of the child support enforcement program in order to increase the financial stability and well-being of children and families.

S. 1307

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to rules governing litigation contesting termination or reduction of retiree health benefits and to extend continuation coverage to retirees and their dependents.

S. 1311

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1311, A bill to impose certain sanctions on foreign persons who transfer items contributing to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles.

S. 1320

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, A bill to provide a scientific basis for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assess the nature of the association between illnesses and exposure to toxic agents and environmental or other wartime hazards as a result of service in the Persian Gulf during the Persian Gulf War for purposes of determining a service connection relating to such illnesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1326

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1326, A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for medicaid coverage of all certified nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists services.

S. 1334

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a demonstration project to evaluate the feasibility of using the Federal Employees Health Benefits program to ensure the availability of adequate health care for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries under the military health care system.

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, supra.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1360, A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1379

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1379, A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and the National Security Act of 1947 to require disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act regarding certain persons, disclose Nazi war criminal records without impairing any investigation or prosecution conducted by the Department of Justice or certain intelligence matters, and for other purposes.

S. 1482

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1482, A bill to amend section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a prohibition on commercial distribution on the World Wide Web of material that is harmful to minors, and for other purposes.

S. 1554

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1554, A bill to provide for relief from excessive punitive damage awards in cases involving primarily financial loss by establishing rules for proportionality between the amount of punitive damages and the amount of economic loss.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Republic of China should be admitted to multilateral economic institutions, including the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 164—INFORMING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES THAT A QUORUM OF EACH HOUSE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 164

*Resolved*, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 165—INFORMING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT A QUORUM OF SENATE IS ASSEMBLED

Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 165

*Resolved*, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

## SENATE RESOLUTION—166—RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE DENVER BRONCOS IN WINNING SUPER BOWL XXXII

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 166

Whereas on August 14, 1959, a passion was born in the heart of the Rocky Mountain Region that brought such memories as ''Orange Crush,'' ''The Drive,'' ''The Fumble,'' ''The Three Amigos,'' and 4 previous Super Bowl appearances;

Whereas the fans of the Denver Broncos are recognized throughout the National Football League (referred to in this resolution as the ''NFL'') for their unconditional allegiance to the team, contributing to 229 consecutive sold-out stadium home games;

Whereas the Denver Broncos' organization assembled a championship caliber coaching staff who created a championship caliber team;

Whereas the Denver Broncos played in 4 previous Super Bowls without winning, represented the American Football Conference in Super Bowl XXXII which had not won a Super Bowl in 13 years, and was considered the underdog in the game; and

Whereas after almost 40 years, the Denver Broncos became champions of the NFL with a victory in Super Bowl XXXII over the defending national champions and perennial contenders, the Packers from Green Bay, Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the outstanding achievement of the Denver Broncos in winning Super Bowl XXXII on January 25, 1998; and

(2) congratulates the players, staff, and fans of the Denver Broncos for a terrific football season and a thrilling victory in Super Bowl XXXII.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 167—RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT OF JOHN ELWAY IN THE VICTORY OF THE DENVER BRONCOS IN SUPER BOWL XXXII

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 167

Whereas since becoming quarterback for the Denver Broncos in 1983, John Elway has been involved in some of the most striking comeback victories in the history of the National Football League (referred to in this resolution as the ''NFL'');

Whereas John Elway has been a Pro Bowl quarterback, was named NFL Most Valuable Player in 1987 and the American Football Conference's Most Valuable Player in 1993, holds numerous NFL passing records, and is the all-time winningest quarterback in the history of the NFL;

Whereas John Elway's leadership, dedication, and perseverance symbolizes excellence in these qualities for the entire Nation and represents these qualities for America to the world; and

Whereas John Elway, an exceptional athlete, has sustained a high level of personal competitiveness and has finally led his team to the honor of a Super Bowl championship: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the outstanding achievement of the Denver Broncos' quarterback, John Elway; and

(2) congratulates John Elway as the winning quarterback of Super Bowl XXXII.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States will outline some important issues for our consideration during the second half of this Congress, and, as I have sat here for the last 40 minutes listening to some of my colleagues, they have spoken with great emphasis on the importance of the points on which they are going to agree and disagree with him. But today I rise, with my friend Senator ALLARD, to submit two resolutions that are on a happier note. These resolutions are to honor the outstanding achievement of the Denver Broncos in their winning of Super Bowl XXXII.

The first resolution recognizes the entire Broncos organization and the other honors John Elway, the team's veteran leader, who happens to be a personal friend of both Senator ALLARD and myself. For the first time in 13 years, an AFC team has won the Super Bowl, and it is only the second time a wild-card team has won since 1980. Indeed, they were the underdog in the betting from Las Vegas to Atlantic City and all points in between.

As those football fans among us might know, the Broncos have glimpsed victory on four prior occasions, but had victory elude them each time. All of that changed this past Sunday. With an inspiring team effort, they beat the odds and the legendary Green Bay Packers, a team as talented and formidable as any of the championship Packer teams before it.

So sure were some people that the Broncos would lose, one electric appliance merchant in Farmington, NM, and Durango, CO, offered unlimited free appliances to customers on the day before the game if the Broncos won. Under the agreement, the customers would have only had to pay if the Broncos lost. Lucky for him, he had the foresight to take out a $300,000 insurance policy, which barely covered his losses to jubilant customers as the unexpected happened and they showed up yesterday at both of his stores to collect on their free appliances.

In a brilliant athletic and strategic contest, both the Denver Broncos and the Green Bay Packers reflected qualities that we all value and admire: hard work, teamwork, preparation, dedication, and sportsmanship above all things. For that, and a beautiful display of terrific physical talent, both teams must be commended and applauded.

I want to highlight the Denver team, of course, because I am from Colorado and because they displayed a resilience and perseverance in overcoming four previous Super Bowl losses, qualities which any one of us must cheer who, in