

into the next century. We have the resources, we have the brain power, we have the courage and skill of our war fighters to make that happen. This amendment is all about making sure that we use and develop those natural strengths that America has to the best of our ability.

I come back to the final point that we have to involve the American people more in these discussions. Sometimes, particularly when we exist, as we do now, at a time of relative national security, it is hard to get people to focus in on the details and on the need to continue to commit adequate resources to our national defense. I am convinced that if we find ways to involve more of our citizens in these discussions, in the work of a nonpartisan panel, a national defense panel, in the hearings that it may hold, in the hearings that will surely be held here in Congress after we receive these reports from the Secretary of Defense, then the American people and we, their Representatives in Congress, will surely provide the resources necessary to preserve our liberties and defend our national principles and interests.

Mr. President, an informed public will always understand the wisdom and the memorable comment made by the great British soldier and leader, Sir John Slessor, when he said,

It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditure on armaments as conflicting with the requirements of social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free.

Mr. President, I hope when we introduce this amendment later in the afternoon that other colleagues will join us in cosponsoring it and, of course, in voting for it.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the amendment. I look forward to returning and actually introducing the amendment when the appropriate unanimous-consent agreement is entered. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment to be proposed by the able Senator from Connecticut, and I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. President, for the past 3 years the Clinton administration has failed to articulate a sound and credible national security strategy. A large part of this failure is the result of the President refusing to submit a budget request which provides the necessary funds to support the force structure re-

quired by his own strategy. In fact, it is frequently noted that the force structure is underfunded by as much as \$150 billion. Not only has this administration failed to provide the funds required to sustain the numerous foreign adventures in which the President involves our military forces, but the administration has also failed to provide the funds required to modernize our military forces for the conflicts of the 21st century.

Mr. President, the people of the United States cannot afford to continue down this dangerous path.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, the United States has conducted two substantial assessments of the force structure necessary to protect American interests in an increasingly chaotic world. The base force of the Bush administration laid a credible foundation for restructuring our forces in order to meet the realities of the post-cold war world. However, President Clinton's Bottom-Up-Review, which replaced the base force, failed to make any meaningful contribution because it did not outline a force structure that would protect American interests into the next century. As we look toward the future, it is essential that we re-examine the world security environment and develop a military force that will be capable of defending American interests in future conflicts.

Mr. President, the proposed amendment will set this reexamination in motion. The amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to perform an assessment of the national security strategy, and the force structure necessary to support that strategy, through the year 2005. In addition, the amendment creates an independent, nonpartisan panel of national security experts to review the Secretary's assessment and provide a report to the Congress which offers alternative force structures to that which is provided by the Secretary.

The information that is provided by each of these reports will be available to both the administration and the Congress for use in making decisions to prepare the armed forces of the United States for the 21st century. These reports will make a significant contribution to ensuring that our national security strategy is sufficient to protect American interests in the future, and that the force structure is sufficiently funded to support that strategy. We must be sure that the strategy and force structure are balanced and affordable.

Mr. President, now is the time that we should undertake a fundamental re-examination of our national security requirements. The national security strategy of the Clinton administration has failed to provide for the future security of the United States. We cannot commit the security of our children to this failed strategy and insufficiently funded force structure. Therefore, I urge my fellow Senators to support this amendment.

Now, Mr. President, in closing, I want to commend the ranking member, Senator NUNN, for the remarks he made on this subject, about going ahead. We need to know what the amendments are. Any Senator who has an amendment to the defense authorization bill should come forth and present that amendment. Time is fleeting. We want to finish this bill by Thursday night, and we would like to know what it is.

The other thing I want to mention is that amendments should be defense-related. If they are not defense-related, they should be offered on some other bill and not on this particular bill.

Mr. President, this is important. We have to finish this bill in due time, and we should waste no time in getting these amendments in. Let the amendments be defense-related, or offer them to some other bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3448, H.R. 3415, AND S. 295

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to join now with the Democratic leader in getting a very large unanimous-consent agreement. A lot of effort has gone into the preparation of this unanimous-consent agreement. It is based on a lot of give and take in negotiations and trust and good faith. I will continue to try to proceed in that way.

I want to thank Senator DASCHLE for his cooperation, and I hope we can continue to work in this way. I would like to proceed now with the request, and we can discuss it further as we go along, or after we get the agreement entered into.

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 8, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after notification of the Democratic leader, the Senate turn to the consideration of H.R. 3448, the minimum wage bill, and it be considered under the following restraints:

That immediately following the clerk reporting the bill by title, the committee amendment be agreed to and considered original text for the purpose of further amendments, and the Senate then deal with amendments to title I, the small business tax title; that there be one first-degree amendment relevant to the small business tax title for each leader, with no other amendments or motions to refer in order to the bill, other than the minimum wage amendments listed below, except for any manager's amendment

which can be cleared by the two managers and the two leaders, and that no points of order be considered as having been waived by this agreement.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon the disposition of the small business tax amendments, Senator KENNEDY be recognized to offer an amendment making modifications with respect to minimum wage and time on the Kennedy amendment be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided in the usual form; that no amendments, points of order, or motions be in order during the pendency of the Kennedy amendment, and following the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the amendment be laid aside.

I further ask that following the debate on the Kennedy amendment, Senator LOTT or his designee be recognized to offer an amendment relative to minimum wage, and it be considered under the same restraints as outlined for the Kennedy amendment, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the Lott amendment, to be followed immediately, regardless of the outcome of the Lott amendment, by a vote on the Kennedy amendment.

I further ask that time for debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided in the usual form, and further, that following the disposition of the Kennedy amendment, no further minimum wage amendments be in order to the bill. I will ask at a later time that the minimum wage amendments be printed in the RECORD.

Further, I ask that all remaining first-degree amendments be submitted to each leader in the form of a summary by 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 26, provided that either leader may void this agreement after consultation prior to 3 p.m. on Wednesday, June 26, 1996.

I emphasize here that this is so that everybody will be on notice as to what the content is. It is our intention that we would go forward and that it would not be void at that point. But we felt that extra protection was called for.

I further ask that following the disposition of the above listed amendments the bill be advanced to third reading and final passage occur, all without further action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate may turn to the consideration of H.R. 3415 regarding the gas tax repeal, at a time to be determined by the two leaders and if the bill has not been reported by the Finance Committee it be automatically discharged and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration and it be considered under the following time agreement:

That there be 1 hour of debate on the bill to be equally divided in the usual form, that the bill be open to four first-degree amendments to be offered by Senator LOTT, or his designee, relevant to the gas tax bill, and subject to relevant second-degree amendments and four first-degree amendments to be offered by Senator DASCHLE, or his des-

ignee under the same terms as outlined for Senator LOTT, with no motion to refer in order and no points of order to be considered as having been waived by this agreement, and following the disposition of the above-listed amendments and the conclusion or yielding back of time the bill be advanced to third reading, and final passage occur, all without further action or debate.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the passage of H.R. 3448 the Senate proceed to calendar No. 389, S. 295, the TEAM Act, under the following restraints:

Two amendments in order to be offered by the Democratic leader, or his designee, and two amendments in order to be offered by the majority leader, or his designee, and that all first-degree amendments in order to S. 295 be relevant and submitted to the two leaders in the form of a summary under the same terms as described for H.R. 3448 with the same veto authority expiring at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, June 6, 1996, and that time for debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour in the usual form, with time on each amendment limited to 1 hour equally divided, and that no other amendments or motions to refer be in order and no points of order be considered waived by this agreement.

I further ask that following the disposition of the above-listed amendments the bill be advanced to third reading and the Labor Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 743, and the Senate proceed to immediate consideration, that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of S. 295, as amended, if amended, be inserted, the bill be advanced to third reading and final passage occur, all without further action or debate.

And, finally, I ask unanimous consent that no call for the regular order serve to displace H.R. 3448, H.R. 3415, S. 295, or H.R. 743 during their pendency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object. I wonder if I might be afforded a few moments to comment after we get the agreement.

Mr. LOTT. I believe the Senator wanted 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY be able to proceed for not more than 10 minutes after this agreement has been entered into.

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

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not care to object at this moment. On last Thursday I attempted to lay down, but I did not actually send to the desk, an amendment to the defense authorization bill relative to closing of a loophole that we created in the GATT treaty that relates to two or three drug companies that are making enormous windfall profits as a result of our mistake.

Mr. President, I got in a little bit late on the distinguished majority

leader's request. I am wondering if anywhere in the unanimous consent request if my thrust of offering this amendment is going to be impaired in any way, or will there be an opportunity?

Mr. LOTT. If I might respond, Mr. President, there is nothing in this agreement that in any way affects that, or stops it being offered. I know the Senator has indicated the desire to do that at any and every opportunity. This in no way impairs that right.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I was trying to protect my rights and protect the opportunity to offer this amendment at the appropriate time either on the DOD or some other subsequent piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I will not object. I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could be recognized—I know the distinguished Democratic leader would like to be recognized—to summarize.

This means we will take up the minimum wage, small business tax package, and amendments to that on Monday July 8, and I am sure it will go over until Tuesday, July 9. That will be followed by the TEAM Act which involves employee-employer relationships in the workplace. That will be taken to final passage.

And then at a time and in a way that we will work on further, the gas tax repeal bill will also be brought up at a later date.

I am sure there are a lot of Senators that are not totally happy with this on both sides of the aisle. But I think this is what needs to be done to move these issues through the process, allow the Senate to offer amendments, and have debate and have votes. And then we will see what the result is, and we will go on from there.

But we do have very serious work that we need to do for our country, and we are still working on hopefully an agreement on health care reform. We are hoping that we can—well, we intend to complete the defense authorization bill this week. We have a number of other bills that we need to consider for the good of the country—nominations that are pending. And I think this helps get us moving again.

Again, I want to thank all Senators on this side of the aisle for their cooperation, and also Senator DASCHLE for his cooperation. A lot of work has gone into this. I do not think it serves any purpose to say that this was given or that was taken. I think it is a fair enough deal for all concerned. I am glad we were able to achieve this agreement.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. A

lot of work has gone into the negotiations on this compromise proposal for the last several weeks. I appreciate his willingness to work with us to achieve this agreement today. We will have an up-or-down vote as we have requested on minimum wage on July 9. I appreciate very much his willingness to work with us to achieve that.

This effort would not have been successful were it not for the distinguished ranking member of the Labor Committee. He has been stalwart in the effort to find a way to ensure that we have this opportunity. I applaud and thank Senator KENNEDY for his contribution to these negotiations and his arduous work in making sure that we have been successful this afternoon.

As the distinguished majority leader said, this allows us to move the process forward. We will have a series of votes and an opportunity to vote on relevant amendments. That was key during these negotiations—relevant amendments during the consideration of these bills. Once that has been achieved we will go to conference.

I am very hopeful, very desirous, and fully confident that we can resolve these matters with the House in conference sometime during the month of July—sooner rather than later. It is my expectation they will be resolved successfully in a form that will allow us to bring back a conference report that is acceptable to the Democrats and that the President can sign. I will work with the majority leader to ensure that that happens. My colleagues have my commitment that I will make every effort to see that that happens in the next several weeks.

As the distinguished majority leader also mentioned, the health bill is not part of this package. It was our hope that we could resolve the differences with regard to health as well. But we will work on that next.

It is not our desire to offer the health bill as an amendment today to the defense bill. I hope that at some point in the next 24 hours, the majority leader and Senator KENNEDY and I can sit down to work on that, as we worked on minimum wage, to see if we can find a way to resolve the impasse and leave with the week intact and with the confidence of knowing we can resolve health, as now we have been able to resolve the matter of the minimum wage, in an acceptable manner procedurally at least.

So, again, I thank very much all of those who were involved in this negotiation. I am hopeful that we can now look with some promise, some confidence to this issue being resolved in a successful way in the very near future. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join our two leaders in welcoming this

agreement which will permit the Senate to vote on the issue about whether families that work hard 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, ought to have a livable wage. I think it is important to note that with this agreement the time of obstruction, delay, and stonewalling has been put aside.

It did not have to be this way. Increases in the minimum wage have been bipartisan in times past, and they should be bipartisan today if we are going to reward work and respect work and make sure that families that are working will have enough of an income to provide for themselves, for their children, to put food on the table, and pay a mortgage.

That has been a proud tradition for the last 58 years. Fifty-eight years ago today President Roosevelt signed the first minimum wage bill. It was 25 cents an hour. He predicted at that time there were going to be voices raised saying this was to be the end of democracy in America. So often with the increases that I have seen in the minimum wage since the early 1960's, there have been similar calls, that any increase was going to destroy the free enterprise system.

Of course, that is not what this is about. It is about fairness. It is about decency. It is about respect for work. It is about making sure American families are going to be treated fairly.

So I am grateful that we will have that issue before the Senate. Today is really a victory for working families, those working families that came here and appeared before various forums in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. We were not permitted to have hearings to hear from these families, denied those hearings in the past year and a half. Nonetheless, we were able to have forums. Families told us about their hopes and dreams, told us how they work not one job but two jobs. Families pointed out they did not mind working one job, two jobs, three jobs but what they resented most was not having sufficient income so they could set aside a few hours to spend with their children and members of their family.

That is what this is about. Women in the work force, 65 percent of those who receive the minimum wage are women in the work force. It is about children of working families in the work force.

So, Mr. President, we will look forward to debating this issue when we come back after the Fourth of July break.

Finally, as we are looking at this moment, we also have to consider what our friends on the other side are offering as an amendment to the minimum wage and their view about what the minimum wage should be. If perchance their amendment is accepted, then even the position of the House of Representatives, which said that the minimum wage would have gone into effect at the time of July 1, just a couple of weeks after the time of the passage, their proposal is going to delay that

until the early part of next year, January of next year—another delay.

Second, it is going to have a provision to provide 180-some days, so that any entrant into a new job for 180 days can still be paid at the old wage of \$4.25 an hour. We have seen other gimmicks in the past on the minimum wage. We had a 90-day delay called the Youth Training Program, even though there never was a training program included, and then another 90 days included if that youth were under 18 years of age.

Now we have a delay of 180 days for the entrant at the minimum wage, whether that be a teenager—the 30 percent of those who are making the minimum wage who are teenagers—or whether that be a single mother who has to provide for her family. If we pass this bill and get it enacted into law, it is going to be delayed until the early part of next year under the Republican amendment, and then it will be delayed another 180 days under the Republican amendment. And then the final provision of the Republican amendment is to have a carveout for businesses of up to \$500,000. That will carve out approximately 10 million Americans that will no longer be included in coverage for the minimum wage.

So on the one hand, as we are going to have an agreement to at least vote on this issue and to address this issue of fundamental fairness, we also have to be aware that there will be a proposal on the floor of the Senate that will carve out 10 million of the 13 million Americans who would be affected by this minimum wage, will carve out those new entrants into the job market at the lower level of the ladder for 180 days from getting any benefit of the increase in the minimum wage, should we support it, and then delay that program until the first of next year. That is a totally unacceptable proposal, and I hope it will be resisted here.

But I am grateful to our leaders for working out this proposal. I am particularly thankful to those on our committee and here on this side of the aisle who have been constant. Every Member on our side of the aisle has voted in support of the increase in the minimum wage, and I commend the number of Republicans who have also joined with us and have reflected their support for the minimum wage in the past. We thank them for their constancy and indication they were going to take every step that was going to be necessary to get a vote on this issue.

I hope that over the period of the next few weeks, the American people will look at what the alternative will be in this Chamber that effectively, on the one hand, will give an increase in the minimum wage and, on the other hand, withdraw it. That is an unacceptable way of proceeding. I hope that amendment will be defeated. It is important that the American people in these remaining days, when they see their Members of the Senate at the Fourth of July parades and at the picnics over this period of time, say, when