economic boom. They have yet to recover from the serious erosion of their earnings from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s. The share of full-time workers in poverty has doubled since the late 1970s—from about 1.5 million to almost 3 million by 1998. Millions of poor children are dependent upon these full-time workers. 

"Minimum Wage Careers?" An August 1999 study by two government economists, found that 12 percent of all workers have spent the first ten years of their careers within $1 of the minimum wage. 8 percent of workers, predominantly women, minorities, and the less-educated, spend at least 50 percent of their first ten post-school years in jobs paying less than $1 above the minimum wage. This research demonstrates that millions of workers stay at or near the minimum wage for years after their entry into the workforce. The minimum wage is not just an "entry level" wage. As the study concludes, "minimum wage legislation has non-negligible effects on the lifetime opportunities of a significant minority of workers."

Raising the minimum wage is not just a labor issue. The minimum wage issue is also a family issue. Forty percent of minimum wage workers have families. Parents are spending less and less time with their families. Listen to this: 22 hours less a week than they did 30 years ago, according to a study last year by the Council of Economic Advisers. As reflected in a report released by the Economic Policy Institute last week, an average middle-class family in 1998 spend 6.8 percent more time at work then it did in 1989. These extra hours at work mean that parents have less time to spend with their children. 

Raising the minimum wage issue is also a children's issue. Thirty-three percent of minimum wage earners are parents with children under 18. Over 8 million children living in poverty live in working poor families. The Children's Defense Fund recently released a report called "The State of America's Children 2000." A chapter on Family Income explains that if "recent patterns persist, one out of every three children born in 2000 will have spent at least a year in poverty by his or her 18th birthday." The inadequate pay of these workers is the reason why 33 percent of all poor children, or 4.3 million children, in 1998 were poor despite living in a family where someone worked full-time, year-round. Children who grow up in poor families face a much higher risk of poor health, high rates of learning disabilities and developmental delays, and poor school achievement and they are far more likely to end up in poverty themselves. 

Raising the minimum wage is also a civil rights issue. A disproportionate share of minorities will be affected by an increase in the minimum wage. While African Americans represent 12 percent of the total workforce, they represent 16 percent of those who would benefit from a minimum wage increase. Only 8 percent of workers whose minimum wage is Hispanic, but 19 percent of those who would directly affected by an increase in the minimum wage are Hispanic.

"Raising the minimum wage is also a women's issue. Sixty percent of minimum wage earners are women. The workers affected by an increase in the minimum wage are concentrated in female-dominated occupations. Above all, raising the minimum wage is a fairness issue. Minimum wage earners, such as waitresses and teacher's aides, childcare workers, and elder care workers, deserve to be paid fairly for the work that they do. They should not be forced into poverty for doing the work that is important to the citizens of the Nation."

In this period of unprecedented economic prosperity, the 10 million workers at the bottom of the economic ladder who will benefit from raising the minimum wage should not be forced to wait any longer for the fair increase they deserve. 

Each day we fail to raise the minimum wage, families across the country continue to fall farther behind. Two facts tell the story. The minimum wage would have to be $7.66 an hour today—and instead of its current level of $5.15—to have the same purchasing power it had in 1968. If wages had kept pace with worker productivity gains over the last twenty-five years, the minimum wage would have to be $8.79 today.

We heard a great deal about opposition to the increase in minimum wage because we are not getting increases in productivity. No economy has ever had the dramatic increases in productivity as we have had, Mr. President. If we tied those increases in productivity to where the minimum wage should be, it would be at $8.79 instead of $5.15.

These disgraceful disparities show how far we have fallen short in guaranteeing that low-income workers receive their fair share of the nation's prosperity. No one—no one—who works for the work that they do. They should not be forced into poverty for doing the work that is important to the citizens of the Nation. 

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. President, as we enter the final weeks of the 106th Congress and the home stretch of the President's campaign, two health issues demand immediate action—protecting patients against the abuses of HMOs and other health insurance plans and providing coverage of prescription drugs under Medicare for senior citizens. The American people deserve action on both of these issues from this Congress. The position of the two Presidential candidates on these issues has become a key factor in determining whether they are truly committed to serving the needs of the American people and the position of every member of Congress on these issues is important for the same reason. 

With regard to the Patients' Bill of Rights, last week, ABC began to air a documentary series—"Hopkins 24/7"—that vividly illustrates once again the need for prompt action to end HMO abuses. Hopkins 24/7 is a documentary on life at one of the nation's finest hospitals—Johns Hopkins. The documentary is the result of three months of intensive filming. The first segment, shown on August 30, showed American medicine at its best, and the abuses by managed care at their worst. 

A 14-year-old girl, Tiffanie Salvadia, sought care from Johns Hopkins for her cancer of the uterus. The diagnosis had been delayed for six critical weeks because crucial tests were not ordered by her HMO physicians. When Tiffanie finally reached Johns Hopkins, the cancer had spread from her uterus, raising the risk of this serious illness even further. When Tiffany finally reached an institution capable of giving her the quality care she needed, the problems with her HMO were not over: Authorization for a vital test was needed, but the hospital was unable to contact the HMO for the authorization. Fortunately, Hopkins simply went ahead and performed the test, and hoped that the hospital might be able to claim payment.

Tiffanie ultimately received fine care from Hopkins, and her chances of recovery from the cancer now seem good. But her favorable prognosis is no guarantee of her continued care. Dr. Paul Colombani, the oncologist at Hopkins, had to say about Tiffanie's case and about his experience with managed care generally.

On the difficulty in getting the test authorized, he said, "I have to do the diagnosis codes and the procedure codes. And we have to submit them to the insurance company ahead of time. And they have to say yea or nay. We're not going to do this. You have to do that. I think it is ridiculous that a high school clerk should be telling me that I can or cannot do an operation on a patient."

On the delay in getting Tiffanie an accurate diagnosis and treatment, the doctor asked, "We see delays in diagnosis because of the inadequacies of the managed care system all the time. And for . . . the 1 percent of patients where it turns out to be a life and death situation, they just look at that as the price of doing business. It's pathetic. In October or September, or whatever, that was the time to do that surgery. Now we're playing catch up."
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On Medicare prescription drugs, the second major issue of health reform facing us is insurance coverage of prescription drugs under Medicare. 

The Administration has put a solid program on the table for the consideration of Congress—and their program is not adequate. It is not Medicare and it also for the federal budget—because they do not use the surplus for hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthy.

The Bush plan is not adequate and it is not Medicare. In fact, it has endorsed a regressive plan to change Medicare in a way that will raise premiums and force senior citizens to join HMOs.

That is not the kind of Medicare the American people want, and it’s not the kind of prescription drug benefit they want either.

Under Bush’s version of Medicare reform, the premiums paid by senior citizens for conventional Medicare could increase by as much as 47% in the first year and continue to grow over time, according to the nonpartisan Medicare actuaries. The elderly would face an unacceptable choice between premiums they can afford and giving up their family doctor by joining an HMO.

Senior citizens already have the right to choose between conventional Medicare and private insurance options that may offer additional benefits. The difference between what senior citizens have today and what George Bush is proposing is not the difference between choice and bureaucracy—it’s the difference between choice and coercion—driven by a right-wing agenda of privatization. On this ground alone, it deserves rejection, regardless of its provisions for covering prescription drugs.

But the program to cover prescription drugs is equally flawed—so flawed that it is an empty promise for millions of senior citizens. To begin with, the value of the Bush program to senior citizens is only one-half of what Vice President Gore has proposed. The reason is obvious—after massive tax breaks for the wealthy, there is not room in the Bush budget for adequate prescription drug coverage for senior citizens.

The Bush plan provides little help to the vast majority of senior citizens who are not poor, but are of modest means and cannot afford large drug expenses or large increases in Medicare premiums. Under the Bush plan, these seniors have to pay three-quarters of the cost of their prescription drug coverage—and the coverage is not even adequate.

In the entire history of Medicare, senior citizens have never been asked to pay such a high share of the cost of the premiums for any benefit.

The defects in the Bush plan go far beyond the inadequacy of the benefits. It is a program that only a drug company executive could love. For the first four years, there is no Medicare benefit at all, just a program of block grants to the states for providing coverage for
low income senior citizens. Senior citizens want Medicare, not welfare, and they deserve Medicare, not welfare.

When the Bush plan finally becomes available to all seniors, it does not provide a real Medicare benefit—or any other adequate benefit. Instead, it gives senior citizens what is, in effect, a voucher—and it tells them to go out and buy their own coverage from a private insurance company. If the price is too high in the area in which they live, they are out of luck. If the drug company’s list of approved drugs does not include the medicine they need, their only recourse is a time-consuming appeal. There is no defined benefit—senior citizens are not even guaranteed the same coverage in Missouri that they would get in Mississippi. It is all up to the insurance company.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has estimated that under the similar Republican plan passed by the House of Representatives, benefits would be so inadequate and costs so high that less than half of the senior citizens who need help the most—those who have no prescription drug coverage today—will even participate.

A prescription drug benefit that leaves out half of the senior citizens who need protection the most is not a serious plan to help senior citizens.

It is ironic that in offering this inadequate plan, Mr. Bush has criticized Mr. Clinton for a “big-government, one-size-fits-all” solution. The Gore plan covers prescription drugs under Medicare and makes the same way that Medicare covers doctor and hospital costs. Mr. Bush obviously feels this is a one-size-fits-all solution. That is why he has endorsed an extreme restructuring of the Medicare program. He may favor forcing the elderly into HMOs, but that is not what Democrats in Congress support. That’s not what Vice President Gore supports. Most important, that’s not what the American people support.

There is still time for Congress to enact a genuine prescription drug benefit under Medicare. The Administration has presented a strong proposal. Let’s work together to enact it this year. It is not too late. The American people are waiting for an answer.

I am hopeful we will pass that legislation. Again, I am strongly committed, as I believe my colleagues, Senator Daschle and others are, to ensure we will have an opportunity to vote on that measure before we adjourn.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

TO AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we started earlier today the initial discussion of what I call the China trade bill. The Senate by law ratifying the agreement that has been worked out by this administration and the Government of China to level the playing field for trade between the United States and China.

In a simple form, the bill before us will give access for U.S. exporters—meaning manufacturing, services and agriculture—to China on the same basis that China has had access to our markets for the last 15 years.

When you have an opportunity for our people to export to China, to sell to China, on the same basis that China has been able to do with the United States, it is a win-win situation. My Midwestern common sense tells me this is a good situation for America. So that debate has started today.

We are on the question of the motion to proceed. I support this motion. I hope we get to a final vote on the bill, because I think it will pass by an overwhelming margin, not the very narrow margin that it passed in the House of Representatives. This will give us an enhanced opportunity to do business with 20 percent of the world’s population.

There are many reasons I support this bill, which is probably one of the most important matters to come before the Senate this session. But today, I would like to address just two reasons. The first is a very positive aspect to this legislation. The second is human rights, which some people view as a reason for being against this legislation. I suggest to you that even though the human rights situation in China is not good, trade gives us an opportunity to improve that human rights situation.

In each case, I want to address concerns of real people in a commonsense way. Too often, when we talk about major policy changes, we do so in lofty terms, not connected to the people’s concerns and their interests, and what is important to everyday working Americans.

Today, I would like to talk about how real people will be affected by making it possible for the United States to take advantage of China’s pending accession to the World Trade Organization.

Lowering protectionist tariffs and tearing down trade barriers that discriminate against American products will create many thousands of new American jobs. A new era of free trade with China, under the WTO World Trade Organization disciplines, will help us continue to build the tremendous prosperity that we enjoy as a result—a very real result—the success of our postwar trading system: going back to 1947, as we have used the gradual freeing up of trade around the world to expand the world economic pie. Because of free trade, with a population that is now about double what it was back then, we now have more prosperity for more people. If we had not expanded the world economic pie, we would, in fact, have less for our increased world population. So think in terms of the economic enhancement of individuals and the political stability that comes from it.

In my State of Iowa, we know our economic interdependence with the rest of the world is not a policy choice; it is a fact. Trade means jobs anywhere, but particularly in my State. In just 5 years, Iowa’s merchandise export to China has soared 35 percent.

In the Waterloo-Cedar Falls area—that is close to where I was born, and where I have lived my entire life—recent merchandise sales to China have surged 806 percent. Iowa’s trade-related jobs mean that a young couple can afford their first home. They can afford tuition for school. They can afford to buy a car. They can afford to care for their families, the way working people want to care for their families.

But unless we seize this moment, this opportunity will pass us by. When China enters the World Trade Organization, which it will do regardless of the outcome of this vote on the Senate floor—and if we do not remove all of our current conditions on trade with China, which this bill does—other countries will reap the rewards of a trade deal that we helped negotiate. America that is not now taking advantage of free trade, or the potential merchandise sales to China have surged 806 percent. Iowa’s trade-related jobs mean that a young couple can afford their first home. They can afford tuition for school. They can afford to buy a car. They can afford to care for their families, the way working people want to care for their families.
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