

it very clear what is at stake with this minimum wage legislation. I thank him for his remarks.

I will use this opportunity to reinforce some of the comments made by my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts.

It is pretty amazing to see a front page story in the Washington Post, "Business Seeks Tax Breaks in Wage Bill"—I believe I heard the Senator from Massachusetts say perhaps to the tune of \$100 billion or thereabouts.

I want to say to Senators, I think this minimum wage bill goes to the heart and soul of the question of whether we have a heart and soul as a Senate. We are now at \$5.15 an hour, and we are talking about trying to get this up to \$6.15 an hour, then to \$6.65 an hour, in increments.

I am going to make two or three points. The first is personal, but it really is true. If we are going to vote ourselves a raise of over \$4,000 a year—Senators make about \$140,000—some a year—it seems to me we ought to be able to vote for a raise in the wage of the lowest paid workers. We are talking about people who work 40 hours a week, almost 52 weeks a year, and they are still poor.

I think there is no standard of justice here if we are going to vote a hefty increase for ourselves—we are handsomely rewarded for our work—and yet are unable to raise the minimum wage for the lowest paid workers.

Second, in Minnesota there is a stereotype that it is teenagers working part-time who receive the minimum wage. The fact is, many more people are paid the minimum wage. At the moment—and we will see what happens with the economy, some employers are paying higher wages—many people are working minimum wage, a disproportionate number of them women. I think it is a matter of elementary justice for women and other working poor people to raise the minimum wage.

Finally, it takes some real chutzpah on the part of my colleagues, the Republican leadership, to say the only way you are going to get a minimum wage bill through, which speaks to people who are working 52 weeks a year and are still poor in America, is to add in all kinds of corporate welfare and breaks for large businesses.

Democratic Senators, that is the deal you have to accept. We are going to bleed the revenue base with these Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cuts that the majority party is trying to push through the Senate this week or next week, with over 40 percent of the benefits going to the top 1 percent, and a pittance, if that, for children, for education. Whatever happened to our commitment for affordable prescription drug costs for elderly people? Now, according to this piece, the strategy is to load onto a minimum wage bill more corporate welfare and more breaks for

large financial interests and economic interests in the country.

I think it is transparent. I look forward to the debate. Not that long ago—it seems like just yesterday—we had several weeks' worth of debate about campaign finance reform. There were a variety of different arguments made. I suggest that our failure to raise the minimum wage is all about the need for campaign finance reform. These working poor people, men and women in our States—nobody can say they are not hard working—who cannot support their families, they are the last people in the world to be able to hire the lobbyists. They do not have lobbying coalitions here. They are the last people in the world to give the big contributions. They are the last people in the world to be the investors in either political party.

But you know what? If you believe it is important for people to earn a decent standard of living so they can support their families and give their children the care they know their children need and deserve, then we ought to be willing to support a raise in the minimum wage. It is just unbelievable to see in today's Washington Post this story.

I don't know, maybe I should not be surprised. Frankly, I do not want to be dishonest. You never want to be dishonest. I don't want to feign total shock because I have looked at the greed that is reflected by this tax cut bill that my colleagues want to bring to the floor, and I have looked at who gets the benefits. So I guess I should not be surprised that now what we have is this all-out vigorous opposition to raising the minimum wage from \$5.15 to \$6.15 and to \$6.65 unless there is corporate welfare, unless we do well by all these large economic interests, unless we get yet more tax breaks for them.

It is really pretty simple to figure out. When I was a political science professor, was it Harold Lasswell's definition that politics is all about who gets what, when, why? That is what this question is about: Who gets what, when, and why?

As I would put it as a Senator from Minnesota: Who decides and who benefits and who is asked to sacrifice? Who decides to keep the minimum wage so low that there are so many people who are poor still today in America?

If you are working hard, and, as some of my colleagues have said, playing by the rules of the game, then you shouldn't be poor in America. You should be able to support your family.

Who decides to keep the minimum wage down? Who decides that instead now we have to load on all kinds of corporate welfare and all kinds of additional tax breaks for large economic interests in the country?

I think people in the country are going to focus on this debate. I look forward to joining Senator KENNEDY and other Senators.

I remember a number of years ago when we first started this debate. I am a proud original cosponsor of this legislation. I don't think any of the arguments that have been made about how, if we raise the minimum wage, we would see a decline in jobs that turned out to be true. The last time we had a raise in the minimum wage—it was very modest—we had colleagues in the Chamber talking about how people were going to lose their jobs. It didn't happen. I would be willing to say that if there is a point at which you raise the minimum wage at too high of a level you could lose jobs, but it is not going from \$5.15 an hour to \$6.65 an hour.

It seems to me Senators are in a fairly awkward situation when we voted ourselves over a \$4,000 increase in our already high salary and we are not willing to vote to raise the minimum wage for working poor women and men in this country from \$5.15 an hour to \$6.65 an hour so people have a better chance of being able to support their children and support their families. This is a perfect example of the song that was written by Florence Reese from Harland County, KY—the song about which side you are on. In this particular case, it is, whose side are you on? Are you on the side of hard-working people? We all say we are for hard-working people. Or are you on the side of large economic interests? Are you on the side of elementary justice to raise the minimum wage for workers and their families? Or are you going to insist on somewhere in the neighborhood of \$100 billion of yet more tax breaks for economic interests so there is even less for children, even less for education, and even less for affordable prescription drug costs?

I am telling you, my colleagues like to say in the Republican majority that some of these comments are class warfare. And I just have to smile because if there ever were an example of "class warfare", if that is what you want to call it, it would be a U.S. Senate that is so generous to itself in giving ourselves big increases in a big salary and are unwilling to raise the minimum wage for poor working people in our States and in our country.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO CRAIG M. SOMERS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the outstanding accomplishments of Craig Somers throughout his 32-year career with the U.S. Senate. I, along with my colleagues, congratulate Craig on his retirement from the Sergeant At Arms Office.

His Senate career began in August of 1962, as a part-time employee and Senate page. In 1969, he became employed full-time with the Printing, Graphics & Direct Mail Department, then known

as the Service Department, where he acquired many varied skills, including his initial position as an Addressograph Operator. Craig worked his way up to his current position as the Night Supervisor of the Lithographics Department.

All of us in the Senate thank Craig for his tireless efforts with our printing needs and processing of our constituent mail. His work has helped us keep in touch with those we represent.

Craig, we congratulate you and wish you well in your retirement.

NOMINATION OF OTTO REICH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on April 29, the Los Angeles Times printed a thoughtful op-ed article by former Costa Rican President Oscar Arias that raises troubling questions about President Bush's nominee to serve as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Otto Reich.

President Arias discusses the important role played by the Assistant Secretary, and questions Otto Reich's suitability for this position, in light of his record as head of the State Department's Office of Public Diplomacy, his support of President Reagan's policies toward Central America, his involvement in lifting the ban on the sale of advanced weapons to Latin America, and his views on U.S. policy toward Cuba.

I urge my colleagues to read the article. The significant concerns raised by this distinguished Nobel Peace Prize recipient must be carefully considered. I ask unanimous consent that the article by President Arias be printed in the RECORD.

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

[FROM THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, APRIL 29, 2001]

A NOMINEE WHO STANDS FOR WAR (By Oscar Arias)

Given the importance of the role of the U.S. assistant secretary of State for Western Hemisphere affairs, many of us in Latin America are surprised and disappointed by George W. Bush's nomination of Otto J. Reich for this post. Reich headed the Office of Public Diplomacy, which was closed down by Congress in the wake of the Iran-Contra scandal because it had, to quote official investigations, "engaged in prohibited covert propaganda activities designed to influence the media and the public."

More than almost any other U.S. diplomat, the person in this post will have the power to shape the relationship between the United States and Latin America for better or worse. Virtually everything that the U.S. needs to do with Latin America, from establishing a free-trade area to dealing with drug policy and immigration, will require a bipartisan approach. Appointing someone of Reich's ideological stripe and experience would be a real setback in hemispheric cooperation.

I offer my experience as president of Costa Rica as testament to the importance of com-

promise on hard-line policies. With my region torn by civil wars in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala, I proposed a peace plan whose essence was democracy as a precondition for lasting peace. The plan was signed by five Central American presidents in August 1987, but President Ronald Reagan refused to support it. He would settle for nothing less than military victory over the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. It was not until George Bush became president in 1988 that the United States backed off its dogged support for war and let the Central American leaders give diplomacy a chance. It was Bush the elder and his foreign-policy staff, including Secretary of State James A. Baker and Bernie Aronson, then-assistant secretary of State for inter-American affairs, who changed U.S. policy from one of undermining our efforts to strongly supporting them, and thus contributed greatly to a peaceful solution to the Central American conflicts.

I am afraid that Reich will cling more closely to the Reagan model than that of the former Bush administration. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that this will be so. His involvement in the Office of Public Diplomacy until 1986 demonstrated his allegiance to the Reagan administration's hawkish policies toward Central America. The purpose of his office was none other than to get the American people to side with war over peace, using propaganda methods determined to be "improper."

Reich's support of militarism did not end with the wars in Central America. According to news reports, he has made his living in recent years as a lobbyist and consultant representing corporate interests in Washington, among which is the arms manufacturer Lockheed Martin. Reich apparently helped Lockheed overcome the executive ban on the sale of advanced weaponry to Latin America. As a result, the company is poised to sell a dozen of its F-16 fighter jets with advanced missile technology to Chile.

Ever since the ban was lifted in 1997, I have been active, along with former President Jimmy Carter, in trying to convince Latin American leaders to submit to a voluntary moratorium on buying such weapons. If a Latin American country goes shopping for sophisticated weaponry, it will touch off the last thing this hemisphere needs—an arms race. In the face of continued poverty, illiteracy, hunger and disease in so much of our region, investing in unnecessary military technology is an act of grave irresponsibility. That Reich has been an accomplice to this deal makes me feel very uneasy about what ends will be served by his potential leadership in our hemisphere.

One last example will illustrate the poor fit that Reich would be for the interests of hemispheric cooperation: his unwavering support for the long-running and unproductive embargo against Cuba. I believe many American farmers and businessmen are aware that U.S. economic warfare against Cuba harms broader U.S. interests, while at the same time injuring the people, but not the government, of Cuba.

To those who think it unbecoming for a foreigner to comment on the appointment of a U.S. official, I would say that although the assistant secretary of State for Western Hemisphere affairs will make little difference in the lives of ordinary people in the United States, he could have a profound effect on the lives of Latin Americans.

There is so much work to be done in our part of the world over the next four years, and enough inherent problems and strains in the relationship between the United States

and Latin America, that we will be assuring ourselves of getting nowhere if we give in to hard-line ideology over flexibility and bipartisanship. On behalf of Latin Americans, I hope that the administration of George W. Bush can find another candidate for this job—one capable of building trust and earning respect from all the leaders of this hemisphere.

(Oscar Arias was President of Costa Rica From 1986-1990 and Winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1987.)

TRANSIT ZONE STRATEGY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, I want to draw attention to our interdiction efforts throughout the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific, commonly referred to as the "transit zone."

Although Plan Colombia is our primary counterdrug operation in Colombia and the emphasis in the Andean region, commonly called the "source zone", continued interdiction efforts in the transit zone are an important part of our overall "defense-in-depth" plan. I have noted for some time, however, that our defense in depth seems more like a defense in doubt. I want to be confident that the United States has a well-thought out, overarching national drug control strategy, involving all components of both supply and demand reduction, including eradication and fumigation, alternate development, trade incentives, interdiction, prevention, treatment, and education. I am very pleased the President is ready to appoint the new Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, to assist with reviewing our plans, programs, and strategy. But I am concerned that we lack coherent thinking on our interdiction efforts. I am concerned about rumblings from the Department of Defense, DOD, that it is going to duck and weave on supporting such a plan.

I desire our interdiction efforts to be integrated and balanced, both interagency and internationally, as well as between the source zone, transit zone, and arrival zones. We need balance, within the transit zone, between the Caribbean and the Eastern Pacific, as well as balance with in the eastern, central, and western portions of the Caribbean itself. We need to have adequate intelligence community and DOD support for both the source zone and the transit zone. We need to be balanced between our air and maritime interdiction efforts. We need to be equally dynamic and risk adverse as the smuggling organizations are, when route and conveyance shifts are detected. Our counterdrug forces on patrol should also be aware of the terrorism threats that are increasing focused against our country. It is not clear to me that we currently have these things I have outlined.

The Senate Drug Caucus is planning an upcoming hearing on the Transit