

25, 26, and April 15, 1996, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

### 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. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 1721. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purposes of carrying out the activities of the State Justice Institute for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 1722. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the National Labor Relations Act, to strengthen minimum wage and striker replacement, and to ensure quality job training, education, health care, and pension security for workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 1723. A bill to require accountability in campaign advertising, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THOMAS:

S. 1724. A bill to require that the Federal Government procure from the private sector the goods and services necessary for the operations and management of certain Governmental agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. EXON, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 1725. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to create a third category of long-distance trails to be known as national discovery trails and to authorize the American Discovery Trail as the first national discovery trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ASHCROFT):

S. 1726. A bill to promote electronic commerce by facilitating the use of strong encryption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. SMITH, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 tax rate increase on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Mr. FORD, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 1721. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purposes of carrying out the activities of the State Justice In-

stitute for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation not only for myself, but for Senator HEFLIN, the ranking minority member of the Court Subcommittee of Judiciary, and for Senator GREGG.

This legislation would reauthorize the State Justice Institute [SJI] for 4 more years through fiscal year 2000. Congress originally authorized the State Justice Institute for 4 years in the State Justice Institute Act of 1984, then reauthorized it for 4 more years in 1988, and another 4 years in 1992. The bill I introduce today will authorize annual appropriations for this program of \$20 million each of those 4 years.

The requested authorization levels will enable the State Justice Institute to fully carry out its statutory mission to award grants, to improve the quality of justice in State courts throughout the 50 States of our Nation.

The State Justice Institute serves critically important Federal purposes. Just as Federal financial assistance to State and local police, prosecutors, and corrections is critically needed to help them control crime, it is equally imperative that Federal funds assist the State courts that decide 98 percent of the criminal cases brought in this country.

SJI plays an important role in the Nation's response to crime by providing the critically needed funding to support projects that evaluate the effectiveness of new trial and sentencing approaches, and improve judges, performance in cases involving violent crimes and drug abuse.

The Institute also has been a leader in fostering improvements in the civil justice system by supporting efforts to evaluate innovative procedures to reduce litigation delay, demonstrate innovative alternative dispute resolution programs, and increase the public's access to the legal system. In addition, the Institute has devoted considerable resources to improving the public's confidence in both the criminal and civil justice system.

The list of the Institute's current grant priorities reveals just how important it is to our overwhelmed State court system. The Institute's 1996 grants will focus on: children and families in court; improving public confidence in the courts; application of technology; education and training for judges and key court personnel; the relationship between State and Federal courts; and projects following up on recent Institute-supported conferences on court-community collaboration, drug courts, funding the courts, and eliminating race and ethnic bias in the courts.

Mr. President, the Institute has performed the mission Congress assigned it exceedingly well. The judges and court staff who toil in our Nation's un-

derfunded and outmoded State court-houses commend the Institute as the only national source of support for innovation, education, and information about how other States are coping with similar problems in their struggle to better serve the public.

The Institute is the only vehicle the Federal Government has to assure that State courts deliver a high quality of justice to every citizen in every type of case. By doing so, the Institute fulfills the highest standards of federalism. Its seed money bears fruit across the country, carrying out SJI's important national purposes in a cost-efficient manner that maximizes the impact of every dollar that Congress provides.

Reduced to its core, that is State Justice Institute's special role: Supporting promising innovations and spreading the word about them to every key State—and Federal—judge and court official. That saves State and Federal governments significant money, time, and effort on a national scale.

The bill also specifies that funds appropriated to the Institute are available until expended, without regard to the expiration of the year in which they were appropriated, and proposes three technical amendments to the State Justice Institute Act.

Mr. President, as chair of the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, which has oversight authority over SJI, I am pleased to note that the cosponsor of this bill is the ranking member of that subcommittee, senator HEFLIN. We urge the Senate to continue its support of the Institute in order to enhance the State courts' ability to deliver effective justice in areas that are critically important to the Federal Government and the American public.

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

S. 1721

*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 "State Justice Institute Reauthorization Act of 1996".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 215 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10713) is amended to read as follows:

##### "AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 215. There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this title, \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000, to remain available until expended."

#### SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) OPEN MEETINGS.—Section 204(j) of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10703(j)) is amended by inserting "(on any occasion on which that committee has been delegated the authority to act on behalf of the Board)" after "executive committee of the Board".

(b) REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Section 213 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10712) is repealed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor the legislation Senator GRASSLEY is introducing today to reauthorize the State Justice Institute for another 4 years.

I was the original sponsor of the State Justice Institute Act when Congress first passed the act in 1984, and when it reauthorized SJI in 1988 and 1992.

The State Justice Institute has proven to be a uniquely valuable component of the Nation's justice system. Among all the agencies in the Federal Government, SJI is the only organization dedicated to helping the State courts of our Nation. Mr. President, those courts handle well over 95 percent of all the criminal prosecutions and civil litigation brought in this country.

No one State can provide the funds for innovation that SJI can, and no State has the ability, the money, or, in fact, the reason to share its good ideas with every other State. That's the role SJI plays, and it has worked very well with the very modest appropriations Congress has provided over the years.

Congress has entrusted the decision about what innovations merit SJI support to a board of directors composed—by statute—of State supreme court justices, appellate and trial judges, court administrators, and members of the public, all of whom who are keenly aware of the real problems in our courts and dedicated to assuring that SJI target its funds at the courts' most serious problems nationwide.

In this era of Federal fiscal responsibility and restored political balance between Federal and State governments, this small, economical institute that is governed largely by State officials may be an excellent working model for any Federal grant program that serves important national purposes.

At a time when every segment of American society is demanding a more effective justice system, Congress must keep alive the only Federal entity that is dedicated to helping the State courts of this country manage an overwhelming torrent of cases with greater effectiveness, efficiency, and justice.

I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY in sponsoring this important legislation.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 1722. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the National Labor Relations Act, to strengthen minimum wage and striker replacement, and to ensure quality job training, education, health care, and pension security for workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### THE WORKING FAMILIES ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT OF 1996

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Working Families Economic Security Act of 1996. This legislation is an effort to bring together in one comprehensive

bill a number of items that have been on my legislative agenda for working families over the years, along with a number of new ideas, and to move forward on them in this Congress. It does not address every issue vital to the economic prosperity of American families; it does not pretend to. It is simply one more way of ensuring that bread-and-butter economic issues, which are so important to people in my State and throughout the country, are brought back front-and-center to the attention of this Congress, which has so far all but ignored them. Passing this omnibus legislation would be a good step toward protecting the working people who are the backbone of our economic, political and social system. This bill contributes significantly to efforts within the Democratic caucus in the Senate on improving the paycheck security, health security, and retirement security of all Americans.

The very real and historic changes that have rocked the American economy have helped some Americans, but have done great harm to many others. While some of the statistics that we use to measure the performance of the economy and to gauge the standard of living seem to show that the U.S. economy is doing well, the reality for many is that good-paying jobs are being lost in the face of unprecedented downsizing by many firms. Many of the new jobs that are being created pay lower wages; corporate executives' salaries are rising, while workers' salaries are declining; the health insurance system is inadequate to the tasks of the modern workplace. There is deep apprehension and concern about the future.

Let me give just one recent example from Minnesota. I visited during the recess with members of the Cusick family in Duluth about their economic worries. A life-long resident of Duluth, Ken Cusick will graduate this Spring from the University of Minnesota-Duluth. He has three kids and a wife who works, and yet they struggle every day. They worry about having money to pay for groceries, day care costs for their kids, and rising education costs.

Their lives reflect a broader reality in our country. Underneath the numbers which reflect record highs in the stock market, low unemployment, and slow growth in the economy, a time bomb is ticking for American families. Many workers are in fact being left behind, with only dim hope for a brighter future. They are working more and earning less. And even though some Clinton administration economic advisers have begun to highlight certain positive economic news, including in a report last week that challenges certain assumptions about lay-offs and jobs in the economy, I agree with Labor Secretary Reich: it is still true that for many, especially low and moderate income working people, the economic recovery is spotty, partial, and has failed to increase their real take-home pay.

Many working families today are afraid. Workers fear losing their jobs, having no money for retraining, losing their pensions and health care, not being able to take care of aging parents, and paying for their kids' college. And they are angry that their wages are stagnant while corporate executives—even those who may be failing in their jobs—reap windfall salaries for downsizing their firms, and putting good people out of work.

Twenty years ago the typical CEO of a large company earned 30 or 40 times the salary of an average worker. Today that CEO earns almost 200 times more. A recent survey of American CEOs reported in the New York Times indicates that CEO compensation last year rose at the fastest rate since the mid-1980's, skyrocketing by 31 percent in 1995 alone. This increase was double the rise in 1994, and triple the one in 1993. This illustrates a larger societal trend that is spinning out of control: the vast majority of the economic gains in today's economy are going to the very wealthy few, while working men and women are being short-changed.

For example, from WWII until the 1970's, American workers were responsible for an almost 90 percent increase in productivity. In return, their real wages increased by over 95 percent. But from 1973 to 1982, workers got only half as much of an increase in real wages as they gave in new productivity. And from 1982 through 1994, they got only a third as much.

This legislation addresses a number of basic economic concerns of the average American. It includes an increase in the minimum wage; a means to directly address government subsidization of growing wage disparities, protections for striking workers, a streamlining and expansion of job retraining, and modest health care portability reforms. It embodies a number of initiatives that I've worked on over the years, as well as some new ideas that I think must be part of an economic program to provide real economic security for America's families. I know this Congress won't act on all these initiatives, but I hope we will act on some this year. Those which remain may have to wait for a new Congress to be elected, controlled by a Democratic Party which considers the interests of working Americans priority one.

#### MINIMUM WAGE

This provision would raise the Federal minimum wage from the current \$4.25 to \$5.15 by 1997. But unlike some other approaches, it proposes to index the minimum wage to prevent its erosion by inflation or by long periods of Congressional inaction to the point where it is no longer possible for minimum wage workers to lift themselves or their families out of poverty. This measure provides for modest but overdue increases and, most important, begins to narrow the gap between the minimum wage and a living wage. I am