

the ages of 25 and 44. I fear that everyone in America will soon know someone who is infected with HIV. My friends and neighbors in Washington do now: his name is Senator Cal Anderson.

Mr. President, let me conclude by thanking Cal for everything he does for my home State, and by wishing him and his partner, Eric, only the best with his therapy and in the future.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support raising the minimum wage. It helps working Americans improve their standard of living. It moves in the direction of self-sufficiency and away from welfare. It gives help to those who practice self-help.

First, raising the minimum wage will certainly help increase working Americans' standard of living. In this country, a full-time job should not mean full-time poverty. The typical American family is living on less than it did 15 years ago. The current minimum wage of \$4.25 an hour for a full-time year-round worker equals only \$8,500 per year. This minimum wage is not a living wage.

Second, increasing the minimum wage helps people move toward self-sufficiency and away from welfare. I know that raising the minimum wage 90 cents is not enough to lift a family above the poverty level. But, if a 90 cent increase to \$5.15 an hour is the best we can get right now, then we will take it.

Finally, raising the minimum wage will help those who practice self-help. Two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults over the age of 21. They are reliable, dedicated employees who want a chance to move up in society, or just to get back on their feet.

They believe, as we all do, in the satisfaction that comes from hard work. They do not apologize for not making a lot of money and they are not looking for public hand-outs, but they certainly deserve a decent wage for honest work.

Mr. President, the minimum wage is worth less than it used to be. Because of inflation, the value of the minimum wage has fallen by nearly 50 cents since 1991, and is now 27 percent lower than it was in 1979.

I know in the coming weeks we will see many statistics, graphs, and figures from supporters and opponents of raising the minimum wage. But in this debate, I do not want my colleagues to lose sight of the fact that these statistics represent people, real people who go to work every day so they can pay their bills, and have a decent place to live.

These are real people, who live in Baltimore, Annapolis, Hagerstown, and other American cities who must choose between clothing or food for their kids, between medical care or heat.

A low minimum wage contributes to the notion of "working poor". By raising the minimum wage, we give people a chance to help themselves, to do bet-

ter for themselves and their families, and to achieve the American dream.

That is why I support this legislation to help make work pay.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate is concerned about the national security of our country. I know each of my colleagues give serious thought and consideration to the details of how best to provide for our national defense and the strength and well-being of our Armed Forces.

And for that reason call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article by the Secretaries of State and Defense, entitled "Foreign Policy, Hamstrung," which appeared in the February 13 edition of the New York Times. Secretary Warren Christopher and Secretary William Perry have joined together to present what I believe is a most cogent and informative analysis of the National Security Revitalization Act, legislation which the other body is considering today and tomorrow.

Secretaries Christopher and Perry point out that this act which is part of the so-called Contract With America that the Republican leadership of the House is rushing to pass, is in its current form, a deeply flawed piece of legislation. It is their considered opinion that the measure would undermine any President's ability to safeguard our national security and to effectively exercise his or her constitutional role of commanding our Armed Forces.

I believe we should give serious consideration to the concerned views expressed by these two able Cabinet officers, who are directly responsible for overseeing the day-to-day work of guiding our Nation's foreign and defense policies.

They believe that the act's first major flaw is that it would return the United States to a crash-schedule deployment of a costly national missile defense system designed to protect against a nonexistent credible threat to our national security. They correctly point out that such an unwarranted and expensive system would not only divert billions of scarce defense dollars from other more urgent defense needs, such as the readiness and well-being of the men and women of our Armed Forces, but that the unnecessary expenditure of funds on continental defense against a nonexistent ballistic missile threat would also be detrimental to the ongoing development of an effective theater defense system.

It is indeed ironic that while some on the other side of the aisle, both here and in the House, loudly proclaim the need for increased spending on a multibillion-dollar star wars program to defend against a theoretical intercontinental ballistic missile attack, they are, at the same time, unwilling to support the necessary funding for the Nunn-Lugar program to reduce the threat of nuclear attack by working

cooperatively with Russia to dismantle the missiles and nuclear warheads which were once aimed at our cities.

Secretaries Christopher and Perry also point out that the proposed act unilaterally designates certain Eastern European states for NATO membership without consideration of the concerns and desires of other NATO members, or the readiness of the designated states to assume the military and political obligations inherent in NATO membership.

Furthermore, they contend that, by its restrictive language this act would effectively abrogate our U.N. treaty obligations to pay our share of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The end result of such short-sighted restrictive action would be the elimination of the availability to the United States of U.N. burden-sharing resources.

We in the Congress must be extraordinarily careful not to permit overzealous partisanship to encourage the hurried enactment of legislation which restricts the ability of this, or any future President of the United States, to carry out his fundamental constitutional duty to protect the national security of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1995]

FOREIGN POLICY, HAMSTRUNG

(By Warren Christopher and William J. Perry)

This week Congress is to consider legislation that would undermine this and every future President's ability to safeguard America's security and to command our armed forces. The measure is deeply flawed. It is called the National Security Revitalization Act, but if adopted it would endanger national security.

We are committed to working with Congress in a bipartisan fashion. But if this measure is passed in its current form, we have told the President we will recommend that he veto it.

The bill's first flaw is that it would return the United States to a crash-schedule deployment of a national missile defense, designed to protect the U.S. from missile attacks. That deployment is not justified by any existing threat to our nation's security, and it would divert billions of scarce defense dollars and other resources from more pressing needs, particularly in the area of theater missile defenses.

We are building effective theater defense systems; they will protect U.S. forces abroad, and the ports and airfields they use, from Scud-like missiles in the hands of rogue states like North Korea, Iraq and Iran. The continental U.S. does not now face a ballistic missile attack from these states. But we are not complacent. We are conducting a broad research and development program that will, in a few years, be able to deploy a national missile defense system whenever a threat emerges.

Second, the bill unilaterally and prematurely designates certain European states

for NATO membership. NATO should and will expand. NATO expansion will strengthen stability in Europe for members and nonmembers alike. But new members must be ready to undertake the obligations of membership, just as we and our allies must be ready to extend our solemn commitments to them. Our present steady and deliberate approach to NATO expansion is intended to insure that each potential member is judged individually, according to its capacity to contribute to NATO's goals.

That approach gives every new European democracy a strong incentive to consolidate reform. But if we arbitrarily lock in advantages now for some countries, we risk discouraging reforms in countries not named and fostering complacency to countries that are. Indeed, the effect of the measure before Congress could be instability in the very region whose security we seek to bolster.

Third, the bill would effectively abrogate our treaty obligation to pay our share of the cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations that we have supported in the Security Council. The bill would require us to reduce our peacekeeping dues dollar for dollar by the cost of operations we conduct voluntarily in support of U.S. interests. These operations deter aggressors, isolate parish states and support humanitarian relief in places like Bosnia and Iraq.

If we deduct the cost of our voluntary actions against our U.N. dues, it would cancel our entire peacekeeping payment. Other nations—Japan and our NATO allies—would surely follow, and U.N. peacekeeping would end. Under current circumstances, it would end U.N. peacekeeping overnight.

That would eliminate peacekeepers already stationed at important flash points like the Golan Heights on the Israel-Syria border, where U.N. forces support progress in the Middle East peace process. It would pull U.N. forces from the Iraq-Kuwait border, from Cyprus and from the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia. In short, this bill would eliminate an effective tool for burden sharing that every President from Harry Truman to George Bush has used to advance American interests. It would leave the President with an unacceptable option whenever an emergency arose: act alone or do nothing.

The measure would also impose unnecessary, unsound and unconstitutional restrictions on the President's authority to place our troops under the operational control of another country—even a NATO ally—for U.N. operations. Our forces always remain under the command authority of the President, and we already apply the most rigorous standards when we pass even the most limited responsibility to a competent foreign commander. But the Commander-in-Chief must retain the flexibility to place troops temporarily under the operational control of officers of another nation when it serves our interests, as we did so effectively in Operation Desert Storm and in most other conflicts since the Revolution. By restricting that flexibility, the bill would undercut our ability to get the international community to respond to threats.

Effective American leadership abroad requires that we back our diplomacy with the credible threat of forces. When our vital interests are at stake, we must be prepared to act alone. And in fact, our willingness to do so is often the key to effective joint action. By mobilizing the support of other nations and leveraging our resources through alliances and institutions, we can achieve important objectives without asking American soldiers to bear all the risks, or American taxpayers to pay all the bills. That is a sensible bargain the American people support.

This Administration has worked hard to improve our consultation with the Congress on every issue raised by the National Security

Revitalization Act. But in each case, what is at stake is fundamental: the authority of our President to protect the national security and to use every effective option to advance the interests of the U.S. In its present form, the bill unwisely and unconstitutionally deprives the President of the flexibility he needs to make the right choices for our nation's security.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that the Founding Fathers made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,807,066,615,385.66 as of the close of business Tuesday, February 14. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$18,247.71.

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 Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 419. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 420. A bill to establish limitations on the use of funds for United Nations peacekeeping activities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FORD:

S. 421. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of a hydroelectric project in Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 422. A bill to authorize the appropriations for international economic and security assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COHEN:

S. 423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide improved access to quality long-term care services, to create incentives for greater private sector participation and personal responsibility in financing such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. 424. A bill to provide for adherence with MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 425. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the establishment in the Department of Veterans Affairs of mental illness research, education, and clinical centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 426. A bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should not have granted diplomatic recognition to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. 422. A bill to authorize the appropriations for international economic and security assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FOREIGN AID REFORM LEGISLATION

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me there are two good reasons for a complete overhaul of foreign aid the world has changed and Congress has changed. The cold war is over replaced by a new, ambitious Russia, a host of violent smaller regimes, ethnic tensions, nuclear concerns, and massive refugee movements affecting even our own borders.

On the bright side, there are former communist nations actively seeking U.S. support, the flourishing of free enterprise and democracy, giant leaps in free trade and real prospects for peace in some of the most war-torn parts of the world.

Since the world has changed so dramatically, our tools of foreign policy must change with it—and one of the key tools is foreign aid.

That is the impetus for the proposal I am introducing today.

Our ability to effectively target foreign aid is crippled in large part by the outmoded and unduly complicated Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The 300-plus pages of this document contain 33 conflicting goals, 75 questionable priorities, which effectively tyrannize the 10,000 AID employees who carry out 1,700 projects in 89 countries.

There is no real sense of coherence, strategy, or focus to the law or our aid program. It may seem reasonable to direct the President to support a rural development program, but should we be