brothers Import Plaza, grew into revitalized Historic Old Town. An abandoned department store building became the Galleria shopping center, the 1980's anchor of Portland's commercial revitalization. He turned an old warehouse district into the McCormick Pier apartments, luring middle-income residents into downtown Portland.

While he prospered personally from his business initiatives, Bill Naito was generous with his time and assets, and his sense of civic responsibility enriched Portland endlessly. In addition to serving on countless boards and civic organizations, he donated space in office buildings to nonprofit or public agencies. He was a founder of Artquake, a long-running annual arts festival. He also donated land to help launch Saturday Market, a weekly showcase of local performers and artisans that has drawn tourists and suburbanites to downtown Portland for a generation. He was perhaps most popularly noted for preserving the White Stag landmark when the company moved out of Portland. Thanks to Bill Naito's sense of whimsy, each Christmas season west-bound motorists enjoy the White Stag reindeer's illuminated red nose.

Though he was never one to trumpet his own accomplishments, it was clear that Naito took the greatest pride in the creation of the Japanese-American Historical Plaza in Tom McCall Waterfront Park. Naito is the son of Japanese immigrants, and his family was forced to relocate to Utah in 1942 to avoid the internment forced on Portland's Japanese community. Though he seemed to carry little personal bitterness from those war years—in fact, he joined the Army himself in 1944—he worked the rest of his life to make sure that Oregonians wouldn't forget the lessons learned from the Japanese internment. The memorial he spearheaded, dedicated in 1990, is a moving tribute to the families interned during World War II, and serves as a reminder of the guarantees the Bill of Rights provides for us all.

The accomplishments I have enumerated only begin to convey the varied contributions Bill Naito made to Portland throughout his life. This 70-year-old, who worked long days at an age when most men are content in retirement, spent a lifetime fusing community and business pursuits. Bill Naito seemed the image of hard-working vigor and energy when cancer snuck up on him, and he died just a week after being diagnosed. His death saddens those he touched personally, and he enriched the lives of many more Oregonians who live, work, and visit the city to which he brought so much life. The nose of the White Stag reindeer burned red last week in tribute to Bill Naito. Portland has truly lost a treasure, Mr. President, and I want to pay tribute to him again here today. ●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 57

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Republican leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 15, the Senate begin consideration of the budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the Republican leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Executive Calendar nomination Nos. 543 through 548, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Coast Guard.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations were considered and confirmed en bloc, as follows:

COAST GUARD

The following regular officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

John E. Shkor
Paul E. Busick
John D. Spade
Douglas H. Teeson
Edward J. Barrett

The following regular officers of the United States Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral (lower half):

Joseph J. McClellan, Jr.
John L. Parker
Paul J. Pluta
Thad W. Allen

Vice Adm. James M. Loy, U.S. Coast Guard to be chief of staff, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice. Adm. Richard D. Herr, U.S. Coast Guard, to be vice commander, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Kent H. Williams, U.S. Coast Guard, to be commander, Atlantic Area. U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Roger T. Rufe, Jr., U.S. Coast Guard, to be commander, Pacific Area, U.S. Coast Guard, with the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Richard W. Schneider

The following officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade of rear admiral (lower half):

Jan T. Riker

Coast Guard nominations beginning Michael S. Fijalka, and ending Kimberly J. Nettles, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 28, 1995.

Coast Guard nominations beginning George J. Santa Cruz, and ending Kevin M. Pratt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 22, 1996.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Steven D. Poole, and ending Kevin J. Macnaughton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 9, 1996.

Coast Guard nomination of Sherry A. Comar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 20, 1996.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Gerald E. Anderson, and ending Constantina A. Stevens, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 5, 1996.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 15, further that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, and the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the Senate then begin consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, the budget resolution.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. So the Senate will begin tomorrow morning discussion of the budget resolution. That resolution is limited to a 50-hour statutory time. So we can expect late night sessions and votes throughout the remainder of the week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I make a brief statement and the Senator from Mississippi makes a statement and Senator DASCHLE makes a statement that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will take just a minute of the Senate's time to express my disappointment that we were unable to agree on any of the unanimous-consent requests that we presented to my colleagues on the other side with respect to the pending gas tax repeal, the TEAM Act, minimum wage, taxpayer bill of rights, and the White House travel legislation.

It was my hope that we could reach an understanding. I thought, based on conversations, we might be able to work out some procedure to ensure that the three main issues—the gas tax repeal, the TEAM Act, and the minimum wage were split into three separate bills—that the Senate would be able to reach an agreement on an overall consent that would include these issues in a relatively short timeframe. But unfortunately that does not seem to be the case.

I think it is fair to say that we have offered pretty much what my colleagues had requested, with some minor changes, a consent agreement that does, in fact, divide the three issues into separate bills and limits time on each issue. I think they could be concluded in as little as 5 or 6 hours.

But now I understand that there are additional requests to not only separate the issues, but also to require the approval of the final language that the House is marking up in the committee today relative to the minimum wage. Obviously, I cannot dictate what the House does with minimum wage and cannot ensure what might finally come out of the conference.

But it seems to me that what we should do is move ahead before Memorial Day, resolve these three issues, as well as the taxpayer bill of rights, which I understand there is no opposition to.

The gas tax repeal is being held hostage because of the demands about the minimum wage. The so-called TEAM Act is unacceptable to my colleagues on the other side. I understand there will be a filibuster on that issue. I guess the bottom line is, we have been trying to figure out some way to resolve this issue. We have not reached it yet.

I do not believe we will ever be in a position to say to my colleagues on the other side that we will guarantee, notwithstanding it is a Republican House of Representatives and a Republican Senate, that you draft the minimum wage proposal. I do not think that will happen because we have some ideas, amendments for the minimum wage. I do not know what my House colleagues have in mind, but they may report that out later on today.

So I just suggest that we continue to work with the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE. Time is running. I hope that we can act on all these issues prior to Memorial Day. But this week we will probably be on the budget. Next week we hope to do the missile defense measure, along with the DOD authorization bill. That would not leave a lot of time for these three issues.

So I just want to report to the Senate that we have not given up. But I do not believe we can ever agree that, in effect, we first have to clear it with the President before we pass it. I am not certain that will ever happen.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader as to the desire to find a way to finish our work on all of these important matters prior to Memorial Day. I am relatively optimistic that is possible.

The majority leader indicated that it is very difficult to make some assumption with regard to what the House may do on minimum wage. I understand what is normally a difficult set of circumstances in anticipating anything that the House would or would not do, but I am all the more confident that it is possible, given what has just happened on the budget.

The distinguished majority leader asked if we could go to the budget in an expeditious way tomorrow. We are prepared to do that. I have indicated to him after consulting with a number of my colleagues that is possible. I want to go back to that point in a moment.

That entire budget was preconferenced by Senate and House Republicans. Every single detail of the budget we are going to get tomorrow was preconferenced with the House. They decided what the defense number was. They decided what the discretionary number was. They decided what the tax number was. They decided what the entitlement numbers were. They decided what the overall budget plan would be. All of it was done.

It seems to me if we can negotiate an entire budget for 6 years with the House of Representatives, certainly we could find our way to do one tiny little bill on the minimum wage. I hope we could find a way with which to address that. We have been working in good faith with the majority leader to find a way to make that happen. I feel we are making progress in that regard. All we are asking is one tiny little bill. The minimum wage is a tiny bill. But it has profound repercussions for the economic well being, the lives of millions and millions of people.

As the majority leader made reference last week to rocket scientists, it does not take a rocket scientist to recognize the House could come up with a package surrounding the minimum wage increase that might be unacceptable. To declare this agreement acceptable, without any assurance of what the House would do—the House could come up with a package that we have to vote against, that the President would have to veto—that is no agreement, Mr. President. That is not what we are attempting to do. We want to find a way to accommodate the concerns of the majority in dealing with this tax issue in spite of the fact we have very serious misgivings on our side. We will have some amendments to address those misgivings.

The Travel Office legislation—again, some of us have very serious misgivings in terms of the precedent it would set. We want to deal with that. Obviously, there is the TEAM Act, about which we have extraordinary misgivings. We will deal with that. Then there is the taxpayer bill of rights for which there is apparently some consensus. We will deal with that. Those are four pieces of legislation the majority wants to deal with. We say we want one, the minimum wage. All we ask is that we are not going to be embarrassed in coming to an agreement that ultimately allows us this freestanding vote that we all say we want but then the President will have to veto. That is not acceptable. Everybody understands that. That is all we are saying—continue to work, ensure we know what the House's intentions are. If we can do it on a complete budget agreement, it seems to me we can do it on one little bill, the minimum wage bill. That is what we are talking about.

Now, with regard to the budget, as I said, I have agreed to go to the budget resolution early tomorrow, after consultation with our caucus at noon and with individual Members who raised some very serious concerns and even though we have not yet been allowed to see the report. We are not going to make a big deal of the fact we do not have a report. Our colleagues on the Budget Committee were not even allowed to write it. No minority report. That was not allowed. There was no consultation with Democrats, at all—locked out completely.

This proposal is the most partisan budget we have seen in many, many years. In fact, at the news conference I recall, the Nation was told this is a Bob Dole budget. It was not the Senate Budget Committee document. We were told, ''This is the Bob Dole budget.'' I must say, with all this interest in bipartisanship and accommodation and cooperation, when it came to the budget, we are not getting a great deal of it. We have not seen much yet. What goes around comes around.

In spite of the fact that we have not been given very much, if any, consideration with regard to the budget so far procedurally, and it is going to get worse, we will go to the budget resolution and, eventually, to the three reconciliation bills that in my view are flatout illegal. We will have to face all of that in the future. We will go to the budget tomorrow, because in good faith we are trying to work through these things. We will try to deal with the budget. And we are trying to deal with these five bills. But we will not be pushed.

I have had to assure my colleagues we will take all the time we need to have a good debate, to offer amendments. We will do all of that. We will

go to the floor tomorrow as requested of us in order to accommodate the majority in what we know to be a very full schedule. I hope we can continue to work. I am very hopeful we can achieve all that I know the distinguished majority leader wants to accomplish prior to the time we get into the Memorial Day recess.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. My question, just so I am fully in tune with the points you were making, the majority leader is telling us that he cannot accommodate us in terms of the minimum wage; he says he cannot have any control over the way it is handled in the House. What I heard my leader say is when it comes to the budget, which is a huge document and is actually a 6-year budget, that, in fact, there was cooperation between the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans. They did, in fact, preconference many of these issues so that they were in step.

Am I right in assuming when it comes to the minimum wage, the majority leader says: Gee, he just cannot control it, so we could agree to all the other measures. You point out this caucus on this side is split on something because we so much want to see the minimum wage take effect and start helping people, millions of people. I might say the majority of them are women, and we talk a lot about the gender gap around here. I think the women in this country know who is fighting for them.

When it comes to this, we could give away our position, our leverage, and wind up with all the other bills and not the minimum wage increase. Is that the fear that has been expressed by the Democrat leader?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from California says it so ably and succinctly. That is our concern. She used the word ''cooperation'' between the House and the Senate. It was cooperation. But I did not go further. It was absolute unanimity, agreement right down the line, word for word, paragraph for paragraph, provision for provision. There was no disagreement. The joint news conferences by the chairs of both the House and the Senate Budget Committees certainly made that point. There was no disagreement whatsoever. Normally you would expect cooperation. This was lockstep agreement on every single detail of a 6-year budget agreement.

It seems to me with that kind of precedent there ought to be an opportunity for one little bill, this minimum wage bill, which has such a profound effect on so many people all through the country. That is all we are hoping to do. I intend to work with the majority leader to ensure that happens. I yield the floor.

GAS TAX REPEAL, MINIMUM WAGE, AND THE BUDGET

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is unfortunate, indeed, that we are not getting a vote on the repeal of the gasoline tax that was imposed in 1993, the 4.3-cent gasoline tax that has been debated and discussed here on the floor for these past 2 weeks now.

When the Senate came back into session following the recent recess, the majority leader indicated to the Senate that the order of business would be that we would debate and dispose of the so-called taxpayer bill of rights, legislation that has been reported from the Senate Finance Committee, that had been discussed for some time over a period of the last several years; as a matter of fact, a priority of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I can recall when my good friend from Arkansas, Senator PRYOR, introduced legislation along that line some time ago and invited Senators to cosponsor. I joined in cosponsoring the legislation.

There have been enactments of similar legislation in the past but this seemed to address the current problems. It had bipartisan support. To that legislation, the majority leader proposed to add a temporary repeal of the gasoline tax that had been imposed at the President's request, and with the opposition, the active opposition of all Republicans in the Congress.

The fact of the matter is, this was a part of the initial deficit reduction package proposed by President Clinton soon after he came into office. It was opposed by Republicans because for the first time there would be Federal taxation of gasoline that would not be earmarked for road and bridge construction under the Highway Trust Fund Act.

Gasoline, tires, batteries, and accessories had been taxed in the past, at the initiative of President Eisenhower some time ago, to try to build a national defense highway system. It was thought at the time that the American people would support that, if the highway users could support and pay for it through Federal taxes on gasoline, oil, batteries, and the like, those things that would be purchased by the users of the Nation's highways, those funds would be dedicated for that purpose.

Now, President Clinton comes into office as President and, for the first time, suggests that there be a Federal tax on gasoline that would go into the General Treasury, which would not be a part of the highway trust fund. There was strong objection to that. We had a rollcall vote in the Congress, and Republicans unanimously voted against that tax. With gasoline prices rising, with people finding it more and more difficult to operate their trucks and cars with these new, high prices, it was appropriate, in the view of this side of the aisle, that we act to repeal, temporarily, that gasoline tax.

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. I have a question because my friend made a statement that President Clinton was the first President to suggest that gasoline taxes be used to reduce the deficit. In 1990, under George Bush, there was a tax put in until 1995 on gasoline which was used to reduce the deficit. It was part of an agreement under the leadership of President Bush. So I just wanted to know whether my friend was aware of that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to respond by saying I do not think that was a suggestion by President Bush. I think at the time of that summit——

Mrs. BOXER. He signed onto it. It happened under his administration, and he signed the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not yield further, Mr. President. I am responding to the Senator's question. I will continue to respond. That summit meeting was held for a lot of purposes, to try to deal with a lot of issues that had been brought up in the Congress. The gasoline tax was not proposed by President Bush.

I stand by what I said. President Clinton is the first President who suggested an addition to the gasoline tax that would not be used as a part of the highway trust fund.

The fact is, the Republican leader in the Senate proposed that there be a repeal of this 1993 tax. He stated the reasons for it. It had almost unanimous support on this side of the aisle and, I think, support on the Democratic side as well. What happened next was, the Democrats offered an amendment that they wanted to have voted on before the gasoline tax repeal would be voted on, which was to increase the minimum wage. Now, it is not unusual to have some Senator offer an amendment on a completely different subject from the legislation that is pending before the Senate. It is one of the unique characteristics of the Senate that any Senator on either side of the aisle, at any time, can offer an amendment to any bill or any other amendment and discuss the merits of that proposal without interruption for as long as that Senator seeks to do so, or at least until 60 Senators vote to impose cloture and cut off debate. That is one of the unique features of this body. So I am not criticizing Senators who seek to use the rules to call to the attention of the Senate a matter of some urgency that needs the immediate consideration of the U.S. Congress.

What is curious about that proposal and that amendment, though, was that, for 2 years, the Democrats controlled both Houses of Congress and the administration. President Clinton came into office talking about giving a middle-class tax cut, talking about helping working people meet their goals and achieve their ambitions. Not once did a committee chaired by a Democratic Senator report out legislation to increase the minimum wage. Not once did a Democratic Senator offer an amendment to any bill to increase the