

amendment on everything, we will make it illegal for anybody in America to work for \$5 an hour because somebody in this Chamber has determined you should not have a job if it is only \$5 an hour. I disagree with that philosophy. I disagree with it very strongly.

Now, if the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from any other State, if their State wants to raise minimum wage to \$5.25, which I think they have done in the State of Massachusetts, they are scheduled to go to \$5.25, that is fine. If the State of New York wants a minimum wage of \$6 an hour, they have the right to do so. Why in the world should we make it national? What about the State of Montana, or some rural town in Montana? Maybe they have different economic circumstances, which they most certainly do, than, say, New York City or Washington, DC.

Why should we presuppose we have all the wisdom and we should mandate what the wages should be nationally, and make it is against the law for you to have a job even if you are 16 years old and want to get started climbing the economic ladder? We are going to say, "No, if you cannot get a job that pays at least \$5.15 an hour, you cannot have a job. The Federal Government has determined it is better for you to stay at home, not work. If you cannot get a job at \$5.15 an hour, we prefer you not to have a job. It is against the law for you to have a job."

I think that is a mistake. I think it is a serious mistake. I think it will cost jobs. I do not know how many jobs it will cost. The Congressional Budget Office estimates employment losses for a 90-cent-per-hour increase in minimum wage from roughly 100,000 to 500,000 jobs. That is a pretty significant economic impact on that 100,000 or that 500,000 people who lose a job.

Those are people that may need the job more than anything. Maybe they are people that want to start climbing the economic ladder, and we will say, "No, you need not apply. That job is not worth it." Maybe it was pumping gas, sacking groceries, or some menial task. That first job can be one of the most important, in fact, maybe the most important job somebody will have because they start learning skills. They might learn they need more education, or have an idea, "Wait, I need to make more money, so therefore I better go back to school," or vo-tech, or finish high school, or maybe go to college. No, we will have a Federal law that says if you do not make at least \$5.15 an hour, we have determined you should not have a job. As a matter of fact, it is illegal for you to have a job. I think that is wrong.

The Employment Policies Institute estimates that the job loss for an increase of 90 cents is over 600,000, if Senator KENNEDY's amendment passes. Mr. President, 10,000 are in Oklahoma, 18,000 would be in Georgia. I do not want to pass a law that will put 10,000 Oklahomans out of work. Again, if

they want to do that in the State of Massachusetts, power to them. If they want to do it in other States, they have that right to do so. We should not interfere with that.

What about States rights? The 10th amendment of the Constitution says all the rights and powers are reserved to the States and the people. They did not envision the Federal Government mandating that if you do not make \$5.15 an hour, you cannot have a job. That is what Senator KENNEDY's amendment would do.

Senator KENNEDY's amendment is even worse than the language that already passed the House, which President Clinton said he would sign. The House bill at least has a training wage of 90 days; Senator KENNEDY only has one for 30 days. The House bill does not hit the restaurant owners and workers; it allows a tip credit. Most people that work in restaurants make \$8 or \$9 an hour on average. They are not minimum wage, so they keep the tip credit at \$2.13. Senator KENNEDY has that increased. That would be a big hit on somebody that has a small restaurant. My point being that his language is even worse than what passed the House. The net result is you will put hundreds of thousands of people out of work.

I believe that is a serious, serious mistake. Not only that, but now it would be retroactive. So, think of that. You have a small business. Senator KENNEDY does not give a small business exemption, no matter how small. My colleagues know I used to have a janitorial service. We did not pay minimum wage. I used to work for a janitorial service that did pay minimum wage. Senator KENNEDY's bill would make it retroactive. That might be nice if you got the wage, but what about the employer that could not cover it?

I remember asking my boss, when I was making \$1.60 an hour, for a raise, and after a couple weeks he gave me a nickel-an-hour raise. Senator KENNEDY will mandate they have to give 45 cents retroactive to July 5. What if they cannot afford that? Sorry, you just lost a job, thanks to Senator KENNEDY's amendment.

We should not allow that to happen. We should not be passing laws around this place that will put hundreds of thousands of people out of work. We should not be passing laws around this place that say it is illegal for you to have a job that pays \$5.10 an hour because the Federal Government has determined that any job that is worth having should pay at least \$5.15 an hour.

I believe that is very bad economics. It does not make sense. I do not believe we can repeal the law of supply and demand. If we can, why stop at \$5.15? Maybe we should have another amendment that says make it \$10 an hour if there is no negative impact on a 21-percent increase in the minimum wage. Increase it 100 percent—make it \$10 an

hour or \$20 an hour. Anybody making \$5 an hour, I would like them to make \$10 or \$20. I would like them to be better off financially. If there are no negative economic consequences, why not do it? We are not going to do it because people know it would have a negative economic consequence. We know we would be putting people out of work, and there are certain jobs in certain places that cannot afford to pay it.

The people we will hurt the most are the people we should be hurting the least. We will be hurting a little restaurant or grocery store that is competing in some rural town, trying to stay alive, competing against Wal-Mart. Some big business comes in and the little guy is having a hard time staying alive. Yet, we are going to mandate a 21-percent increase in minimum wage. Maybe they were hiring some young people, 16 and 17 years old, that wanted to earn some money in the summertime, and we will tell them, "No, you cannot do that. It is against the law. Unless you pay at least \$5.15 an hour, we have determined that job is not worth having." We have decided that in Washington, DC, because we are the source of all wisdom.

What is right about \$5.15? Why not make it \$6 or \$7 or \$8 or \$10? It just does not make sense. If you repeal the law of supply and demand, we should make it \$10 or \$20, but we cannot. It will cost jobs. If we pass the increase in minimum wage, it will cost jobs. We will put people out of work, people that need to work the most, people that want to start climbing the economic ladder. That is a serious mistake.

I mentioned, Mr. President, I worked for a janitorial service in Stillwater, OK, and the 1968 minimum wage was \$1.60. My wife and I both had a job there. We worked at it a month before we asked for the raise. We got the nickel. We decided that was not enough, so we started our own janitorial service and we made a lot more money working for ourselves. We got started low on the economic ladder, but we were able to climb up. I am glad the Federal Government did not come in and say they wanted the minimum wage at that time to be much, much higher. I might not have gotten that job. I might not have gotten the training, and I might not have started my own janitorial service and put myself and several other people through school.

We should not deny people economic opportunities. We should not be passing laws that will be putting people out of work. That is exactly what we will be doing if we pass this increase in minimum wage. I hope we will not do it. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Kennedy amendment tomorrow.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 2, 1996,

during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1880. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the "Edward Madigan Post Office Building."

H.R. 2704. An act to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located at 7436 South Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building."

H.R. 3364. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Scranton, Pennsylvania, as the "William J. Nealon Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, on July 2, 1996, the Secretary of the Senate, the enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on July 8, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2070. An act to provide for the distribution within the United States of the United States Information Agency film entitled "Fragile Ring of Life."

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently, during the session of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1508. An act to require the transfer of title to the District of Columbia of certain real property in Anacostia Park to facilitate the construction of National Children's Island, a cultural, educational, and family-oriented park.

H.R. 2853. An act to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to House Resolution 471, electing ENID GREENE, a Representative from the State of Utah, Speaker pro tempore through Wednesday, July 10, 1996.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

REPORTS SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1996, the following report of committee was submitted on July 2, 1996, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1662. A bill to establish areas of wilderness and recreation in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104-314).

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. BROWN:

S. 1930. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain industrial nylon fabrics; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. FRIST):

S. 1931. A bill to provide that the U.S. Post Office building that is to be located at 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, TN, shall be known and designated as the "L. Clure Morton Post Office and Courthouse"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to limit the amount of nonconstituent contributions that a candidate may accept, 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 Mr. ROBB:

S. Res. 276. A resolution congratulating the people of Mongolia on embracing democracy in the parliamentary elections held on June 30, 1996; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THOMPSON (for himself and Mr. FRIST):

S. 1931. A bill to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located at 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "L. Clure Morton Post Office and Courthouse"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

THE L. CLURE MORTON POST OFFICE AND COURTHOUSE DESIGNATION ACT OF 1996

• Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a bill to designate the post office and courthouse in Cookeville, TN, the L. Clure Morton Post Office and Courthouse. I am also pleased that my colleague from Tennessee, Senator BILL FRIST, is joining me as an original cosponsor.

After graduating from the University of Tennessee's School of Law in 1936, L. Clure Morton spent 33 years in private practice and as a special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In 1970, President Richard Nixon appointed Morton a U.S. district court judge in Nashville, TN. Judge Morton was elevated to chief judge in 1977 and took senior status in 1984. Presently Judge Morton presides in the north-

eastern division and lives in Cookeville.

Middlet Tennessee trial lawyers and judges alike comment on the absolute fairness, intellectual honesty, innovative sentencing, and no-nonsense manner in which Judge Morton conducted his courtroom over the past 26 years. A jurist of great courage, Judge Morton handled many controversial constitutional issues not addressed by his predecessors. He dealt resolutely with the issue of school integration in Nashville and reforms in Tennessee's prison, welfare, and mental health systems.

The city council of Cookeville, TN, recently passed a resolution to recommend this name change of the U.S. post office and courthouse to honor Judge Morton. The resolution reads as follows:

"A resolution to (recommend to the United States Senate) rename the United States Post Office and Courthouse Building, 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, Tennessee, as the L. Clure Morton Federal Building, to honor Judge L. Clure Morton on the occasion of his retirement.

"Whereas, the Honorable L. Clure Morton has announced his intention to leave active service as a United States judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, and retires to Knoxville; and

"Whereas, Judge Morton was appointed United States District Judge by President Richard Nixon in 1970, and has performed his duties with the utmost dedication and integrity for over 25 years; and

"Whereas, he has handled the entire Northeastern Division docket in Cookeville since 1970, and has presided exclusively in Cookeville, Tennessee since 1984; and

"Whereas, Judge Morton has ruled from the bench without passion or prejudice, seeking only to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States; and

"Whereas, Judge Morton is widely respected and admired by his peers and associates in the legal profession and by members of this community; and

"Whereas, this Council desires to recognize the outstanding and lasting contributions made by Judge Morton to the legal profession in middle Tennessee; and

"Whereas, Judge Morton's chambers and courtroom are located in the United States Courthouse and Post Office Building, 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, Tennessee. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Cookeville City Council, That we recommend that the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse Building, 9 East Broad Street, Cookeville, Tennessee, which has housed an esteemed member of the judiciary and an outstanding public servant for over a quarter of a century, be renamed the L. Clure Morton Federal Building, in recognition for his significant contributions as a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee."

Middle Tennessee is a safer, fairer place because Judge Morton served on the bench. This legislation is an appropriate tribute to a man who so positively touched so many middle Tennesseans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill we introduce today be printed in the RECORD.

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