

spending and reduce the deficit, regardless of which side of Pennsylvania Avenue they work on, and regardless of which party they call home.

My only regret about the line-item veto we will pass later today is that it does not allow the President to veto pork in tax incentive programs. There is no difference between a program that appropriates \$100 million to directly subsidize a certain activity and a tax incentive that cuts taxes by \$100 million for the same activity. Both increase the deficit and neither is available to the average citizen.

I urge my colleagues to support the line-item veto. It is a good tool in the hands of both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

#### REDUCE FEDERAL SPENDING

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is one thing the American people have had their fill of, it is seeing their hard-earned tax dollars squandered on frivolous special interest projects. Whether it is a \$500 toilet seat for the military or \$100 million interstate to nowhere, the American people have had it with paying for someone else's pork.

Up until now America's real pork producers, referring, of course, to Congress, has buried their pet pork projects in important legislation. That is why our line-item veto is such an important part of the Contract With America. It gives the President the power to search out and destroy wasteful spending before it starts.

With the line-item veto, the buck isn't all that stops at the President's desk. The pork stops there too. Several minutes ago the President delivered to Congress his budget, which is out of balance by over \$210 billion, the 27th year in a row.

It is time the President and Congress worked together to reduce Federal spending. When Mr. Clinton ran for President, he said he wanted a line-item veto. Our Contract With America gives him just that.

Happy birthday, Ronald Reagan.

#### SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE HAS GOOD CREDENTIALS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think every American would agree that one of the most critical health problems we have in this Nation is the raging incidence of teen pregnancy. I was very proud when President Clinton came forward with a nominee for Surgeon General who has credentials that are better than almost any other American in dealing with this very im-

portant issue of teen pregnancy. Dr. Henry Foster, Jr., is a very distinguished Ob-Gyn in Tennessee who has worked in the housing projects, who has worked in his State tirelessly to tackle teen pregnancy, and this country could make great strides with his knowledge.

How sad I am that some people on the other side want to treat this President as though he is road kill. They are saying they will not deal with this nominee because of his associations with Planned Parenthood of America.

Now, I thought the right to free association still stood. I think that Planned Parenthood of America is a very honorable group to be associated with, and I certainly hope they change their mind.

#### SUPPORT FOR RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an increase in the minimum wage by 45 cents over each of the next 2 years. I spoke last week on this issue. However, due to new opposition and a new Republican proposal, I find it necessary to address the minimum wage increase again.

The proposal was offered by Senator DOLE to strike a deal with Democrats whereby we would support a capital gains tax cut in return for support of the increase in the minimum wage. This is ludicrous and it clearly demonstrates the sharp differences between the two parties.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is not interested in making deals that would give a tax cut to the richest in our society. When we are trying to break the cycle of welfare dependency, our Republican colleagues are trying to ensure that the wealthy are protected from paying their fair share.

The January 29 issue of the Washington Post, they state that "Republicans want to replace welfare with work." If we do not increase the minimum wage, we are making that even harder.

#### ONE FOR THE GIPPER

(Mr. BUNN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today is Ronald Reagan's birthday. As one of our greatest Presidents, Ronald Reagan won the cold war, expanded the economy, and restored America's faith in herself. He inspired us because in his heart, he knew the American people were crying out for a smaller Government, lower taxes, and a strong defense.

Ronald Reagan fought for these goals over the unending objections of a do nothing Democrat Congress. Now, as he

fights against the cruel indignities of Alzheimers disease, a Republican Congress meets to take up the line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine a more appropriate birthday present than the passage of the line-item veto Ronald Reagan so desired, and so deserved. So, to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle—let us go to work, pass the line-item veto, and win one for the Gipper!

#### MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

(Mr. KLINK asked as was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today also to talk about the increase in the minimum wage.

I was talking to a woman from my district on Friday. She said, "Congressman KLINK, I don't want to be forced to go on welfare." And then she listed off the expenses that she would have to pay when she goes to work, with child care and with her rent and with food and with transportation costs.

And she said, "for \$4.25, I can't afford to go to work; I don't want to go on welfare."

In fact, that is the position so many people find themselves in. They want the pride of going to work each day, of having sweat on their brow at the end of the day and talking about a job well done. They want to get some discipline back in their lives again. But at \$4.25 an hour, they just cannot afford to do that.

I think it is among Members of this House and the other body also to say to people that \$4.25 an hour is not a livable wage and to increase the minimum wage of this Nation.

#### LINE-ITEM VETO: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS FINALLY COME

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote to add one more disciplinary tool to the budget and appropriations process, the line-item veto. Along with the balanced budget amendment, which we passed 2 weeks ago, the line-item veto will help bring fiscal sanity to Congress' out-of-control spend-a-thon over the last 40 years.

Former President Ronald Reagan used to say the line-item veto was not a partisan issue but a good-government issue. Unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Congress refused, refused to put aside partisan differences to pass this important legislation. But today we will finally throw aside partisan politics. We will pass this good-government measure.

Happy birthday, Ronald Reagan. The line-item veto is an idea whose time has come. It is too bad we could not

have done this years ago when Ronald Reagan was President.

#### LINE-ITEM VETO WILL HELP CUT WASTEFUL SPENDING

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today we will note on H.R. 2, the Line-Item Veto Act. Having recently cast a historic vote to pass the balanced budget amendment, we are on our way to sound fiscal management. But if we are genuinely interested in bringing the Federal budget under control, we must look at additional means of restraining spending. H.R. 2 is an important tool in this process.

H.R. 2 gives the President true line-item veto authority, empowering him to disallow specific items in spending bills without having to veto the entire legislation—which may contain worthwhile and necessary programs. Perhaps more importantly, H.R. 2 places the burden on Congress to act initially to reject a President's rescission message.

Too often, spending bills passed by Congress contain items, especially pork-barrel projects, that would not stand up to the test of an individual vote. If used in a conscientious manner, the authority that H.R. 2 confers on the President could indeed help effectively cut wasteful spending out of the Federal budget.

I support H.R. 2 and urge my colleagues to likewise support this important measure.

#### RESTORE SANITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY TO FEDERAL SPENDING

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, here is a list of good reasons why the line-item veto must be passed:

A \$58 million bailout of George Steinbrenner's shipbuilding company; \$15 million for never-authorized court-houses which were opposed by the Federal judges whom they were built for; \$11.5 million to upgrade a powerplant for the soon-to-be-closed Philadelphia Naval Shipyard; and \$35 million to eradicate screwworms in Mexico.

It is time to end the spending sprees and get off the pork-barrel merry-go-round. The American people are watching and they are demanding greater accountability in the budget process. We should pass the line-item veto with the same bipartisan majorities that the unfunded mandates and the balanced budget amendment had.

Mr. Speaker, the line-item veto is a no-brainer. We need it; the American people want it. And we should act now to restore sanity and accountability to Federal spending.

#### AND THE BEAT GOES ON

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, that sound you hear from the other side of the aisle is the last drumbeat of the old order. Our liberal friends continue to march to the beat of Government mandates, Government spending, and Government taxing. That is why they are so quick to endorse an increase in the minimum wage, so quick to oppose the balanced budget amendment, so desperate in their opposition to the line-item veto.

But the American people are marching to the beat of a different drummer. They look to the future and to us for new solutions, smaller Government and fewer mandates.

The American people want the private sector to be able to create jobs that pay more than just the minimum wage. They want a future free of non-sensical, repetitive, and unproductive regulations. And that is why the people voted against liberal Democrats in overwhelming numbers last November.

Mr. Speaker, the tired, old drumbeat of bigger Government, bigger taxes, and bigger spending goes on. Thankfully, the American people have stopped listening. They have started reading the "Contract With America," soon to be No. 1 on the best seller list and the No. 1 priority of this New Republican Congress.

□ 1430

#### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE WILL HELP MAKE WORK PAY

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter last week from Harvey Nehring, who lives in Farmington, NM. Harvey cannot understand how anybody could even think of opposing a raise in the minimum wage.

Harvey stated that people who oppose an increase in the minimum wage do not realize that it costs the working poor \$40 an hour to get their car repaired and \$60 an hour to fix their plumbing. The working poor have no health insurance, no retirement benefits. They receive no gifts from lobbyists, and do not receive frequent flyer miles. In Harvey's words, the working poor are simply honest Americans who work hard to keep this country going.

Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage is a bipartisan issue. In 1989, the vote on increasing the minimum wage was 382 to 37 in the House. It was proposed by then President Bush. Mr. Speaker, we should all agree that in order to get people off welfare, we need to give them a salary that will help their ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Harvey. Let us raise the minimum wage.

#### THE TAXPAYER WILL BE THE WINNER WITH THE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last fall, we asked the American people to vote for us, the Republican Party, and in return, we would change the way Congress does business. We promised a three-part attack consisting of change, reform, and fiscal accountability.

We pledged to adopt the Fiscal Responsibility Act, combining the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto. Two weeks ago, we soundly passed the balanced budget amendment, and now it is our responsibility, to pass the line-item veto.

The bill continues the fight we began for the American people in January. The veto requires Congress to justify or eliminate all spending projects. Ultimately, it changes business as usual, no longer will the President blindly sign a bill with hidden pork projects.

It is the ultimate budget reform initiative. Let us continue the fight and pass this much needed legislation. The taxpayer will be the definite winner.

#### INCREASING THE BUDGET DOES NOT CUT SPENDING

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the spending increases in the budget recently proposed by President Clinton. Only in Washington, DC, would we look at spending increases from year to year and talk about budget cuts.

Mr. Speaker, look at the numbers. In fiscal year 1995, we will spend \$1,539 billion. In fiscal year 1996, if we do as the President has proposed, that number goes to \$1,612 billion. Mr. Speaker, that is a spending increase of \$73 billion, and all I am hearing discussion about is how we have cut spending. We have not cut spending, we have increased spending by \$73 billion.

Carry this thing out to the year 2000. In the fiscal year 2000, if we do as is proposed today in the President's budget we will spend \$1,905 billion. That is an increase of \$366 billion. We have not cut spending, Mr. Speaker, we are increasing spending. It is about time the American people knew what was going on here, so we can get down to the serious business of balancing this budget.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. We must do better. Our children deserve it.

#### A PROMISE TO FORMER PRESIDENT REAGAN: THE HOUSE WILL PASS THE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House