

lawlessness to rule our streets and thugs to terrorize our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons I support the Contract With America. It represents real change that most Americans can support.

I urge the defenders of the status quo to reflect on one thing: Can our children afford to continue on the path you advocate? For most people, the answer is clearly no.

SOLVING THREE PROBLEMS AT ONE TIME

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the last several months, as we have been in the House there have been three issues that have been discussed in some manner, one of them being capital gains breaks for the rich, one of them being adjusting the minimum wage, trying to adjust the wage by which we increase the payments to those who are the working poor, as well as welfare reform.

I come today offering a solution to all of it. Let us give capital gains reductions, let us target it so we give minimum wage to the working poor, while at the same time as we move persons off of welfare give them an opportunity to work at a job that pays a decent wage.

We can solve all three problems if we can work together. Let us remove all the partisanship, let us not look at these issues as being disjointed, let us hook them up together, capital gains, minimum wage increase while at the same time changing welfare. We can solve the problem for everybody.

Win, win, win.

SAFE STREETS FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the saying, "If you can't do the time, don't do the crime."

Unfortunately, the sad fact is that if you commit a violent felony there is only a 3- to 4-percent chance you will do any jail time. Looking at that another way, 96 to 97 percent of the time a violent criminal never sees the inside of a jail.

No wonder Americans have said that they have had enough and want their streets back.

When people are afraid to step outside their doors at night something is wrong. When people are afraid to sit on their porch, something is wrong. When fear of crime prevents many Americans in our inner-city areas from taking a night job or going to night school, it hurts all of us.

Even the wealthy who live in guarded, gated communities feel an immediate need to do something about violent crime. But for middle class and

poorer Americans, who bear the brunt of violent crime, this is a life-and-death issue that affects them every day.

If nothing else, we owe the working men and women of our country, the ones who pay the bills, safe streets.

REINING IN THE IRS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS is loading up. Individual dossiers now on every taxpayer, not just your credit history and your wife's background, your speeding tickets, how about news stories, how about informant's tips and how about rumors, ladies and gentleman.

□ 0910

Now, if that is not enough to pirate your software, check this out: It is not even confidential. Last year they slapped on the wrist 300 agents for snooping through tax returns. Unbelievable, ladies and gentleman.

And the Congress of the United States has allowed this to happen. I say it is time for Congress to act. What makes it even worse, when the IRS comes to the door with their Gestapo file and looks you in the eye, you are guilty and have to prove yourself innocent.

Do yourself a favor, do your constituents a service, and cosponsor H.R. 390 and let us put the IRS where they should be. They work for the American people.

APPROVAL RATING FOR CONGRESS HAS DOUBLED

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, there is a new-found respect for Congress in the country. Republicans have only been in charge for 1 month, and the approval rating for Congress has already doubled.

The reason is obvious. Under Republican leadership we are working hard to keep our promises to bring big change to America.

Nowhere is that more apparent than in the crime package we are now debating. We are making tremendous progress in ensuring that the criminal justice system will be more concerned with the rights of victims and society than the rights of criminals.

And who will benefit most from our rough crime package? The middle and lower income classes, who live with violent crime every day. They know what we need to do: catch, convict, and confine violent criminals.

That is what our crime package is all about. And that is why we will continue working hard to see that it is enacted.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE A LIVABLE WAGE

(Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of livable wage for all Americans by the year 2000. Congressmen CLYBURN and HILLIARD and I have introduced a bill, H.R. 768, that moves the debate from a minimum wage to a livable wage. Many Americans who work in retail establishments such as McDonald's already earn more than \$5 per hour. The current minimum wage of \$4.25 per hour amounts to approximately \$9,000 a year. No individual or family can live at a decent level on this income. Contrary to popular belief, two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults and not teenagers.

The minimum wage has not been raised since April 1, 1991, nearly 4 years ago. For the richest country in the world, this is a national disgrace. All of us know that the cost of goods and services have risen over this time period. By supporting a liveable wage, we send a clear signal to the Nation of our support for the working poor.

Let us vote for a livable wage and index future increases so that all American families can keep up with the rising cost of living. My constituents in Mississippi deserve it. Your constituents deserve it. We must demand it.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SAN FRANCISCO 49ERS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Chargers were picked in their division, but then the season started; our Bolts pursued a vision. Often they would fall behind. They bested the toughest teams in the AFC. In the playoffs they beat Pittsburgh and Miami.

Then on Super Bowl Sunday, the 49ers won. I picked the Chargers. The gentlewoman from California, I had a 19 point advantage on her. I thought I had an advantage. Well, us males have thought that for thousands of years, and I guess we will never learn, because here I am to pay off my Super Bowl bet to the gentlewoman from California, the most prized possession that I could possibly own, El Indio chips and Mexican food, salsa and homemade guacamole, fresh from San Diego.

The 49ers are champs, and they will have our respect. But all the NFL will seek the trophy they protect. Should the San Francisco team return next year, I will still bet on my Chargers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman for the great,

valiant effort of the Chargers. California sent two great teams to the Super Bowl, and I thank the gentleman for his salsa, chips, and guacamole, and give him a T-shirt.

CONGRATULATING TWO GREAT FOOTBALL TEAMS FROM CALIFORNIA

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Chargers and my colleague, all of my colleagues, from San Diego.

We are very proud in California of two great teams.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is a good sport. I waited awhile for him to pay off on this debt. His "the chips are on their way" became like "the check is in the mail." You know, the Super Bowl has been over awhile, and I thought that as to this concession he was waiting for Michael Huffington to concede before he conceded the Super Bowl loss.

In any event, he is a great Californian, a great sport. I thank him for that.

I also will have to say how proud I am of the San Francisco 49ers, owner Eddie DeBartolo, president Carmen Policy, you know, quarterback Steve Young, Jerry Rice, Rickey Waters, and the list goes on and on.

It was a great Super Bowl. We are very proud. Five trips to the Super Bowl for the 49ers, five championships, five world championships.

Go '9ers.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING TAXPAYER-BACKED MEXICAN RESCUE PACKAGE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today with bipartisan cosponsorship, I am introducing a resolution of inquiry concerning the recent U.S. taxpayer-backed Mexican rescue package.

Far too many questions regarding the terms of the financing and the financial risks to our people and our banking system remain unanswered. The purpose of this resolution is to obtain factual information from the Clinton administration on a series of questions contained in the resolution, including the soundness of the collateral backing the agreement, the solvency of PEMEX, the actual terms of the short-, medium-, and long-term loans, and the rate at which funds are being drawn down.

I ask my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution of inquiry and respectfully request the Committee on Banking and Financial Services report it favorably within the 2 weeks required.

VIOLENT CRIMINAL INCARCERATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 63 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 667.

□ 0917

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 667) to control crime by incarcerating violent criminals, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, February 9, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Four hours and ten minutes remain for consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 2, Watt No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 17, strike lines 16-23 and page 18, strike lines 1-3.

Page 18, line 4, strike the letter "g" and insert instead the letter "f".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This should not take 5 minutes. I actually engaged in some degree of debate on this amendment during the period of general debate.

This amendment simply would strike the provisions in the bill having to do with the award of attorneys' fees.

I now realize that I may have the wrong amendment at the desk.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute amendment No. 3, Watt No. 3, and have that one read instead. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that was originally read be withdrawn and that the Watt amendment No. 3 be substituted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment has been withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer my new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 16, strike lines 10-20.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

□ 0920

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment actually relates to the procedure by which an appeal is taken from an order in which relief has been granted in a prison lawsuit.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am uncertain as to what this amendment is. The amendment that was read does not seem to be amendment No. 3 that was printed in the Journal. I would like to understand what amendment we are on at this point.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The gentleman's side has a copy of them. We redesignated the amendments because when the bill came out of committee it came out in a different form that the amendments that were printed in the RECORD conform with. So we have gone back and conformed the amendments to comply with the actual printed bill.

Does that address the gentleman's concern?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. It does. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I had given the gentleman's side a copy of this amendment and the revised amendments yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, resuming my time, the bill provides that when an order has been entered by the court and the defendants in the case who have already been found to have violated a constitutional right by prison overcrowding or in some other way violating a prisoner's rights and an effort has been made to try to correct that, when the motion to revise that order is made, that order continues in effect during the pendency of the motion to revise the court's order. Well, that is exactly what happens in any lawsuit. If the court ever enters an order in a case, that order stays in effect until the court comes back and changes that order or until some higher court changes that order.

The provisions of this bill would say if the court has entered an order, the order is in effect, the defendant files a