

The purpose of the National Infrastructure Development Act is to increase the public works investment critical to our long-term economic growth. It does so by using innovative financing and techniques already used in the private sector to encourage more investment in our roads, bridges and transit systems.

The National Infrastructure Development Act establishes an innovative, investment-oriented Foreign infrastructure strategy to help States and municipal governments finance needed infrastructure. It creates a National Infrastructure Corporation to provide a broad array of financing for infrastructure projects.

The Clinton administration's innovative investment program shows that there is tremendous interest among States and local governments in new methods that would make Federal capital dollars go further. In the past year alone, the administration has given approval to over 70 innovative financing projects in over 30 States. Moreover, 20 States have expressed interest in establishing State infrastructure banks that would enable them to make more created use of Federal transportation funds.

While the Congress in ISTEA provided greater flexibility in our highway program, we have only scratched the surface of the potential. The recent experiences with privately-financed toll roads in California and Virginia and my many discussions with State officials, business leaders, and local leaders lead me to believe that there is a strong need for creative Federal leadership.

By leveraging private and other public sector monies, the corporation would substantially increase the amount of infrastructure created by each Federal public works dollar. Experts estimate that the corporation would leverage up to \$10 in private investment for every \$1 it receives from the Federal Government. Under this legislation, the corporation's capitalization would be \$3 billion. It is anticipated that this could support generate tens of billions in new investment and hundreds of thousands of jobs, while eliminating hundreds of infrastructure bottlenecks that stifle growth.

Congresswoman DELAURO has proposed an innovative mechanism to address the national problem of underinvestment in our public works. The legislation make a valuable contribution to understanding the issue and attaining this goal. I urge my colleagues to join in our effort to boost the Nation's public investment and productivity.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation creating the National Infrastructure Corporation [NIC], of which I am an original cosponsor.

Today, it is estimated that there are over \$30 billion in unfunded infrastructure projects throughout the United States. Due to increasing Federal, State, and local budget constraints, important infrastructure projects are being delayed or not considered at all. While it is clear that the United States is becoming increasingly a technology and information driven based economy, the necessity to build, repair and upgrade our roads, bridges, rail system, schools, and water treatment projects are just as important today as they ever have been.

That is why I have joined my colleagues today to address this important issue. This bill established the National Infrastructure Corporation to foster more public/private construction projects and to help create good jobs. The

NIC will provide credit assistance in the form of direct loans, bond insurance, and development risk insurance for critically needed infrastructure projects throughout the country.

The creation of the NIC is an innovative or smart financing mechanism to help augment existing Federal and State grant programs. As we in Congress look for better ways to leverage Federal resources, the NIC is a prime example of how the Federal Government can provide initial financial and significant in-kind resources to build new infrastructure and strengthen our old and outdated infrastructure.

To that end, I look forward to working with Representative ROSA DELAURO to bring this legislation to the country's attention and make it a priority in Congress.

□ 2100

#### REPORT FROM INDIANA ON HOOSIER HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana. Every weekend Ruthie and I travel around my district and often meet amazing people, individuals who are truly dedicated to being the backbone of our community.

These are good people, taking responsibility for the future of our community. I like to call them Hoosier heroes. Today I want to praise leaders of the Stop the Violence movement in Anderson, IN, who have come together to help their community. With their persistence and dedication, they have created a very special group called Stop the Violence. Members of the community like Garrett Williams, Rev. Ray Wright, and Al Simmons have joined with schoolteachers and students at the Shadeland Elementary School. They were fed up with gangs and drug dealers and the violence in their streets, and they came together and said, "Stop the violence now." They marched through their streets wearing purple ribbons, purple T-shirts, and a purple ball cap to symbolize peace in our community.

They sent a message to the drug dealers. They were not going to take it anymore. Today, the Stop the Violence movement, which is spearheaded by Rudy Porter in the mayor's office, sends a message to the schoolchildren of Anderson: You do not have to carry guns, you do not have to fight with your classmates, you do not have to buckle under to the pressure of drug dealers to be cool.

Stop the Violence gives schoolchildren and parents hope. They give our entire Nation hope, and I am proud to have been able to march with Rudy and those students, and I wish all Americans could witness the pride and joy that came from those children's faces as they set out to stand up to the criminals and the drug dealers who roam their streets.

They said no. No more violence, no more drugs, no more crime. Hoosier he-

roes like Rudy Porter and Stop the Violence Committee give us hope that America's best days are indeed yet to come.

That is why I would like to commend not only Rudy, but also the schoolteachers, Karen Crawford and Freddie Williams, and a principal at Shadeland School, Sharon Taylor Martin, who cares deeply about her children. And let us not forget the children, the children in Shadeland School, whose small, tiny voices, spoke out loudest of all. You made us proud. You are all Hoosier heroes.

If every community in America had Hoosier heroes like Rudy Porter and the students and the leaders of the Stop the Violence movement, our young people would get a message from us, a message loud and clear, we care about you, we have not forgotten who you are.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is my report from Indiana for today. God bless.

#### NIKE'S RACE TO THE BOTTOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in support of our "Come Shop with Me" campaign, the New York Times fortunately ran a story this month on the business page with the subtitle "Low Wages Would Foreign Business, But the Price Is Worker Poverty." The story, which I will enter in the Record tonight, describes how a 22-year-old Indonesian man named Tongris was dismissed from his job making Nike shoes for export to the United States because he was organizing his fellow workers to demand more than the government-dictated poverty wage.

How much was Tongris and his co-workers getting paid to make Nike shoes? Twenty cents an hour. And that is with no benefits.

More than 5,000 workers turn out Nike shoes at this plant in Indonesia, shoes which often sell for over \$100 a pair here in the United States. Nike and thousands of other manufacturers have been lured to set up business in Indonesia by the pitifully low wage level, along with the assurance by the Indonesian government that it will tolerate no strikes or independent worker associations. But as the Indonesian government itself admits in the article, it sets its wage purpose fully extremely low to only provide the minimum calories the worker need to survive each day.

My friends, this is no different from how plantation owners thought about feeding their slaves. Feed them enough so that they will not die on the job. In fact, I remember visiting the Auschwitz death camp and reading the sign above the entry gate that read "Work will make you free."

Nike would like you to believe that they are truly a great American company. Nike in fact has been spending

over \$250 million a year in advertising to sell you, the consumer, the message that they are a good American corporate citizen. Nike has virtually bought off the entire American sporting world. Just look at how many college coaches and athletes in the NCAA basketball tournament now being played have been paid to wear Nike's trademark, the Gold Swoosh. Your people across this Nation are literally killing people to acquire Nike products.

The truth of the matter is, Nike does not produce one athletic shoe in this country, not one. It has shut down all its U.S. production while siphoning off billions of dollars in this marketplace through sales. But it employs 75,000 workers in places like Indonesia and China, hidden from view of the news media of this country. And they pay their workers exceedingly low wages, 10 cents an hour in China, 20 cents an hour in Indonesia, work them 7 days a week, under complete control of those employers. And yet though the shoes cost only \$6 to make and ship to the United States from Indonesia, we end being asked to pay up to \$150 a pair.

So it is fair game to ask who is benefiting from this kind of production system? It is not the American worker who is no longer employed making Nike shoes. It is not the worker in Indonesia or China who earns poverty wages. Finally, it is not the American consumer, who is being gouged to pay outrageous prices for Nike.

As Hakeem Olajuwon, the star basketball player from the Houston Rockets courageously pointed out when he refused to endorse Nike shoes, he said, I saw the prices go from \$40 to \$90 to \$150, and in full cognizance that people were dying for these shoes, including inner-city kids, the kids that Nike was targeting with their inner-city role models. There is one sports figure with a conscience in this country. Thank God for that.

We as American workers and consumers could do one better. We could stop buying Nike shoes until Nike pledges allegiance again to the workers of this country and to its producers around the world. Is it not time we put a little bit of conscience back into corporate America?

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the New York Times article.

[From the New York Times, March 16, 1996]

AN INDONESIAN ASSET IS ALSO A LIABILITY

(By Edward A. Gargan)

SERANG, Indonesia.—Many days Tongris Situmorang, in his blue baseball hat with a large X on the front hangs around the gates of the enormous Nike sport shoe factory here, talking to friends leaving the assembly lines at the end of the work day.

The gangly 22-year-old used to work inside the well-guarded gates, but five months ago he was dismissed for organizing workers to demand more than the 4,600 rupiah they are paid each day, about \$2.10, the Government-dictated minimum wage. Then, after being dismissed, he was locked in a room at the plant and interrogated for seven days by the military, which demanded to know more about his labor activities.

"We went on strike to ask for better wages and an improvement in the food," Mr. Situmorang explained. "Twenty-two of us went on strike. They told us not to demand anything. They said we wouldn't get any money. But I have sued to get my job back."

Low wages are a big attraction for foreign companies doing business in Asia as high labor costs in the industrialized nations make the manufacturing of many consumer goods uneconomical. Like a wave washing over Asia, labor-intensive factories have swept south and west as incomes and living standards have risen from Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea, across Asia to China, Vietnam and Indonesia.

And across the region, businesses in developing economies are feeling pressure from workers like Mr. Situmorang to lift wages. Clashes erupt between workers who want more and businesses and governments that fear that rising wages will drive away jobs to even-lower-wage countries. As strikes and worker-organizing attempts have increased here, the Government has taken a harsher line by cracking down on workers with police and military force.

For some companies, like Levi Strauss, worker complaints, were enough to prompt it to leave Indonesia two years ago. But others, like Nike, whose shoes are made in 35 plants across Asia, have expanded in the region to take advantage of cheap labor.

For the Indonesian Government, the long-term solution may be to find manufacturers of products that can support higher wages. "Our strategy is to improve our products so we are not producing products that are made in China, Vietnam, India or Bangladesh," said Tunghi Ariwibowo, the powerful Minister of Industries and Trade. "We cannot compete on wages with them."

More than 5,000 workers churn out Nike shoes here, shoes that often sell in stores in Asia, Europe and North America for perhaps \$100 a pair. Nike and thousands of other manufacturers have been lured to set up business in Indonesia by the low wages—and the assurance that the Government will tolerate no strikes or independent unions.

Yet even at a little more than \$2 a day, there is a widespread sense in Government circles that even that is too high for Indonesia to stay competitive.

As the Government tries to hold down wages—wages the Government admits provide only 93 percent of the earnings required for subsistence for one person—strikes and worker organizing have increased. And with the increase in labor agitation have come harsher crackdowns by the Government.

A spokeswoman for Nike in the United States, Donna Gibbs, said she was not aware of Mr. Situmorang's case or of the detention and interrogation of workers for a week. However, when pressed, she said, "Our information is that workers were not held for a week."

All the plants that manufacture Nike shoes in Asia, Ms. Gibbs said, are owned by subcontractors, mostly Koreans. Each subcontractor is required to adhere to a code of conduct drawn up by Nike, she said, and managers from Nike are involved in the daily oversight of subcontractors' operations, including not simply quality control matters, but the treatment and working conditions of the labor force.

Nike's code of conduct, Ms. Gibbs said, requires compliance with all local laws, the prevention of forced labor, compliance with local regulations on health and safety and provisions of workers insurance. She said she was unaware of 13- and 14-year-old girls working at the Nike plant here.

"Certainly we have heard and witnessed abuses over time," she said "and typically what happens is that we ask the contractor

to rectify the situation and if it is not resolved we can terminate the business."

Ms. Gibbs said Nike has four to six subcontractors in Indonesia, a number that varies according to production needs. She said the minimum monthly wage was 115,000 rupiah, about \$52.50, although the average was 240,000 rupiah, about \$110. For a pair of shoes costing \$80 in the United States, she said, labor accounts for \$2.60 of the total cost.

"The problem is that the minimum wage does not provide for minimum subsistence," an Asian diplomat here said. "And beyond that, the companies don't always pay what is required by law. The level of unrest is not reported, but there are lots of reports from around the country of strikes."

"The philosophy of the minimum wage is to make sure the minimum calorie need per day is fulfilled," said Marzuki Usman, who heads the finance and monetary analysis body for the Finance Ministry and was the first chairman of the Jakarta Stock Exchange. "That is the formula."

On April 1, the minimum wage is to rise in many places to 5,200 rupiah, about \$2.37.

"There are so many labor strikes," said Apang Herlima, a lawyer for the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation who specializes in labor cases in Jakarta. "Employers always call the police and they come and interrogate the workers. Then, the workers are fired."

Because Indonesia's press treads carefully around sensitive issues—and social unrest is among the tenderest of subjects—it is difficult to gauge precisely the level of labor unrest. The Government reported that there were 297 strikes last year, although it did not provide the number of workers involved. Independent labor organizers insist the actual number is far higher.

"The number of strikes is increasing," said Leily Sianipar, a labor organizer in nearby Tangerang. "Most factories don't actually pay the minimum wage. Garment factories should pay 4,600 rupiah each day, but there is usually underpayment. So there are strikes. We try to organize workers. The factory owners use the police and the military to crack down. They try to intimidate the workers."

The Indonesian Government recognizes only one Government-sponsored union, the Federation of All Indonesian Workers Union. But most workers and independent activists maintain that the Government union does nothing to represent Indonesia's 40 million workers.

"Since they don't come from the bottom, and they aren't elected by the workers, there is no hope for the Government union," said Indera Nababan, the director of the Social Communication Foundation, a labor education group sponsored by the Communion of Churches of Indonesia. "I don't think over 10 years there has been any considerable change. The workers have no rights here to argue for their rights."

Not far from the Nike factory here, Usep, a lean man of 25, leaned against the cement wall of the tiny room he shares with his 19-year-old wife, Nursimi. Together, said Mr. Usep, who like most Javanese has only one name, the couple earn about \$4.10 a day—or \$82 a month. Of that, they must pay about \$23 for the 6-foot-by-6-foot cement room they live in, with the remainder for their food and other needs.

A single bare bulb dangles from the ceiling, its dim glare revealing a plain bed, a single gas burner, and a small plastic cabinet. Their room, one of a dozen in a long cement building, is provided with one container of water daily. If they want more water, each jug costs 100 rupiah, about 5 cents.

"Of course we're not satisfied with this," Mr. Usep said, his words coming quietly. "We

tried to talk to friends about this, but there is no response. Probably they are worried they will lose their jobs."

It is workers like these whom Ms. Sianipar has been trying to organize for the last seven years, a task that entails the constant risk of arrest.

"If we have a meeting, the police take us to the station and want to know if we want to make a revolution," she said, a laugh breaking over her words. "We had a meeting here last week and the police came. So we changed the topic of the meeting, but they took me to the station anyway. The police got angry and banged the table. But they let me go at 4 in the morning. They had the idea that we were doing underground organization."

Still, she admitted, the attitude of the police has moderated somewhat over the years. "Five years ago," she said, "we would have had much more trouble."

Not all foreign investors who use cheap Indonesian labor have ignored workers' complaints. In 1994, the American clothing company Levi Strauss withdrew its orders from a local garment contractor after reports that the management had strip-searched women to check if they were menstruating.

But many factories that manufacture clothing, shoes or electronic goods for American companies are owned by Taiwan or Korean companies, and labor organizers contend that conditions in these factories are much worse than in factories directly owned by Americans.

"American companies are here because they have to pay very little," said an American who works for a private aid organization, but who did not want his name used. "But American companies are not the worst violators of basic working conditions. The Koreans really stand out for poor conditions in their factories."

Outside the Nike factory, Mr. Situmorang continues his vigil, waiting for a court decision on whether he can get his job back. "I've gone to the labor department and the court," he said. He paused and sighed. "I really don't think in the end I will get my job back. This is Indonesia."

#### COMPARING 104TH CONGRESS TO 103D CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of topics we wanted to talk about tonight, and have with me my colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], and we may have others joining us. But what we were going to do is talk about some of the difference between the 103d Congress, the Congress that was here in 1993 and 1994, and contrast that with the current Congress that was elected and began to serve in 1995.

If you look back 2 years ago, which was my first term in Washington, and think about the changes, in 1993 the President had just passed the largest tax increase in the history of the country and then turned around and tried to nationalize or socialize medicine.

At the same time, the bureaucracy did not want to get left out of the action, and OSHA, the Occupational Safe-

ty and Health Administration, came up with a proposal that said if you smoke in your own house and you have a domestic employee, then you must have a smoke ventilator in your own kitchen.

The EEOC, meanwhile, came out with a ruling that one of the most dangerous hazards in the workplace today is religious symbols. So if you were working at the Ford plant and you had a "Jesus saves" T-shirt on, or if you had a necklace that had a Star of David, that was offensive. EEOC decided it was time to go after those dog-gone religious symbols in the workplace. That was the kind of thing that we had going on in the 103d Congress.

Now, contrast that with the 104th Congress. We have a Congress that has cut staff by one-third, reduced its operating expenses by \$67 million, and put Congress and all of its Members under the same workplace laws as the private sector.

Now instead of debating should we reform welfare, we are debating how to reform welfare; instead of debating should we balance the budget, we are debating how to balance the budget. And when the crisis with Medicare came that was pointed out to us by a bipartisan committee, this Congress did the responsible thing and acted to protect and preserve it.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, is night and day compared to that that was the 103d Congress. But we have our criticism. A lot of the criticism comes from the press and its allies over at the White House, Mr. Clinton. What we were going to do tonight is talk about some of the criticism.

Education, apparently Republicans do not have children, we do not care if they get educated or not. Seniors, apparently we all came from test tubes and none of us have moms or dads and we do not care what happens to their Social Security or Medicare, according to the President. Of course, the environment, we want to pave Old Faithful and level the Rocky Mountains.

But what is really going on with these issues, Mr. Speaker? We want to talk a little bit about the environment tonight, we want to talk a little bit about taxes and the middle class, and we will continue through a series of discussions to talk about some of these other issues.

I will yield the floor to Mr. HAYWORTH at this time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Georgia. I am heartened by the fact that other colleagues from the majority join us tonight to talk about a variety of topics.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct. There could not be a greater difference in Government than the difference that exists between the 103d Congress, held captive by the proponents of big Government and more and more centralized planning and more and more taxation and more and more spending, and those of us now in the majority in the 104th Congress, unafraid to offer Amer-

ica, Mr. Speaker, a clear, commonsense approach to Government, an approach which really beckons and harkens back to our founders, an approach typified in the first act this Congress passed, which simply said this: Members of Congress should live under the same laws every other American lives under.

Indeed, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, with a litany of progress on a variety of issues, there is one inescapable fact that we confront at this juncture in the second session of the 104th Congress, and that is the criticism, the carping, the complaining, of liberals, both in this city and nationwide, of the powerful special interests who have as their mission in life the maintenance of the welfare state, the maintenance and enhancement and growth of centralized planning; those disciples of big Government who now would criticize the new commerce in this new majority and paint our agenda, indeed, our contract for America, as somehow being extreme.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to point to this simple fact: The only thing extreme about the agenda of the new majority is the fact that it makes extremely good sense.

I take, for example, the comments of my friend from Georgia, who talked about the fact that in the wake of the 1992 election the incoming President, as one of his first acts, chose to proposed and this Chamber approved by one vote the largest tax increase in American history. Emboldened by that victory, our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue worked in secret to devise a plan of government, that is to say, socialized medicine.

The American people said "Enough," and in November 1994 gave this new Congress a mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I can vouch as one who watched with interest my colleague from Georgia and my other colleagues here who served in the 103d Congress and served valiantly to point out the absurdity of the extremism of those who always endorse the liberal welfare state, I saw with my eyes their valiant efforts.

□ 2115

But more importantly, through the votes of the good people of the United States of America with a new majority, we have moved to do simple things, ironically, the same things that a candidate for the Presidency, who was ultimately elected in 1992, talked about. My friend from Georgia remembers this well. Remember the campaign rhetoric: I will balance the budget in 5 years?

Mr. KINGSTON. Larry King Live, June 4, 1992.

Mr. HAYWORTH. My friend from Georgia offers the attribution. And if he would continue to yield, we would know that the President has had to be persuaded by Members of his own party to offer a phantom budget that would come into balance in 7 years, and using a personal analogy that I am sure my friend from Georgia can appreciate,