

many committees of Congress in both bodies and everyone working in the same direction.

We also must look at how we are spending these resources, and when you see that most of the drug treatment and abuse programs, at the very end, they are failures. Very few of them have any success rate whatsoever. Then the international program is 2.34 percent, and you dismantle an interdiction program at this critical juncture, you are making a mistake as far as your priorities. It has to be interdiction, enforcement, education, and there must be treatment also.

Mr. ZELIFF. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the things we are finding out in Manchester, NH, again I cite Peter Favreau, who has done a great job along with the Federal, State, and local agencies that have worked with him. But we have worked with courageous people in the school systems. You can put a policeman in a school yard but we have to get inside the schools, work with the kids and be role models.

It is not just the President, it is all of us individually. We have got to get the media to wake up and pay attention to this. We have got to start talking to parents. Parents have to start talking to their kids. Business people have to be involved, communities have to be involved. We have to reconnect with basic values. If we do not, we are going to lose big time and we will not have anything left.

It is time now, and hopefully with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], you might just describe what we ultimately want to try to do here. We are trying to bring it all together to show to everybody the importance of this issue, and we really appreciate your effort.

Mr. HASTERT. Reclaiming my time, we have used the word "balance" a number of times, but this is a balance purely between supply and demand. We have to do our part. We promised those Presidents and those Congresses in those Central American countries of Mexico and Panama, and certainly in the Andean countries of Colombia and Bolivia and Peru, that we would work in our country to try to hold down that demand.

That is partly a result of the government. If we take this chart, we can see that from basically 1980 the demand for drugs, the kids' usage of drugs in this country had fallen rapidly until 1992. All of a sudden, the demand for drugs and the use of drugs goes up.

This chart here shows exactly what happens. Twelfth graders, in 1980 the use started to go down. In 1992, it went up. Tenth graders, it went up. Eighth graders, it went up. I am sure if you have a chart there, you will find that sixth and fourth graders' use went up too.

We have to change from a government that used to say "just say no," and we had good results during that time, to a government which has lately

just said nothing, and we need to work and develop that as a huge issue in this country. Parents, and as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] said, everybody has to work together. I am sure we can get the job done, but it has to be a country effort. And we have to work in those countries that produce this, work with their governments, work with their presidents who are willing to work with this country and try to eradicate the supply side of this, as well.

You can see in these charts it is there. They are doing it. They are doing it today. Farmers are planting cocaine seedlings on sides of mountains, under the brush in Bolivia and Peru, and we have to help stop that.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I am not necessarily known as "Mr. Internationalist." In fact, I authored with the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] an amendment that said unless Mexico worked harder in this effort, that we were going to cut off funding and support. I have been critical of a number of the trade missions.

One thing I have seen, and we did not shy away from communicating this to them, that all the issues that we are dealing with are related to narcotics in our country. At the same time we need to acknowledge that we have leaders around the world, as you said earlier, who are committed to democracy, who need our support, or we are going to lose the best chance for freedom around the world.

Mr. HASTERT. In closing, I thank all the gentlemen who have worked on this, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ZELIFF, who has taken the lead in committee, our friend from Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, and of course my friend from Florida, Mr. MICA. I thank the gentlemen.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to the well to talk about an issue really of great importance for working middle-class families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise. I call on Speaker GINGRICH to take a pause from the Republican revolution and allow the people's House to vote on raising the minimum wage now.

The Nation's minimum wage today is a paltry \$4.25 an hour. I am proud to join with my Democratic colleagues and President Clinton to sponsor legislation to boost this wage to \$5.15. It is the least we can do.

Hard working American families need a break. The minimum wage has lost 27 percent of its value over the past

15 years, and now stands at a 40-year low. It buys less groceries. It buys less gasoline. It buys less clothes for the children of these hard working families than it has in four decades.

These statistics are particularly troubling considering the fact that corporate CEO salaries have risen at the fast clip of 9 percent a year since 1990. In fact, last year the median compensation for CEO's was a staggering \$2 million a year. That's more than 200 times the salary of a minimum wage worker.

A recent poll in my home State of Connecticut shows that a full 80 percent of the people support raising the minimum wage—four out of five Connecticut residents favor this measure. A New York Times poll reports that 94 percent of Democrats, 86 percent of Independents, and even 71 percent of Republicans support raising the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour.

Yesterday, a brave group of my Republican colleagues joined the Democratic call for a vote on this issue. I congratulate my colleagues for having the courage to challenge Speaker GINGRICH's wrongful opposition to giving minimum wage workers a modest raise in pay. But the bottom line is the Republican leadership refuses to bring this legislation to a vote. It's all talk and no action. The Republican leader has said the minimum wage increase will come to this floor over his dead body.

This morning's Congress Daily reports Speaker GINGRICH's latest cynical ploy to stiff working Americans. "We're going to look at it," Speaker GINGRICH is quoted as saying, "There should be hearings."

Hearings. The revolutionary Republican leaders just 3 days ago wanted to rewrite the U.S. Constitution without a single hearing.

Hearings. The revolutionary Republicans last year passed \$270 billion in Medicare cuts to pay for tax breaks for their rich political contributors—all without a single hearing. And now that the American people are making their voices heard in support of raising the minimum wage, Speaker GINGRICH promises hearings.

Talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, and so is the minimum wage. So too unfortunately is the cynical way the Republican leadership is treating this modest proposal. Forget the hearings. I call on Speaker GINGRICH to allow this House to vote to raise the minimum wage now. It is a no-brainer. We should do it without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, a livable wage is not exactly a revolutionary concept, but the American people need a raise nonetheless. If we are truly to move people from welfare to work, we must make work pay.

A great American once said, "No man can be a good citizen unless he has a wage more than sufficient to cover the bare costs of living . . . so that after his day's work is done he will have time and energy to bear his share in the management of the community,

to help in carrying the general load." Which great American said that? Theodore Roosevelt, the former Republican President of the United States. He was not a revolutionary, but he did understand progress.

Workers who earn the minimum wage pocket only \$8,500 a year. That is less than Members of this Congress made when they shut down the Government over Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, working American families do not ask for much. They work hard. They pay their bills. They play by the rules. They are not looking for a revolution. All they want is a little progress.

America needs a raise. I call on the House Republican leadership to stop the stalling tactics and allow the people's House to vote on raising the minimum wage. Now.

□ 1700

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, it might be of interest in the context that you have just established in regard to the minimum wage to note that the State of Hawaii already has a minimum wage at \$5.25. We were an economy in Hawaii based on agriculture. We have moved into one of the most service-oriented economies it is possible to have; that is to say, a dependence on travel and tourism.

Yet the argument is always made that if you are in a service economy, you have to keep wages at an absolute minimum. If you are in an agriculture economy, you have to keep wages at an absolute minimum. Yet the prosperity of the State of Hawaii has been based upon the fact that we recognized that people who are working, families that have to work, are best able not just to survive, but to prosper, when they are able to earn more than just a living wage, more than just an adequate wage, but a wage which enables them to fully participate in the economy.

That economy is invested in by the very people who are doing the work. The money stays in the area where it is earned. It is not taken by multinational companies, by international companies, elsewhere. It is not moved into a global economy as such.

That money earned in that State, whether it is Connecticut, whether it is in Hawaii, whether it is anyplace, whether it is in Georgia, in Cobb County, in Mr. GINGRICH's home district, that money stays in that district. That money is invested in that district. Small business people make money in that district as a result of it.

Those kinds of wages, the minimum wage, in service oriented jobs, when it is earned, is spent in the clothing store to buy shoes for the children right there in the local community. That is where it goes. The small investor, the small businesses, are the direct beneficiary of the raise in the minimum wage.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his

comments. It just makes good sense, and he is absolutely right. The money that is earned stays in the community. The purchases are made in the community, and it helps that local economy to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE BENEFICIAL TO ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to continue the discussion on the minimum wage. I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, which is directly responsible for the minimum wage, and I am certainly delighted that I hear rumors that suddenly there are manifestations taking place within both the House and the Senate, which means that our great logjam on the minimum wage may soon be broken.

I understand there are some Members of the Republican majority in this House who have begun developing a bill calling for an increase in the minimum wage, and this may lead to the call we hoped for for a long time. There are moments in this House when reason does prevail. There are times when parties lay aside their particular ideological bents and understand the best interests of the American people are served by a particular course of action and the two parties come together.

I hope we are on the way to doing that. I hope the Republicans will recognize that there is a terrible injustice that has been done to working people over the last 20 years. We have a wage gap that is increasing. The value of the dollar has fallen, the minimum wage value has fallen, and we should take steps to do something about that as soon as possible.

As the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Workplace Protections, I chaired a hearing on the minimum wage increase on Thursday, November 30 of last year. I invited several people to come. One of them was the minority leader for the Democrats, Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. GEPHARDT's testimony summarizes it very well.

That testimony I think is such that it would be good to quote it here again, because it does summarize very well where we are and it talks about where we should be going. Mr. GEPHARDT is the sponsor of the prime legislation that is now introduced in the House on increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. CLAY together are calling for a minimum wage increase of 45 cents per year for 2 years. We are talking about a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage over a 2-year period. This is a very modest increase, and the President has endorsed the increase, and indeed held a press conference at the White House where he announced that endorsement.

I just want to read some excerpts from the testimony of the Democrat minority leader, Mr. RICHARD GEPHARDT.

I would ask unanimous consent to include for the RECORD the statement in its entirety. I would like to note that I have requested unanimous consent on a few documents and they have not been entered in their entirety. In addition to entering this in its entirety, I will comment on it now. I would like at the end of the presentation to have it entered in its entirety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. GEPHARDT said "I want to thank you for holding this important hearing—for realizing that, even as many Republican call for the outright abolition of the minimum wage—even as they refuse to schedule real hearings or a vote on a minimum wage increase—it is an issue we simply cannot ignore."

I might emphasize that we have repeatedly called for hearings in the committee. I am on the committee of jurisdiction. Just yesterday we called for hearings again on the minimum wage, and so far have had no response from the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the committee.

Quoting Mr. GEPHARDT, "Real wages for all working people have been declining in this country for 20 years; some economists believe it is our longest and steepest income slide since 1820.

"And the people at the bottom of the income scale have been doing the worst. Between 1983 and 1989, two-thirds of all new wealth created in the United States went to the top 1 percent of American households. The bottom 80 percent actually saw their assets drop by about 3 percent. No wonder America has the greatest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized nation in the world."

Continuing to quote from the statement by the minority leader, "That is why we must question the wisdom of the Republicans' supply-side revival, which would shower more tax breaks on the wealthy, while raising taxes on the poorest working families, and making huge cuts in Medicare, student loans, and education. The Republican agenda would actually make America's income gap much worse.

"Democrats have a different philosophy. We believe in valuing and encouraging work—not passive profit and speculation. We believe in making work pay, and making sure that no working family has to live in poverty and deprivation. That's why, early this year, President Clinton joined with Congressional Democrats to propose a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage over the next 2 years—a way to lift up millions of hard-working families who have been falling behind."

Continuing to quote Minority Leader GEPHARDT, "Even before we announced

this proposal, it came under fierce attack by Republicans who see stagnant wages and eroding job security not as problems, but as the solutions to their ultimate goal: "Helping those at the top of the economic ladder, even while they're sawing off the bottom rungs. Why else would Republicans propose a tax plan that cuts taxes by \$8,500 a year for the top 1 percent of families, while raising taxes on the poorest working families by slashing the earned income tax-credit, cutting back on one of the best ways for struggling families to lift themselves into the middle class:

"The fact is, for the millions of Americans who try to support a family on the minimum wage, real wages have plummeted by 30 percent since 1979.

"We're not talking about a bunch of kids working at summer jobs. The fact is one-third of America's 4.8 million minimum wage earners are the sole earners in their families. Seventy percent of them are adults. They are now faced with the virtually impossible task of raising a family on \$8,700 a year. In fact, one in five of them are still living below the poverty line.

"Is that the message we want to send to working America? That you can work hard, and take responsibility for your family, and still live in poverty and deprivation?

"That is why it's time to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents. It's a matter of fundamental fairness. It's a matter of basic decency for those at the bottom of the ladder, struggling to climb up. But there are other reasons to support this proposal.

"Raising the minimum wage would help make work pay more than welfare—and too often, that's just not the case today.

"Republicans keep saying a minimum wage increase will cost jobs. But it has been proven time and again that raising the minimum wage won't cost jobs. The last time we raised the minimum wage, Republican Members of the House said it would be a 'death warrant * * * for small business,' and that it would destroy jobs, increase the Federal deficit, and raise inflation. It did none of those things.

"On the contrary, recent research—including a study of noted economists David Card and Alan Krueger—shows that a minimum wage increase has little or no effect on the number of jobs. Since when it is bad for our economy to put more money in the pockets of our workers and families and consumers?

"And it has been proven that raising the minimum wage pushes up wages for millions who already earn more than the minimum wage today.

"Republican leaders have already pledged to fight this increase, as they have resisted similar increases in the past. Republican Leader DICK ARMEY does not merely oppose an increase—he wants to abolish the minimum wage altogether. To the Republicans, lower wages—combined with huge corporate

tax breaks—are just money in the bank. Never mind that people are suffering while those profits soar.

"The American people want this increase by overwhelming margins. After too many years of declining wages and opportunities, they deserve it. And Democrats are going to fight to give it to them—because it's right for our economy, and it is right for the hard-working families who are the heart of our country."

I end my quote from the statement made by Minority Leader GEPHARDT on November 30, 1995, at a hearing held by the Democrats on the workplace, Subcommittee on Work Force Protections, which I will include for the RECORD.

TESTIMONY BY HOUSE DEMOCRATIC LEADER RICHARD A. GEPHARDT IN SUPPORT OF MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, HEARING OF DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF HOUSE ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1995, 10:00 A.M.

Ranking Member Clay, and Members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities:

I want to thank you for holding this important hearing—for realizing that, even as many Republicans call for the outright abolition of the minimum wage—even as they refuse to schedule real hearings or a vote on a minimum wage increase—it is an issue we simply cannot ignore.

Let's begin at the beginning: America needs a raise.

Real wages for all working people have been declining in this country for twenty years; some economists believe it is our longest, steepest income slide since 1820.

And the people at the bottom of the income scale have been doing the worst. Between 1983 and 1989, two-thirds of all new wealth created in the United States went to the top one percent of American households. The bottom eighty percent actually saw their assets drop by about three percent. No wonder America has the greatest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized nation in the world.

That is why we must question the wisdom of the Republicans' supply-side revival, which would shower more tax breaks on the wealthy, while raising taxes on the poorest working families, and making huge cuts in Medicare, student loans, and education. The Republican agenda would actually make America's income gap much worse.

Democrats have a different philosophy. We believe in valuing and encouraging work—not passive profit and speculation. We believe in making work pay, and making sure that no working family has to live in poverty and deprivation. That's why, early this year, President Clinton joined with Congressional Democrats to propose a ninety-cent increase in the minimum wage over the next two years—a way to lift up millions of hard-working families who have been falling behind.

Even before we announced this proposal, it came under fierce attack by Republicans who see stagnant wages and eroding job security not as problems, but as the solutions to their ultimate goal: helping those at the top of the economic ladder, even while they're sawing off the bottom rungs. Why else would Republicans propose a tax plan that cuts taxes by 8,500 dollars a year for the top one percent of families, while raising taxes on the poorest working families by slashing the Earnest Income Tax Credit, cutting back on one of the best ways for struggling families to lift themselves into the middle class?

The fact is, for the millions of Americans who try to support a family on the minimum wage, real wages have plummeted 30 percent since 1979.

We're not talking about a bunch of kids working at summer jobs. The fact is, one-third of America's 4.8 million minimum wage earners are the *sole* earners in their families. Seventy percent of them are adults. They are now faced with the virtually impossible task of raising a family on \$8,700 a year. In fact, one in five of them are still living below the poverty line.

Is that the message we want to send to working America? That you can work hard, and take responsibility for your family, and still live in poverty and deprivation?

That is why it's time to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents. It's a matter of fundamental fairness. It's a matter of basic decency for those who are at the bottom of the ladder, struggling to climb up. But there are other reasons to support this proposal.

Raising the minimum wage would help make work pay more than welfare—and too often, that's just not the case today.

Republicans keep saying a minimum wage increase will cost jobs. But it has been proven time and again that raising the minimum wage *won't* cost jobs. The last time we raised the minimum wage, Republican Members of the House said it would be a "death warrant . . . for small business," and that it would destroy jobs, increase the federal deficit, and raise inflation. It did none of those things.

On the contrary, recent research—including a study by noted economists David Card and Alan Krueger—shows that a minimum wage increase has little or no effect on the number of jobs. Since when is it bad for our economy to put more money in the pockets of our workers and families and consumers?

And it has been proven that raising the minimum wage pushes up wages for millions who earn *more* than the minimum wage today.

Republican leaders have already pledged to fight this increase, as they have resisted similar increases in the past. Republican Leader Dick Arney does not merely oppose an increase—he wants to demolish the minimum wage altogether. To the Republicans, lower wages—combined with huge corporate tax breaks—are just money in the bank. Never mind that people are suffering while those profits soar.

The American people want this increase by overwhelming margins. After too many years of declining wages and opportunities, they deserve it. And Democrats are going to fight to give it to them—because it's right for our economy, and it's right for the hard working families who are the heart of our country.

Thank you for listening. Now I'm happy to take your questions.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for a statement.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York allowing me to participate in his time and particularly on the issue of the minimum wage.

□ 1715

Also, Mr. Speaker, and to those who are privileged to have heard the reading of the statement from the minority leader, indeed those same issues are as pertinent now as they were then, and it is indeed the fair thing to do, it is the right thing to do, and in the final analysis it is the economical thing to do;

for all of us to have a livable wage so Americans can live better and therefore our economy prosper.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense that a person in America who wants to work, and who has a job and works more than 40 hours a week, can still fall below the poverty level. That is the situation we have under the current minimum wage.

The President has proposed, and many Members are supporting, and even a few Republicans are supporting a modest increase. And I want to repeat, it is a modest increase. Only 90 cents over a period of 2 years, 45 cents per year.

Yes; Mr. Speaker, I know that some in the business community have argued that an increase in the minimum wage will cause many businesses to lay off workers. Yes; I know that some of the business community have maintained that an increase in the minimum wage would cause many businesses to increase the price of their products and their services in order to recoup what they pay the workers who provide services for us.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest and recognize the fact that while, over the course of the past few years, without the minimum wage, we have witnessed the economy prospering. Wall Street is boasting of a great margin of profits, and indeed our economy is moving. But it is not moving for all Americans. And the minimum wage simply says that the average worker also should see their wages go up as well.

In fact, the average wages have stagnated and the minimum wage, indeed, has not moved at all. Mr. Speaker, the value of the minimum wage is now 29 percent lower than it was in 1979. In fact, it has fallen nearly 50 percent in real value since it was last increased. Yet we hear the Republicans say, "Well, you had 2 years and you have not done it". Well, this may be the time we should go ahead and do it. Simply because we have not done it does not mean it should not be done now. That is why workers who work full time, 40 hours a week and more, are not able to provide, because the value of that has decreased over 50 percent in real value in the last few years.

And who are these people we are talking about? And by the way, why should we, those of us who make over \$130,000, despair of other people getting a 50-cent increase? It is unbelievable that we have the gall, the arrogance, to be so uncaring about people.

Who are these workers we care about, Mr. Speaker? They are our fathers, our mothers, our children, our neighbors, their friends. Two-thirds of them are adults in working families, and only one-third of them are actually teenagers, which we hear thrown out as an excuse.

We also hear the excuse there are so few of them. Well, we are concerned about the top few of our economy; why not be concerned about the bottom few

of our economy as well? Forty percent of those who are on minimum wage are the sole providers, the sole providers of their children.

Speaker GINGRICH often has compared this Congress with the New Deal under President Roosevelt, and he apparently is a great admirer of President Roosevelt, as I am; but I want to tell you there is no comparison. The New Deal Congress offered people hope, hope; it did not increase their economic insecurity or anxiety, where we are refusing to give people any hope. We are depressing their opportunity.

In this Congress, the Speaker offers only cynicism and anxiety by attempting to enrich the few at the expense of the poor.

It is unconscionable to me that the majority in control of this Congress would propose a huge tax cut for the wealthiest among us, while simultaneously attempting to eliminate the earned-income tax credit, and at the same time refusing to have any opportunity for increasing the minimum wage, as well as wanting to take Medicaid and other things that help the poor away.

True, Mr. Speaker, these are indeed tough times. Our Nation is faced with a staggering national debt, built up over the past decade, that is threatening to rob our children and our grandchildren. But what will rob our children and our grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, is an inability for their parents and their grandparents to earn for them, rather than to be dependent on welfare.

There is a growing gap between the rich and the poor, creating economic anxiety and fear, that has led many to question their place in society and to look with suspicion and envy at others of us. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, during these tough times, we must always remember the true test of a government is not where we stand when times are easy but, rather, where we stand when times are tough. History recalls how good government has responded during similar times, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, history will certainly ultimately judge this Congress and the this Government.

America has traditionally rewarded work. Why should we not reward work? It is better for us to reward work rather than welfare. If this Congress fails to pass a minimum wage, it would be tantamount to making the will to work a penalty rather than a prize. Reward work, raise the minimum wage. It is the right thing to do. It is the American thing to do.

Thank you, Mr. OWENS for allowing me to participate with you.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, and I wonder if she knows that she has about 11.3 percent of her working population in North Carolina that earns a minimum wage. I wonder if she also knows a lot of fuss has been made about Davis-Bacon and how Davis-Bacon artificially inflates wages. The figures for North Carolina for Davis-Bacon, pre-

vailing wages under Davis-Bacon, are only slightly higher than the minimum wage in North Carolina.

So the gentlewoman has a great depression of wages in her State. It is very interesting.

Mrs. CLAYTON. If the gentleman would yield, as those figures are depressing as a State, I want the gentleman to know that my district is even more disadvantaged because the earned-income tax credit eligibility is higher than it is for my State as a whole. Also, those who are working at lower wages in my district, which is the First Congressional District in North Carolina, again a higher percentage of my workers are working at lower wages.

So this is critical, critical to the survivability of a lot of my families in my district. It is not incidental. Their earned-income tax credit, Medicaid, minimum wage, all of these issues go to whether families in my district—

Mr. OWENS. Some of these people are at the very bottom of the rung. Although they are working, they are at the very bottom in terms of wages and income and were benefiting from the earned income tax credit. You just mentioned that. But not only have the Republicans refused to allow a discussion of an increase in the minimum wage, but they have gone ahead and cut the earned-income tax credit also.

Mrs. CLAYTON. In some instances they wanted to eliminate it. They cut it, but they wanted to eliminate it in many instances.

Mr. OWENS. So there is a kind of war on the poor.

I want to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia and say to her that her State is about the same in terms of the percentage of people who are making only the minimum wage, working people who are earning only the minimum wage, about 11.9 percent in Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Well, I would begin by thanking the gentleman from New York for reserving this time so that we could talk about how America does need a raise, and our constituents, in particular, need to have a raise.

I brought with me a cartoon from the Washington Post, Saturday, April 13. I want to read this cartoon. It says: "The bad news, Johnson, is you are being let go. The good news is you can have your old job back at half your former pay." And then poor Johnson says: "I can't live on that." And then his boss says: "The rest of the good news is we can offer you a second job, also at half your former pay."

The title of this cartoon is job growth. And now at the bottom it says: "I'd offer you a third, but I'm afraid of overheating the economy."

Mr. OWENS. They have been reading Alan Greenspan.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I think this poignantly demonstrates the situation that America's workers are facing today, even those people who had white-collar jobs, who thought that they were secure.

I have a constituent who was employed by IBM, who thought that that was a contract for life employment, and now, of course, finds himself among those others who have been downsized, dispossessed of their dignity, while corporate CEO's, of course, make salaries that even our athletes, our star athletes, begin to blush at.

Last year the heads of about 30 major corporations made 212 times more in compensation than the average American worker. And as we saw in the newspaper yesterday with Mr. Allen, the chairman of AT&T, he said that he really was not prepared to talk about his salary. And we saw him on "60 Minutes"; "60 minutes" did a thing, and he was not prepared to talk about his salary.

But, of course, what about those 43,000 who were downsized. What do they face? The fate that they face is jobs at half the pay, sometimes. If they are lucky, it is at half the pay of what they were formerly making.

I have another chart here. This is a quote from our right honorable majority leader. He says the minimum wage is a very destructive thing. I will resist a minimum wage increase with every fiber in my being.

Now, I do not know about my sister and my brother, my sister from North Carolina, my brother from New York, but I cannot imagine leadership of the United States of America that would resist giving people who are working every day—

Mrs. CLAYTON. Fifty cents.

Mr. OWENS. Forty-five cents.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Yes, 45 cents.

Ms. MCKINNEY. A dollar. Because now we have some Republicans who have said, well, we are willing to support a dollar increase in the minimum wage. I would suggest just with my last little quote here from my charts—

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield for just a minute?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I will.

Mr. OWENS. Most Americans do not realize that this is not a budget issue. An increase in the minimum wage will not cost the taxpayers a single penny. We are not talking about the Government paying an increase in the minimum wage. It is the people working out there for employers in the private sector who would receive the wages. It is not an item we put in the budget to increase the minimum wage. So we are not talking about downsizing the Government or helping to get rid of the deficit. We are talking about a humane action to make it possible for every American to pursue happiness.

The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence talk about the right to pursue happiness. They need to have a decent wage before they can pursue happiness.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But this is the same group of people who want welfare reform, and they want to kick people off of welfare and send them to work, but they want to send them to work at a job that does not even sustain a decent living.

Mr. OWENS. I think \$8,400 a year is what the present minimum wage comes out to. Eight thousand four hundred dollars a year. And we just pointed out about 4 million of these people are the sole wage earners in their families.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Kevin Phillips, a conservation political analyst, said the 104th Congress may be the worst in 50 years. Now, can you imagine that we are presiding over something that is going down in history, but going down in history the wrong way?

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield to correct that? We are not presiding over it.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is true.

Mr. OWENS. There is a Republican majority in power for the first time; they are presiding over it.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you very much for the correction. Perhaps this is one way that they can get on the right side of history, by doing something that is a moral obligation to working Americans so that they can at least go to work every day and then come home and not have to live in poverty.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I certainly will.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I think you are right, it is the moral thing to do. And so often we hear values about family and we hear values about trust and honesty and decency. Well, how we really cause families to unite is to give them the resources to be self-sufficient. And the best welfare reform to take away dependency is to have sufficient income to take care of yourself.

□ 1730

So that is indeed the right thing, the moral thing, the American thing, but in addition to that, this money goes right back into the economy. Why? Because people want to provide food, they want to provide shelter, they want to provide clothing. So this is not money that is going to be taken out. This money generates consumers who are purchasing services that they cannot purchase now; so this idea that it will be detrimental to the economy because it will reduce jobs, and think the comment that Congressman OWENS read earlier from the minority leader referenced a couple of studies that were made, one in New Jersey and the other in Pennsylvania, where they actually studied that there were increasing jobs. Why? Because there were demand for greater service. Philadelphia did not waste theirs, Pennsylvania did not raise theirs, New Jersey did raise theirs. New Jersey increased jobs; Pennsylvania did not.

In fact in my State, North Carolina, when they raised the minimum wage the last time, indeed there was a slowing of jobs. But when you looked at over a period of a year, that increase came back in, and I would ask some farmers, the minimum wage is, said you know what we have found out: you cannot keep good workers at the mini-

mum wage. So people understand if you are going to sustain your company, you have to have a stable work force that you can depend on so it is good for the economy, it is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do.

And I agree with you. We do not want to be a part of a Congress that would be held accountable because I said earlier history records what we do and tough times, and indeed these are tough times, but there are a lot of people who are having tough times that government should give some hope to. The minimum wage gives just a little of that. Does not give a lot, but we should do that.

Mr. OWENS. I think it is important to point out at this point that I said earlier that there are rumors that the Republicans or some Members who are beginning to generate a bill calling for an increase in the minimum wage. In fact, the increase, as you pointed out, they are calling for a 50 cent per year for 2 years which means maybe a \$1 increase.

I welcome that, and I hope that the American voters out there will also begin to encourage their Congressmen, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, to go forward. We need this increase.

And some of the brightest moments of my 14 years here in Congress have been the times, all too few, when Republicans and Democrats have come together on something that makes sense. We did it in terms of sanctions against South Africa, very tough sanctions against South Africa. We did it to pass the law which created the Martin Luther King birthday. We have done it on the occasion of the Americans With Disabilities Act; you know, Republicans and Democrats coming together to do something that makes sense and benefits large numbers of people.

In the next few days and weeks nothing would make me happier than to see the Republicans join us and do the right thing. You know, let us go forward on a minimum wage increase.

Mrs. CLAYTON. My understanding is that the minimum wage has been traditionally a bipartisan. In fact, Speaker GINGRICH has voted for the minimum wage. Senator DOLE has voted for the minimum wage. Why not now vote for it? You are right. Why cannot we join in that bipartisan effort, because when you look at who has been voting for the minimum wage, they are already. So why you at this time are refusing to do the right thing which you already have done? History has reported you have had a vote on the minimum wage, and they voted for it. So why not now? Is this just a political effort? People are suffering, so they need that effort, and I agree with you. It would be the right thing to do, and the Republicans have a bill that says a dollar, I think the dollar is better than 45 cents. I certainly would want to join that.

Mr. OWENS. People in the poorest parts of my district would welcome an increase of 45 cents or 50 cents. We

really need more. They do not care where it comes from Republicans or Democrats. There are people who are suffering that need that increase in the minimum wage.

Ms. MCKINNEY. To deny an increase in the minimum wage and also to cut the earned income tax credit is nothing other than mean, and that is not the kind of government that the American people deserve, and I know that is not what they voted for.

Mr. OWENS. I think it is very important to note that 20 percent of those living on the minimum wage the last time it was raised in 1991 were in poverty. An additional 13 percent were near poverty. In 1993 the President expanded the earned income tax credit which we noted the Republicans have tried to cut out completely, but they certainly decreased, and it raised income to 15 million families that helped many working families move above the poverty line. Yet to complete the goal of insuring the full-time working families, getting them out of poverty, we need to raise the minimum wage.

Recent analysis by the economic policy institute and preliminary work by the Department of Health and Human Services suggest that 300,000 people would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage was raised to \$5.15 an hour we are proposing. The figure includes 100,000 children who are currently living in poverty. The current poverty line for a family of four is \$15,600. A family of four with one worker earning \$4.25 an hour and working full-time year round earn \$8,500, and they will receive a tax credit of \$3,400 under the 1996 provisions of the earned income tax credit. They would collect food stamps worth \$3,516 and would pay \$615 in payroll taxes out of what they earn. This family would end up \$834 below the poverty line.

With all that help, they go to work every day, they get the help from the food stamps, they get the earned income tax credit, they are still \$835 below the poverty line.

On the other hand for a family of four with one worker earning \$10,000, \$300 a year, that would be a full-time worker on \$5.15 an hour after the increase takes place. The EITC, the earned income tax credit, would provide the maximum tax credit of \$3,560, food stamps would provide \$2,876, and they would pay \$788 and payroll taxes. The increase in the minimum wage, along with EITC and food stamps would lift this family out of poverty. A family of four with those kinds of, that kind of, assistance, plus working every day would be lifted out of poverty.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is certainly an inducement to those who would want to get off welfare but who find welfare more attractive because working every day pays less than welfare in some places. This is an inducement for those people who want to work to go to work and then to be able to live a decent life at the end of their work.

Mr. OWENS. Now the problem is we have a kind of elite minority decadent

reasoning that takes place. Even though it does not cost the government one penny, the elite minority reasoning is that you do not want to do anything which might lessen the profits of the people who are making all the money already.

The corporations are making tremendous amounts of money. We are in a boom cycle. You got a bull stock market, you know. Why are they watching so closely to see to it that the bottom line should be kept so low? Why are they trying to keep our wages in this country at the same level of the wages in Bangladesh or China, Mexico? Or why are they trying to bring down the American workers? Why not let everybody share in the prosperity?

We have this kind of decadence that has been made into a very complicated philosophy. We have Alan Greenspan adding to this decadent economics. But Alan Greenspan argues that whenever you have unemployment up, that is good because it means that it keeps inflation in check, but unemployment goes down, it is bad because inflation will increase because the number of workers out there, if the supply is less than the demand, and when the supply is less than the demand and the workplace that drives up the ability of the wages because the workers can negotiate for higher level of wages.

So our Federal Reserve has been pursuing a policy of keeping wages low, keeping unemployment high. You know, we have the body that is set up to promote prosperity for everybody, deliberately joining forces with the kind of reasoning that says wages should be kept at the present level or not increased in order to keep down the amount of money paid by corporations to the lowest-level workers in America.

These are decadent institutions they must be challenged head on. The American people need to understand. We recently had Mr. Greenspan up for reappointment, and he sailed through. Everybody agrees that Alan Greenspan should be reappointed. And he is the great untouchable on the Federal Reserve Board. But I think we better stop and take a look at the policies being promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board, especially since that same Federal Reserve Board which is responsible for keeping our economy well managed, for seeing to it that we have policies which promote prosperity, for seeing to it that we minimize waste, that same Federal Reserve Board was found by the GAO to have \$3.7 point billion in a slush fund. They have \$3.7 billion lying around that they are not using that they have not returned to the Treasury. If we had that \$3.7 billion in the Treasury, the deficit would be decreased by \$3.7 billion.

Why is the Federal Reserve holding on to the money? I have an answer, Mr. Greenspan, but the General Accounting Office points out they say they keep the money for a rainy day, they keep the money in case their operations, which are quite huge, they earn money

on the interest they charge the banks, they earn money on the services they provide the banks.

In the last 79 years they have never had a rainy day, the last 79 years they have never had a loss, never broken even. They always have a surplus, but the surplus is now increased to the point where it is \$3.7 billion.

Now, Mr. Greenspan is in charge of this, the same mentality that says keep unemployment up, keep wages low, also said that, "I need \$3.7 billion around in my slush fund just because I might have a rainy day."

We ought to do something about that. The American people ought to listen closely to what is happening. You know, it is just like what happened in another one of those sacred cow agencies, the CIA; they found \$2 billion lying around in a petty cash slush fund of the CIA, you know. If we get all of these slush funds cleaned out, you know, we could balance the budget properly.

You know, my friend from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, has done a study, and she shows that the debts owed to the U.S. Government by the Farmers Home Loan Mortgage, which is one of the worst perpetrators, and many others, section A, the royalties that are due by companies that are supposed to pay, oil companies that are supposed to pay royalties to the Government, when you add it all up, there is \$55 billion out there uncollected that, if we were to pursue with more zeal, we could get that money, help balance the budget, and we would not be talking about keeping the economy in check with inflation so that it can generate for profits; hopefully those profits would be taxed, and that is the way we get our revenue.

Let us bring down the deficit. Let us take care of the minimum wage. Let us begin to manage our economy better, and let us not have a balancing of the budget, a driving of the economy by shortchanging the people who are at the very bottom who are earning the minimum wage. It is a decadent scenario that ought to be challenged by every fair-thinking American.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to add, too, it has been usually the principle that we have been working on that would reward work, that productivity is a factor of the profit, and that we reward that when the productivity goes up and the profit goes up, you share that with the workers. But somehow the wages have been stagnant even for those who are not at the minimum wage; I mean those who are middle income. The wages have been stagnant at the same time the profit has been going up. So the productivity, which is a factor of that high profit, is not necessarily a benefit of the workers, and we need to change that principle, as well, also.

The other principle we need to change, it seems to me, is that America is a country of great opportunity. It is the entrepreneurship and the opportunity to work that should give

hope to all of us that we always will work harder, train and be better skilled to get the next job. However, when we give messages that create such a disparity between the top 5 percent and the lower 5 percent, and it is growing, it is growing and we seem not to even concern ourselves about that, I mean the distance between the richest of the individuals in America and the poorest of the individuals is larger now than ever before, and yet at the same time we are having great profit, great productivity. You would think that that would inure to the workers as well. Just as you share the profit with your stockholders, you reward people for doing a good job; they get an increase.

And also the minimum wage should move up. And by the way, the cost of living has gone up rather than wages now, so it is costing the people to get a gallon of milk or bread or Medicare; all of those things that they must provide for their families, that is going up.

Ms. MCKINNEY. And in order for the minimum wage to have the same purchasing power as it did in the 1970's, it would need to be \$6.07 an hour. So when you talk about purchasing power and inflation, it has eroded the minimum wage, the purchasing power of the minimum wage.

□ 1745

Mrs. CLAYTON. We are not talking about even taking people up to purchasing power, as you have indicated. This is just the beginning of the process.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct. I would just like to say something about the notion of a social good. At some point we have got to start thinking about the community. We have got to think about the community that is America.

I know we went through the 1980's, and the 1980's was the "I-me" decade. We are seeing the fruits of that now. The fruits of that, as you have correctly pointed out, is the fact that we have got concentration of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer Americans. They are getting more and more and more of the pie. The rest of us are being left out.

At some point when you have productivity increases, you would think that America as a whole, the community, would grow as a result of that productivity growth. But what we have seen is that we have got this "winner take all," and the winner is the CEO and those folks who are in that orbit. They get everything, and can even get rewarded by laying people off, by putting people on the streets, by telling them "We don't need you anymore."

At some point we also have to think about the dignity of work and how people define themselves and their self-worth by what they do in life. If they have nothing to cling to because their commitment that they thought they had with their company, with their corporation, has been broken, not for

the social good, not for America's good but for the good of individual people, one or two people get all of the results, all of the rewards, and they have to pay the price.

At some point America and Americans have to wake up and say that it is one thing to be an individual who can soar to the top, but there is also some emptiness in being at the top if everyone else beneath you is way down at the bottom. We all can soar, and that is what is so good about this country, is that there is room for everybody, if the value is there that includes everybody.

Mrs. CLAYTON. That is what America was built on. Give me your weak and your frail.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. This is what the Statue of Liberty is all about. That is why people want to come to America, for a better opportunity to live. So the quality of life adds to that community spirit, and also the quality of life and the community spirit adds to the stability in our communities.

When you find the family down the street who has no economic stake in that community, pretty soon he becomes a factor of the criminal element that finds themselves not feeling they need to protect you either. So we need to see how we keep our families together by ensuring that they have the resources to take care of themselves. That also will help stabilize our community as a place that is caring and protective.

We are all in this boat together. We are all in this American boat together. Obviously someone with greater skills is going to be rewarded but, as the gentlewoman said, we should be equally concerned for those who are at least among us, because their quality of life helps our quality of life.

Mr. OWENS. I thoroughly agree with both of my colleagues. We have a moral duty, and we are charged as public officials by our Constitution to promote the general welfare.

If you look at it in hard, cold terms in terms of promoting the general welfare, Henry Ford was a smart man. He might have had some problems with unions, et cetera, but he came to the reality that if he is going to sell his cars in large amounts, he has got to pay his workers enough wages to buy his cars, and that is just plain old American common sense.

We have serious problems in our economy right now with consumer spending. The retail establishments are suffering. Why they are suffering is because the people on the bottom, from the bottom up, are the ones who spend the money in the stores because they need immediate necessities. They need food, clothing, shelter, they need refrigerators, they need the kinds of things that you buy from our stores.

The people at the very top who are drawing large amounts of profits from Wall Street, they are the rich and the famous who pick up and travel around

the world, and spend their money all over the world and buy real estate all over the world, buy diamonds, jewels, and certain kinds of things that do not feed back into the economy. They do not turn the money over.

The great locomotive of the free world economy has been the American consumer. We are about to destroy the American consumer and end the great economy that has fed the free world for all these many years. If you do not have those consumers with basically good salaries on a steady basis, then you are going to take the heart out of what drives our economy.

Other economies recognize this more so than we do. A higher standard of living of workers now is not in America. It is in Germany. Japan, with all of its economic difficulties, has a far lower rate of unemployment than America. Japan does things to protect its workers, and its workers are considered a large part of its middle class.

Japan does not have to spend large amounts of money on prisons, on crime prevention or crime detection. They do not have to spend large sums of money on drug rehabilitation and drug-related crimes. They do not spend almost any money on guns and the results of people being destroyed, mangled, injured by guns. We have got something like 16,000 people killed by guns 2 years ago. The statistics are complete. At the same time less than 100 people were killed by guns in Japan.

A more stable society, including gun control laws, by the way, a more stable society with a middle class preserved. We criticize Japan a lot about the way they resist our imports coming in. They have all kinds of tricks to slow down the flow of goods from the outside because they protect each industry, the middlemen and all the folks down at every level in their economy to maintain a middle class. The biggest part of that middle class are the workers in the factories who earn wages which are good enough to make it unnecessary for them to have to have EITC or food stamps or all the other benefits that we have to generate as a result of our failure to pay our workers.

In Japan, in Germany, in France, in all of the industrialized nations, the executives, the chief executive officers and the middle management earn far less than the chief executives in the United States corporations. Far less. You will have to look for a long time to find a chief executive officer in Japan who was paid more than \$1 million in compensation last year. You might find a few more in Germany but you will not find them in Japan.

Let us make a comparison. If Majority Leader ARMEY is really interested in doing what is good for the economy instead of saying he wants to abolish and eliminate minimum wage, let us put some kind of hold on the unbridled, forever escalating amount of money that the chief executive officers of corporations are earning. Of course the

chief executive officer earns, what is it, the top guy is \$20 something million. AT&T or Disney, I forget, somebody is past \$20 million in compensation per year.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I saw a newspaper article from I believe the Washington Post about a company called Greentree, and that CEO was being compensated at around \$60 million. It is absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. OWENS. \$60 million. Oh, that is an aberration, most of them are at around \$20 or \$15 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Nowhere in Japan will you ever find anybody earning \$60 million or \$20 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It is absolutely incredible. Two hundred and twelve times more in compensation than the average American worker.

Mr. OWENS. Let us take care of our economy. Mr. Greenspan wants to take up inflation. Seems to me Mr. Greenspan would address his concern to inflated salaries at the top levels, and deal not so much and scrutinize not so much the wages paid to people at the very bottom.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman and the gentlewoman would recall the arguments around NAFTA, do you remember that some people were saying that if we pass NAFTA and NAFTA becomes law, that American standards then would become global standards? So we did not have to fear about workers' wages going down, because workers' wages would go up. We did not have to fear about environmental standards going down because environmental standards were going up.

I do not know that that has been the experience.

Mr. OWENS. Just the opposite has happened. The common denominator is becoming the prison laborer in China, the workers in Bangladesh, the workers in Mexico. The philosophy behind the assertion by the Republican majority that we need to keep our wages low is that in order to be competitive, the lowest wages in the world is what we are competing with. So just the opposite has happened as a result of GATT and NAFTA. We are pulling down the standards of the American workers.

I thank my colleagues for joining me on the special order on minimum wage. I hope everybody understands we are moving forward and common sense will prevail. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will soon join us in increasing the minimum wage.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 18, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

CALL FOR AN INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the increase in the minimum wage. As probably has been mentioned on the floor here this afternoon, if an individual works full time, he or she brings home \$8,400 a year. In a family of 4, if you have two wage earners working full time at the present minimum wage, they make, well, we can do the math, under \$17,000 a year. How could it be that in a country this great and this decent that we do not pay a living wage to the hard-working people, hardworking families who want to do the best for their children.

We must reward work and we must do it with a decent livable wage. I hope that this Congress will be increasing the minimum wage by at least \$1, which would enable families to buy more groceries. We are talking about the basics.

Another point I want to make about the minimum wage is that by keeping the minimum wage as low as it is, we are increasing the cost to the U.S. taxpayer. We have to provide food stamps, housing assistance, and other assistance to supplement the meager earnings that these people make, even though they are working full time, even welfare benefits I some cases. So this is not about reducing the deficit or anything else. It is about providing adequate rewards to Americans who work.

There has been some discussion in the course of this year about the earned income tax credit. I believe that the cuts that were proposed for American working families were wrong. Our colleagues on the other side will say, no, we kept it in there. We kept it in for some but not for all of the people who were working, hoping to have families and contribute to our country.

We have and we need an earned income tax credit because we have this artificially low minimum wage. The American taxpayer is subsidizing American business with food stamps, housing assistance, earned income tax credit, because we have such a low minimum wage.

I saw a cartoon in the paper that I want to share with my colleagues. On one side it had a woman working for the minimum wage for 1 year, her salary, \$8,400 a year, working full time, and in the other frame was an executive, and the average salary for corporate CEO's in our country would make, in 1 day, some say really in a half a day but let us be generous, in 1 day what this woman was making in 1 year.

□ 1800

Certainly we want to reward success and we want to honor the entrepreneurial spirit. But how could it be OK for us to have one person working 1 day for the same as the average, and I am not talking about the highest, I am talking about the average corporate CEO's salary? I think it is a matter of conscience and decency, and a sign of a great country, that we reward work, we increased the morale of our work force, we give people a chance to take themselves out of poverty by saying we respect you, we respect what you do. We want to give you the dignity that you deserve as a hard-working person in our country. Not by throwing some crumbs to you and making you grovel for other benefits and be disdained for that, but instead by giving you a living wage.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I did not necessarily want the gentlewoman to yield, but I was just thinking about the depth of your feeling and your compassion. It is a shame that we have leadership in this country, leadership that leads this country, that does not feel anything at all about leaving folks who are hard working, who go to work everyday, get up by the clock, punch out by the clock, and they want to leave them behind and leave the embrace of this Government away from them, yet they rush to those who already have.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comment on that. I was particularly concerned the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, said he would fight the increase in the minimum wage with every fiber of his being. He is a good guy. Let us change his mind on that subject and show the support, which has always been bipartisan, has always been bipartisan, for an increase in the minimum wage.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: "MOTIVATE OUR MINDS"

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.

In the Second District of Indiana, there are so many special people striving day and night to make a difference.

These are good people doing good things. And today I rise to commend the volunteers at the "Motivate Our Minds" program in Muncie.

These individuals, Mr. Speaker, are Hoosier heros. Hoosier heros because