

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

they care about our community and care deeply about helping others.

These heroes reach out and lend a helping hand to at-risk schoolchildren.

Motivate Our Minds—MOM's for short—is a very special organization in my hometown of Muncie.

Mr. wife, Ruthie, visited the MOM's program just a few weeks ago. She shared with me the love and friendship the volunteers at the MOM program give to inner city schoolchildren.

MOM's first started in 1987, when two women, Mary Dollison and Raushanah Shabazz (Ra-shanna sa-bez) opened up their home and went to work helping "at risk" schoolchildren.

They knew in their hearts that the key to a bright future for a disadvantaged child is a strong and loving hand to guide them. Special children need motivators.

Mary Dollison knew that when children feel good about themselves they do well in school. They become successful adults, and their contribute positively to their communities.

MOM's has grown from helping 16 students tutored in Mary's home, to providing assistance for more than 69 at-risk students today on East Highland Street.

Mom's teaches at-risk students: "To think they can, until they know they can." Parent volunteers like, Lola McGregor, Ball State students, community leaders, parents, and the children can witness first hand young men and women striving to achieve new goals and forming new hopes and dreams for their own future.

Dedicated volunteers, and the true Hoosier Heroes of the MOM's program. Volunteers, like Wilma Ferguson, a retired school teacher, gives her time and friendship every single week.

Beth Quarles, the office manager, at the MOM program, has worked tirelessly to ensure that the program has the funds and the resources needed to keep the center growing. Frances Garrett makes sure that the students' school projects and their art work is displayed at the center.

Mrs. McGregor has two daughters—LaRessa and LaNeice, who are 5th grade students enrolled in the program. Mrs. McGregor witnessed how the MOM program helped her own daughters and she decided to give something back. She is now one of the top volunteer at the MOM program.

When I was young, I can remember my mom tacking my drawings and assignments to the refrigerator door—it was something so small, but it sure made me feel good, but you know, I took that for granted. Some of these children, have never had their work tacked up on the refrigerator door.

But Frances Garrett makes sure their precious drawings, paintings, spelling tests, and high scored homework assignments are displayed.

This is important to send a message that hard work and accomplishments are honored. Students leave MOM program knowing in their hearts that there is nothing they can't do.

No task is too big. No challenge is too great. These dedicated young people are faced with amazing challenges but they never give up.

A special gift that these young men and women have received, is something that I, too, learned at an early age: "Always do your best, hard work will be rewarded and never, never give in."

Mr. Speaker, the volunteers and especially the children involved with the MOM program in Muncie, Indiana are Hoosier heroes. That is my report from Indiana. God bless.

PRESIDENT'S CATHOLIC STRATEGY

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the full sense of collegiality here, I would like to yield, and I will stay on my feet, the first 20 minutes of my special order to my good friend, the distinguished colleague from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS, to speak about our budget crisis and getting America's fiscal house in order.

THE WORK ETHIC IN AMERICA

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding I will not be using the full time. I do appreciate his willingness to allow me to participate in your hour's time.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican majority, this new Congress, has three objectives. Our first objective is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and at the same time grow this economy. That is the first objective, and it is absolutely essential that we succeed in it.

Our second objective is to save our trust funds for future generations, particularly Medicare, from ultimate bankruptcy. In fact, Medicare part B, the health services that Medicare recipients receive, started to go insolvent last year, not this year as expected.

Our third objective, Mr. Speaker, is to transform our caretaking social and corporate, I would even say farming welfare state, into a caring opportunity society.

Now, the words opportunity society are words used by conservatives primarily. They are great words, and are words that have existed in this country in particular for well over 200 years. And they are preceded by the word "caring."

This is not a conservative agenda that throws up our hands in the air and says, "You live in the cities, you were raised by a crack mother, you did not have much of an education. Too bad. You are on your own."

That is not the agenda. This agenda is an agenda that is trying to help people grow the seeds.

Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to do what we have failed to do for so many years. We are not

looking to repeal the New Deal, but much of the Great Society simply did not work. Not all of it, but a good part of it.

I was coming to Washington this week, I noticed on my calendar, I have quotes on my calendar. This one happened to have been from Ann Landers. I think it defines something that is absolutely essential. It says, "In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your children, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings."

I look at this and say this is absolutely the center of what we need to do as a Government. In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your citizens, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

As a moderate Republican, someone who has voted for a number of programs that would be part of the Great Society, I have had to analyze and say, where have I been doing the right thing, where I have helped make a difference, and where have I actually caused problems?

If I am honest with myself, there is a part of me that recognizes that I could go and vote for some of these programs and say, you know, I have dealt with your need. I can pat myself on the back. I can go to certain groups and they can say, oh, isn't it nice that you care?

Well, I would contend that some of my caring has resulted in caretaking, not in caring, and that what I need to truly do is be a caring person. And a caring person is going to do more what Ann Landers says, and that is what have you taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings?

I have made a point in the last 4 years of my 9 years in Congress of asking anyone who has had a difficult life, that is perceived as difficult, and obviously nobody walks in someone else's moccasins, all of us face difficult things, but people who have been raised in poverty, been raised by one parent in poverty, people who may have had an experience on drugs, a whole host of different challenges that have faced them, and I have said what made a difference in your life? Why are you the successful person you are today? What was it in your life that made you so successful?

Almost to a person, it was "Someone in my life, my father, my mother, my brother, my sister, my aunt or my uncle, my grandparent, somebody, a mentor, someone took an interest in me and taught me how to grow my own seeds."

I think of parents who are raising their children, and I think well, in the final analysis, it is what you did for your children or what you taught your children to do for themselves that made the difference? And to a person they would not tolerate doing something for their children without teaching them what they can do for themselves, making them independent.