phrase which when translated means: "The soldiers are coming, the soldiers are coming." These are the words of a then terrified 14-year-old girl who was able to survive the atrocities inflicted upon her people many years ago.

I join with my colleagues in calling on President Clinton to use the word "genocide" as the only accurate description of the terror inflicted on the Armenian people. For the dead and the living, we must bear witness so that this horror will never happen again.

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

[Mr. DURBIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MANTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMEMORATING THE 81ST ANNI-VERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues, Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, for once again organizing

this special congressional opportunity for Congress to pause to honor the memory of the 1½ million Armenians who were killed between 1915 and 1923 by agents of the Turkish Ottoman Empire in what is known in infamy as the Armenian Genocide.

While we cautiously welcome the important gestures recently made by Turkey, in recognizing the independence of Armenia and the opening of an air corridor to Armenia, the history of the relationships between these two countries must be kept in perspective.

Some would claim that our remembrance today fans the flames of atavistic hatred and that the issue of the Ottoman government's efforts to destroy the Armenian people is a matter best left to scholars and historians. I do not agree. For whatever ambiguities may be invoked in the historic record of these events, one fact remains undeniable: the death and suffering of Armenians on a massive scale happened, and is deserving of recognition and remembrance.

This solemn occasion permits us to join in remembrance with the many Americans of Armenian ancestry, to remind this country of the tragic price paid by the Armenian community for its long pursuit of life, liberty and freedom.

Today, I rise, with my Colleagues, to recall and remember one of the most tragic events in history and through this act of remembrance, to make public and vivid the memory of the ultimate price paid by the Armenian community by this blot against human civility.

We come together each year with this act of commemoration, this year being the 81st anniversary of this genocide, to tell the stories of this atrocity so that we will not sink into ignorance of our capacity to taint human progress with acts of mass murder.

The Armenian genocide was a deliberate act to kill, or deport, all Armenians from Asia Minor, and takes its place in history with other acts of genocide such as Stalin's destruction of the Kulaks, Hitler's calculated wrath on the Jews, Poles, and Romany Gypsy community in Central Europe, and Pol Pot's attempt to purge incorrect political thought from Cambodia by killing all of his people over the age of fifteen, and more recently, the ethnic cleansing atrocities in Bosnia.

We do not have the ability to go back and correct acts of a previous time, or to right the wrongs of the past. If we had this capacity, perhaps we could have prevented the murders of millions of men, women and children.

We can, however, do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. To do this, we must educate people about these horrible incidents, comfort the survivors and keep alive the memories of those who died.

I encourage everyone to use this moment to think about the tragedy which was the Armenian Genocide, to con-

template the massive loss of lives, and to ponder the loss of the human contributions which might have been.

Although, the massacre we depict and describe started 81 years ago, the Armenian people continue to fight for their freedom and independence today, in the Nagorno Karabagh.

Again, this year, I would like to close my remarks with an urgent plea that we use this moment as an occasion to recommit ourselves to the spirit of human understanding, compassion, patience, and love.

For these alone are the tools for overcoming our tragic, and uniquely human proclivity for resolving differences and conflicts by acts of violence.

This century has been characterized as one of the bloodiest in our archives of human history. Certainly, the genocide perpetuated against the Armenian peoples has been a factor in this dismal record.

The dawning of a new century offers our human race two paths. One continues along a road of destruction, distrust, and despair. Those who travel this path have lost their connection to the primal directives, which permit us as a society to maintain balance, continuity, and harmony.

I would ask my colleagues, on this 81th anniversary of one of history's bloodiest massacres of human beingsand during a time in history when violent solutions to problems between peoples continue to hold sway-to contemplate the second path. The map to this path exists within the guiding teachings of all major world religions and are encapsulated in what Christians refer to as the 10 Commandments. I would ask my colleagues, no matter their religious or political persuasions and beliefs, to revisit these core teachings which form a common bond between all peoples. To use these common beliefs as the basis for action and understanding in these trying times. The surface differences between peoples, offer only an exciting diversity in form. At the core all peoples are united by common dreams, aspirations, and beliefs in a desire for harmony, decency, and peace with justice.

Let these testimonies of the atrocities perpetuated against the Armenian people serve as a reminder that as a human race we can, and must, do better. It takes strength and wisdom to understand that the sword of compassion is indeed mightier than the sword of steel.

Certainly, as we reflect over the conflicts of this century, we can only come to the conclusion that violence begets violence, hatred begets hatred and that only understanding patience, compassion, and love can open the door to the realization of the dreams which we all hold for our children and for their children.

Let our statements today, remembering and openly condemning the atrocity committed against the Armenians,

help renew a commitment of the American people to oppose any and all instances of genocide.

□ 1800

ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS OF INCREASING MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on how we should increase wages of workers in this country and how we should not increase those wages.

The debate over the minimum wage is a debate really about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I would like to make three points:

First, historically it has been well noted by many economists, Frederich Bastiat pointed out in 1853 that a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services.

Now, what this minimum wage legislation will do is tell, for example, a senior that wants to work part-time at maybe a day-care center, and 48.5 percent of those receiving minimum wages are voluntary part-time workers, that she or he cannot work if the day-care center cannot afford to pay \$5.15 per hour

It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job and learn a skill if that employer cannot pay \$5.15 per hour, and if his services are not worth that at the beginning of his employment, prior to training, then he will not have that opportunity.

Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor. So here is a Federal law saying you cannot work, you cannot sell your labor, for less than what the Federal Government mandates is a fair wage.

This is not consistent with a just society or the freedom of individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage is really going to harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in some workers being laid off. So the question is, are we going to pass a law that helps some, because some will benefit from an increase in minimum wage, while at the same time telling a few of those who are no longer going to be employed that they cannot be employed because the employer will not pay them the higher minimum wage that is contemplated to be established?

It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case.

This is just a quick effort to represent the supply and demand for the

market for unskilled, entry level jobs. If you have the demand curve going down; in other words, the higher the wages, the less number are going to be employed, and so as the demand curves down to a lower wage and a greater number being employed, and likewise the supply is going to increase so the higher the wages the more people that are going to be looking for those jobs, you end up at the intersection with what is the equilibrium wage. If we raise the minimum wage higher, that means this change will represent that number of people that are going to no longer be employed.

It just makes sense that there are some people in our society at the beginning that will no longer be able to be employed if we raise the minimum wage up to \$5.15 an hour. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working for the minimum wage. Increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities.

Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs.

Now, an increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by an estimated 2.2 billion, and those price increases will mostly affect poor people. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low wage industries, and who buys their goods in stores are certainly the poor people. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their businesses.

The way to increase wages is to cut the payroll taxes, cut the capital gains tax, balance the budget, make sure we do not have an increase in inflation, increase the skills of the future work force and current work force, and enact significant regulatory reform.

The debate over minimum wage is a debate about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I'd like to make three points.

First, as Frederich Bastiat pointed out in 1853, a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services. What this minimum wage legislation will do is to tell the senior that wants to work part-time at the day care center, and 48.5 percent of minimum wage workers are voluntary part-time workers, that she cannot work if the day care center cannot afford to pay her \$5.15 an hour. It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job, and the training that will go along with it, unless he can produce \$5.15 per hour worth of services. Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that the government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor services. This is not consistent with a just society of free individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage will harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in workers being laid off and fewer job opportunities. It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case. Those that wish to increase the minimum wage assume that a maiority of the Congress with the approval of the President may decide that those who lose their jobs, or are denied their first job, must suffer this in order to make others better off. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working at minimum wage. And increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities. Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs. The unemployment rate among black teenage males is currently greater than 38 percent, while the national rate for adult males is 5 percent. Who is likely to suffer from the loss of low-skilled iobs?

An increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by \$2.2 billion. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low-wage industries. And who buys their goods at stores staffed by people making minimum wage? Who buys food at restaurants that hire first-time workers? The wealthy are not going to suffer from the higher prices. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their business because of an increase in the minimum wage. But the poor, unskilled, job-seeker, and the small business owner on the edge of making it will suffer. How can we as a Congress claim that we can make the decision that these people must suffer in order for some other people to gain? It is time to admit that this increase in the minimum wage is an unjust interference of the Government in the lives of the working poor which will cause more harm than good.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARME-NIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Once again, I join my colleagues and Armenians around the world to honor over 1.5 million Armenians who were killed in this tragic event.

Like every human tragedy, we must retell this terrible story to our children to teach a lesson: Hatred and bigotry must not be tolerated. Instead, as our world grows smaller every day, we must learn to live together in a global village. We must discover and treasure the differences among peoples around