

going to assist you to get the education you need to boost your skills and your opportunities."

What the Congress expended in increased educational opportunities was repaid to the Federal Government within 10 to 12 years. But the economic accelerator of that has gone on for decades as we have seen those men and women who got the chance to upgrade their skills, to improve themselves, go on to much higher income levels, to being able to produce much more for our economy and themselves.

So just as the GI bill produced that kind of economic growth that was so important following World War II, so it is that we need to take that lesson from history and vow to do the same for our present day workers and young people.

I want to speak for a second, Mr. Speaker, on the health care legislation that is emerging. The House and the Senate have both passed reform measures. They are incremental. They deal with limited areas. The reality is that that is the best we are going to get this year and probably to the next few years is incremental, and that is fine. We will move on that basis, addressing particular needs and in so doing trying to cover more and more.

The basic premise of this legislation is that it would make it much more difficult, indeed, to ban denying somebody health insurance because of a pre-existing condition that they might have. That is very important. The second is that it would make it much easier for an individual who leaves one workplace where they are covered by health insurance to carry that health insurance to another workplace.

Certainly many of us have become aware of job lock, where a family is afraid to leave a job they have even if they could boost their wages, boost their opportunities, because in so doing they may endanger the health insurance which covers their children. So the House and the Senate have passed legislation. They are now trying to work out the differences.

The Senate has a piece, they did add an amendment that I consider very important. I am proud to have joined on a bipartisan basis with other Members to support parity for mental health benefits. The fact is that 30 million Americans at any time may be having trouble, may be suffering some sort of mental concerns, mental problems, emotional distress and only 20 percent of those will be seeking help. The fact is that most insurance does not encourage us to be seeking assistance for any kind of emotional distress, emotional disturbance, or mental illness.

Every study has documented that the amount of time lost in productivity to this economy because of mental health problems is way into the hundreds of billions of dollars. At some point one out of five Americans is going to have a problem with mental health, and so it becomes important that we recognize this.

I have heard all the arguments about how, well, mental health is different than physical health, and we can identify a physical illness and we know how many treatments to give it, but mental health, how do we put some kind of handle on that? How do we identify how many treatments are necessary to deal with a psychiatric problem or an emotional problem?

I guess I look at it this way. How do we identify how many treatments are necessary for chronic back pain? How do we identify what it is going to take for many of the types of pains or migraine headaches or other problems that people are afflicted with?

The fact is that physical science is not a complete science, yet and what we are learning is that mental health is indeed much more of a science than what was conceived of just 20 years ago. When I was working in that hospital at minimum wage, I was working in a psychiatric facility, and I am still struck by the incredible changes that have taken place in mental health during that period of time.

Thirty years ago, not quite 30 actually but, say, 25 years ago when I might have been up and down the hall all night with a young person afflicted with a schizophrenic process, because outside of Thorazine we did not really know what to do except sedate them, today the National Institute of Mental Health, the research that former Congressman Sil Conte was so responsible for getting started and funded, and creating the decade of the brain and the amazing research that has been done with BET technology, with MRI's, all of that, has made great breakthroughs in the treatment of mental illnesses. So that today you would not be having to walk the floors all day and all night with that affected individual. You would be administering some basic medications, you would be taking certain steps that were unknown just a few short years ago.

So that is the importance of moving ahead in research, of moving ahead in treatment techniques, and also moving ahead in recognizing the parity of mental health with physical health and, indeed, recognizing there is a holistic approach that needs to be taken here. Mental health and physical health are really one in many ways. We have not thought about it that way in the past. That is why this legislation that is in the Senate that would, in addition to safeguarding a person's right to gain insurance and not be denied because of preexisting conditions, the legislation that would protect the individual's ability to carry their insurance from one job to another, that is why that amendment is so important, and I hope the House conference will adopt it, that would say that mental health is to be considered the same in insurance as physical health and that there should be parity between the two. That is the humane approach. It is also the scientific approach and the proper one.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I join with many other Members, Republican and

Democrat, on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers, the House and the Senate, in urging that that step be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I might also say that health care can be part of that growth package I was talking about because one of the areas that so affects people, so makes them back up and say, "Well, maybe I won't take that chance and become a small business person, maybe I won't take chance and become an entrepreneur, because if I leave my regular job, I leave my insurance and I don't want to leave my children naked without it," maybe to that welfare recipient who says, "If I go and take this job, I lose my Medicaid card, which I'm prepared to give up for myself but I'm not prepared to sacrifice for my children," maybe by providing adequate health care and access to health care, then that too becomes a component of that growth package. So we add health care now to minimum wage increase, to education, and training, to infrastructure development, to capital budgeting and building a growth component into our Federal budget, and also now we add health care to make it a total package.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be talking a lot more about growth. My hope is that Members on both sides of the aisle will join in this discussion and recognize something that actually, I think, began to develop in the Republican primaries. While I have to be honest, they did not invite me to participate as much as they might have in that process, I do think that the useful debate was started by Steve Forbes and by some of the others about the role of growth in this whole budget process.

Everybody agrees on the need for a balanced budget, but on the way to balancing the budget, if we run the economy into the ground, what have we accomplished? What we have accomplished is at the end of 7 years, we may have a balanced budget—I do not think so—we may have a balanced budget, but we will have an economy that is incapable of generating the jobs and opportunity that we want, and in so doing will be generating future and greater deficits.

That is not a situation any of us want. We do not want to be generating future problems for Social Security and Medicare and many of these other programs. So we ought to be able to rally and come together around the growth initiative and say to both Republicans and Democrats alike, 2.3 percent growth just does not get it and we need to be focusing on something much more attainable, much more achievable, and something that truly reflects where it is we want the American economy to be.

□ 1315

THE EFFECT OF RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE ON UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of the working people, whose opportunity to work will be jeopardized if we proceed with what apparently we are going to, and that is an ill-advised increase in the minimum wage. And here is the truth: The politics say it is an election year, increase the minimum wage. Never mind that the President had the chance to do so in the first two years of his administration when his party controlled the Congress. Never mind that. Now it is an election year.

But, please, think of the average man and woman who may be making the minimum wage, and ask, do you want to put that person out of a job? Who do you benefit, who do you hurt?

You hurt the person who would not get the job, except that it was at the minimum wage. Who do you benefit? You benefit those people who stay in their job and whose wages are increased. And that is a trade-off I just do not think we should make.

What data do I have to support this? Let me just recite that every time since the mid-70's, which is where my research began, that we increased the real minimum wage and the economy was like it is today, we saw an increase in unemployment.

It stands to reason, does it not? Because an increase in the minimum wage is a tax on an employer who is offering somebody a job. It is not paid for by all of us. It is paid for by the exact person, the employer, who is trying to offer a job. And we say an the natural result is that there will be fewer such jobs available.

In 1974 there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 14 percent. In 1990 there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 4 percent. In 1991, there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 22 percent. 22 percent!

Now, have there ever been instances when the increase in the minimum wage did not lead to an increase in unemployment? Yes. And that was when the economy was so strongly growing that even an increase in the minimum wage could not stop the effect of more jobs. Years in my search that were of that nature were in 1976 and 1978, both of which had above 5 percent real growth.

We are not at 5 percent real growth. We are at anemic real growth. Indeed, the news this morning is so optimistic that we finally achieved a 2.8 percent rate of real growth in the first quarter of this year to match the barely 1 percent real growth of the last quarter of last year.

Here it is, simply put: An increase in the minimum wage means: First, a tax on people who offer jobs to those who most need them; second, as a result, fewer jobs offered to those who most need them; but third, political again

for the President. I will not have any part of that. It is not right, it is not fair.

#### SITUATION IN BOSNIA

Mr. Speaker, I rose for a second purpose and I would like to turn to that now, and that deals with the situation in Bosnia and the fact that the President has now requested, or told us I should say, he has not requested, Mr. Speaker, he has told us that he intends to keep United States troops in Bosnia for longer than one year. Do not you recall that when he asked, again he did not ask, when he insisted on putting United States troops in Bosnia, he said it would only be for one year? And now he is informing us it will be more than one year.

What about the constitutional responsibility of the representatives of the people of this great country in the Congress to vote yes or no on going to war? Well, I was concerned about this, and I brought it to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and he wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, excuse me, to the President himself. Let me just recite the facts that indicate at the very least the War Powers Resolution should now be invoked.

You remember, the War Powers Resolution was adopted to provide a system whereby Congress could decide, as our Constitution says it should, whether American troops are put into hostilities overseas, and it was a compromise. Realizing the President would occasionally have to respond to emergencies, he could go and put troops overseas in hostilities for 60 days. But if those American troops stayed for longer than 60 days, the President had to come to the Congress, because that is what the Constitution says, and let us decide, we the representatives of the people, whether our sons and daughters and brothers and sisters should be put into hostilities on behalf of what purpose and with what prospects of success.

I argued at the time that Bosnia was not like Kuwait, that the prospects of success were extremely unclear, that this 1-year promise would probably be breached. How can you say when you have succeeded in Bosnia, when the last partisan stops hating the last other partisan? That will not be within our lifetime, let alone within a year.

But what most concerned me was that the War Powers Resolution says the President must obtain the permission of Congress if American troops are put into hostilities after 60 days. And you will remember January 28 of this year, Lt. Shawn Watts was wounded by sniper fire in Ilidza, Bosnia. On January 31, a U.S. Humvee was struck by snipe fire. On February 3, two British soldiers were wounded by sniper fire as part of the NATO force and another NATO vehicle was hit by sniper fire on February 12 with one occupant wounded. If these are not hostilities, the meaning of the word is lost.

So the chairman of our Committee on International Relations wrote to

the President and said, Mr. President, are these hostilities? Let me just continue with the facts. The New York Times quoted a spokesman for NATO on January 29, Lt. Colonel Brian Hoey, as saying, "Unfortunately, this shooting is not an isolated incident . . . In a city like this, it would be difficult to establish trends, but this is one of a series of recent incidents that have put soldiers at risk."

So the chairman wrote the President. He said why not bring this to Congress? Are these not hostilities? Is this not what the Constitution requires? By the way, would you please let us know if there have been any other hostilities since the date of this letter to the time of your response?

The words of the War Powers Resolution require the approval of the Congress where U.S. Armed Forces are placed overseas in hostilities, "where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."

What response do we have? A very disappointing response dated April 25, not signed by the President, but by the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, who writes the chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, "While there have been incidents involving sniper attacks by unknown gunmen, such sporadic criminal acts are not hostilities as that term is used in the War Powers Resolution."

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed. You cannot play word games with the lives and national interests of our country and its soldiers. Are there hostilities in Bosnia? Who would say no? Who would stand up before citizens in a town hall meeting like I do when I am back in my district, and again this month say, oh, Bosnia? That is not hostilities. It is, and now the President is saying 1 more year, or perhaps at least some time beyond a year. I will be fair. He did not say an additional year, he just said that 1-year promise is no longer operative.

Well, it seems to me the time is appropriate under our Constitution for the Members of the House and the other body to stand before the American people and say it is our responsibility on behalf of our citizens, our constituents, to say yes or no to the use of force in hostilities in Bosnia before we put American soldiers lives at risk. This is for Congress to decide and for the President to do beyond the 1 year without congressional approval. It is time that he come to the Congress, make his case, and if he succeeds, fine; if he does not, he must act to withdraw the United States troops from Bosnia. I put to the Speaker that we should put to the President this challenge: Abide by the Constitution, its spirit; instead of taking the word "hostilities" and straining it beyond its logical meaning.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS, for 5 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONDIT.

Ms. LOFGREN.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAMPBELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mrs. CHENOWETH.

Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Ms. GANSKE.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. MORAN.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 966. An act for the relief of Nathan C. Vance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world, as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution; to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to

the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2024. An act to phase out the use of mercury in batteries and provide for the efficient and cost-effective collection and recycling or proper disposal of used nickel cadmium batteries, small sealed lead-acid batteries, and certain other batteries, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 6, 1996, at 2 p.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2741. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Sheep and Wool Promotion, Research, Education, and Information Order [Order] (Docket No. LS-94-015) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2742. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Standards for Grade of Slaughter Cattle and Standards for Grades of Carcass Beef (Docket No. LS-94-009) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2743. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Relaxation of Quality Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches (Docket No. FV95-916-5FR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2744. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Assessment Rate (FV95-915-1IFR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2745. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 1996 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers (CN-96-001-FR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2746. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act when the Department of the Army violated restrictions of section 101 of the Military Construction Act of 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2747. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the annual report on research and technology development activities supporting defense waste management and environmental restoration, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 3141(c)(1), (2) (103 Stat. 1680); to the Committee on National Security.

2748. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration [MARAD] for

Fiscal Year 1995, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on National Security.

2749. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the estimated amount of fiscal year 1997 staff-years of effort [STE] to be funded by DOD for each DOD sponsored Federally Funded Research and Development Center [FFRDC], pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2367(d)(1); to the Committee on National Security.

2750. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China [China], pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2751. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 1995 annual report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8106(a); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2752. A letter from the Commissioner, Rehabilitation Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal activities related to the administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 712; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Personal Protective Equipment for General Industry (RIN: 1218-AA71) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Natural Resources Damage Assessment—Type A Procedures (RIN: 1090-AA21 and 1090-AA23) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2755. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule to Rescind FMVSS No. 211, Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs, Hub Caps (RIN: 2127-AF71) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2756. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report on international terrorism entitled "Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1995," pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2757. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the 1995 annual management report for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2758. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the proposed budget for fiscal year 1997 for the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, pursuant to Public Law 104-8, section 106(a)(1) (109 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2759. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service retirement and disability fund for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1308(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2760. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 1995 section 8 report on National Historic and Natural Landmarks that have been damaged or to