

and enhancing parent's employment and educational status.

ISSUES

Head Start's record of achievements and experience in providing comprehensive services to low-income children and their families, makes it the perfect program to address these new challenges and to help build a competitive and strong country. Head Start has the potential to serve as a model of comprehensive services, to reach large numbers of children and families, to respond to a diversity of needs, and to provide leadership in collaboration and research for the entire early childhood field. Yet today, funding for Head Start falls short and limits the program's ability to meet its full potential.

Three conditions exist in Head Start that must be addressed. First, to be effective in the future, the program must continue to provide good early childhood services. However, Head Start faces threats to program quality.

Second, in the upcoming years, Head Start must be expanded to serve all eligible children and must be flexible enough to meet the diverse needs of children and families, particularly demands for full-day centers. Presently, Head Start serves 20 percent of zero to five-year-olds. The demand for Head Start is still tremendous.

Third, as the largest early childhood program, Head Start must provide leadership to the entire early childhood field. It must help develop a coordinated delivery system, ensure adequate community services for low-income families, encourage the continuation of comprehensive services as children move on to the public schools and develop new knowledge to improve practice and policy. There is increasing concern that the progress made by children in the Head Start program may be lost when there is not continuation of comprehensive services in the school. At the federal and local levels, there has been a lack of collaboration between Head Start and federal programs serving low-income families.

The Administration of Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) has put considerable effort into improving the transition of children as they move to kindergarten through the Transition Project. Although these efforts have been useful to the initial adjustment of children as they enter school, there is a need for schools to become much more involved with families.

Despite the challenges, Head Start has accomplished major early childhood services. The following are some of Head Start's ultimate highlights: The Child Development Associate (CDA) programs; Home-based services; Bilingual-multicultural approaches; Indian and Migrant Head Start Programs; Resource Access Projects provide training and technical assistance to programs; Early Start provides services to zero-to-three year-olds; Performance Standards; and Quality Improvement.

Congress and the Clinton Administration must remember that Head Start is an investment. President Clinton has proposed for Head Start for fiscal year 1997 \$3.981 billion. The National Head Start Association urges Congress to consider an appropriations bill that moves toward the goals of both the Bush and Clinton Administrations to expand Head Start to guarantee services to all eligible children by the year 2000.

TESTIMONY OF JERRY LEWIS, J.D., BEFORE
THE CONGRESSIONAL EDUCATION CAUCUS,
MAY 16, 1996

Senator Wellstone, Congressman Fields, Members of the Education Caucus, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. My name is Jerry Lewis and I am the Director of Intensive Edu-

cational Development at the University of Maryland-College Park. In that capacity I am responsible for two of the Federal TRIO Programs sponsored by the University. These include the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program and the Student Support Services Program. I am testifying today on behalf of the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations (NCEOA).

Before sharing my brief remarks on post-secondary educational opportunity as it relates to low-income students in America, I want to take a moment to applaud your efforts in establishing this Caucus. The federal role in assuring educational opportunity has become increasingly questioned in recent years. Moreover, even those who articulate support for education often do not back their words with dollars. Your active advocacy for education is deeply appreciated.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY IS DECLINING

There is presently extensive evidence on the growing gaps in educational attainment between children from upper-income families and children from low-income families. As reported in *Business Week*, utilizing Census data, Thomas Mortenson demonstrates that a child from a family in the bottom income quarter (family income below \$22,000) has only an 8% chance of graduating from college with a Baccalaureate by the time he is 24. In contrast, a child from a family in the top income quarter (income above \$68,000 per year) has a 79% chance of attaining the Baccalaureate at this juncture. Thus individuals from upper-income families are more than ten times as likely to graduate from college by the time they are 24 than are individuals from low-income families.

At the same time, the ability of any worker to adequately support his or her family without a college education is declining. Today, median family income in households headed by an individual with a college degree is \$73,000 per year, an increase in real dollar terms of 14% since 1973. At the same time, households headed by individuals with only a high school diploma have a median income of \$41,000, a decrease of 20% in the same time period. Households headed by families without a high school diploma have a median income of only \$28,000. Real median income for households headed by the least educated individuals has fallen over 37% since 1973.

ADDRESSING THIS CRITICAL ISSUE

The Federal government has historically utilized a multi-pronged strategy to support post-secondary educational opportunity. Student financial assistance—grants, loans and work—are made available to low and middle-income students so that lack of financial resources does not prevent them from enrolling and succeeding in college. Unfortunately, as the following chart demonstrates, student aid has not kept pace with inflation. While in the Mid-1970's the principal Federal grant program—Pell—covered nearly 80% of the cost of attending a public, four-year college, today it covers less than 40% of that cost.

While student financial aid helps students overcome financial barriers to higher education, TRIO programs help students overcome class, social and cultural barriers to college. Over 1,200 colleges, universities and agencies now sponsor TRIO programs which enroll nearly 700,000 low-income students who aspire to attend or are currently enrolled in college.

As mandated by Congress, two-thirds of the students served in TRIO must come from families with incomes under \$24,000, where neither parent graduated from college. Over 1,750 TRIO Programs currently serve nearly 700,000 low-income Americans between the

ages of 11 and 27. Many programs serve students in grade six through twelve. Forty-two percent (42%) of TRIO students are White, 35% are African American, 15% are Hispanic, 4% are Native American, and 4% are Asian. Sixteen thousand (16,000) TRIO students are disabled and 7,000 are military veterans.

TRIO is made up of five programs. Three assist young people and adults in learning about and preparing for college: Talent Search, Upward Bound, Educational Opportunity Centers. Congressman Fields is himself a product of one of the programs—Upward Bound at Southern University—and he has often voiced strong support for TRIO.

In addition to their pre-college efforts, there are two programs—Student Support Services and Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program—which serve undergraduates. At the University of Maryland, for example, each year Student Support Services provides counseling, tutoring, and other support to over 350 students. These services are made possible by over \$350,000 in institutional funds and \$245,000 in TRIO funds. And this investment has made a difference. For example, it has raised the graduation rates of those minority students enrolled in Student Support Services by over 70% over graduation rates of minority students not assisted by Student Support Services.

EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

I could speak much more than my allotted time, providing evidence on TRIO's behalf. It is noteworthy, for example, that:

Students in the Upward Bound program are four times more likely to earn an undergraduate degree than students from similar backgrounds who did not participate in TRIO.

Nearly 20% of all Black and Hispanic freshman who entered college in 1981 received assistance through the TRIO Talent Search or EOC programs.

Students in the TRIO Student Support Services program are more than twice as likely to remain in college than those students from similar backgrounds who did not participate in the program.

TRIO Programs are very effective and many students from low-income families depend on these programs to succeed academically in high school and college. In fact, since 1965 an estimated two million students have graduated from college with the special assistance and support of our nation's TRIO Programs.

I am more comfortable, however, citing individuals than statistics. One has only to look at Congressman Fields—and his three colleagues in the House who were also TRIO participants—to learn of TRIO's merits. (Congressman Bonilla, Congressman Watts, and Congressman Wynn were also TRIO graduates.) One can turn to the nineteen freshmen in Student Support Services' freshman class at the University of Maryland who have grade point averages above 3.0 as a measure of TRIO's achievement. One can look at our recent graduates who came from D.C. Public Schools and single parent homes and are now enrolled in doctoral programs in mathematics and computer science to learn of TRIO's achievement. I am confident each of you has also visited with TRIO students and TRIO graduates and knows of TRIO's accomplishments.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify today and would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

REPUBLICANS' SNEAK ATTACK ON AMERICA

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

12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there is a move afoot to pass labor legislation in this half of the 104th Congress through a kind of guerrilla warfare process, antilabor legislation, I should say antiunion labor legislation, antiworker legislation.

We had a very interesting development take place as the Republican majority assumed control of the 104th Congress. We had what might be called a sneak attack on American workers. I say it is a sneak attack because there was a Contract With America which laid out in great detail what the Republican majority would do once they took control, and it spelled out the issues, and that is the basis on which they went to the American people and were able to win the majority of that small number of people who came out to vote. They won a majority of the 39 percent of the people who came out to vote, and they had a clear bill of particulars, a clear agenda, and it was felt that whether you agreed with that agenda or not, it would be that agenda that the 104th Congress would operate on.

It is to their credit that they have moved forward on their Contract With America. But what has been surprising, what has been shocking, is the fact that there were items that were not in the agenda that have been pursued with great hostility, with great vengeance. The attack on the American workers and the working families of America was unexpected, totally.

It was not expected that the Republican majority would attempt to wipe out the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act protects workers who for the most part are middle income workers, middle class workers, or they used to be when their wages were held at a decent level. As wages have been depressed and gone down, more and more construction workers who happen to be fortunate enough to be under the Davis-Bacon Act protections, are quite poor, as I will point out in a few minutes.

Nobody expected the Republican majority to assault Davis-Bacon, or any other programs that are protecting workers. They never said that they would go after OSHA. OSHA, which protects the safety of all workers, those in unions and those not in unions. As you know, unfortunately, in America right now a great majority of workers are not in unions. That is unfortunate, because that is part of the reason that the wage level is going down for all workers, because there are not enough unionized workers. Unions are good for workers and good for America, but they are now every much on the defensive in terms of their numbers. They are decreasing. It will not help to have the Republican Party clearly out to destroy that basic underpinnings or protection for workers.

Nobody ever said when they developed the Contract with America that they would go after, over time, the Fair Labor Standards Act and the provisions in the Fair Labor Standards Act that provide for overtime. They now want your overtime. They are coming for your overtime.

Nobody ever said they would go after the very heart of the collective bargaining process by coming up with a thing called the TEAM Act. The TEAM is a way to officially and formally recognize company unions and to move in such a way that eventually you would destroy all existing unions and have the unions tied to the management.

So nobody ever said that in the Contract With America. They never stated that that was what they were going to do. Yes, certainly they were developing secret contracts on the side, obviously. There were contracts that were not contracts with America, but they were contracts with somebody. They were contracts with the bosses, contracts with unscrupulous management. There is a whole lot of businesses and corporations in America that accept the fact that we have some very civil laws which help protect workers, and by protecting workers, the corporations are better off. The businesses are better off. Not all bosses, not all businesses, are ready to make war against worker protections, but the Republican majority had this as a secret agenda.

We know they made some contracts on the side, because they have told us, they confessed, one Member, a chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the chairman of that subcommittee was quite honest and forthright. He was forthright in his discussion with the Washington Post reporter about the fact that although they did not put it in the Contract With America, on the side they made deals with business people. They made dealings with certain corporations, certain corporate entities and certain business people which said in essence if you contribute to our campaign we will go after OSHA, we will go after Davis-Bacon, we will wipe out certain aspects of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This was in the Washington Post. It was a direct quote of the subcommittee chairman. He did not deny it. He was honest enough to say it and honest enough not to deny it. There was a figure of \$65,000 mentioned in his State alone, \$65,000 was collected as part of the secret contract to go after labor.

So what you had was, much to the surprise of the American people, what you had was what happened at Pearl Harbor. The Speaker has often compared politics to war. We do not like the comparison, but that is sort of the language of the 104th Congress. So politics are compared to war; politics is war, without blood. In this case it was not stretching the imagination at all to say that what we had was a Pearl Harbor sneak attack. A massive at-

tack. They threw everything they could at us at Pearl Harbor. A massive attack, but it was a sneak attack. There was nothing that said ahead of time that the probability was that the Japanese would attack America at Pearl Harbor. In fact, the admiral who headed the Japanese Navy was a Japanese who had been educated at Harvard, Admiral Yamamoto. Admiral Yamamoto was educated at Harvard and known as a great card player at Harvard. He had lots of friends. You talk about deception made intimate, deception on a one-on-one basis, the fact that Admiral Yamamoto commanded the Japanese Navy in the attack on Pearl Harbor, the most humiliating defeat our Nation has ever suffered was instructive.

□ 2115

We should look at that. That is a good instruction as to what has happened here, because what has happened here is that the Republican majority have staged a sneak attack on the American workers, a sneak attack of great force. They are moving across the board attacking everything at once. The Davis-Bacon Act must be repealed. Nobody ever said that in the contract, but now they are saying the Davis-Bacon Act must be repealed.

They are saying that they want your overtime. We do not want overtime. We want to have compensatory time instead. Substitute compensatory time for overtime and make that part of a Fair Labor Standards Act, changing the requirement that overtime must be paid after working a certain number of hours.

They wanted to go after the National Labor Relations Board, which makes it possible to organize workers, and they wanted to put the National Labor Relations Board in a straitjacket fiscally. They moved and cut it by one-third, proposed to cut it by one-third, but that did not prevail.

They are moving again to put pressure on the National Labor Relations Board. Some of the Members are writing letters to the National Labor Relations Board. One member of the Committee on Appropriations said your appropriation will be coming from me, and I am going to get you. In so many words he was saying that he would stop the National Labor Relations Board from functioning because it rendered some decisions that he did not like. That was one member, but the spirit of the entire Republican majority has been that kind of spirit, to bring to a halt those parts of the American Government, laws that exist that have been built up over the years which help to protect working people.

Mr. Speaker, Pearl Harbor was a massive attack. I say it was because it was launched at the beginning of the 104th Congress, and it did not succeed. So to replace the Pearl Harbor sneak attack, Admiral Yamamoto was defeated. Now they are resorting to the guerrilla warfare. Some members of

labor assume that, since they did not prevail in the first half of the 104th Congress, that the Republicans will now break off the attack and leave labor alone, that the scorched earth policies that started the session will no longer be pursued. That is not the case. It is guerrilla warfare now. They are waging the same, have the same objectives, but they are waging the war in a different way.

But it is instructive, and I hope that labor leaders, union members, workers in general will understand how the sneak attack was promulgated. The sneak attack was forced upon us by a group that pretended to be friendly to labor. A lot of labor legislation in the last 10 years, certainly since I have been here in this Congress, has been bipartisan legislation. Even when the legislation was not bipartisan, after the legislation was passed without Republican votes, throughout the country Republicans have snuggled up to labor leaders and pretended that they cared about working people. They have pretended in the back-slapping kind of manner, in the one-on-one friendships, they pretended to be friends of labor.

It is Admiral Yamamoto, the spirit of Admiral Yamamoto has been there and wooing labor into an ambush. That is what Pearl Harbor was. They ambushed our forces on a Sunday morning. Admiral Yamamoto had gone to Harvard. He knew the habits of Americans. So he knew very well that a Sunday morning attack, when Americans like to sleep late and they enjoy Saturday night, et cetera, he knew the habits.

So we have a group of leaders in the Republican majority who have been very friendly with labor in the past. They knew the habits. They wooed labor. Even Members who belong to unions voted uncharacteristically in large numbers for Members of the Republican party.

Mr. Speaker, the shift over the years has been away from working class people voting almost 90 percent or 85 percent Democratic to a gradual shift led by Ronald Reagan where working class people have voted in much larger numbers for Members of the Republican majority. They have wooed the working class vote very well, but now the sneak attack has come. In an overwhelming force it has come down for the first half of the 104th Congress and we have beat it back. We have stopped them on Davis-Bacon. They have not yet succeeded in repealing Davis-Bacon although a bill was introduced very early to repeal Davis-Bacon, just repeal it outright, wipe it out. No reform of Davis-Bacon, no adjustment of Davis-Bacon, wipe it out; that was the cry, wipe out Davis-Bacon.

The same legislation called for wiping out the national service contract. The service contract is a companion bill, companion act to Davis-Bacon, which came along late which protects workers in Federal installations, the actual people who do the janitorial

work, and the cleaning ladies. Various people at the very lowest rungs are protected by also applying the principle of paying the prevailing wage to those people as well as paying prevailing wages to the people who work on construction on Federal contracts.

Mr. Speaker, it was quite surprising, but an all-out attack has happened. The friends of Davis-Bacon, both on the workers side, the labor side, as well as on the business side, and there are thousands of contractors who support Davis-Bacon as a reasonable, rational piece of Federal legislation, Federal protection. It protects not only workers. It protects the quality of life and the standard of living in certain areas. It protects contractors from the assault that they are constantly under from unscrupulous contractors who do not want to pay their workers decent wages, unscrupulous contractors who do not want to pay fringe benefits, unscrupulous contractors who will cut corners and do shoddy work in order to do the job cheaper, employ workers who did not do the job with the same kind of skills and place at risk the entire job. They are constantly fighting against those. So there are people on the management side, the contractors, the owners of construction industries who support Davis-Bacon as well as the construction workers themselves who support Davis-Bacon.

So the attack is on them, too. Admiral Yamamoto has attacked not only the workers, he has attacked businessmen who have been doing a good job of carrying out the process of constructing Federal buildings, at the same time providing decent wages for their workers.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the history of Davis-Bacon. It is far from being a radical piece of liberal legislation, concocted by wild-eyed radicals, not at all. Davis-Bacon is a piece of legislation which was designed to protect the wages and the standard of living of middle class workers. Probably most of them were Republicans that they were protecting. But certainly the originators of the Davis-Bacon Act were Republicans. Who was Davis, who was Bacon? Representative Robert Bacon was a Republican from New York. New York, my home State, is always associated with radicals and liberals, and nothing for the middle class, nothing for the working population comes out of New York, if you accept the kind of stereotype that has been painted of New York by certain people. But out of New York came a bill to protect construction workers.

Robert Bacon, Representative Robert Bacon of New York was a Republican. Senator James Davis of Pennsylvania, another east coast State, not with a radical reputation like New York, but it is on the east coast, and you might say that that is where the liberals live, that is where progressives live. That is where the people who gave us the New Deal and the Great Society, all came from the east coast. No, Senator James

Davis was a Republican from Pennsylvania, and Representative Robert Bacon was a Republican from New York.

Senator James Davis had served as Secretary of Labor in the Cabinets of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. Listen, Senator James Davis had been Secretary of Labor in the Cabinets of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. The act was adopted, the Davis-Bacon Act was adopted in 1931 at the urging of Herbert Hoover.

Let me repeat that. Two Republicans, Representative Robert Bacon of New York and Senator James Davis of Pennsylvania, two Republicans, created, authored the Davis-Bacon Act. The act was adopted in the Hoover administration, Herbert Hoover was President, in 1931. This Davis-Bacon Act requires that Federal construction contracts specify the minimum wage rates to be paid to the various classes of laborers working under those contracts. Minimum wages are defined as those rates of pay found by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing, prevailing in the locality of the project, prevailing for similar crafts and skills on comparable construction work.

It does not say that they must pay union wages that have been negotiated in a collective bargaining process. It does not. It says whatever the wages are, the prevailing wages, if the area has low prevailing wages. As we will see later on in the discussion, it can sometimes drag down the prevailing wage. Prevailing wages are very close to minimum wages in some instances because the prevailing wage in the Davis-Bacon wage is very close to minimum wage because that is the prevailing wage in the area.

Mr. Speaker, the act does not require that collectively bargained union wages be paid unless such wages happen to be prevailing in the locality where the work takes place. It is most unfortunate; I wish the act had required that collective bargaining rates have some role in guiding the level of the Davis-Bacon wages, but they do not.

So Davis-Bacon is under attack. The Republican created Davis-Bacon Act, the Davis-Bacon Act signed by President Herbert Hoover, a Republican President, under attack. And even later, the Republicans showed their support for Davis-Bacon under the most popular Republican President probably in history, save since Abraham Lincoln: Ronald Reagan. Under Ronald Reagan Davis-Bacon was reinforced. Ronald Reagan said he did not want the Davis-Bacon Act tampered with.

He wrote a letter in September 1981 to Mr. Robert Georgine, President of Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO. Ronald Reagan wrote a letter which says:

Dear Bob, I want to acknowledge the Building and Construction Trades Department letter of September 11 concerning efforts to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. I have

asked the Secretary of Labor to respond directly, but I want to assure you and your general president that I will continue to support my campaign pledge to not seek repeal of the act. With best wishes, very sincerely, Ronald Reagan.

So here we have a history, not ancient history, but recent history, and Ronald Reagan is in support of Davis-Bacon. If you look at the records of the House of Representatives, you will find the last time a vote was taken on Davis-Bacon on the floor of the House it was bipartisan. There were democrats and Republicans voting for it, and Democrats and Republicans voted against it. Always bipartisan. So why did we wake up following the victory of the Republican majority and have Admiral Yamamoto-style Pearl Harbor secret attack on working people in general and Davis-Bacon in particular? Why?

Mr. Speaker, the attack now has become very well orchestrated. As I said before, Pearl Harbor was an open onslaught. Pearl Harbor was not guerilla warfare. That was direct attack. They threw everything they had from the air on Pearl Harbor. They did not succeed in winning the war in the Pacific. They did not succeed in winning the war. Warfare of that kind is seldom now. From that point on, after World War II, with the defeat of Nazi Germany and the defeat of the Japanese, very seldom has anybody contemplated, except the Soviet Union, an all-out war directly being waged on the United States of America. But we have suffered greatly in guerilla warfare type actions. Vietnam was guerilla warfare, not a direct onslaught. They did not come out and face American military power head on but guerilla warfare.

Now we have the guerilla warfare against Davis-Bacon and other workplace protection legislation. The guerilla warfare is deadly. It is poisonous. Most of all, it takes advantage of the fact that now there is an atmosphere of optimism, of an optimism that is not justified. There is an atmosphere of optimism which is seeping over the progressive Democrat friendly to labor forces in this Congress.

□ 2130

All too early we have declared that the Republicans have lost and the American people understand clearly what is at issue here and that the Democrats are going to roll to victory, working people need not fear, the legislation will not be wiped out, they will be saved. It is a premature declaration of victory because now that the Yamamoto Pearl Harbor-style attack, only it was not a sneak attack, it was still a direct attack, has failed, they are pursuing guerilla warfare, and the guerilla warfare means that in every possible way they will be attacking labor from behind the lines, from the side, from underneath.

We had a housing bill on the floor a little more than 2 weeks ago, and in the bill which dealt with public housing, the part of the bill that dealt with

public housing, the construction of public housing with Federal funds, there was a clause written in there which said that Davis-Bacon would not apply to housing units, to housing, which has less than 12 units. If you had a certain number of units, below that number you did not have to apply Davis-Bacon.

That was just sneaked into the legislation and caught everybody by surprise. It was a guerilla warfare tactic, and by the time the forces that want to see Davis-Bacon continue recovered, I am afraid they were too dizzy, too shaken, to really reason straight because there was a compromise made, and that is part of the law now. Public housing units; I think 10 or 12 or 20, I do not remember exactly; if it is below that number of units, then Davis-Bacon does not apply. We do not know what dollar figure is related. For constructing public housing in certain parts of the country, you may be talking about \$5 million or \$6 million for that number of units. We do not know how that translates. We do not know whether when you start talking about units in public housing, later on it is going to be other kinds of units applying to office buildings that are being constructed by Federal money by construction workers.

It is a guerilla warfare tactic that paid off, in my opinion. There is some that think it is not difficult, did not do that much damage, but it is indicative of the kind of guerilla warfare tactics that are being waged, the kind of tactic that we are going to see take place on the floor of the House this week where they are proposing to put the minimum-wage law, an increase in the minimum wage, will be placed on the floor some time this week, and that increase in the minimum wage which is proposed by the Democrats to be 90 cents over a 2-year period, it may be more or less as the Republicans put it on the floor, but that increase that they are proposing will be tied to another guerilla warfare attack on workers.

The Team Act is going to be part of it, or it may have the Team Act and the Porter Act. What is the Porter Act. It is a small matter relating to the requirement that when you are asked by your employer to take care of a vehicle overnight, and you may take it home with you, whatever, it is necessary to take care of it, you do that, and you may be required to do some other things like check or take it by the station to check the oil, various other things, or you may be required instead of going home to make a stop on the way. Instead of coming straight from the home to the job, you may be required to drive an extra amount of miles to some other location. Whenever there is that extra requirement which means that you are doing labor for your employer, you have to be paid for it under the law.

But now they are proposing a change which would require that that never apply. If you are taking it overnight,

the employer can dictate the terms and not pay for your extra work and your extra time and the extra travel miles that you may put in. That may be attached to the minimum wage. You may have two items, two attacks guerilla warfare-style, on workers in the minimum wage bill.

Puts everybody on the spot. You all want a minimum wage increase. The fact it is coming on the bill means that the Republican majority is finally not treating the American public with contempt. They are finally going to bow to the wisdom and bow to the common sense of the American people.

You know more than 74 percent of the American people say that we need to raise the minimum wage at this point, that nobody can live on \$8,400 a year. Even if you put in all of those 40 hours every week for 52 weeks, that is all you get, \$8,400 a year. Now, know by Republican standards we have heard certain spokesmen, spokespersons, on the floor who are Republicans who talked about, you know, middle class starts at \$100,000, so they have lost their sense of perspective as to what people need to live on, and they just do not believe that it is true that there are people out there who only make \$8,400 a year under the minimum wage. Minimum wage is \$4.25 an hour; that is what it comes out to. Well, it is not going to be more than about a thousand dollars more once you get the 90 cent increase that the Democrats are proposing, but at least it is going forward.

A family that is very poor can certainly use another thousand dollars to buy some groceries, some shoes for the kids, and a thousand dollars goes a long way when you are poor.

I will have you know that my father was very skilled in the furniture making business, in the mill department, highly praised by his foremen and his bosses when they brought in new machinery and he figured out how to make it work, and only he could make it work and not have the boards burning. And they, one time they got angry with him for some reason, they laid him off, and so many boards were burning in the mill department until they came to get him a few days later so that he could get the assembly line started again and stop the boards from burning. There was a little trick that he had that he told me about, about how you slap a little glue on the end of the boards as they are going out, and it keeps the boards from burning, that he never told them about.

But at any rate, with all that kind of basic, fundamental skill in what was called an entry-level, nonskilled job, but really required some skill and some know-how and some common sense, he never made more than the minimum wage. They never paid the workers at the Memphis Furniture Factory more than the minimum wage, and only when the minimum wage went up did he get an increase.

So there are jobs in this country still like that where you do not get more

than the minimum wage in certain parts of the country, so the fact that there are large numbers of workers who make above the minimum wage, there are a great percentage of workers in America who make above the minimum wage, does not mean that the 20 million or more out are on minimum wage cannot use an increase.

So I applaud the wisdom, the common sense, of American people who in the polls keep saying you need to give a minimum wage increase. I applaud that. We are going to have it on the floor because the Republican majority has finally bowed to the wisdom of the American people.

But in that package there will be a guerrilla war poison pill. There will be a land mine, a couple of land mines maybe, but at least one. They are going to wage that kind of guerrilla war fare, and Davis-Bacon, of course, is one of the victims.

One of the things that have decided to do is to go after Davis-Bacon by undermining the basic concept in terms of it is an effort to keep the level of wages in a given community at the level of the wages in that community by not having a Federal project come in and pay less and undermine that wage structure. Instead, the Federal project is governed by what is prevailing already, and unfortunately I would like to see Federal projects raise the level of wages but unfortunately they do not do that. What they do is merely seek not to undermine the level of wages.

So Davis-Bacon is not going to be allowed to do that if the Republic guerrilla tactics could work. What they are saying is first is costs the American people too much; second, and I will not go into all of the particular guerrilla warfare attaches that are being staged at this point, we will just talk about one today and maybe we will pick up on some of the others later.

Today I would like to talk about the charge that Davis-Bacon is racist. Now, stop for a moment and consider the fact that the Republican majority of this 104th Congress is now waging a guerrilla attack on Davis-Bacon, and its tactic, one of its tactics, is to accuse the Davis-Bacon Act of being a racist act, the Davis-Bacon program of being a racist program. All of a sudden, you know, all of a sudden, we have a great concern about racism being manifested from the Republican majority side of the aisle. All of a sudden there is a concern with racism.

We have suffered from the Republican majority's attacks on affirmative action all year long, ever since they came to power in the 104th Congress, November of 1994, one attack after another on affirmative action. On set-asides, on the Voting Rights Act. You name it, anything related to trying to give some relief from the horror of racism, from the disadvantages of racism, from the long history of racism, from the effects of 232 years of slavery and a hundred years of de facto oppression

that went on in certain parts of the country, the rampant discrimination that prevailed throughout the Nation.

You know, no relief will the majority, Republican majority, allow. They want to roll back all of the laws and all of the provisions that have been made which proposed to give relief to people who have suffered from racism, particularly the African-American community, and I say "particularly" because the African-American community is a special community among the minority groups. The African-American community is unique because the African-American community is made up of the descendants of slaves. The descendants of slaves are people who were brought here, not as immigrants; they did not come voluntarily. They were brought against their will. The descendants of people who were brought against their will here, the descendants of slaves, were made to suffer for 232 years.

Immigrants come, and they have difficult, hard times for a couple of generations, maybe. But nobody else in the fabric of American life has been made, no other group has been made, to suffer 232 years of legal slavery, legal enslavement, and then, after that, all kinds of forms of subslavery and oppression. So we are unique.

The Republican majority has refused to provide any relief. They have offered nothing new, and they have attacked everything that exists that was generated by the New Deal, the Great Society, the civil rights movement. Everything is under attack related to discrimination and racist relief from discrimination and relief from racism. But the same people who placed it under attack are now saying that they do not like Davis-Bacon, they want Davis-Bacon to be repealed, destroyed, because it is racist.

How great can the degree of hypocrisy become? You cannot surpass that in terms of the hypocrisy. That is unabashed, blatant: "Davis-Bacon is bad because it is racist."

Even if it were true, one could just dismiss the Republican majority's utilization of that as a ploy because they cannot be about relieving anybody from the scourges of racism. But it is not true. It is a big lie that is being generated, and they are going to try to use the big lie technique, like Herman Goebbels under Hitler: If you say it often enough and keep saying it, then people begin to believe it is true. So over and over again you hear that Davis-Bacon is racist, Davis-Bacon is racist.

What is the germ of truth there that they are utilizing? One germ of truth there is that when Mr. Davis and Mr. Bacon, Senator Davis and Representative Bacon, two Republicans, when they developed the Davis-Bacon Act, they were trying to protect local workers in neighborhoods throughout the country, mainly those neighborhoods in the Northeast that has higher standards of living than other parts of the

country. And what was happening is that unscrupulous contractors, people who have the same mentality as the plantation owners, were taking advantage of the fact that was 1931, a period where people were desperate for work; all over the country workers were desperate for work.

□ 2145

If they were desperate for work all over the country, you can imagine that poor workers who were black, African-Americans in the South, or who happened to be of Hispanic origin in the West or Southwest, those were the workers who were most desperate. So these most desperate workers were being picked up in trucks and carted about all over the country. If you think the conditions for immigrants on farms are bad, you should take a look at the kinds of conditions these people had to live under.

These people did not have open fields, at least, to compensate for some of their suffering, to relieve themselves of the kinds of horrors of being crowded into trucks. They could at least, if they were farm workers, get out and go for long walks and have the joys of countryside. But when they were carted into big cities, they were forced to sleep in cramped quarters, and they were just there, Davis-Bacon utilized as chattel in the making of big profits by a few unscrupulous contractors, the people who never get enough.

There are people who just never get enough. They do not want to make profits. They want to make a killing on every deal. They want to make the maximum on every job. They want to rob the Federal Government of every penny. They were not getting less from the government, they were paying workers less. They were increasing their profits by paying the workers less. They could bid a little lower on the job and undercut the local contractors because they were paying the workers, who were like chattel, semislaves. They were paying them so much less that they could undercut and win the job, and throw out of kilter the whole work force of a given area as a result of bringing in large numbers of desperate workers.

Among those desperate workers, and they were not the majority, among those desperate workers were workers who were black, workers of African descent, so there is a grain of truth that in the case of Mr. Davis and Mr. Bacon, they were protecting local workers from outside workers. Some of those workers were black. So they have twisted that to mean Davis and Bacon were trying to preserve jobs for white construction workers against the needs of black workers, or to undercut the provision of jobs to black workers who were being brought in from all over the country under terrible conditions, and being forced to work for the very cheapest possible labor, in many cases just food and shelter.