

to conference on the budget resolution next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Of course, I believe the Senate is still proceeding on that, but as soon as we can next week we will be going to conference.

Mr. BONIOR. And if I might inquire, what day does the gentleman from Texas expect to consider the privileged resolution concerning the subpoenaed documents that he referred to in his remarks?

Mr. ARMEY. Most likely on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. Most likely on Friday.

And finally, in light of the close to \$60 billion CBO estimates on the star wars or missile defense program, when does the gentleman think that bill will be brought back for consideration?

Mr. ARMEY. I have no announced plan at this time. I would like to bring it back in the next couple of weeks. But I will have to wait and to announce it later.

Mr. BONIOR. And I would say to my friend from Texas, if he could inform us how late Wednesday, that might help Members plan. The gentleman said 5 o'clock we will have our first votes. And we expect a late evening on Wednesday?

Mr. ARMEY. The science bill could go late. We would try to get some authority to roll votes so that we could organize the time on behalf of the Members, but we should be prepared to work late on Wednesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. I wish him a happy Memorial Day weekend and a good evening.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday, May 29, 1996, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TODAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extensions of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR BASS TO BITE IN TEXAS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that it be the will of the Congress that the bass bite early and often throughout the weekend in Texas.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object if it is not in New York, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lay down the Senate adjournment resolution when it is received from the Senate.

DESIGNATION OF HON. ROBERT S. WALKER TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MAY 29, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 23, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT S. WALKER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Wednesday, May 29, 1996.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to. There was no objection.

□ 1545

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was just called to my office and informed that I was not recorded on the last vote on H.R. 1227. I was present on the floor at the time, from the time of the first Goodling amendment, and apparently inadvertently left the floor without having cast my vote, although I was under the impression that I had.

My vote on final passage of 1227 would have been "yes."

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GOSS). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her 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. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

QUESTIONING PRESIDENT CLINTON'S COMMITMENT TO OUR NATION'S SPACE PROGRAM, AND URGING MEMBERS TO SUPPORT BUDGET RESOLUTION ON NASA

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of difficulty with President Clinton's real commitment to our Nation's space program. We have all heard his official position, but how does that compare with the demonstrated position? On the one hand, his science adviser says the President steadfastly opposes any cuts in science and technology. That came from Jack Gibbons on March 29. Vice President GORE said the President's 1997 budget will provide generous funding for science and technology. But if we look at what the President does to NASA's budget, if we look at what the President actually does, rather than what he says or his staff says, we get a different picture.

Mr. Speaker, the President made dangerous, deep cuts in NASA's long-term budget. We can see on this graph that I have here, the House budget does decline NASA's budget slightly over 7 years in the effort to balance the budget, but the President's cuts are very, very deep and I believe seriously undermine our ability to have an effective and growing investment in science and technology.

Indeed, the President puts a lot of investment in a program that I think is of some questionable scientific value. One has to wonder about the foundations of his space policy. I believe the future of space exploration lies in programs such as our international space station and continuing our investment in the shuttle program, as well as developing new launch vehicles.

I know what would happen to our space program if the United States were left with the kind of budget that the President is proposing here. It would just be a shell of a program. Our

nation is a space-faring Nation. We are an exploring Nation.

If we look at the history of the great nations of the world and what happened to many of them when they stopped exploring and they stopped reaching out, they began to shrink. They began to diminish. They began to become less of a significance in the world. And they went on, to quote President Ronald Reagan frequently, into the dustpan of history.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the \$2 billion that the President wants to cut out of NASA's budget is setting the stage for that kind of development for our Nation. I believe what the House is doing is the responsible thing. We all know everybody has to play a role in balancing the budget, and everybody has to do their part.

It is wrong, it is immoral, to keep saddling our children with excessive amounts of debt. The debt burden, as we all know, today is huge, \$5 trillion; something like \$18,000 for every man, woman, and child. NASA has stepped up to the plate and has been able to continue doing what it has been doing in the past with fewer people. The men and women of NASA have done a yeoman's job in being able to continue the shuttle program, continue to allow it to fly safely, continue the space station on schedule and on budget, as well as continue investment in science research. But what the President is proposing, Mr. Speaker, I think would be devastating to our space program, and is just wrong. I believe that the President's budget proposal is the wrong approach to our science program.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that we could almost describe his space policy as being lost in space. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all my colleagues to support our House budget resolution on NASA. It is the right proposal. It is a proposal that would allow us to continue our crucial investment in the space station, in the shuttle program, in the development of a new launch vehicle, and would not devastate the program, as the President is proposing.

THE HOUSE VOTE ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us can accept this week, as we head into the honoring and celebrating of our veterans and those who are in our military bases across this land and this world, that today we struck a very positive blow for working Americans. It is difficult sometimes with the flurry of debate and one accusation after another to really clear away some of the confusion, and to know whether or not we were in fact destructive, undermining, or whether in fact we have given something worthy for those who work every day in America.

I would simply like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this wound up being a bipartisan decision to increase the minimum wage. It was a reflection of over 80-percent of the American public who said yes, this is a good idea. In meeting with a small businessowner today for lunch from my hometown in Houston, I was very proud of her and the words she said, in offering, "I think it is the right thing to do."

We have heard in this debate again the rising of one and the sitting of another, and coming to the well to rebut what the other one has said. It seems confusing, and the singular tone or sound of those who opposed this was the elimination or the undermining of small businesses and the elimination of jobs that are given by small businesses. Let me say to America that that was an attractive hook for you to hang onto, but it was absolutely wrong.

First of all, the main point is that in the State of Texas, 1.1 million workers would be denied an increase if we had not raised the minimum wage. Right now the minimum wage is \$4.25. I do not know about you, but I respect young people, and I am sorry that we used them as a hammer, as well: All the people making the minimum wage are young people.

Who says that the reason that they work is not a valid reason: supporting the family, adding to the ability to go to institutions of higher learning, or even being able to stay in school. Why should we denigrate our young people because they are at the bottom rung?

Second, let me say that, I hate to say it, minorities were used as another club: Well, if you raise the minimum wage, you will see the jobs lost for African-Americans and Hispanics and maybe women. Let me offer to say that this is not a racial issue. This is not to say that the only people who need an increase in the minimum wage are African-Americans and Hispanics. They are Americans.

Let me also give a point of information, that most of the small businesses owned by African-Americans, women, minorities collectively, are sole proprietorships. That means that they do not hire anyone, they are still climbing the rung, they are still climbing to access capital. But in fact, the broad number of individuals who work for a minimum wage are individuals who have families, who have opted to work over welfare. Why not reward them, being the first increase in almost 6 years, the lowest minimum wage since 1938 in terms of its output? In 1979 the minimum wage equaled \$6.25, not in the number but in what it could purchase. What can you do with \$4.25? That is giving you change back from a \$5 bill.

So it was important for this house today to vote on a clean minimum wage bill, one that would increase it a mere 90 cents, to \$5.15, and to rebut those arguments that you would put small businesses out of business or you would eliminate jobs.

We understand the free marketplace. Yes; I would be dishonest not to say

that goods and services may increase because of the profit margin, but people will be working for a fair and decent wage. They will then circulate their dollars back into the system. We will give them dignity. They will be able to maintain a family, that 59 percent that we talked about, many of whom are single parents, women in particular.

I think it is important that we kind of clear the air and explain why, in fact, the Goodling amendment to exempt businesses of a certain category was not good, because those businesses in our malls of America where we go and shop, there are people who work there who go home every day and have the same responsibilities as all of us: the rent payment, the electricity payment. It is important not to make this a war against the American worker and small businesses. We can work to support small businesses, as we have done with the Small Business Tax Incentive Act, which I supported, and we, too, can vote for the American worker. I am glad today that we increased the minimum wage for all America to have a decent quality of life.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS PASQUARELL, SR.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if you or other Members have ever been in my office, no doubt you've seen the fire helmets lining the walls.

I must have a hundred of them.

They are symbols of the enormous respect and admiration I have for volunteer firefighters.

It's not just that I used to be a volunteer firefighter myself in my hometown of Queensbury, in upstate New York.

It's more than that.

I could sum up my feelings about volunteer firefighters in three words: Louis Pasquarell Sr.

Mr. Speaker, Lou Pasquarell, Sr., is celebrating his 60th year as a volunteer firefighter.

As you all know, I measure a man by how much he gives to his community. And Mr. Speaker, by that yardstick, Lou Pasquarell, Sr. is a giant among men.

Let me tell you a few things about volunteer firefighters in general.

These are ordinary citizens from all walks of life who represent the only available fire protection in rural communities like the one I represent.

In New York State alone they save countless lives and billions of dollars worth of property every year.

They surrender much of their personal time, not only to respond to fires, but to upgrade their skills with constant training.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, fighting fires is a dirty, exhausting, and frequently dangerous job.