

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.

Volunteer firefighters approach that job with a selfless dedication, and the highest degree of professionalism.

Typical of these volunteers, or, I should say, more than typical, is Lou Pasquarell, Sr.

He joined the Jonesville Volunteer Fire Co. in Clifton Park 60 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way to calculate the lives and property he has helped save in those 60 years, the number of hours he has spent in that effort, or the number of younger firemen he has inspired.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least five other firefighters in the company who, when they were children, drove in parades in the miniature fire vehicle Mr. Pasquarell built for the Jonesville future firefighters.

He has served on numerous committees, the board of directors, and on the police fire squad.

He has been both a Lieutenant in the company and for many years the chairman of the district board of elections.

In his capacity as Captain of the fire police squad, he was instrumental in placing the area's first fire police vehicle in service.

He also organized a special event last Christmas at the firehouse through the adopt an angel program for a 6-year-old boy who suffers from a terminal illness.

Mr. Speaker, Lou Pasquarell Sr.'s contributions go far beyond his firefighting.

He also played a major role in building two bocci courts for use by Shenendehowa senior citizens on the pavilion on Main Street.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't too often you get to meet a living legend. And that's what Lou Pasquarell Sr. is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members to join me in saluting this great volunteer fireman, this great American, this man I am privileged to call a good friend, Louis Pasquarell, Sr., of Clifton Park, New York.

□ 1600

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

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

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 601(A) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 17, 1996

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	BA	1996 outlays	NEA	BA	1996-2000 outlays	NEA
House Committee						
Agriculture:						
Allocation	-992	-992	177	-8,477	-8,477	-2,164
Current Level	-330	-722	-758	-5,051	-5,406	-6,811
Difference	662	270	-935	3,426	3,071	-4,647
National Security:						
Allocation	-1,168	-1,168	382	1,733	1,733	1,467
Current Level	369	367	401	1,657	1,653	1,803
Difference	1,537	1,535	19	-76	-80	336

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF MAY 17, 1996 FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996-2000

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1996 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2000.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), for legislation having spending or revenue effects in fiscal years 1996 through 2000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 22, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1996 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2000.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of May 17, 1996.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1996 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 602(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 67 for fiscal year 1996 and for fiscal years 1996 through 2000. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement

authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1996 with the revised "section 602(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, since the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) suballocation. The revised section 602(b) suballocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on December 5, 1995.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 67

[Reflecting Action Completed as of May 17, 1996]

	On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars	
	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1996-2000
Appropriate Level: (as set by H. Con. Res. 67):		
Budget Authority	1,285,515	6,814,600
Outlays	1,288,160	6,749,200
Revenues	1,042,500	5,691,500
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,306,869	(NA)
Outlays	1,307,746	(NA)
Revenues	1,038,986	5,654,519
Current Level over(+)/under(-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	21,354	(NA)
Outlays	19,586	(NA)
Revenues	-3,514	-36,981

NA=Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 1997 through 2000 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for fiscal year 1996 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause fiscal year 1996 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 67.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing any new budget or entitlement authority that would increase fiscal year 1996 outlays (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause fiscal year 1996 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 67.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss in either fiscal year 1996 or for the total for fiscal year 1996 through 2000 would increase the amount by which revenues are less than the recommended levels of revenue set by H. Con. Res. 67.