

air group, which became known as Fabled 15, was credited with the destruction of more enemy airplanes than any other Navy group in the Pacific war. That means in history.

It goes on to mention all the places that he fought, the Marianas, that was called the Turkey Shoot of Iwo Jima, bloody Palau, the Philippines, Formosa, and Nansei Shotos. He took part in the first battle of the Philippines. Over 400 enemy planes were destroyed in one battle. His remarkable exploits continued up to and including the Battle of Leyte Gulf.

It goes on to talk about the ships sunk, a Japanese battleship, 3 aircraft carriers, a heavy cruiser, additional ships, 3 more battleships, another carrier, 5 heavy cruisers, 4 light cruisers, 19 destroyers. They destroyed the navy.

And I remember George Bush's backseater Leo Nado. I said, "Leo, in 58 missions, how many times were you jumped by Japanese aircraft?" He said, "Congressman, Mr. Bush," he says "I still call him "Mr." because that is what he called ensigns and lieutenants," he said, "Mr. Bush and I never saw a Japanese airplane." I said "What, in 58 missions getting shot down twice?" He said, "No, our fighter pilots, those Hell Cat pilots," he is talking about McCampbell, and he gestured with his arm, Leo says, "They swept the skies clear in front of Mr. Bush and myself." Bush of course in his combat missions was hit with ground fire.

But we have buried another great hero at Arlington. He is in the new part of the cemetery, the plot where all the Vietnam veterans are.

Mr. Speaker, I will be a conferee on the Senate-House authorization bill conference this year. I was just talking to Speaker GINGRICH about it. I will be a conferee. I tell you that I will dedicate myself to a good authorization bill by thinking about people like Navy ace of aces David McCampbell.

REPORT FROM INDIANA—BENNIE MAJERS/RACHAEL GINDER

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give my weekly report from Indiana. There are special people in our society who reach out and lend a caring hand to all who are alone in the world. These individuals make our community a better place to live. Every weekend when Ruthie and I return home, we meet good people who are doing just that. I call them Hoosier heroes, Hoosier heroes because they are generous in their acts of love, because they sacrifice and serve as an example for the rest of us in our community.

Today I want to recognize Bennie Majers and Rachael Ginder, both of Madison County as Hoosier heroes. These two women shared their story

with me during my visit with them over the Fourth of July break. I met with them because a good friend of mine, Judge Dennis Carroll had shared with me how much they had contributed as advocates for children in our community.

For over 16 years, Bennie Majers has been investigating the accidental deaths of children that turn out to be homicides. She is able to pursue most of these unthinkable cases because of her own life story. As an abused child, Bennie witnessed her own father murder her young brother. Bennie is known throughout Madison County and around the country because of her determination and hard work to uncover similar heinous crimes. She told me she does it in the memory of her young brother because she wants to make sure that other young people do not have that happen to them.

Her reputation as a victims advocate has earned her national appearances on the Oprah and the Geraldo shows. Certainly Bennie is one of those people who is helping out our community. She works with the sheriff's office in Madison County and develops profiles to indicate where a murder may have occurred of a young child. Her heart is filled with love and hope, and her impressive résumé is full of efforts to help children. Her commitment is indeed commendable.

The story of Rachael Ginder is also one of those that deserves mention and special recognition. Rachael and her husband Ron have provided foster care for nearly 150 children, many of whom are difficult and hard to place. Rachael shared with me that often those children have come back to them as adults and thanked Rachael and Ron for the love that they provided them and gave them a chance for a better life.

Many of the children that they have had are severely retarded, mentally handicapped. The doctors often say that some of the children have very few months of live or only days. But the Ginders have been willing to love them and to never give up hope on those children who enter their home. In their hearts, their thoughts and their prayers, they feel that it is their special gift to love these children, to give them a home where they can be nurtured.

One particular story involves a young girl named Melissa, who was born with no brain tissue, only a brainstem. The doctors gave her only a few days to live. She came to the Ginders when she was 15 months. They have adopted her as their own child, and now she is a young girl of 15 years who enjoys listening to music, the piano and the flute, and she continues to be a joy for all those in her house.

With the strength and hope in their hearts and God to guide them, the Ginders continue loving these children, like Melissa, unconditionally. The Ginders open up their hearts to these children, children who desperately need them, and they shower them with

love. The Ginders seek to be more Christlike in their approach as they continue to give to those who are least fortunate in our society.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lift up Ron and Rachel Ginder and Betty Majers and her husband as Hoosier heroes in the true sense of the word. They have made sacrifices in their lives so that young people who are less fortunate than they were have a chance for hope and a better life in the future.

FAMILIES FINISH LAST IN GOP WELFARE REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we passed the Republican majority's welfare reform bill, H.R. 3734. I think this triumph of the Republican majority again proves what we have said all along, that Democrats put families and children first, Republicans put families and children last. The Republicans are at least open and consistent, I appreciate their honesty. They are open and consistent in their extremism. As Speaker GINGRICH has said, politics is war without blood. The Republicans have declared war on families and children and they do not hide it. They have declared war on working people. They do not hide it. They are consistent. The American people will have a clear choice in November. There is no camouflaging of their intentions. The Republicans have done more than they said they would do but they clearly have laid out a pattern which shows that they are not for families, they are not for children. They use the rhetoric, they use the slogans, but the proof is in their actions. Today's welfare reform legislation certainly proves that.

I am all for welfare reform. I am in favor of reforming any program and any function of government, in fact. That is part of our vital function here, to keep the process of reform going. There is not a single government program or a single function of government that cannot stand improvement. The process of reform should be a permanent, ongoing process, and welfare certainly needed reforming. It did not need reforming because the poor people have ruined it because poor people do not administer anything. Poor people have no power. Poor people have no say in how we have administered any program, and certainly they have had no vital function here in the administration of the welfare program. If the welfare program needs reform and needed reform, and I think it did, it is because the people who are running it, including the policymakers in our Congress and our various State legislatures and city councils, it needed reform because we have not operated properly. Did it need such extremism as we have seen

today, in today's Republican welfare reform bill?

It can best be described, I think, and I will read this little description from the Democratic whip notice. I think it describes it quite well and summarizes some of the problems quite well. The Welfare Budget Reconciliation for Fiscal Year 1997 is what the title of the bill is.

It creates a welfare block grant to replace the current Aid to Families with Dependent Children and three other related programs. The bill is tough on kids and weak on work. More than 1 million children will be pushed into poverty, and in 70 percent of these families, one of the parents is working. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Republican bill provides \$10 billion less than what States need to meet its work requirements. The bill has certain requirements for work but there is a need for funding for those requirements and they have \$10 billion less than what is needed by the requirements of the bill according to the Congressional Budget Office. This bill makes it less likely that child support orders will be updated regularly. It actually weakens current law on dead-beat parents while increasing Federal costs. In addition, emergency funds for use during a recession are inadequate.

There was also an amendment to the bill which passed which Members ought to know about which limits the lifetime use of food stamps. There is a lifetime limit of 3 months for the use of food stamps. Individuals, families who have fallen into hard times for a brief period and need to eat, something as basic as food will be denied. You have got 3 months for your lifetime, regardless of your circumstances, the Federal Government will help you eat and stay alive for only 3 months. We do not say we have 3 months, or that there is a limit on the amount of earthquake assistance we give. If people live in zones where they have earthquakes, no matter how many earthquakes you have, the Federal Government will always rise to the occasion and there will be aid for people who suffer from disasters that are natural disasters, like earthquakes. No matter how many hurricanes or tornadoes come, there will be Federal aid for people who are in the path of a hurricane or tornadoes. There will be Federal aid for people who are in flood plain zones. Even if they have had floods there before and people know the danger, and they continue to build houses there, there is still Federal aid. There is no limit on the amount of Federal aid you can get.

Over the last 3 years, we have paid out quite a bit of Federal aid for natural disasters, earthquakes, floods, and hurricanes. But individual disasters, family disasters, which are economic and which will come, we all admit. We have a fluctuating economy, an economy which is constantly in motion, and there will be temporary losers. That is a certainty. But the temporary losers now will have a limit on how

much you can get in food stamps. The most elementary and the least thing that the Federal Government can do for you is to give you an opportunity to eat. That is going to be limited. That is what this bill does.

I am not going to spend all my time talking just about this bill. I want to bring a commonsense perspective to the whole welfare debate. This great triumph of the Republican majority today which will certainly be repeated in the Senate, and we can expect this bill to go the President's desk. He has said he will veto it as it is, but the perspective that should have been brought to the discussion and the debate today, we could not bring it there because there was so little time to debate the bill.

I have had a lot of comments from people who watch these special orders, and there are a lot of good people out there who watch them. I am always surprised at the number of people who say that they do watch the special orders. They want to know why you are talking in an empty room.

□ 1830

Why bother to talk to an empty Chamber? Two things: They do not know for most of the time debate is going on and during the regular session, the Chamber is almost empty.

But more important than that, this is an institution, a special order institution, which allows us to bring some perspective to the debate, to talk in terms which will allow the American people to understand what is going on here. It is an opportunity for those of us who care about making commonsense decisions and making reasonable decisions with the best information that we can get.

We take advantage of this opportunity to give real information to people. We do not talk about the things that are really important in this country. We do not give the time we need to the life and death kinds of public policy decisionmaking.

People think that food, clothing, and shelter are the three necessities of life, and that is the way it is and that is the way it always has been. Well, food, clothing, and shelter are three basic necessities, but information to make informed decisions is as vital as food, clothing, and shelter.

In a democracy, the public policy decisions made will often determine whether you will get food, clothing, and shelter. Certainly nothing offers a better example of that than the bill that passed today, which deprives people who are in desperate circumstances of food stamps.

So I am here because this is an opportunity to help bring a perspective to the situation that I could not bring otherwise.

Why did I not talk during the debate? I talked during the debate for 2 minutes. I had to beg for 2 minutes. That is the best I could get. You can understand if there are 435 Members of the

House, and seldom do 435 Members of the House all want to speak on the same subject, let us say 200 Members of the House want to speak, and they are given 1 minute apiece, that is 200 minutes.

I think we should have the 200 minutes. Maybe we should all get 5 minutes apiece. You need at least 5 minutes to make a decent statement. We cannot get 5 minutes apiece if 200 people want to speak on a subject.

In fact, you might be interested to know that on this very important topic of welfare reform, where we are making vital decisions about the entitlement to subsistence, this is a matter that was decided in the 1930's under Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, when the Social Security Act was passed. We gave people an entitlement to help when they are in desperate need. Families were given this entitlement.

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children is an entitlement which in essence says children in need must be helped and the Federal Government is going to stand behind you and guarantee that help. The States are obligated to make their contribution in this process.

So the entitlement is taken away by this legislation. Something as vital as an entitlement is gone. I am happy to report that the entitlement for Medicaid, which they are trying to steal also, the Republicans are quite honest, they do not pretend to care about families and children. They put families last. Democrats put families first. And they have not camouflaged their intentions. They wanted to take away the entitlement for Medicaid as well as take away the entitlement for Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

When we take away the entitlement for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, we begin to chop away at the substance and foundation for Medicaid, because if you are not deemed eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children—and the States have a block grant, they have a great deal of freedom and leeway in making the decisions about who actually gets designated as a person in need—then they will be able to lower their Medicaid bill by refusing to certify that people are eligible for AFDC.

The families are eligible for help. So we have already begun to chip away at Medicaid, which is the first and most important step this Nation has ever made toward universal health care.

So, as I say, we had 2 hours of debate allotted for this, 1 hour for the Republicans and 1 hour for the Democrats. Two hours allotted for debate, in a Chamber which has 435 people. So you can see how important this institution is of special orders. When 435 people are there, there is no time to actually give a discussion which makes sense.

I think we should allocate more time for debate on the floor. I do not know why we cannot spend more time in session. You might be interested to know that Roll Call, the newspaper here

which is focused primarily on the coverage of activities in the Congress, Roll Call does periodically a little chart called Congress at Work, and they give the work load figures for the first half of the year.

Here is a comparison of Congress' effort so far this session against the same period in 1994. To compare the Senate and the House, they have the number of days that we have been in session, the House of Representatives, with 435 people who need time to deliberate and speak.

The House has been in session for 82 days this year, from January 3 to June 30, 82 days in session. The Senate with only 100 people has been in session for 90 days. The House, with 435 people who need to have time to deliberate and to debate, has spent 615 hours in session from January 3 to June 30 with its 435 members, while the Senate has spent 651 hours, more hours with only 100 members.

So just that little item tells you that something is very strange about the way we operate. Are we afraid of debate? Are we afraid of discussion in the House? Why can there not be more time allotted on the floor for an issue as vital as life and death matters related to food stamps, related to children, aid to families with dependent children.

That is just what it says, it is aid to families with dependent children. No matter how many stereotypes we have thrown at us about welfare mothers, and there are excesses and abuse, it is primarily a program to help children. If they do not have children, they do not get AFDC. The money is really there for children.

We have taken away the entitlement, the Federal Government's participation guaranteeing that everybody will get it. We left it to the States and the localities to decide who gets it, who does not, and how much.

We have made a radical change. This is an extreme change. We could have had welfare reform without such extremism. We did not have to go to that extreme, but we have taken an extreme step, and we only had 2 hours of general debate on the floor.

There was another hour to debate a Democratic substitute, 30 minutes on one side and 30 minutes on the other. So you have these far-reaching public policy decisions which will mean life and death for numerous families, numerous individuals in the future. If not life and death, for many others it will mean a lot of suffering that cannot be relieved in some reasonable way. And all we had was 2 hours to debate. So we need an opportunity to set this thing in perspective.

I would like to put it in the context of other developments in this 104th Congress. Let us take a look at this great triumph of the Republican majority today. They passed a bill which is going to hurt families and children.

They put families and children last, as they have done from the very begin-

ning. We had the same phenomenon in the fall when the school lunch programs were being discussed. They started with their attack on school lunches, and, to some degree, they relented because we exposed them. They started with their attack on education programs, title I. They wanted to cut it by \$1.1 billion. Head Start they wanted to cut by \$300,000. Many other education programs are wiped out completely, a total of more than \$5 billion in cuts.

But we took that case to the American people, and the voters out there in their districts let every Member of Congress, regardless of their party, know that those education cuts were not acceptable. So they backed down and they did not cut it. But they did make the attempt in their war against families, in their war against children. They had to capitulate.

Even Hitler's Wehrmacht had to capitulate in a few cases in its early days. They thought they had victory after victory after victory, and when they invaded Russia, it looked as though they were going to march all the way to Moscow. But because of the resistance in certain pockets, they had to capitulate and yield. Finally you had the counterattack at the doors of Moscow, which sent them into a whole series of defeats and left them in the Russian winter.

But despite this capitulation temporarily on education, the are back again this year with more cuts on education. The war on children, the war on students, the war on education continues. They are not saying anymore, the Republican majority is not as extreme as they were when they started at the beginning this 104th session. If you recall at the beginning of the 104th session, the Republicans proposed to abolish the Department of Education, eliminate it, wipe it out, send a signal across the country that the Federal Government has no role in education.

Then there was the assault on workers. In the Contract With America, the Republicans never said that they were going to assault workers. They never said they were going to go after the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. OSHA was never attacked in the Contract With America. But the minute they gained power the attack on OSHA began, to wipe out the safety regulations and the agency responsible for the safety and health of workers all over the country.

The the attack on Davis-Bacon, which calls for prevailing wages to be paid on Federal construction programs underway in any neighborhood, any city across the country, to pay people what the local wages are. There is nothing unreasonable about Davis-Bacon, but they attacked Davis-Bacon.

They attacked the National Labor Relations Board, which is responsible for guaranteeing that there is a collective bargaining process and it moves along smoothly.

Finally, they have recently attacked the overtime pay you get. The Repub-

lican want your overtime pay. The Fair Labor Standards Act, they want to change in order to force people to accept compensatory time in private industry instead of a cash check. The Republican want your overtime. They have come for your overtime.

So they have been very consistent. The attack on families, the attack on children, has been very consistent. Republicans put families and children last, and they have not hidden that fact.

Who do they put first? Well, you have got evidence clearly in the budget. They have not attacked spending for defense. They increased that by \$13 billion, at a time when they were determined to balance the budget and were making all of these cuts in education programs and school lunch programs, in Head Start.

They were making these cuts in the name of fiscal responsibility. They wanted to balance the budget in order to eliminate the possibility that we would continue to have a rising national debt. The pace of the national debt started by Ronald Reagan in a Republican administration, they wanted to end that.

We are all in favor of that. We do not want to continue to do what Ronald Reagan started. The deficit was about \$60 billion in the last year of Jimmy Carter's administration. In the last year of Ronald Reagan's administration, it was up to \$400 billion. That is the annual deficit. This means under Ronald Reagan all those years, the deficit kept increasing.

The national debt, of course, goes up as a result of each year's deficit. So we are all in favor of ending that. But do you have to attack children and do you have to attack families in order to end the increase in the national debt?

Why not cut the defense budget, or at least leave it as it is. Why add \$13 billion to the defense budget, as we are doing in the present budget that recently passed? Why go after families in the name of cutting the budget, when you do not go after farm subsidy programs, farmers home loan mortgages?

Billions of dollars have gone down the drain in farmers home loan mortgages. Nobody bothers to collect them, it is just a gift. Billions of dollars have been given to the farmers, and nobody is out there trying to collect them anymore in the farmers home loan mortgage program.

Farm subsidy programs, paying farmers not to plant crops, not to plow up the soil, and various other little subsidy programs, have given farmers across the country a handout for years. We do not propose to cut those handouts drastically.

But Aid to Families with Dependent Children, which is about 1 percent of the total budget, has been under attack. There is a hysteria that has been generated about welfare and giving aid to families with dependent children. So we rushed into scapegoating, we rushed into persecuting the poor. Welfare reform was needed, but you did not need

to persecute the poor. You did not need such extremism.

Let us look at this matter again in context. Welfare reform has been touted as a way to put the bums to work, take people off the dole and put people to work. That is a big lie, because most of the people on welfare are not able to go to work.

□ 1845

The whole theory behind Aid to Families with Dependent Children is you are giving the aid to the mother who is there to take care of the child. If you did not have a mother to take care of the child, you offer day care for those mothers who go to work while they still have young children. Well, you have to pay for the day care then. You offer job training. You have to pay for that.

The important thing is that the whole notion that people are out there on the dole and they are there because they do not want to go to work means that there are jobs out there and that they should use those jobs, or that they are able to go to work and it is cheaper for them to go to work. Leave the child with a day care program and we, the public, will pay for the day care program and go into a training program if you do not qualify for a job now. The public will pay for the training program.

And finally you get a job. The question is, Will there be jobs there when you go through the training program, make the arrangements for your child's day care? Will there be jobs? No, we do not have jobs in the places where we have the largest concentrations of people on aid to families with dependent children.

Let us assume we did have the jobs. If the Republicans cared about families, if they did not put families last, they would not be opposing the minimum wage. We would like for the jobs to pay enough for the mother to be able to go to work, put the child in a day care program and pay part of that, I guess, and be able to take care of the family.

I suppose if they do not have health benefits on the job, they have to pay for their health benefits. But in order for this to happen, they have to have something above the minimum wage pay.

The current minimum wage pay will give an individual about \$8,400 a year if you work every hour of a 40-hour week of the year. Never lose time. Never lose pay. You work every hour for a 40-hour week every week of the year, and you come out with \$8,400. That will not support a mother and child. That will not support a mother and child.

We propose a minimum wage which would help matters a little bit more, where an individual would be making, instead of the \$4.25 an hour, which produces \$8,400, an individual would be making \$5.15 an hour, a 90-cent increase, which would be granted over a 2-year period, which does not improve

things that much but it is one small step forward. You would be making a little more than \$9,000 a year if you worked 40 hours a week every week of the year.

So minimum wage makes sense if you really are sincere about wanting to provide work opportunities for people who are on welfare. Minimum wage makes sense. Minimum wage coupled with health care makes even more sense. Really, we need to give that combination of the minimum wage plus a guarantee of health care in order to really make sense for families that are poor with children to take care of.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children makes a person automatically eligible. If the receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children, they are automatically eligible for Medicaid. If they are not receiving AFDC, they are not eligible for Medicaid anymore. They lose their health care benefits.

Are you going to get a minimum wage job that also has a health care benefit? Most of them do not have health care packages. Most minimum wage jobs are the ones that are rudimentary and not in a structure which would provide for a minimum wage plus a health care package. So many people find ways to stay on welfare just to hold on to their health care.

The Republicans have made it clear that they do not really believe in work because they are not willing to pay a minimum wage. They are not willing to reward work. Work at the very bottom at least deserves a minimum wage as a reward.

Now, the majority in this House finally capitulated to common sense. The people out there have a lot of common sense. If more of that could be communicated in a more intense form, we would have a great improvement of what happens here in Washington. But the problem is America's common sense does not come through often.

When it came to the minimum wage, people clearly understood that, if we care about people and care about work and if we want to promote the work ethic, then the guy on the street, the person on the street out there understood that the least we could do is raise the minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour over a 2-year period to \$5.15. That is a minimum. That is the least we could do. That is a tiny improvement, to go from \$4.25 an hour to \$5.15 an hour.

Most American workers are making more than that, but there are more than 10 million who are making minimum wage only. That number is growing, of course, as we move from more people into a service economy where minimum wage is more likely to take place.

So America's common sense was communicated up through the focus groups, up through the public opinion polls. It was so strong and so clear and so consistent that even a Republican Party that had sworn that it did not want to pass the minimum wage had to

relent. So we passed a minimum wage bill here in the House after some people said it would never happen. Some Republican leaders said over their dead bodies would we even put the bill on the floor.

But America's common sense and pressure and communication of their common sense to the Members of Congress resulted in the passage of a minimum wage bill here on the floor of this House. And the Senate finally got around to it. They passed a minimum wage bill also.

But what is happening now? During the same period where we are waging war against families by reducing food stamps, by taking away the entitlement for Aid to Families With Dependent Children, the Republicans are holding the minimum wage bill hostage. It has passed the Senate and it has passed the House. They are determined it will not go unless we pay ransom for it.

Let me just read from the communications from our leader, DICK GEPHARDT. It is called Outrage of the Week. And I agree with the communications leaflet that comes from our Democrat leader's office:

When you're losing the game, change the rules: Republican leaders ignore majority vote, put stranglehold on minimum wage.

Republicans proved this week that they will go to any length to stop 12 million American workers from getting a modest raise in their wages.

After the Senate voted overwhelmingly 74 to 24 to pass a bill increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents, one month after the House had approved a similar bill, Senate Republican whip DON NICKLES intervened to stop the bill dead in its tracks. NICKLES told reporters Tuesday that he wouldn't allow the minimum wage bill to proceed to the next legislative step until he got his way on a health insurance bill that's currently bogged down by Republican attempts to add a special perk for the Golden Rule Insurance Co.

Said NICKLES: "My intention is to see that we don't have conferees appointed on the minimum wage bill until after we have conferees appointed to the health bill."

Republican leaders made good on their threat Thursday, blocking the minimum wage bill from going to conference by trying to attach unacceptable strings like the controversial health bill.

Now, the health bill is one item on the agenda which has a lot of good pieces in there. Everybody is in favor of a health bill which allows you to move your portability of your health care package and plan from one place to another. The end to discrimination on people with preexisting health conditions.

There are a number of good things in there. But in that health bill, when they talk about a perk for the Golden Rule Insurance Co., they are talking about the medical savings accounts, medical savings accounts which will allow certain healthy people to opt out of the Medicare system as it is now and receive a reward for being healthy.

That is good, receiving a reward for being healthy. But the whole principle of the Medicare insurance is based on a pool of people being there. If we take the people out of the pool that are the

healthiest and leave only the sickest people, it means that the pool is going to be paying money to take care of the sickest people and the pool is not supported by the insurance premiums paid by the people who are healthiest. The whole principle of the insurance pool collapses.

If we would allow that in other insurance situations, we would find insurance companies would go out of business. But we are going to destroy Medicare. The same people who said they want to save it will destroy it by placing this special item in there, and that is one insurance company which specializes in medical savings accounts. That is Golden Rule Insurance Co.

So Senator NICKLES wants to hold the minimum wage bill hostage because he wants to make room for the Golden Rule Insurance Co. to capitalize on a provision to have medical savings accounts.

Why is Senator NICKLES so determined to sink this minimum wage bill?

I am continuing to read from the Democratic leader's communication.

Why is Senator NICKLES so determined to sink this minimum wage bill? Here's a countdown of the three key reasons:

He's mad because he lost a key vote on the Republican amendment to gut the minimum wage bill, by denying the increase to millions of otherwise eligible workers. A similar amendment had also been defeated in the House in May.

What Senator NICKLES had proposed is the elimination of small businesses. A large number of small businesses would be eliminated. And that is where we have millions of the people who earn a minimum wage, no higher than minimum wage. They are working in small businesses. He wanted to eliminate the requirement that small businesses pay minimum wages and trap all of these people in a situation where they would not be covered by the minimum wage. He lost that vote in the Senate.

Another reason that Senator NICKLES is upset is, Republicans don't believe in the minimum wage. They just do not believe in it. As I said before, they do not hide their feelings. They do not hide their policies.

They have been quite clear to the American people that they are against families and children, they are against poor people, and they are against working people. They do not hide it. They started the year by saying we do not want the minimum wage, and some people said over my dead body will we even put the minimum wage bill on the floor.

So the Republicans do not believe, as the Republican Senate aide said to the New York Times on Tuesday, "Republicans don't believe in raising the minimum wage. We voted for it because it was killing us."

As I said before, common sense was killing the Republicans, common sense that was communicated by the people out there back to the Senators, back to the Members of the House, which said

we see the minimum wage as being a fair proposition. If you care about work, you want to reward work. If you want to encourage the work ethic in America, then you have to pay a higher wage and have that wage be rewarded. So they had to respond. It was killing them.

And finally, Senator NICKLES is determined to sink the minimum wage for the following reason:

Special interest money is just too good to pass up. Senator NICKLES' strategy is directed at two special interest groups, both of which gave big bucks to the GOP. The first is the Golden Rule Insurance Co., which would reap huge profits from the medical savings account provision Republicans want to add to the health bill. The second is business and industry lobbyists, who loathe the minimum wage bill as much as Republicans do. The New York Times confirmed this, reporting Wednesday after the vote on the Republican amendment to gut the minimum wage bill that Republicans said they hoped to use yesterday's vote to win donations from small businesses.

They are referring to the vote that took place in the Senate, which would have exempted small businesses, and one of the reasons was to win donations from the small businesses.

This is a communication from the Democratic leader, DICK GEPHARDT, called "Outrage of the Week." It is an outrage. It is outrageous the position that consistently is taken by the Republicans against families, putting families last, and against children.

If we are going to set this welfare vote that took place today in perspective, what do we want poor people to do? If we are not going to help them by giving aid to children, then we need to provide jobs and job opportunities.

□ 1900

The first step is not there. There is no provision to increase the number of jobs. Let us assume that jobs are there. The jobs need to pay a living wage. A living wage is really above the present minimum wage plus a health care package. A health care package is a vital part of a living wage. A job is not a job of any substance for a family unless in addition to providing the minimum wage, it also provides the health care package. The Republicans are determined that neither one of those will be there.

The welfare reform needed to take place. We needed to reform welfare. We needed to make better use of the dollars spent to help children. We needed to make better use and end waste in the way we handle our food stamps. There are a number of things about welfare reform that had to take place. But this welfare reform bill is an extremist bill.

It starts with the very extreme step of eliminating the entitlement. Poor people are no longer guaranteed that the Federal Government will be there to give you help when it is needed. The Federal Government will be there to give you help if you are a victim of an earthquake. The Federal Government

will be there to give you help if you are the victim of a flood. The Federal Government will be there if you are the victim of a hurricane, some other weather, which is proper, altogether fitting and proper that the Federal Government should be a participant in the process.

Maybe the States should do more in helping hurricane victims themselves. They do not have any State or local provisions for that. Maybe the States should do more in being responsible for their earthquake victims. Maybe the States should do more to be responsible for their flood victims. The Federal Government should participate. Right now it is the primary participant in providing relief for people who suffer from natural disaster. So people who suffer from economic disaster deserve at least some help from the Federal Government, and we have taken away the Federal Government's participation.

In perspective, this is consistent with what the Republicans have been doing. In perspective, their attack on education is another part of the problem. Educational opportunity must be provided to poor people if you want to guarantee that they do not have to ask the Federal Government or the State government or the local government for help.

Let us provide some fishing lines. The statement that if you really want to feed a person, you do not keep supplying them with fish. You buy them a hook and line and teach them how to fish. Let us teach people how to fish.

Let us follow the evidence that is clear that everybody who has an education in America is able to make a contribution back to both himself and the economy. Certainly when it comes to college graduates, this evidence is quite clear and overwhelming. Most college graduates are able to support themselves and also to pay income tax, which supports their government, pay income taxes and other taxes.

College graduates, graduation up to now almost guarantees that you are going to get some kind of job. So why not have the Federal Government play a greater role in education instead of a lesser role? From our House Democratic leadership there is another communications which bears out my oft stated hypothesis that Republicans are the enemies of public education.

Republicans are consistent, though. This is the way to help families, this is the way to help children. They do not want to do that. In this communication we call it the Republicans' raid on education.

Republicans in Congress get an F. The GOP fails to meet growing educational needs of America's children. While the needs of our children and schools are increasing, the GOP Congress has failed to grasp this important reality. Indeed, at the end of the 1995-96 school year, the GOP Congress has failed America's children and has earned an F once again for failing the American educational system.

Specifically, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution narrowly passed in the House and Senate and the fiscal year 1997 Labor-HHS appropriations bill that the House will vote on this week, just the same old song from last year. This was a week ago, cutting back on programs important to educating our Nation's children when we need to be moving forward to meet their growing educational needs. Only this time it is a little better disguised than the cuts were in the previous budget.

While Republicans claim to have moderated their course, the performance of the GOP Congress on education in 1996 is consistent with the extreme cuts in education that they voted on in 1995. Indeed, many of the education programs the GOP is proposing to cut, freeze, or eliminate this year are the same priority education programs that they tried to last year.

Indeed, the record of the GOP Congress shows that rather than working to expand the access to a college education and to maintain Federal support for local schools, the GOP Congress continues to move in exactly the opposite direction. They have flunked in every aspect of meeting America's educational needs. While Republicans claim to freeze spending on education in the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution, the reality is that they do not understand the fundamentals of math. The fiscal year 1997 GOP budget resolution freezes spending on education and training programs below the fiscal 1996 level for the next 6 years and cuts spending on education by 21 percent in real terms by the year 2002. Such a large 21-percent cut in real terms will result in deep cuts in services to children and education.

Furthermore, the resolution provides no allowances for helping schools meet the challenge of projected enrollment increases of 12 percent over the next decade.

Republicans put families and children last. Republicans are against public education being used as a way to help people out of dependence on government at any level.

There is a rumor that there is going to be a new initiative taken by the Republicans on education, that the Republican candidate for President is going to announce his new initiative next week or this weekend. I hope so. I hope that the Republicans will take the initiative on education and the attack on education, because we used to have far more bipartisan cooperation on education.

There were differences in many areas but when it came to education, we sort of came together and understood that probably more important than any other function of our Government's local, State, and Federal governments is the function of education. Education has become even more important now that the world has changed and the competition in the world does not revolve around military strength and military hardware, military preparedness.

Competition in the world revolves around the quality of education the population has, which enables that population to compete and be productive, which enables that population to understand the complexities of world trade and the complexities of modern life so that people themselves do not become a burden on their society because they are overwhelmed by the complexities.

The only answer to that being overwhelmed by the complexities of modern life and the only avenue and instrument for being able to make yourself productive for yourself and make yourself productive so you can make a contribution to the society is education.

Education was always the answer. Among the newly freed slaves, it was clearly understood in the African-American community that education was the answer. From the very beginning slaves understood that if the slavemasters had passed legislation that it was bad to teach them to read, prohibited the teaching of reading to the slaves, then it must be indeed a powerful weapon, this reading must be a powerful thing. Education must be a powerful thing.

So it was understood by all that they wanted to have a piece of this education process, and it has been of value in the African-American community since then. The African-American community believes strongly that education is important. The problem is that there is a lot of confusion about how you guarantee that their children get an education. There are a lot of battles that have to be fought with the bureaucracy, especially in our big cities like New York, to guarantee that children are given an education which is going to be relevant to guarantee that children are given course work which makes them feel that their education is relevant.

To guarantee that children are given some kind of course work and built into the curricula are items which will motivate those children, build up their self-esteem and make them feel that they are important and feel that they have some hope and feel that education is going to be important so that they themselves will contribute more than half of what is needed in that education process, regardless of what teachers do or what kind of equipment you have or what kind of schools you have. If the children are motivated, they will overcome, they will move forward.

The big problem is that we do not have an education curriculum in most of our big cities that motivates children to begin with. Just as important as the motivation, of course, is the need for concrete opportunities to learn by providing a decent building, conducive to learning. The lighting in the school classroom has to be proper. The atmosphere in the school has to be safe. The water has to be free of lead and not poison the children.

The ceilings have to be free of asbestos. We have a situation now where

schools across the country are in serious trouble. Half the schools across the country have some kind of health hazard. The health of young people who attend these schools is jeopardized by the fact that an asbestos problem or lead in the water problem or a problem with the way the lighting is and the ventilation.

The President recently announced an initiative, again, I hope the Republicans will join this initiative, an initiative to begin to offer some Federal help on school construction. It is long overdue. Half the school buildings in America need help, not just with repairs; a lot of them need to be torn down and rebuilt.

The President before that announced an initiative in the State of the Union Message. In the State of the Union Message the President talked about wiring all the schools in America by the year 2000. He first talked about by the end of the year 20 percent of schools in California were going to be wired and they are using volunteers to accomplish a lot of this in the wiring process. I think that that objective and that estimated goal of the President with respect to California has proven true. They have gone on and done that. Twenty percent of the schools are wired.

□ 1915

But the big problem of wiring all the schools in America so that they can receive the kind of help that you get with the Internet going into the classrooms, the classrooms being able to have the latest educational technology, all of that is still to come. And we see on the horizon in many of the inner-city schools, like the schools in my district, no hope that that is going to happen unless you have more help from the Federal Government.

Yes, volunteers may help to some extent, but I am not sure that in the context of a big city you are going to get enough of that to have any significance whatsoever in overcoming the problems faced by our schools that do not have proper wiring to be able to install the computers and be able to have the Internet and the educational technology that is needed to keep pace and guarantee that our children will get the benefits of the best and the latest in education.

All of these things can happen only if you have some help with the construction and the physical environment that our schools exist in, so the President's initiative is welcome. I hope the Republicans will join the initiative.

I do not think it is enough because it is talking about Federal Government picking up the interests on part of the cost of construction of schools. I think we need a grant program to jump-start our schools across the country and rebuild the infrastructure by giving maximum help instead of the minimum.

But at least this is a start. The construction program offered by, proposed by, President Clinton begins the process, and I hope the Republicans will join us.

Today we had our first planning meeting for National Education Funding Support Day. We joined last year in conjunction with the National Commission for the Education of African American Children. We had a National Education Funding Support Day last November. Today we launched the first planning meeting, and the effort will go forward this year.

The date for the National Education Funding Support Day is October 23. October 23 has been chosen because we want to have a whole month of activity, and October 23, National Education Funding Support Day, will kick it off. Citizens will be encouraged to go right through to National Education Week, which takes place in the middle of November. You have a month of activity designed to raise the level of awareness of the average American, the person out there on the street who is not a part of the education family.

Yes, last year we had participation by the teachers, we had participation by the teachers' unions, we had participation by the companies that do business with schools. People who are in the education family responded to our initial effort in National Education Funding Support Day, and this year we want to go beyond that. We want to make certain that the churches are involved. We want to make certain that the fraternities and sororities and religious organizations of various kinds are involved. Civic organizations.

The need is to communicate again to our decision makers the way you have just communicated on the minimum wage bill. The public understood the vital necessity of increasing the minimum wage. The public understood that the man on the street, the women on the street, everybody understood that if you got a paycheck and you are getting \$4.25 an hour and a proposal is made to raise that to \$5.15 an hour, that makes sense. So the public supported raising the minimum wage.

We want the public to understand that education needs Federal help, education needs more resources, and regardless of what you hear, money comes first, resources come first. There are a lot of problems that have to be solved in education reform. There are a lot of problems, and they will be there for a long time, and we have to work at them, but before you can get those problems resolved, you are going to have to have resources, you need money.

The favorite statement of people who want to oppose funding social programs or funding nondefense programs is you cannot solve the problem by throwing money at the problem. They throw money at the Department of Defense all the time. They constantly throw money at the Department of Defense because they know you cannot solve a problem in the military unless you do have money. They make a lot of errors, and a lot of gross boondoggles take place there, a lot of errors that have cost people, cost the American people

as much as \$2 billion and \$3 billion on weapon systems that never got developed. Even when they say they developed certain smart weapons like the ones used in the gulf war, later evaluations showed that the smart weapons which cost a great deal did not prove their value. I mean they did not perform at a level to justify their cost.

So they throw money at the Defense Department. And I do not like the phrase: throw money. But that is what they do in the case of defense.

In education they do not throw money; they never throw money at social programs, they never throw money at education. The amounts of money that any social program has received has always been compulsory in connection with the need, and in the case of education the Federal Government's participation at this point is less than 7 percent. You know, the total education bill, which is above \$360 billion now annually, that bill is borne mostly by the States, that cost is borne mostly by the States and local governments. Local governments fund and support most of the expenses for public schools. State funding supports most expenses for public schools. For public higher education institutions, States are the primary funding sources.

So the Federal Government's participation is all too small already, 7 percent. At least it will be increased. At least it will be increased at every level. We need more money for day care, we need more money for elementary and secondary school, we need more money for higher education. It will never be the overwhelming part, the funds spent for education. You will always have local control, and local governments will always pay most of it or State governments will always pay most of it. But why can we not raise the Federal participation and funding for education from 7 percent over the next 4 years to 25 percent? Why cannot we go between now and the year 2000 up to 25 percent of the total cost of education? The States and localities will still be funded at 75 percent. If they have 75 percent of the funding power, they will have 75 percent of the control. The control will still remain with the States and local government. But we will be providing the kind of resources necessary to carry us into the 21st century on education.

So what I am saying is that the President's proposals, whether you are talking about wiring schools or providing new funds for construction, they are welcome, they are necessary, they are all too inadequate. We need more. And in order to have the public understand this, we need to have ways to communicate to the public the importance of common sense getting involved here. If common sense gets involved, if the average person out there begins to understand what the costs are for providing education at a level necessary to go into the 21st century, and they communicate that to the congressmen, they communicate that to the Senators, we will get some action.

So National Education Funding Support Day on October 23 is designed to get down to the street level and have people understand that you need to communicate to your government at every level, and certainly the Federal Government is key because the Federal Government, despite its small percentage of the funding for education, sets the tone. We need to set the tone so that the cuts that are taking place at the State level in education and the cuts that local governments are perpetrating on education, like New York City has had a 5-year string of cuts in education, New York State now has had dramatic cuts in education; they take their clue from the Federal Government. The Federal Government starts making cuts, then the importance of education seems to go down on the priority agenda of the Governors and of the mayors.

So we need to start first at the Federal level. So in order to get the Federal Government moving, they need to hear from the very bottom.

National Education Funding Day, then, is like the National Night Out Against Crime. We took our cue from the National Night Out Against Crime. Citizens put together a National Night Out Against Crime where on a single night, Tuesday night I think it is, in August, everybody across the country demonstrates that they care about what is going on in their neighborhoods in terms of crime and protection, and they want their police departments and their district attorneys and all the people who are professionally responsible for the criminal justice system to understand that they are upset. They want some new action. They want some new resources. They want to make certain that we do not continue the way we are.

That National Night Out Against Crime effort has been very successful. Communities all over the country do turn out. They show up.

So we want to capture that same spirit in a National Morning Out For Education. A National Morning Out For Education on October 23 means that whatever can be done, whatever activities that take place which send a message to your government, your city government or the State government, or send a message to the Federal Government, do it. If it means buying some gifts for the children in the school, they are publicizing that so that they have in schools like the ones in my district who do not have crayons, who do not have erasers, they have a problem with Xerox paper; they will get some gift which highlights the fact that they are not being supplied properly by the government. If it means that day care centers are brought to the attention of local merchants so that occasionally they will help the day care centers in some way, then let that be the way we do it. If it means the police department and the various law enforcement agencies are going to guarantee the safety of children going to school and they

want to highlight their support for education, schools that way, let them do it. There can be a thousand ways to show your support for education and, in this process, send a message to both the Republicans and the Democrats that education is important.

And finally it makes sense in the context of everything I have said before. Education, minimum wage, all that has to play a role if you want to move people from welfare to sufficiency in a humane way.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD

The following is a reprint of remarks in their entirety, both printed and omitted from the RECORD of Thursday, July 11, 1996, at page H7447:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, to close for our side, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], my friend and colleague.

(Mr. STUDDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, somebody may wonder why I or my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK, have not taken greater personal umbrage at some of the remarks here. I was thinking a moment ago that there might even be grounds to request that someone's words be taken down because my relationship, that of the gentleman from Massachusetts and, I suspect, others in the House, was referred to, among other things, I believe, as perverse. Surely if we had used those terms in talking about anyone else around here, we would have been sat down in one heck of a hurry.

I am not taking this personally, because I happen to be able, I hope, to put this in some context. I would ask those, anyone listening to this debate this hour of the morning, to listen carefully to the quality and the tone of the words over here and the quality of the tone of the words over here. I would also ask people to wonder how in God's name could a question like this be divided along partisan lines. There is nothing inherently partisan that I know of about sexual orientation. I do not believe that there is some kind of a misdivision of this question between the aisles, and yet there is a strange imbalance here in the debate and the tone and quality of the debate.

I want to salute some of the folks who have spoken over here, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. We have talked about this before. I marched, although he did not know it at the time, with him in 1963 in the city with Dr. King. I was about as far from Dr. King as I am from the gentleman from Georgia when he delivered that extraordinary speech.

Two years later I marched, although the gentleman did not know it, behind him from Selma to Montgomery. A few years after that, when it was the first march for gay and lesbian rights in Washington in 1979, I was a Member of

Congress too damn frightened to march for my own civil rights. Actually, I changed my jogging path so that I could come within view of the march. I thought that was very brave of me at the time.

But what I know is, because I had heard people like the gentleman from Georgia and because I am of the generation, and there were many, who were inspired by Dr. King is that this is, as someone has said, the last unfinished chapter in the history of civil rights in this country, and I know how it is going to come out. I do not know if I am going to live to see the ending, but I know what the ending is going to be. There is, as the gentleman said before me change, there has always been change.

As I observed earlier, the men who wrote the Constitution, to which we all swear our oath here, many of them owned slaves. Slavery was referred to specifically in the Constitution. People of color were property when this country was founded.

□ 0145

Women could not own property. There could not be marriage between the races. Many things change over time, Mr. Chairman, this, too, is going to change.

I would like to pay tribute, special personal tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], to Dr. King, to all those of both parties and no parties. There was nothing partisan about that movement; there is and ought never to be anything partisan about this, the final chapter in the history of the civil rights of this country.

I wish I could remember, I used to know the entirety of that "I Have a Dream" speech, but we will rise up and live out the full meaning of our Creator. It may not be this year and it certainly will not be this Congress, but it will happen. As I said earlier, we can embrace that change and welcome it, or we can resist it, but there is nothing on God's Earth that we can do to stop it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

We are in a great debate. I would hope that people reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, watching this debate, would compare the tone, the sensitivity, and the reaching out of my friend's words, and then read the earlier words of the gentleman from Oklahoma, the words which were denunciatory and denigratory of the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, and I would hope that people would compare the spirit of the approach, compare the attitude toward others, compare the way in which things are debated.

I would say, as someone who has been included in this denunciatory rhetoric, that I would be very satisfied to have

people in forming their judgment listen to the words uttered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and listen to the words of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think we are helping people form a basis.

This notion that a loving relationship between two people of the same sex threatens relationships between two people of the opposite sex, that is what denigrates heterosexual marriage. The argument that we have denigrated marriage or the institution of marriage or any other formulation says that two people loving each other somehow threatens heterosexual marriage. That is what denigrates heterosexual marriage. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

[The following is a reprint of the RECORD of July 17, 1996, at page H7740, at which time the text of H.R. 3604 was not printed.]

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BLILEY

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLILEY moves to strike all after the enacting clause of S. 1316 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 3604 as passed by the House, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. References; effective date; disclaimer.

TITLE I—PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

Subtitle A—Promulgation of National Primary Drinking Water Regulations

Sec. 101. Selection of additional contaminants.
Sec. 102. Disinfectants and disinfection by-products.
Sec. 103. Limited alternative to filtration.
Sec. 104. Standard-setting.
Sec. 105. Ground water disinfection.
Sec. 106. Effective date for regulations.
Sec. 107. Risk assessment, management, and communication.
Sec. 108. Radon, arsenic, and sulfate.
Sec. 109. Urgent threats to public health.
Sec. 110. Recycling of filter backwash.
Sec. 111. Treatment technologies for small systems.

Subtitle B—State Primary Enforcement Responsibility for Public Water Systems

Sec. 121. State primacy.

Subtitle C—Notification and Enforcement

Sec. 131. Public notification.
Sec. 132. Enforcement.
Sec. 133. Judicial review

Subtitle D—Exemptions and Variances

Sec. 141. Exemptions.
Sec. 142. Variances.

Subtitle E—Lead Plumbing and Pipes

Sec. 151. Lead plumbing and pipes.

Subtitle F—Capacity Development

Sec. 161. Capacity development.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO PART C

Sec. 201. Source water quality assessment.
Sec. 202. Federal facilities.