

while he was campaigning for reelection in 1936. A policeman threw her back into the crowd. "Get the note from the girl," Roosevelt told an aide. Her note read: "I wish you could do something to help us girls. . . . We have been working in a sewing factor, . . . and up to a few months ago we were getting our minimum pay of \$11 a week. . . . Today the 200 of us girls have been cut down to \$4 and \$5 and \$6 a week." When a reporter asked, the President replied, "Something has to be done about the elimination of child labor and long hours and starvation wages."

It was not easy for FDR and his Labor Secretary Frances Perkins to push the Fair Labor Standards Act through Congress in 1937 and 1938, even though all that Act did in the end was apply a 25-cent-an-hour minimum wage and 44-hour week to roughly one-fifth on the workforce.

And it was not even easy for Democrats to raise the minimum wage in the last Congress, even though it had reached its lowest value in 40 years, with the exception of one year during the Bush administration. The Republican majority sought to use the cloture rules to make the minimum wage amendment out of order, but Democrats and moderate Republicans stood together and prevailed.

And despite that victory, America still needs a raise.

Even now that the latest raise in the minimum wage has been fully implemented, and it has reached the level where it requires just over \$10,000 year for a full-time job, its real value remains below its level from 1956 through 1983.

During those post-War years, the incomes of all Americans, rich and poor, grew together. In the 1980s and after, Americans have grown apart. America still needs a raise.

In the 15 years from 1980 through 1995, the minimum wage increased 37 percent. But during that same period, inflation increased 86 percent, company profits increased 145 percent, and CEO pay increased 499 percent. CEO pay increases to 5 times what it was before, and the Titans of industry still complained that a little more than one-third increase in the minimum wage would bankrupt the country! America still needs a raise.

Today I have told you stories of women workers, for theirs has often been a hard lot. Pully three-fifths of all minimum wage workers are women. American women still need a raise.

On July 11, Senator Ted Kennedy introduced S. 1009, a bill that would simply provide increases of 50 cents an hour in the minimum wage in each of the next 3 years and, increases of 30 cents an hour in each of the following 2 years. Congressmen Bonior and Gephardt introduced H.R. 2211 to do the same thing.

Under these bills, the minimum wage would still remain below its levels in the late 1960s.

If this Congress could enact a 5-year budget deal to grant sweeping capital gains and estate tax breaks for the wealthiest among us for years into the future, then the least that it can do is to give those earning the minimum wage a raise for the next 5 years as well. America still needs a raise.

The successors of that imaginary Sinai desert businessman will raise all the same imaginary objections to this labor legislation, as well.

They will argue that we endanger America's competitiveness. But we shall stand with Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who said: "No business which depends for existence on paying less than living wages to its workers has any right to continue in this country. By living wages I mean more than a bare subsistence level—I mean the wages of decent living."

They will say that we seek a centrally planned economy, like the former Soviet Union. But we shall stand with Abraham Lincoln, who said: "To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government."

Yet again, the apologists for big business will cry that the minimum wage is just an unfair mandate on business. But we shall stand with Thomas Jefferson, who in his March 4, 1801, Inaugural Address said: "Take not from the mouth of Labor the bread it has earned."

And when big business cries that all must be left to the sacred market, we shall stand with section 17 of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act of 1914, which says: "The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce."

We shall stand with FDR, with Lincoln, with Jefferson, and with the Clayton Anti-trust Act.

And we shall keep faith with the prayers of those American women who fought so that all working women would receive fair compensation for the sweat of their brow. We owe them nothing less.

We owe it to Harriet Robinson and Sarah Bagley and the girls who sacrificed their youth to the Lowell Mills, to Lucy Parsons, as she rose in tears from the cold jail cell floor to swear an oath to fight on, and to Frances Perkins's memory of her tears falling down like the girls who fell from the Triangle Shirtwaist fire. Let us stand with Clara Lemlich, and pledge to carry on the fight for the cause for which she raised her arm.

And so, with God's help and our own, may the oaths and the prayers of the brave American women who fought before us find an answer in our time.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT VOLUNTARY SAFETY AND HEALTH AUDITS

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental purposes of the Occupational Safety and Health Act was to encourage "employers and employees in their efforts to reduce the number of occupational safety and health hazards at their places of employment." In its focus on enforcement, OSHA has too often overlooked that purpose. One of the promises of OSHA reinvention, however, was that OSHA would encourage employers to voluntarily implement effective safety and health programs in their workplaces.

Contrary to that promise, OSHA has not addressed, in fact has refused to address, a significant obstacle to effective voluntary safety and health programs which it has created through its enforcement policies. OSHA has insisted on full access to voluntary self audits and assessments conducted by employers, in order to use these records during inspections to (1) help OSHA identify potential violations, and (2) to establish a basis for charging that any violations found in the workplace are "willful." In some cases, OSHA has gone so far as to subpoena these records for use in inspections and enforcement.

OSHA's policy discourages companies from conducting complete and honest self evaluations, even though OSHA acknowledges that

such evaluation is a critical element to an effective safety and health program. The Environmental Protection Agency, facing this same issue in the environmental context has recognized that "routine Agency requests for voluntary audit reports could inhibit auditing in the long run, decreasing both the quality and quantity of audits conducted" [1986 Environmental Auditing Policy Statement, 51 Fed. Reg. 25,007]. For that reason, EPA has limited its access to these records. OSHA should be encouraging companies to conduct such safety and health evaluations. Instead, it is discouraging companies from such efforts by threatening to seize them and use them as a weapon against the employer.

The result of OSHA's policy is less health and safety, not more. As one commentator put it: "the 'costs' of the Department's position, in terms of the decreased use and effectiveness of a critical component of voluntary safety and health programs, dramatically outweigh the 'benefits' of the position in terms of access to a possible source of evidence of a violation or of an employer's willful violation."

The legislation applies only to self audits and assessments that are not required by any law or regulation. Further, it applies only to inspections and enforcement proceedings under the OSHAct. It does not address broader issues that would more logically be addressed as part of a change in the rules of evidence. I invite my colleagues to join me in passing this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY YORK

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to pay tribute to Terry York, who has been nominated for the prestigious Fernando Award for outstanding voluntarism.

President Kennedy once said, "For of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when a some future date the high court sits in judgment of each of us, recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state, our success or failure, in whatever office we hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions: First, were we truly men of courage * * * Second, were we truly men of judgment * * * Third, were we truly men of integrity * * * Finally, were we truly men of dedication." The Fernando Award was created to honor individuals who have exemplified leadership, voluntarism and dedication and it is recognized as the leading award for civic accomplishment in the San Fernando Valley. Each year, the Chambers of Commerce in the San Fernando Valley and other community organizations and leaders nominate candidates they feel demonstrate these characteristics. Terry York is a worthy candidate for this award.

As a young boy in southern Illinois, Terry learned the importance of a strong work ethic from his father, who worked at a local mine. Several year later, Terry decided he wanted to work in the automobile industry, but there were no jobs available. He agreed to work for free as a file clerk, and as a result of his helpful nature and outstanding dedication, he was rapidly promoted at the dealership. Within 5

years he was part owner and general manager of Jacobs Chevrolet, one of the largest and best known auto dealers in the Midwest.

The lessons Terry learned growing up in Illinois have been reflected in his daily activities. Not only is Terry a hard worker, he understands the importance of community and the need for everyone to work together toward a common goal. As a result, he treats everyone he works with throughout the day with respect and compassion. Terry is regarded as an invaluable resource by his friends and coworkers who depend on him for advice and support.

For the last 21 years, Terry has been actively involved in our community, dedicating a substantial amount of his time and personal resources to civic, charitable, humanitarian, and government causes. He has been active in the City of Hope, the Boys and Girls Club of San Fernando Valley, and the American Cancer Society, as well as many other important organizations.

Terry has been honored with several distinguished awards to recognize his accomplishments, such as the Spirit of Life Award by the City of Hope and the Free Enterprise Award by the San Fernando Valley Business and Professional Association. Most recently, Terry and his wife Carole were honored by the March of Dimes with the Premiere Parent Award.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in paying tribute to Terry York. He is a role model for the citizens of Los Angeles.

THE NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN— AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this body has spent a good deal of time in recent years trying to come up with ways to balance the budget—much of it to no avail. The good news is that the Treasury Department announced that the end of the 1997 fiscal year brought the smallest budget deficit in ages—\$22.6 billion. The bad news is that Washington can claim little credit for this deficit reduction. The credit should go to American taxpayers prospering in a strong and dynamic U.S. economy and pumping more revenue into the Treasury than many Washington policy wonks predicted. Nevertheless, a balanced budget is finally in sight for the first time since 1969.

Now that Washington may soon see a budget surplus, a number of bills have been introduced in Congress in an effort to contribute to the debate on how that surplus should be spent. The leading bills propose to use part of the surplus to pay down the enormous Federal debt while using the rest to provide tax relief. I have cosponsored one of these bills and believe very strongly that we must protect the budget surplus from Washington's big spenders.

It is in this context that I would encourage Members to look at a bill I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 2329, the National Dividend Act of 1997. The proposal upon which this bill has been crafted has been around for some time,

and the concept has been favorably received by President Ronald Reagan, the National Commission on Economic Growth and Tax Reform—the Kemp Commission—and various congressional committees. The dividend plan has, over the years, enjoyed the support of a bipartisan and ideologically diverse group of Members. At one time, it was introduced by our former colleague Guy Vander Jagt and, most recently, our colleague BILLY TAUZIN introduced the plan. I was a cosponsor of these bills and now Mr. TAUZIN has joined me as a cosponsor of H.R. 2329.

The National Dividend Act of 1997 is the latest incarnation of a plan developed by John H. Perry, Jr., a businessman and philanthropist. Mr. Perry's idea was to give Americans an incentive to be involved in the Federal budget process by giving voters a National Dividend once the Federal budget is in balance. Much like a profitable business shares its economic successes with its shareholders in the form of dividends, the National Dividend will share the economic prosperity of a balanced budget and fiscal restraint with those Americans who participated in the democratic process which led to the balanced budget.

To accomplish this goal, the bill first establishes a cap on Federal spending at the current level for 5 years or until a surplus is finally achieved. Based on the current budget estimates, Congress could bring about a surplus as early as next year.

Next, the bill creates a National Dividend Trust Fund by setting aside tax dollars from the general fund of the Treasury eventually equal to the revenue raised by the corporate income tax as well as selected other excise and tariff revenues. Once the fund reaches 100 percent of the specified revenue, disbursements will be given in equal amounts to all registered voters in years in which the Federal budget is in surplus. If the budget is not balanced, revenues in the fund can be used to eliminate the deficit.

The bill also not only eliminates the tax on corporate dividends, but also the National Dividend. To keep a future Congress from abusing this program, safeguards have been built into the plan. First, the corporate tax rate will be frozen at its current level. Second, a two-thirds majority vote of both Houses will be necessary to increase taxes. Short of a declared war, a future tax and spend Congress will be restrained from raising taxes simply to finance the National Dividend Trust Fund.

I commend the National Dividend Act of 1997 to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to support the bill as we work to put the Nation's fiscal house in order.

BART BREAKS GROUND ON RAPID TRANSIT TO SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 7, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the groundbreaking of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit [BART] Extension to the San Francisco International Airport [SFO]. The groundbreaking, which took place on Monday of this week, marked one of the most significant transportation milestones in

the bay area. It was my great pleasure to join the many residents and elected officials of the peninsula and the bay area who have worked hard to bring fast, efficient mass transportation to the San Francisco Airport. It was a great pleasure to participate in the festivities marking the long-awaited beginning of construction of this world-class transportation link for the entire bay area.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport will connect the 95 mile, four-county BART rapid transit system to the fifth busiest airport in the United States and the seventh busiest airport in the world. The 8.7 mile extension will consist of 7.5 miles of new mainline track, much of which will be underground, and 1.2 miles of track linking the system with the San Francisco International Airport. The BART Extension will expand commuter rail service on the peninsula in and out the city through three new stations in peninsula communities—South San Francisco, San Bruno and Millbrae—and a station at the airport. The BART Extension will provide fast and easy service for travelers directly to the airport for the entire bay area, including the east bay.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport is the cornerstone of BART's rail expansion program—the biggest bay area transit project since BART was built in the early 1970's. The project is also an excellent model for Federal-State cooperation in public transportation investment. Fully seventy percent of BART's expansion program is paid for by State and local funds.

The voters of San Mateo County have indicated their overwhelming support for the BART Extension at the ballot box in a series of referendum data back to 1980's when voters approved measures in 1985 and 1987 which allocated local funding through SamTrans to bring BART to the airport. Subsequent measures in 1992 and 1994 reaffirmed our region's support for a BART Extension to the airport and the willingness of our residents to contribute a fair share of those costs.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension will provide fast and convenient access for travelers and will help alleviate traffic congestion on neighboring freeways. Traffic on peninsula freeways near the airport and into San Francisco already exceed existing highway capacities, particularly during peak commute periods. The airport is already the single largest generator of traffic congestion—over 65 percent of air passengers and employees drive to the airport. The airport's own expansion program is expected to increase annual air traffic by some 70 percent by the year 2006. The extension of BART to the airport will provide much-needed effective mass transit alternative for travelers throughout the bay area.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension to the airport will also provide an important economic catalyst for San Mateo County and the entire bay area. The extension will create or sustain between 30,000 and 40,000 construction jobs and more than 12,000 permanent jobs once the extension is in operation. Construction will create new business opportunities for peninsula suppliers and vendors. When completed, the BART Extension will improve access to local businesses and retailers and will significantly enhance the region's important travel and tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, the BART Extension will provide an effective transportation alternative for hundreds of thousands of bay area residents