chief executive officer earns, what is it, the top guy is $20 something million. AT&T or Disney, I forget, somebody is past $20 million in compensation per year.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I saw a newspaper article from I believe the Washington Post about a company called Greentree, and that CEO was being compensated at around $60 million. It is absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. OWENS. $60 million. Oh, that is an aberration, most of them are at around $20 or $15 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Nowhere in Japan will you ever find anybody earning $60 million or $20 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It is absolutely incredible. Two hundred and twelve times more in compensation than the average American worker.

Mr. OWENS. Let us take care of our economy. Mr. Greenspan wants to take up inflation. Seems to me Mr. Greenspan would address his concern to inflated salaries at the top levels, and deal not so much and scrutinize not so much the wages paid to people at the very bottom.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman and the gentlewoman would recall the arguments around NAFTA, do you remember that some people were saying that if we pass NAFTA and NAFTA becomes law, that American standards then would become global standards? So we did not have to fear about workers' wages going down, because workers' wages would go up. We did not have to fear about environmental standards going down because environmental standards were going up.

I do not know that that has been the experience.

Mr. OWENS. Just the opposite has happened. The common denominator is becoming the prison laborer in China, the workers in Bangladesh, the workers in Mexico. The philosophy behind the assertion by the Republican majority that we need to keep our wages low is that in order to be competitive, the lowest wages in the world is what we are competing with. So just the opposite has happened as a result of GATT and NAFTA. We are pulling down the standards of the American workers.

I thank my colleagues for joining me on the special order on minimum wage. I hope everybody understands we are moving forward and common sense will prevail. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will soon join us in increasing the minimum wage.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 18, 1996.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

CALL FOR AN INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the increase in the minimum wage. As probably has been mentioned on the floor here this afternoon, if an individual works full time, he or she brings home $8,400 a year. In a family of 4, if you have two wage earners working full time at the present minimum wage, they make, well, we can do the math, under $17,000 a year. How could it be that in a country this great and this decent that we do not pay a living wage to the hardworking people, hardworking families who want to do the best for their children.

We must reward work and we must do it with a decent livable wage. I hope that this Congress will be increasing the minimum wage by at least $1, which would enable families to buy more groceries. We are talking about the basics.

Another point I want to make about the minimum wage is that by keeping the minimum wage as low as it is, we are increasing the cost to the U.S. taxpayer. We have to provide food stamps, housing assistance, and other assistance to supplement the meager earnings that these people make, even though they are working full time, even welfare benefits I some cases. So this is not about reducing the deficit or anything else. It is about providing adequate rewards to Americans who work.

There has been some discussion in the course of this year about the earned income tax credit. I believe that the cuts that were proposed for American working families were wrong. Our colleagues on the other side will say, no, we kept it in there. We kept it in for some but not for all of the people who were working, hoping to have families and contribute to our country.

We have and we need an earned income tax credit because we have this artificially low minimum wage. The American taxpayer is subsidizing American business with food stamps, housing assistance, earned income tax credit, because we have such a low minimum wage.

I saw a cartoon in the paper that I want to share with my colleagues. On one side it had a woman working for the minimum wage for 1 year, her salary, $8,400 a year, working full time, and in the other frame was an executive, and the average salary for corporate CEO's in our country would make, in 1 day, some say really in a half a day but let us be generous, in 1 day what this woman was making in 1 year.

□ 1800

Certainly we want to reward success and we want to honor the entrepreneurial spirit. But how could it be OK for us to have one person working 1 day for the same as the average, and I am not talking about the highest, I am talking about the average corporate CEO's salary? I think it is a matter of conscience and decency, and a sign of a great country, that we reward work, we increased the morale of our work force, we give people a chance to take themselves out of poverty by saying we respect you, we respect what you do. We want to give you the dignity that you deserve as a hard-working person in our country. Not by throwing some crumbs to you and making you grovel for other benefits and be disdained for that, but instead by giving you a living wage.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I did not necessarily want the gentlewoman to yield, but I was just thinking about the depth of your feeling and your compassion. It is a shame that we have leadership in this country, leadership that leads this country, that does not feel anything at all about leaving folks who are hard working, who go to work everyday, get up by the clock, punch out by the clock, and they want to leave them behind and leave the embrace of this Government away from them, yet they rush to those who already have.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comment on that. I was particularly concerned the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, said he would fight the increase in the minimum wage with every fiber of his being. He is a good guy. Let us change his mind on that subject and show the support, which has always been bipartisan, has always been bipartisan, for an increase in the minimum wage.

REPORT FROM INDIANA: ''MOTIVATE OUR MINDS''

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana.

In the Second District of Indiana, there are so many special people striving day and night to make a difference.

These are good people doing good things. And today I rise to commend the volunteers at the ''Motivate Our Minds'' program in Muncie.

These individuals, Mr. Speaker, are Hoosier heros. Hoosier heros because