Mr. Speaker, I would hope that tomorrow we give a little consideration to the fact that the Congressional Budget Office has said that a 90-cent increase could produce unemployment losses from 100,000 to 500,000 jobs. Now, we better think about that. These are the most vulnerable people we have in our society, and so I would hope that when we get back tomorrow on track that we will consider those 100,000 to 500,000 so that we consider all Americans.

As I said, they are the most vulnerable, and when we move in to try to create more jobs, it is going to be small businesses that are going to promote those jobs and create those jobs. So we better think seriously about that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time in this part of the debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. MCDADE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOSEPH M. MCDADE, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
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 of Representatives, that Michael Russen, a Field Representative in my Scranton, Pennsylvania District Office has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *United States v. McDade.*

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1996.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 637(b), Public Law 104–52, I hereby appoint the following individuals to the National Commission on Restructuring the Internal Revenue Service: Mr. Robert Matsui, California; Mr. George Newstrom, Virginia.

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON RESTRUCTURING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 637(b) of Public Law 104–52, as amended by section 2904 of Public Law 104–134, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the National Commission on Restructuring the Internal Revenue Service the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. PORTMAN of Ohio and from private life: Mr. Ernest Dronenberg of California; Mr. Gerry Harkins of Georgia; and Mr. Grover Norquist of the District of Columbia.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

HUMANITARIAN AID CORRIDOR ACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations is marking up the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill for our international assistance and export financing programs. Yet, ironically, we just learned yesterday that President Clinton has waived one of the most important provisions in the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations bill: the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. The Corridor Act, which was included in the fiscal year '96 bill with broad bipartisan support, prohibits U.S. assistance of any kind from going to a country that impedes the delivery of humanitarian aid to a third country. I think most Americans would just assume that such a basic condition would apply to any recipient of U.S. aid, but it isn't.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is really targeted at the Republic of Turkey, which has maintained a cruel and illegal blockade of neighboring Armenia for the past 3 years. This blockade has prevented the delivery of food, medicine and other humanitarian relief supplies—much of it originating in the United States—from reaching Armenia. The most direct route for aid to Armenia is through Turkey. Thus, the Turkish blockade makes it far more difficult and expensive for relief supplies to reach the people of Armenia.

Turkey is a country that has received billions of dollars of United States aid. They are a military ally of the United States, part of NATO. Yet here is Turkey, a large and militarily powerful nation, maintaining a stranglehold on Armenia, a tiny land-locked country. This is shocking outrageous behavior. Last year, Congress finally said to Turkey: enough. If Turkey wants to continue to benefit from American generosity, they must open their border with Armenia and let the long-suffering people of Armenia get the assistance they need and deserve—assistance which Congress has voted to provide to Armenia, as well assistance originating from private sources.

Unfortunately, the law gave the President authority to waive the requirement that Turkey open its borders based on, ''the national security interest of the United States.'' Quietly, President Clinton last week invoked the waiver.

Mr. Speaker, I have often come to the floor of the House to support the policies of this administration. But tonight, I am completely disappointed and perplexed by the administration's action.

First of all, Congress wasn't even notified. We learned about the waiver almost by accident—from, of all people, the Turkish Foreign Minister Emre Gonensay, who is here in Washington on a working visit. In response to a question at a press conference yesterday the Foreign Minister announced that the waiver had in fact been granted. Thus, we see the Turkish Foreign Ministry was informed before the U.S. Congress. This is completely unacceptable. Given the strong statement of congressional intent, we believe it would have been appropriate for the administration to have advised Members of Congress of its plans with regard to the waiver, and I hope the administration will consult with Congress on this issue in the future.

A further disappointment is that the language in the Presidential Determination contains no reference to the Turkish blockade of Armenia. Failure to at least mention the blockade in the context of the determination to waive the Corridor Act sends the disturbing signal that the United States is not concerned about the ongoing, illegal blockade of a small country striving to establish democracy and a market economy. I once again call on the administration to make a top priority of imploring the Turkish Government, the recipient of so much United States aid, to lift its blockade of Armenia and accept Armenia's offer to normalize relations without preconditions.

Tomorrow, I am sending out a Dear Colleague letter asking Members to join me in signing a letter to the President expressing our opposition to the waiver and urging that all efforts be made to lift the blockade.

Mr. Speaker, while relations with Turkey are important, I cannot accept

the view that maintaining good relations should entail turning a blind eye to the outrageous actions committed by Turkey. Given the generosity the United States has shown toward Turkey, we have every right to attach some conditions—particularly such a basic condition as allowing the delivery of aid to a neighbor in need. I believe such a condition should be a basic requirement for any recipient of U.S. aid, and I think most Americans would agree.

Armenia is a small, land-locked nation dependent on land corridors through neighboring countries for many basic goods. Armenia has been one of the most exemplary of the former Soviet republics in terms of moving toward a Western style political and economic system. The Armenian people respect and admire the United States. There are more than one million Americans of Armenian ancestry. The bonds between our countries are strong and enduring. But the people of Armenia face a humanitarian crisis which is not the result of any natural disaster but the deliberate policy of its neighbor to choke off access to needed goods from the outside world. I believe the exertion of U.S. leadership can play a major role in easing tensions and promoting greater cooperation among the nations of the Caucasus region. Enforcement of the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act must be an important component of those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, last year I founded the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, which I co-chair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. We now have 49 Members from both parties and all regions of the country. The support for the Armenian people is strong in this Congress, and we will continue to challenge the pro-Turkish lobby here in Washington and, if necessary, the administration, to fight for stronger ties between the United States and Armenia.

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

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

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

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

WHY WE MUST RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today we have been discussing the minimum wage, and the reason that we have been discussing the minimum wage is that since the last time the minimum wage was increased in 1989, it has fallen 45 cents of real value. Employers that were paying the minimum wage in 1989 are now paying 45 cents less in real value than they were paying back then.

The fact of the matter is that the minimum wage is 27 percent lower than it was in 1979. That means that those families, those individuals that go to work every day at the minimum wage, are poorer now than they were in 1989 and in 1979. Those families, those individuals, need a raise. To argue that putting these people back to where they were in 1979, in 1989, is going to somehow put people out of work or destroy jobs is ludicrous. In fact, what has happened is that employers have been benefiting now for more than a decade of the decline in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have to increase that minimum wage is because we are trying to continue to encourage people to choose work over welfare, but work should pay, work should pay a livable wage, and we have an obligation to see to it. The minimum wage is a basic tenet of this country of recognition of the dignity of work, of recognition of the dignity of those individuals who go to work every day and try to earn a living for themselves and for their families. I would hope that we would raise that minimum wage for those individuals.

But we must also understand that when we raise the minimum wage, we reduce the burden on the American taxpayer who is having to subsidize those very same low-wage jobs where employers refuse to pay the minimum wage or above the minimum wage.

□ 2115

Because when in fact we keep the minimum wage as it is today, we increase the subsidies to these same workers because they are eligible for food stamps; because if you work full time at the minimum wage, you are not above the poverty level, and if you have children or a spouse, you are clearly not above the poverty level, so the Federal Government digs into its pocket, into the taxpayers' pocket, and puts money on the table for AFDC, puts money on the table for food stamps, puts more money on the table for housing allowances, more money on the table for the earned income tax credit. Why? Because many employers choose not to pay the minimum wage, even when they can afford to do so.

But the Republicans now will offer an amendment tomorrow that is even more insidious. It will take those employers who are paying the minimum wage today and exempt them from paying it in the future. It will have the potential of uncovering up to 10 million Americans who are currently eligible for the minimum wage today from not receiving it in the future: Women who work in sweatshops making garments for American citizens, the clothes on your back; the people who work in the fields of this country to put food on your table; the people who wait on you when you sit down to a table in a restaurant, who spend the whole day working on their feet and tending to our needs and our demands and our desires. They would be uncovered. They would have the benefits of the minimum wage reduced or repealed to them.

It is argued very often that this is going to destroy employment in those industries like the retail industry; that somehow retailers who do not want to pay the minimum wage, saying they cannot afford paying the minimum wage, would lay many workers off.

It is rather interesting that those people who make their living by making investments in various segments of our economy, Salomon Brothers, one of the largest investment banking companies in this country, says that they believe that many retailers, especially discounters, would benefit from an increased minimum wage due to the enhanced purchasing power that it would create for many low-income consumers.

Then they go on to recommend that if you are going to make an investment in stocks right now, they would recommend the Fred Myer Corp., the Food Lion Corp., the Home Depot Corp., Sears, Roebuck, & Co., and Wal-Mart. They would recommend some of the very same companies that are now fighting the minimum wage, because they say that these companies in fact receive an economic benefit, because Salomon Brothers recognize, as Henry Ford did, if you did not pay a decent wage to the workers of America, they could not buy the products they are making. That is why he paid them $5 a day.

Other manufactures and industrialists criticized him roundly, but be recognized that if you expect people to buy your products at Wal-Mart, if you expect people to buy your products at Sears, if you expect them to dine out at Denny's if you expect them to participate in the American economy, they have to earn a livable wage. These people are entitled to it. They are entitled to it.

But what we see is after months, after months of beseeching the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, and the Republicans to bring the minimum-wage bill to the floor, they have finally agreed to do it, because 80 percent of the people in this country support the minimum wage. Then they want to put an amendment in order to take it away from up to 10 million Americans. It is not fair and it is not right. It ought to be rejected.