said we can't raise wages here while the wages are going down in Mexico.

Does the Speaker really believe that we should base our pay raises in America on what is happening in Mexico? That Mexico should be our benchmark for wages? That 58 cents an hour should be our standard? That is two quarters, one nickel, and three pennies, held together by a bunch of tape. Why does he want to continue to keep the American worker down?

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stand up for working people in this country. It is time we reward people for their hard work. It is time we raise the minimum wage.

TAX CUTS NEEDED, NOT MINIMUM-WAGE INCREASE

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the minimum wage. In the last year I have been talking about the fact that in my State of Maine if I go out to a store to buy a pack of cigarettes, I will pay three taxes. If I go out and buy a can of beer, I will pay four taxes. But if I do the right thing and go out and create a job for a working person at the minimum wage in this country, I am going to pay or manage nine different taxes.

I am tired of the nonsense we are hearing about the minimum wage and how we can increase it and how we are going to do wonderful things for people. I want to focus on the fact that those nine taxes at the minimum wage exceed $1 an hour.

☐ 1100

I think that is outrageous. When I talk to young people in my district, it is bad enough that many of them feel that with the payroll tax burden that is on their jobs, they are more likely to see a UFO than to get a Social Security check when they retire. It is bad enough that they are worried about whether they are going to even receive any benefits whatsoever, now they are going to be losing their jobs.

The issue is not what is going on in the private sector. The issue is a government that is taking $1 an hour out of the minimum wage. I think that is the real issue, and that is where the focus needs to be in the rest of this session.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, nothing speaks more clearly to the need for an increase in the minimum wage than the plight of poor children in America. Earlier this week, the National Center for Children in Poverty released a study that should trouble all of us. The study shows that one in every four children under the age of 6 in our country was living in poverty in 1992. That number is twice what it was in 1972 and includes an increase of 1 million children in the 5 years between 1987 and 1992.

Three of every five of these children have working parents, but they make the minimum wage. And it is not a living wage. Working parents are trying to provide a decent life for their children.

We have heard our colleagues talk about the fact that if someone works full-time minimum wage, they make $8,400 a year, nearly 50 percent below the poverty line.

We have a moral responsibility to give those working parents and their children a fighting chance by giving them a living wage. The American people agree. In December, the Wall Street Journal-NCB poll showed 75 to 20 the American people favored an increase in the minimum wage. In January the L.A. Times reported 72 percent.

In 1989, when we took up this vote, 382 Members of this House, including 135 Republicans, voted for the increase in the minimum wage.

Let us do it again.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). As previously announced, the House has completed 20 1-minutes per side. Additional 1-minutes will occur after the close of business today.

REPORT ON HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

1. In December 1990, the Haitian people elected Jean-Bertrand Aristide as their President by an overwhelming margin in a free and fair election. The United States praised Haiti's success in peacefully implementing its democratic constitutional system and provided significant political and economic support to the new government. The Haitian military abruptly interrupted the consolidation of Haiti's new democracy when, in September 1991, it illegally and violently ousted President Aristide from office and drove him into exile.

2. The United States, on its own and with the Organization of American States (OAS), immediately imposed sanctions against the illegal regime. Upon the recommendation of the legitimate government of President Aristide and of the OAS, the United Nations Security Council imposed incrementally a universal embargo on Haiti, beginning June 16, 1993, with trade restrictions on certain strategic commodities. The United States actively supported the efforts of the OAS and the United Nations to restore democracy to Haiti and to bring about President Aristide's return by facilitating negotiations between the Haitian parties. The United States and the international community also offered material assistance within the context of an eventual negotiated settlement of the Haitian crisis to support the return to democracy, build constitutional structures, and foster economic well-being.

The continued defiance of the will of the international community by the illegal regime led to an intensification of bilateral and multilateral economic sanctions against Haiti in May 1994. The U.N. Security Council on May 6 adopted Resolution 917, imposing comprehensive trade sanctions and other measures on Haiti. This was followed by a succession of unilateral U.S. sanctions designed to isolate the illegal regime. To augment embargo enforcement, the United States and other countries entered into a cooperative endeavor with the Dominican Republic to monitor that country's enforcement of sanctions along its land border and in its coastal waters.

Defying coordinated international efforts, the illegal military regime in Haiti remained intransigent for some time. Internal repression continued to worsen, exemplified by the expulsion in July 1994 of the U.N./O.A.S.-sponsored International Civilian Mission (ICM) human rights observers. Responding to the threat to peace and security in the region, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 940 on July 31, 1994, authorizing the formation of a multinational force to use all necessary means to facilitate the departure from Haiti of the military leadership and the return of legitimate authorities including President Aristide.

In the succeeding weeks, the international community under U.S. leadership assembled a multinational coalition force to carry out this mandate. At my request, former President Carter, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee Sam Nunn, and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell went to Haiti on September 16 to meet with the *de facto* Haitian leadership. The threat of imminent military intervention combined with determined diplomacy achieved agreement in Port-au-Prince on September 18 for the *de facto* leaders to relinquish power by October 15. United States forces in the vanguard of the multinational coalition force drawn from 26 countries began a peaceful deployment in Haiti on September 19 and the military leaders have since relinquished power.

In a spirit of reconciliation and reconstruction, on September 25 President Aristide called for the immediate easing of sanctions so that the work of rebuilding could begin. In response to this request, on September 26 in an address before the United Nations General Assembly, I announced my intention to suspend all unilateral sanctions against Haiti except those that affected the military leaders and their immediate supporters and families. On September 29, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution 944 terminating U.N.-imposed sanctions as of the day after President Aristide returned to Haiti.

On October 15, President Aristide returned to Haiti to assume his official responsibilities. Effective October 16, 1994, by Executive Order No. 12932 (59 Fed. Reg. 52403, October 14, 1994), I terminated the national emergency declared on October 4, 1991, in Executive Order No. 12775, along with all sanctions with respect to Haiti imposed in that Executive order, subsequent Executive orders, and the Department of the Treasury regulations to deal with that emergency. This termination does not affect compliance and enforcement actions involving prior transactions or violations of the sanctions.

3. This report is submitted to the Congress pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c). It is not a report on all U.S. activities with respect to Haiti, but discusses only those Administration actions and expenses since my last report (October 13, 1994) that are directly related to the national emergency with respect to Haiti declared in Executive Order No. 12775, as implemented pursuant to that order and Executive Orders Nos. 12779, 12853, 12872, 12914, 12917, 12920, and 12922.

4. The Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) amended the Haitian Transactions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 580 (the ''HTR'') on December 27, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 66476, December 27, 1994), to add section 580.524, indicating the termination of sanctions pursuant to Executive Order No. 12932, effective October 16, 1994. The effect of this amendment is to authorize all transactions previously prohibited by subpart B of the HTR or by the previously stated Executive orders. Reports due under general or specific license must still be filed with FAC covering activities up until the effective date of this termination. Enforcement actions with respect to past violations of the sanctions are not affected by the termination of sanctions. A copy of the FAC amendment is attached.

5. The total expenses incurred by the Federal Government during the period of the national emergency with respect to Haiti from October 4, 1991, through October 15, 1994, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Haiti are estimated to be approximately $6.2 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. This estimate has been revised downward substantially from the sum of estimates previously reported in order to eliminate certain previously reported costs incurred with respect to Haiti, but not directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the terminated national emergency with respect to Haiti.

Thus, with the termination of sanctions, this is the last periodic report that will be submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) and also constitutes the last semiannual report and final report on Administration expenditures required pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 3, 1995.*

LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 55 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

☐ 1103

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to give the President item veto authority over appropriation acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue acts, with Mr. BOEHNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, February 2, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRATT: In section 2(a), insert ''or tax incentive'' after ''tax benefit'' the first place it appears.

At the end of Section 4, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) The term ''tax incentive'' means any deduction, credit, preference, or exemption from gross income, or any deferral of tax liability, causing tax revenues to be forgone as inducement for taxpayers to pursue or forbear from certain actions or activities.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment known as the Moran-Spratt amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the advocates of H.R. 2 claim that they have found a way to give the President by statute powers that he does not enjoy under the Constitution, the power, specifically, of an item veto. They claim that this power will allow the President to cut out wasteful, unwarranted, spending in appropriations bills that we adopt every year.

Our amendment simply takes the President's newfound veto power to the realm of quasi-spending sometimes known as tax expenditures or tax incentives.

The committee bill already takes a tentative step in this direction. It delegates to the President the power to rescind targeted tax benefits, special interest tax provisions that benefit 100 or fewer taxpayers. But here it stops. It stops, in my opinion, far short of the right goal.

As to spending, this bill boldly covers virtually every item in 13 different appropriations bills, all with discretionary spending, $540 to $550 billion a year, but with tax expenditures it turns timid. It stops at a limited-interest tax provisions which are really just the tip of the iceberg.

Why is this bill so tough on spending and so easy on special interest tax incentives?

Let me read my colleagues what Newsweek said to explain last week, reading from Newsweek.

The fine print of the item veto bill reveals that though the Republicans are tough on spending, they are lax on special-interest tax giveaways. The vast majority of tax breaks, worth hundreds of billions of dollars, would remain immune from the President's veto. Any lobbyist looking for goodies from the Federal Government in the future could work through the tax code instead of working through spending bills.

For some years we all know that has been a favorite recourse. That has been a practice common here for 20 to 25 years. If we want to give people an incentive to install solar heat in their homes, we are not so obvious as to hand them out a subsidy. We allow them a tax credit for part of the cost.

If we want to promote oil and gas exploration, we do not fork over subsidies to the drillers. That would never be approved in the House, appropriating money for the major oil companies. We give them oil depletion allowances, or we let them expense costs that other businesses would be required to capitalize. Nobody notices because it is buried in the Tax Code, and who is to know when we are allowing one cost to be expensed rather than capitalized that we actually are giving a subsidy to this particular taxpayer.

Our amendment would give the President the power to police these tax expenditures, to comb through the Tax Code the way he will be able to comb through spending appropriation bills and cull out questionable policies and provisions.

Under our amendment, the President would have the right to rescind so-called tax incentives or tax expenditures.

What are tax incentives or tax expenditures? Let me read the definition we use in our amendment for tax incentives. The term ''tax incentive'' means any deduction, credit, preference, or exemption from gross income or any deferral of tax liability causing tax revenues to be forgone as inducement for taxpayers to pursue or forbear from pursuit of certain activities or actions.