minimum wage increases and the recessions of 1990–91 and 1974–75. Further, the study determined that higher unemployment rates during the recession of 1990–91 and 1974–75 explained why, over the past two decades, the poverty rate rose in the year after the completion of each minimum wage increase.

So, again, I think it is time to stop indicating that there are no problems for thousands of people in this country when we talk about a minimum wage increase.

So what do we do about that? Well, we do the same thing we have done every time we have had a minimum wage increase, we go back and do what we can possibly do to make sure that those, in this case, 100,000 to 500,000, are not without employment. And so we look at those ways, as we did in the past.

In the past we had a small business exemption. Well, when we talk about a small business exemption we have to understand that every other major workplace policy statute contains an exemption for our Nation's smallest business. Consider the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It exempts businesses with less than 15 employees. The Americans With Disabilities Act exempts businesses with less than 15 employees. The Family and Medical Leave Act exempts those with less than 50 employees.

The overwhelming majority of businesses who have $500,000 or less in gross annual sales have 10 or less employees. They are a ma-and-pa program. Virtually every Democrat Member of the House have supported exemptions for our Nation's smallest businesses from a wide variety of labor statutes. Remember ADA, FMLA and the Civil Rights Act?

Again, providing an exemption for small business is not a new concept, many of its opponents today have supported that concept in the past. So we look at that as one possibility to help those who may be unemployed because of the increase.

We continue the tip credit provision which is in the present law; we continue the present laws that relate to computer professionals; and we reinstitute the opportunity wage, but this time we limit it to 90 days; calendar days. We do not have two periods of 60 working days.

So I would hope as we proceed today that we spend a great deal of time talking about facts rather than fantasies, and by the time we are finished, hopefully, we will have helped all Americans, including that 100,000 to 500,000 that could find themselves in real difficulty if we do not make some of the decisions that we have made in the past when dealing with minimum wage increases.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding me this time, and I rise to oppose strongly the Goodling amendment and to talk about its effect on the underlying bill.

Today we were supposed to vote on a bill to increase the minimum wage by 90 cents and to pay working families a living wage. We were going to raise the minimum wage from its lowest level in 40 years. And what do the American people wake to this morning? The Goodling surprise, an amendment which says that any business with annual sales of under $500,000 is exempted from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In other words, if an individual happens to be one of the 10.5 million Americans who work in these small businesses, they do not have to get paid overtime; they do not earn the minimum wage. Not the old one or the new one.

In my region, the New York City metropolitan area, over 130,000 businesses will be exempt from fair labor laws and 200,000 workers will be left unprotected.

The minimum wage vote should be called the Gingrich two-step. Take one step forward by raising the minimum wage for some people, take two giant steps back by exempting millions from overtime and minimum wage laws all together.

Why must the GOP continue to gratuitously slap American workers? Why did they break their promise to offer a clean minimum wage increase? The only answer must be, as the gentleman from Texas, Majority Leader DICK ARMEY, stated, that they oppose the minimum wage with every fiber in their being, and they will raise it but they will exact their pound of flesh from American workers.

This mean-spirited assault on those who work every day and barely eke out a living wage is horrid. These people work in textiles, in retail, on farms. They work hard, they deserve a raise, not to be punished because the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, will do anything to keep minimum wage from happening.

Now, if the Goodling amendment passes, the President, thankfully, has said he will veto the bill, and I am sure there is a little nefarious plan out here: Goodling will pass, the President vetoes the bill, nothing happens, and the Republicans say we have tried.

But let me assure my coleagues that from this side of the aisle, until there is a minimum wage increase for all Americans, not one out of two or one out of three, we will be on this floor every week and every month to make sure that the minimum wage passes. The Republicans cannot and will not avoid a clean minimum wage increase with this kind of cheap trick.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from New York that unless we make some changes, New York will face a loss of 29,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman HUTCHINSON.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder where all of this passion was 2 years ago when Democrats controlled this Chamber, controlled the other Chamber and controlled the White House. Not once, not once, was a minimum wage proposal brought up before the full House, before a committee, or before a subcommittee. What we are seeing now is rhetoric. What we are seeing is election year politics.

I rise to oppose increasing the minimum wage, not because I do not want to help working Americans, but because I do want to help them. We know, we know, that raising the minimum wage will kill jobs. It will take opportunities away from those who we claim we want to help the most.

I point to Melody Rane and her family who own two Burger King franchises in Eureka, CA. A minimum wage hike will force her to lay off four full-time and eight part-time workers at her stores. She will also be forced to raise her prices, which will hurt everyone, especially the working poor, whom we claim that we have compassion for.

According to Melody, raising the minimum wage will hurt teens more than anyone else she employs because she will no longer be able to provide entry-level jobs for them. The young people that she has hired have not stayed on at minimum wage for very long. They learn their jobs and they move up quickly. All her managers started at minimum wage and her top manager today has been with them since he was 16 years old.

We know that raising the minimum wage is a job killer on the most vulnerable people in our society. A 1993 study by the American Economics Association of over 22,000 economists found that 77 percent of them said that if we raise the minimum wage, there will be significant job loss in our economy.

We know it is inflationary, because if they do not lay them off, they have to raise the price of their goods and services, and that disproportionately impacts poor people who are going to have to pay more for those products that they buy.

Raising the minimum wage is the poorest way to target working poor people. The last time we raised the minimum wage, in 1991, only 17 percent of the new benefits went to people living below the poverty line. Most of them are teenagers living at home with mom and dad. Only 17 percent went to those who are working poor.

Now, I suggest to my colleagues that there is a better way. If we really care about working poor people, there is a better way to do it. I propose that we reform and we refocus and we retarget the earned income tax credit, a program that has enjoyed support from the 1970's on from both sides of the aisle.

□ 0915

This time from GINGRICH to GEPHARDT, they support EITC, but the program is fraught with abuse. It has

grown far beyond its original intentions. If we refocus it, as I have proposed, back on working families with children, we can help them in a better way than the negative impacts of raising the minimum wage. Convert that large lump sum to a monthly payment so it is a practical supplement for family income. Deny the credit to undocumented workers, eliminate the credit for childless adults who never were eligible until 1993 when we expanded it, and then increase that credit for working parents, who it was intended to help in the first place.

That single mom with one child, those parents with one child would see their effective wage rate go to $5.47 an hour under that proposal. With two children it would go to $6.37 an hour, and 12.7 million families would be the beneficiaries of such a change.

This is what happens when we raise the minimum wage by 9 cents: 21 cents is lost in reduced food stamp benefits; 8 cents is lost because we pay that much more in FICA withholding. If they happen to live in public housing, they lose 27 cents more to that. That leaves that working poor person that you claim you want to help getting 34 cents out of the 90-cent increase in the minimum wage. That is not compassion. If we retarget the earned income tax credit we will help more Americans and help them at 44 cents an hour.

Do not talk about compassion until you are willing to look at good alternatives, and Republicans have put forward good alternatives, compassionate alternatives. Not only that, they lose more on the EITC as well. It is simply not real compassion to say we want to raise the minimum wage.

Everybody talks about the polls. What is the politically popular thing to do. That is why this thing is before the floor today. That is why Democrats want to raise the minimum wage when they did not do it 2 years ago when they had a chance. It is because we have an election in November.

It is interesting that CNN–USA, in the latest poll, found that while 81 percent of Americans want to raise the minimum wage, that if you go one step further and you ask this question: If you favor raising the minimum wage, what if that raise in wages meant fewer jobs for low-paid workers, and all of a sudden 57 percent of those 81 percent say no, we do not want to raise the minimum wage if it is going to mean a loss of jobs for low-wage earners.

I suggest to those on the other side of the aisle who are so insistent on raising the minimum wage, knowing that CBO says it will cost a half-million jobs, that you come back to my district and explain to that single mom with two children why she loses her job in the name of compassion.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the passion of the gentleman who was just in the well, who now tells us what we should do is target the earned income tax credit, when a year ago he was leading the fight to slash the earned income tax credit. I appreciate the passion of the gentleman in the well for the family in Eureka example. It is the Congressman from Eureka that is carrying the minimum wage increase so their representative apparently believes that the minimum wage should be increased, the Republican gentleman from Eureka, CA [Mr. RIGGS].

I appreciate the passion of the gentleman suggesting that what the taxpayer ought to do is pay out more money in food stamps, more money in housing, more money in EITC, more money in AFDC to subsidize low wage jobs. He does not want the employer to pay for people to have a livable wage because now he is concerned if the employer pays more money, the taxpayer will pay less. The gentleman is all over the field on these issues. You wanted to slash food stamps. You want to slash AFDC. You wanted to slash the earned income tax credit. But today you want to talk about how it would be better if we paid those moneys instead of the employer paying a livable wage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], a compassionate individual.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest to the impassioned gentleman that I, in fact, did not lead the charge, as you have wrongly, inaccurately alleged to cut EITC. In fact, if you check the facts, I was involved in the conference committee. I was involved in working with Senator NICKLES.

In fact, under the Republican proposal on EITC, with the $500 per child tax credit, as I think you accurately know, not one American would have been worse off. Not one working American would have lost anything in EITC. In fact, they would have been far better off under that proposal.

I would like to note for the record that the State of California will face a loss of 63,100 jobs if the minimum wage is increased and up to 500,000 jobs, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will be eliminated nationwide.

So I would remind my good friend that this unfunded mandate will cost millions of working families and taxpayers over $13 billion according to the CBO.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would say, the last time California raised its minimum wage, there was no job loss by teenagers or others that you are so concerned about. And second, the fact is when you were going to take away the EITC, you were going to take it away from single working people who were trying to find a livable wage. So you just decided that single people should live in poverty. So you were going to take it away from 14 million people, wonderful.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I believe hardworking Americans deserve a raise, and the people's House should increase the minimum wage. I thought we finally would have a chance to raise the minimum wage, as four out of five Americans want us to do. After calling for hearings, stalling for months, and appalling statements by the majority leader, who said that he would oppose the minimum wage with, and I quote, every fiber of his being, I thought that the Republican leadership would finally allow a clean vote on providing a needed raise for American workers.

But the Republican leadership has chosen to poison the minimum wage increase with the Goodling amendment, a distasteful amendment to repeal the minimum wage for millions of American workers.

The amendment not only repeals the minimum wage guarantee for workers at two-thirds of firms in the United States, 10 million people, it also rolls back the Fair Labor Standards Act, and it opens the door to cruel sweatshops that should have been left behind decades ago.

Mr. Speaker, I know something about sweatshops. My mother, who is 82 years old, worked in a sweatshop for many years. Fortunately, the people of this country rejected such working conditions, and they did that decades ago. I watched her work over that sewing machine with other women and they pumped out those dresses to provide an income for their families. But the extreme agenda of the Gingrich revolution would roll back the clock to those bad old days.

The American people want to move forward to higher wages, to rising living standards, and to better working conditions. They do not want to go backward to a darker time in our past when fair wages and safe workplaces were at the whim of the employer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support a real and a simple increase in the minimum wage. That is what our job is about today, to help working families in this country realize their dream, to have more change in their pockets, to be able to buy their kids an extra pair of sneakers. That is what we are about.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentlewoman from Connecticut that Connecticut will face a loss of 4,000 jobs if we do not do something other than just raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the chairman of our committee for his leadership on

this issue. I think, first and foremost, the reason people get upset with Washington is we ask the wrong questions. This is not a question about whether big brother Government Washington ought to mandate a specific minimum per hour salary all across this country regardless of job, regardless of skill.

What we ought to be asking is how do we provide some kind of an incentive to lift up those in the lower income of the earnings scale in this country and what is the best way to do that. Is it in training? Is it in EITC? Is it in small business incentives to hire more people? Is it in tax policy that allows them to earn more, to pay less to the Government and, therefore, pay more to their employees?

We ought to be asking the bigger question. We do not do that. That is what this debate is not doing either. That is why I would like to sort of bring us all back to what is in front of us, which is a comprehensive package to deal with a whole series of ingredients that ought to provide better incomes for those who are younger, limited experience, or lower skills, or whatever the case might be in America's work force.

I really want to commend our leadership for saying, do not take these issues in isolation anymore. Yesterday with a vote of 414, we voted to provide a number of small business incentives through the Tax Code. Everybody on a bipartisan basis agreed that those were good, positive things. What we are talking about today is doing the same thing. We are talking about solving this portal to portal issue, where people are allowed to use the company vehicle without having to pay compensation for it. I do not think there is much disagreement in that particular issue.

We are going to talk about the Goodling amendment. What does the Goodling amendment do? It deals with the training wage. We have had training wages before. Who were we talking about, we are talking about those young people, mainly teenagers, who have never had a job. Whether or not they can get a job at the local drug store or grocery store or have no job and no experience at all is probably going to be determined whether or not we give them a first time, one time, no displacement opportunity wage.

We are talking about a tip credit that says, let us put some kind of basic understanding and simplicity in this whole issue of tips.

The third issue I want to talk about, which is an issue that somehow is getting all controversial around here, is this whole issue of the small business exemption. Somehow people are saying we are trying to exclude all of these family businesses from having to pay a minimum wage. We are not trying to do that at all. What we are trying to do is provide equity for all small and family businesses across this country wherever they may be located.

Mr. Speaker, I want Members to look at this map. I represent all of western Wisconsin, the 220 miles along the Mississippi River. I want Members to look at such towns as DeSoto and Genoa and Stoddard and Ferryville and Pepin and Trempealeau and Stockholm and Nelson. All of these are towns under 400 population.

If the mom and pop stores happen to sell something to someone living literally a mile or 2 miles away in the Minnesota or Iowa border, under existing law they do not have the same benefits that that same mom and pop business would have right over here, 60 miles away. All we are saying is, wherever you live, just because you live by a State border, you should not be impacted because of interstate commerce from not having the same benefits as the small family owned business as everybody else. Jerry's grocery store, Carol's catering, Larry's lawn mower service. My colleagues, we are saying just because you are by a state border, you ought not be disadvantaged.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the other side that a vote for the Goodling poison pill amendment in the State of Wisconsin would deny 210,757 workers an increase in the minimum wage. In the State of Connecticut, it would be 87,000.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I must say this is an issue about values. We are talking about the dignity of work. That is one of the main principles this country has been founded on. Let me tell my colleagues there is no dignity to work if you do not get paid a living wage.

I cannot believe that people are saying this is about politics. It is not about politics. It is about paychecks, paychecks, paychecks.

Now, look, how long does it take to earn a year's minimum wage. Well, for the minimum wage worker, it takes a year. For the average CEO of a large corporation, it takes about a half a day. This is what we are talking about. This is the country with the largest disparity between wages at the top and wages at the bottom of any other western industrialized world. All we are saying if we are going to have dignity to work, we ought to try and raise the bottom. Do you not think the fat cats at the top are getting enough.

□ 0930

They are getting way more than fat cats at the top of any other country, and what is the Republican proposal? They are trying to pretend they give us the minimum wage while they turn around and knock out two-thirds of the businesses in America from having to pay either the minimum wage or overtime.

They also are going to go after tipped employees. If someone gets tips, they do not get the minimum wage. They can run around with their tin cup from place to place begging for more. Oh, there is dignity.

Please, this is about dignity.

I also hear people saying, ''Oh, well, it just goes to teenagers. Teenagers don't need it.''

Yes they do.

Have my colleagues looked at college education? I worked my way through college. One cannot do it today on the minimum wage. Tell me where to go to college and put money away.

This is about paychecks.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to what my colleagues from Arkansas and from Wisconsin said on the other side, and I am amazed how little understanding they seem to have about the person who is affected by the minimum wage.

As my colleagues know, I heard statements about how, well, we will deal with the earned income tax credit, or we will make adjustments with food stamps or other government programs.

What are we talking about? A lot of the people that work on minimum wage, they do not even necessarily apply for food stamps. They do not even necessarily apply for the earned income tax credit. Many of them even do not have the knowhow or ability or even want to get involved with the Government bureaucracy. If we are talking about Washington and thinking about how we do things here, I would venture to say that my colleagues on the other side are too Washington oriented; they do not understand what the average person has to deal with on a daily basis. If they are getting a set salary now based on the minimum wage and we increase that salary somewhat under this very modest proposal, then they will see an actual increase in their wages.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot look at the bureaucratic procedures that they are talking about here. I think the earned income tax credit is great. I think people need food stamps. But a lot of people do not even apply for them who are on minimum wage.

They just do not understand on the other side what it is like for the little guy on a daily basis. And let me tell my colleagues in my own State of New Jersey, because I am afraid that somebody or I think somebody on the other side is going to talk about loss of jobs, let me tell them in New Jersey we had a modest increase in the minimum wage that was similar to what is being proposed here on the Federal level.

The results are that this moderate hike actually increased total employment in the State of New Jersey, and the reason is that minimum wage earners do not have the ability to save. They spend their money on basic necessities.

Raising the minimum wage puts more money into our local economy.

The money in New Jersey was used to purchase more goods and eventually an increase in profits for local businesses.

So raising the minimum wage actually increases economic activity; it means more jobs, not less jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this exemption that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has proposed, do not listen to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said about how it is not going to affect them. It is a broad exemption that is going to repeal the minimum wage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentlewoman from Colorado that that State would lose 8,000 jobs if all we do is raise the minimum wage and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that H.R. 1227 has been hijacked, to be a vehicle for a minimum wage increase. Obviously, some on the other side, do not like business, especially small business.

On its face, H.R. 1227 is a good bill designed to allow workers to continue to use their company-owned vehicles for commuting to and from work.

For example, an electrical company may supply vans to their electricians so that they can respond to service calls. In the past, the time spent driving to and from a service call and back home, was not considered ''on the clock'' time.

Yet, recent Labor Department decisions have put this long established policy in jeopardy. Now, some companies are requiring their employees to bring the vehicles back to the office, so that the company is not subject to minimum wage and overtime liabilities.

In my rural district, the Labor Department's actions could result in long delays in services; increased costs for employees since they would have to pay for the fuel used to commute to and from work—which may be hundreds of miles in a week's time; and more time spent away from families.

If this bill was considered separately, I have no doubt that it would pass this House overwhelmingly. But, I fear the House may soon make a major mistake in increasing the minimum wage, thereby denying job opportunities and increasing costs, and using this bill to do it.

If my prediction bears fruit, then I regrettably urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1227. If a minimum wage increase is attached to this bill, the bad will far outweigh the good.

And that is unfortunate. Commonsense efforts of Mr. FAWELL and others of us who are working to increase and safeguard job opportunities for millions of Americans, will be severely harmed by a minimum wage increase.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for all his good work.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the other side and the gentleman who just spoke that a vote for the poison pill Goodling amendment would result in the loss of 94,150 individuals in Nebraska who would get an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, finally, we get the chance to vote on an increase to the Federal minimum wage. Americans have been calling for a vote on increasing the minimum wage for months. In fact, 85 percent of America supports giving minimum wage workers their first raise in five, long years. But instead of a straight up-or down vote, Republicans had to make sure their business buddies got some goodies in the deal.

This should have been a simple bill. Instead, it guts Federal wage protections by attaching two Trojan Horse amendments full of poison. We should be making work pay. I am truly outraged that Republicans would try to exclude many millions of Americans from being paid a fair wage.

Mr colleagues should come down from their corporate ivory towers and do the work they were sent here to do. Represent the people who have told us loud and clear that they want a clean minimum wage increase period.

Vote against both Goodling amendments and support a clean increase to the minimum wage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding this time to me.

From the first day that I took office here in the Congress in 1991 I have been fighting to raise the minimum wage, and I hope very much that my colleagues finally are going to do the right thing on behalf of tens of millions of workers and raise the minimum wage today.

Mr. Speaker, when the minimum wage was first established in the 1930's, the opponents then said that the world was going to come to an end, the economy was going to collapse. And every single time that an effort has been made since then to raise the minimum wage, the same cries have come forward: The world is going to come to an end, we cannot raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that today, at $4.25 an hour, the minimum wage is a starvation wage. The minimum wage today, in terms of purchasing power, is 26 percent less than it was 20 years ago. In terms of purchasing power it is at its lowest point in the last 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are tens of millions of Americans today who are working hard at $4.25 an hour, at $5 an hour, at $5.25 an hour, and they are unable to take care of the financial needs of their family. They are unable to put away money so that their kids can go to college. They cannot go on a vacation. Every single week, despite 40 or 50 hours of work, they are in as bad shape at the end of the week as they were before the week began.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great economic problems facing our country today is that the richest people are becoming richer, the middle class is shrinking, and most of the new jobs are being created are low-wage jobs.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier, in fact at the beginning of this process, my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], reminded us to stick to fact and ignore fiction, and I would say misleading statements are as bad as are fiction, and in this case misleading statements by Republicans are as attributable to fiction as anything I have ever seen.

The two constant themes that are running through the core argument of the Republicans are that this will cause job loss and that the Democrats did not do it 2 years ago. Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues there were a lot of things we attempted to do, including the EITC 2 years ago, which actually, in effect, was more accommodating to a majority of our friends in our neighborhoods and communities than was the minimum-wage increase.

But let me remind my friends also that every time there has been a minimum-wage increase, and in 1991 there was, my friends on that side of the aisle have worked to dilute it. In fact, in that minimum-wage increase there was what was called a training wage, which gave an exemption to employers to hire people below the minimum wage in order to give them training experience.

What kind of training experience? Cleaning toilets, making beds, washing dishes. I suggest to you that most of us learned that at an early age and do not need any training for it.

Now, in this one we have what is called an opportunity wage, which is another exemption aside from the exemption they give to those people as an exclusion from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments on that side are more close to fiction than they are to fact. We did not do it because we can see that in 1 year of doing the EITC that we could not very well push through a minimum wage, but there are many of us that since our coming to Congress have always felt the minimum wage is too low.

Now the job loss argument: In California they raised it much before the Federal Government did, and in California there was not one job lost. And

so the prognostications of the job losses that are going to occur if this passes I think are totally false.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what we have here today is the first welfare reform bill in the history of this Congress because all the other welfare reform is a fraud if at the end of the day when someone gets their first job they cannot make it work, they cannot pay the rent, they cannot buy food, they cannot pay for their kids' babysitting while they are working, they cannot pay for their transportation.

Do not get up on this floor and talk about welfare reform and then try to take away the protection of the minimum wage for an additional 10 million people.

This is welfare reform, making work, have a salary sufficient to live on, just barely.

In the last decade 60 percent of Americans have slid backward. It is the first time in American history that we have seen the bottom take it on the chin as badly as they have. The top 20 percent has gone up. The next 20 percent below that has gone up just slightly. But the 60 percent of Americans below those top 40 have actually lost buying power. In the decades before that, everybody moved up.

If my colleagues want welfare reform, vote for real welfare reform. Vote for a living wage for Americans. And this hardly does it. Go try to pay rent and take transportation to work. Try to feed kids and clothe them on the minimum wage.

Do not give me phony speeches about getting people off welfare. Give people the hope and opportunity to work and at least have enough money to almost live in dignity.

□ 0945

This is not enough. Speech after speech about welfare reform, about getting people to work. Sure, get them to work at a wage they cannot make enough money to pay their rent, let alone eat and take care of their children. If we want the American people to value work, to respect work, it has to pay enough to live on.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the rhetoric last evening and this morning, I have a feeling they really have a dislike for business, and a terrible dislike for small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. First, as a small businessman, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], on the actual bill we are discussing here, the portal-to-portal bill.

In my case, in the retail business, we had a number of employees, including our service manager and our warehouse manager, who had vehicles that they drove home. It worked well for them. It was something we could do as a joint employer-employee, and to have the Federal Government, through the courts, who often decide that they are the State and Federal legislators of this country and can make better decisions than Congress and State legislators can, to see that overturned is a tragedy for American workers and small business.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am sorry that I cannot vote for that bill, because I cannot support a bill that lays off American workers. I understand it is called a minimum wage bill rather than a layoff bill, but in fact, it is a layoff bill. As the chairman just said, I knew the other side did not like businesses, but I did not realize how much they disliked small businesses. They use the rhetoric of the dignity of work, but in fact, it is the dignity of not working that this is promoting.

They stand up once in a while and talk about different statistics that have no basis in reality. The truth is, facts are stubborn things, and the fact is every time but one when there was a national minimum wage increase, job layoffs increased. Every time but one. The facts are there. State statistics are interesting. That is why we give options to the States. But federally, only one time did the unemployment not increase.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, jobs will be lost in this country. In fact, kids will lose their jobs, minorities will lose their jobs, senior citizens will lose their jobs. In small towns, in center cities, marginal businesses will be devastated.

I am concerned because I grew up in a town of 700, and spent most of my life in this small town. As I look around the country and see the businesses shuttered in these small towns, and see the businesses shuttered in the central cities, in the suburbs, and the people in Washington who often live in the big houses in the suburbs, where they can do the volume of business with which to pay this, do not seem to have the sensitivity for the many small towns that are losing their little businesses.

Many of those people who want a living wage move to the bigger cities, but some people would prefer to live in those small towns. Those kids who now will not have a place to work, those senior citizens who now will be trapped at home because they cannot take a marginal job, those young kids and middle-aged kids who struggled, who obviously have a special need and can barely hold a job at a minimum wage, who lose their job and are thrown back onto the welfare system because of the policies of this Congress, I wish every Member who voted for this bill had to look those people in the face when they get their pink slips, when they are trapped in their homes, when they are standing on the street corners, when they no longer have the opportunity to work because of the supposed rhetoric of compassion, rather than the real compassion.

It really disappoints me to see this promotion of the Wal-Martization of America, the disdain for the marginal businesses. I have heard Members in this body say, if those businesses cannot give enough money to meet the minimum wage standard, then they should just disappear. That is so insensitive.

We are working in the central city of Fort Wayne to try to get a supermarket back in where the supermarkets have all closed down. You will not only raise the minimum wage but all the bumps up. You increase the wages 20 percent, and we will not get that supermarket in the central city or central cities in other places.

This is not a matter of rhetoric, this is not a matter of sounding compassionate. The facts are there. The people do not understand because the American people are compassionate. They hear living wage and they want to give a living wage. The truth is that people at the margin are going to be lost. We could have helped the people who needed a living wage through earned income tax credits, through different types of legislation.

I am sorry our party is not even allowing us to vote on a number of those things, because we should have had that opportunity, and we should have been out there leading how to, in a free market economy, make sure that people, through the market system, can get a living wage. This is not the way to do it. I am embarrassed quite frankly that our party, rather than decide to fight and stand on principle and explain the facts to the American people, instead have tried to work at the margins with the minimum wage.

They have done a good job within the confines of trying to save a few jobs, but I reluctantly am still going to have to vote against the good portal-to-portal bill and against some other things that I support, because I cannot have it on my conscience to cost people that I know their jobs: seniors, young people, people who are handicapped, who have struggled to get into the work force, and now because Washington, people have decided that they should lose their jobs, they are going to lose their jobs.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana who just spoke, if he decides to vote for anything, it would probably be the Goodling amendment. If that passes and becomes law, 315,000 people in the State of the gentleman who just spoke, Indiana, would be denied a minimum wage. Ten percent of the people on minimum wage are senior citizens.

The gentleman's point is the point that many people in the minority make, and that is, a higher wage is bad for business and therefore loses jobs.

Carrying that conservative argument to its conclusion would lead one to believe, incorrectly, that lowering wages in this country would be good for employment and good for business.

That is the difference between that side of the aisle and this. This side of the aisle believes that as we raise the standard of living in America, America does better economically. That side believes, obviously, that as you reduce the standard of living in this country, it is good for this country economically. Nothing in American history demonstrates that Republicans are correct about that.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to increase the minimum wage. It is time to make work pay. It's time to make work pay more than welfare.

I know, because over 28 years ago, as a single, working mother, I was earning so little I had to go on welfare to supplement my pay in order to provide my children with the health care, child care and food they needed.

Unfortunately, too many American workers face the same situation today. In fact, most minimum wage earners look a lot like I did 28 years ago: 60 percent of minimum wage earners are women. Of that, 72 percent are over 20 years old. And, one-fifth of minimum wage earners are single parents.

So, yes, my friends, despite what you've heard from the Republican leadership, families struggling to get by on $4.25 an hour really do exist.

What does not exist, however, is a believable commitment by the majority to boost the wages of working Americans. Now, rather than having a clean up-or-down vote on raising the minimum wage, the Republicans are loading the bill up with amendments that will make an increase meaningless.

Under the Goodling amendment alone, up to 10 million workers could lose their right to any minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, that's not making work pay. It is taking workers backwards. It is letting businesses off the hook who pay low wages. It is forcing the taxpayers through the welfare system to make up the difference for these low wages.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass a minimum wage. No if's, and's or but's. Let's make work pay.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, and I hope that this morning we can have a truth in discussion on the floor of the House. This is a $5 bill, and those who are working and getting minimum wage right now must give back change on this bill. If we do not raise the minimum wage, we will in fact deny 1.1 million workers in the State of Texas an increase.

What I want to talk about is truth in discussion. We support small businesses. In fact, we came to the floor of the House and enthusiastically provided the Small Business Protection Act, giving incentives for small businesses who hire at-risk individuals, giving them a tax incentive to do so, allowing them to spend more money on equipment, providing pension reform, giving them a health deduction provision that we did some months ago. I am for small businesses. But likewise, I have to be for the working public, and 60 percent of those on minimum wage are women with children.

How can you talk about welfare reform when the Republicans are likewise talking about decreasing the earned income tax credit, which would negatively affect over 6.8 million taxpayers who are at the lowest bottom rung?

The American people are fair. We simply want an increase in minimum wage for retail workers, individuals who work every day to stay off welfare. Realize what you do with $5. What you do with $5, you pay your rent, you pay the income needs for your children, you pay health care. What you are doing if you deny the increase in the minimum wage for all Americans, you prevent those who would want to have incentives to come off welfare from being able to support their families.

What are we doing here? We are not discussing the facts. The facts are, you cannot survive on $4.25. Take a $5 bill and get back change and see if you can survive. We need a vote up-or-down on a clean minimum wage for the American people.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentlewoman from California, we would lose 63 million jobs if we do nothing, and in Texas 60,000 jobs, if we do nothing other than raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, this debate is about politics, it is not about economics. If this were such a great deal, the socialists over there would have raised the minimum wage in 1993 and 1994, when they had a huge majority and a President that would have signed it. They did not bring it up, they did not hold hearings, and they did not pass it. What a surprise.

Eighty-three percent of the American people want to raise the minimum wage. The problem is, 78 percent of them cannot tell you what the minimum wage is.

I ask the gentleman, did the gentleman coauthor the Small Business Administration exemption? Yes, he did sponsor the small business exemption that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is offering right now.

Let me tell the Members how minimum wage affected me. As a child I was making $1 an hour at the Grand Lake Theater in Oakland. They raised the minimum wage to $1.25. They told me I was through, they did not have it in their budget. I told them I did not work for government, I worked for them, and I just needed it for my allowance, to supplement my allowance and as experience, because and because as a young person at 16 you cannot get experience. They liked my attitude and paid the minimum wage. But I almost lost my job. I know about minimum wage. It stinks, it is a charlatan game. There is no constitutional right. It is an unfunded mandate. Vote no, and vote yes for the Goodling amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Riggs amendment which would raise the minimum wage and in vehement opposition to the Goodling amendment which would result in millions of Americans earning less than the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of parents in my district—in cities like San Diego, National City, Chula Vista and Imperial Beach—that are working two or three minimum wage jobs to raise their families in dignity. These parents are sacrificing valuable time with their children in order to avoid welfare. These parents have not had a raise in over 5 years.

We also have thousands of students working their way through school, and senior citizens working to augment their Social Security. They, too, deserve a rise.

We must do the right thing for these families.

But today's bill is a cruel hoax on these hard-working Americans. On the one hand we tease them with the prospects of the minimum wage increase, and on the other we snatch it away.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote for the Riggs amendment and against the Goodling exemption, which would allow millions of Americans to be paid less than the minimum wage.

Let's do the right—and moral—thing for American families.

□ 1000

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make a point to my colleagues. I very much support this legislation, the Employee Commuting Flexibility Act. It is commonsense legislation clarifying the Department of Labor interpretations of the circumstances under which an employer must pay an employee to drive to work in company-owned vehicles.

But the minimum wage amendment I am going to offer in a few minutes does not belong in this legislation. It belongs on meaningful welfare reform legislation, like the legislation that

passed this House, passed the Senate and was twice vetoed by the President.

The folks over on this side of the aisle should walk their talk, put their votes where their rhetoric is, and support real welfare reform, because those two issues, a moderate increase in the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation and real reform of the welfare system, go hand, in hand.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. speaker, I want to applaud my colleague from California because I agree that a minimum wage should have been with the welfare reform bill. If we want to get people off welfare, we have to provide them with a decent minimum wage. Right now in our country if a person works 40 hours a week for 52 weeks a year, they make $8,800. They are eligible for food stamps, welfare, whatever it is called. That is why it should have been part of it.

The bills that were sent to the President by this Republican Congress did not have the minimum wage increase in it. It should have been part of the welfare reform bill but it was not. That is not the fault on this side of the aisle. It is the other side. That is why it should be part. I agree with my colleague from California. A minimum wage increase should be part of a welfare reform bill.

The minimum wage increase passed the last time in 1991 with 135 Republicans in the House supporting it. I think that is ironic because we had a Democratic majority in the House and a Republican President that passed the minimum wage increase. Now we have a Democratic President and a Republican majority in the House and the Senate and yet we have waited for 2 months to try and have a vote on the floor today.

What do we have? We have a vote on a bill and an amendment, the bill that has portability which itself could stand alone and be debated, in fact we could probably pass it with some fairness in the portability bill, but, no, we are going to attach a minimum wage increase to it that is going to take away millions of people from coverage under the minimum wage.

We are giving it with one hand and we are going to take it away with the other. That is what the people of the United States have said in 1992 and 1994. They do not want Washington practicing sleight of hand. They want Washington to be up-front and honest with the American people.

By withdrawing the coverage of minimum wage from these interstate small businesses, we are actually lowering the coverage to over 10 million people. That is what is wrong with this bill and the amendment, and that is why when it goes to the Senate, hopefully they will change that if we do not beat it today.

The minimum wage increase passed in 1991 with bipartisan support. Hopefully we will have that again, but it needs to be a real minimum wage increase and not a fake one.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], a member of the committee.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Employee Commuting Flexibility Act which is a good piece of legislation that we really should be talking about which allows employees to use the company car to go home, saves fuel, and is good for the environment, but instead we keep talking about the minimum wage.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle suddenly in this election year have all this compassion for the minimum wage workers. What they do not seem to have compassion for is all of the people that they are going to unemploy by mandating from Washington, that their salary goes up.

The gentleman from Indiana said it previously. Thousands and thousands of people have lost their job every single time the Congress raised the minimum wage. Every economist report except one reports that people have lost their job.

But I do not think you care about them losing their job. You care about getting reelected. You care about who is in control of this body. That is why you are making a big deal out of it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Florida that if he votes for the Goodling amendment, this poison pill amendment, what will happen is that 675,928 workers in the State of Florida will be denied an increase in the minimum wage. He should also know, coming from Florida, that 10 percent of minimum wage workers are seniors.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I rise in strong support of the minimum wage. Not a sham minimum wage, a real minimum wage.

Some people say, ''Well, is this debate about politics?''

No, it is not about politics. This debate is about the American dream. This debate is about standards of living in America. This debate is about whether people can live in America making $8,000 a year after working 40 hours a week. It just does not add up. We need to raise the minimum wage so we can raise the standard of living so people can in fact enjoy the American dream.

The leadership on the other side of the aisle does not believe in that and they do not care about whether we raise the standard of living. They want to say people are going to lose jobs. That is not true. One hundred two economists, including three Nobel prize winners, all support raising the minimum wage. But we do not have to go to the intellectuals. Eighty percent of the American public supports raising the minimum wage. I trust the common sense of the American public. But we can even go to the politicians because, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there are bipartisan majorities in both houses of this Congress who want to support an increase in the minimum wage. But unfortunately there is a Republican leadership that wants to thwart the will of the American people and bipartisan majorities, because they want to undermine this bill with a poison pill. The poison pill will exempt two-thirds of all businesses from the requirements of the minimum wage. That means 10 million Americans will not be able to raise their standard of living and will not be able to enjoy the American dream. It means that we could see the return of sweatshops where people work long hours for low pay. That is not the American dream. In America we pride ourselves not just on democracy but on the ability to support families and to enjoy the benefits of democracy. The only way that that can happen is when people earn a livable wage. What they are perpetrating today is not a livable wage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, this is not about raising the minimum wage. It is about putting young minority students out of work. Raising the minimum wage will put 1 out of every 4 minority workers between the ages of 17 and 24 who are out of school and working today out of work.

Some of the most eloquent testimony I heard on this issue came from a District of Columbia businessman, Abdul Uqdah. This is Abdul Uqdah. He started a business 16 years ago with $500 and 3 employees. He now employs 14 people. He appeared before our committee and begged us not to raise the Federal mandate minimum wage. Why? Because it will not work and because it will put minority youth out of work.

He said, and the fact is, raising the minimum wage will put one out of every four young minority workers in America who hold a job today out of work. This is an unemployment act that hurts minority youth, and it is a shame.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what committee he appeared before, but our committee did not hold any hearings on the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona should be reminded that 200,000 of his workers will be denied an increase in the minimum wage if he votes for the Goodling

amendment, and that two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults; 40 percent are the principal breadwinners in the family. Let us get the facts straight on this issue.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time remains for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The Gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to close.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, let us close this debate by recalling that America is at its best when it does its best by its workers. After half a century of progress, America's standard of high wages is now in decline. In the 30 years from Harry Truman through Jack Kennedy to Lyndon Baines Johnson, the average income of the American family more than doubled.

Since then it has been in decline, in decline despite the fact that there are now two wage earners in millions of American families. In those 30 years, the percentage of women in the American work force has risen by 180 percent. Today women make up half of America's work force.

If Americans were asked to name a big employer in America just a few years ago, they probably would have said Lee Iacocca but they would not have said Beverly. But Beverly hired more people than did all of auto. Beverly runs nursing homes in America, Beverly's workers work for the minimum wage, and most of them are women.

We have had an evolution, in the lifetime of everyone in this Chamber, in the American work force. America must invest in its human capital as well as its physical capital. Corporations in America must get better at long-term planning and less at short-run gain. Manufacturers in America must do better at focusing on quality rather than quick profits.

Our workers must once again be the best paid workers in the world. Why? To create unemployment? No; to put small business out of work? No; to raise the standard of American living, because our people spend their money on Main Street USA.

As a former small businessman myself who owned restaurants in Montana, I can tell Members that my days were never better than when my workers and Montana's workers were well paid. I never had more profitable years than those years when the minimum wage was raised. Do it for America. Take care of America's workers.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Montana would only lose 2,800 jobs if we do nothing but raise the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] to talk a little bit about what we were supposed to be talking about during the last 90 minutes.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

If this were a court of law, Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of what we have hard would be ruled irrelevant and nongermane to the issue before this body. Because whether one is for the minimum wage or not, all that this bill does is to clarify conflicting DOL opinions, and to make sure that when employers and employees and unions want to get together and agree that an employee can use the employer's vehicle, usually it is a pickup truck or something like that in the construction trades, to go from home to work and from work to home, it will not be in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That is all that we really should be talking about at this time. We should take it one at a time.

No one would be forced to do this. It would be voluntary on the part of the employee, and the commuting distance would be the normal commuting distance as determined by the rules of the Department of Labor.

□ 1015

This is supported by all workers basically, union, nonunion, Republican, Democrat, socialist, communist, whatever. It is a sound piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the gentlewomen said we ought to get the facts straight, and I think that would be a pretty good idea. They have been throwing around figures like 3 million, 5 million, 10 million, 100 million if, as a matter of fact, my amendment dealing with the small business exemption, which is the law at the present time, would happen to be adopted.

That is pretty interesting. You know where they are getting those figures? They are getting those figures from the Census Bureau of people who are employed by businesses that have an income less than $500,000.

Well, what they are forgetting to do, first of all, they have to say, well, who is already exempted in that group? Let me tell you who is already exempted in that group: The self-employed, they are already exempted in that group. Then you have the white collar exemptions, doctors, dentists, accountants, and attorneys. They are all exempted in that group. Then you have those who are exempted from the 1989 amendments. They are exempted from overtime requirements. Then you have those who work for individual franchises, such as McDonald's, Burger King, all exempted at the present time. I mean, all do not fit into an exemption at the present time, because they have over $500,000 in income. Can you tell me how many are exempted by State law?

So when you talk about millions, you are not talking about the true facts, I will guarantee you. You are talking about some Census Bureau figures that have nothing to do with who is exempted and who is not exempted under current law.

It is very obvious, as I indicated before, that there is a hate passion from the other side of the aisle in relationship to business, and a tremendous hate passion in relationship to small businesses. Well, it is those small businesses that are going to create the jobs in this country, and I hope everyone will remember that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 104–490.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIGGS

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIGGS: Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Minimum Wage Increase Act of 1996''.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) except as otherwise provided in this section, not less than $4.25 an hour during the period ending on June 30, 1996, not less than $4.75 an hour during the year beginning on July 1, 1996, and not less than $5.15 an hour after the expiration of such year;''.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order against this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, it is not in order for the House to consider any amendment that would increase the direct costs of Federal intergovernmental mandates in excess of $50 million annually. The precise language in the amendment before us on which this is based is ''Paragraph 1 of section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows: Not less than $4.75 an hour during the year beginning July 1, 1996, and not less than $5.15 an hour after the expiration of such year.''

It is upon this basis and the impact this amendment would have on State and local government as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that I raise this point of order, and ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order that the amendment violates section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In accordance with section 426(b)(2) of the act, the gentleman has met his threshold burden to identify the specific language in the amendment on which he predicates the point of order.

Under section 426(b)(4) of the act, the gentleman from Ohio and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the point of order.

Pursuant to section 426(b)(3) of the act, after debate on the point of order the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: ''Will the House now consider the amendment?''

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes. Is there a Member seeking recognition in opposition?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I seek time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized for 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, as you correctly stated, I do seek control of the 10 minutes of time noted. I also would ask the Speaker if it would be in order for me to yield 5 minutes of that time to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to partition his 5 minutes as he deems fit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may do that by unanimous consent.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] be given 5 minutes of my 10 minutes, and that he be allowed to yield that time as he so desires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last year 394 Members of this House voted to pass the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, which, for the first time, ensures that before we vote on measures that impose unfunded mandates on State and local government, that we have three things: First, we have an analysis of what the cost is; second, we have an informed debate on whether the mandate should be imposed; and third, and that is what we are up to today, we have a recorded vote on whether to impose such a mandate.

It does not mean we never mandate, but it means we do so in the full light of day, and that is what this is all about. Having this point of order is about keeping the promise Congress made a year ago to know the cost information, to have a separate debate, and to make a decision in the clear light of day as to whether we impose this additional mandate.

I have a letter here from the Congressional Budget Office which states as follows: ''This amendment would impose both an intergovernmental and a private sector mandate, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, that would exceed the $50 million annual threshold for intergovernmental mandates beginning in fiscal year 1997. For 1998, the first full year in which the minimum wage would be $5.15, the direct cost of the mandate would total $310 million for State and local governments, and $3.7 billion for the private sector.'' That is from CBO.

Thanks to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Law, we now have the facts, and we now have the opportunity as a Congress to decide, do we want to impose these additional costs on the private sector and also on State and local government?

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind my colleagues that if you do not believe we should impose these costs, this would be a no vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question that those of us on this side of the aisle have, which is why some of our Republican friends over here will not allow the House to have a clean, simple, up-or-down vote on the minimum wage? If they are opposed to the minimum wage, then fine. Why do they not stand up and vote no, rather than hide behind procedural maneuvers and these parliamentary tactics?

This is a dilatory motion, a dilatory motion. The House will not even be allowed to debate, much less vote, on the Riggs amendment to raise the minimum wage.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, demonstrates in our view an extraordinary double standard. The Committee on Rules routinely, and I want to emphasize that, routinely waives unfunded mandate law for bills supported by the Republican leadership. In fact, they have taken three rollcall votes to waive the unfunded mandate laws in the last 3 months. Our friend on the Republican side voted for all of those waivers. It was okay then when they wanted to move things that they thought were needed or were important. But now they are using that law to block a vote on the minimum wage, a proposal, by the way, supported by 80 percent of the American people. The unfunded mandate law was never intended, never intended, as a tool for the majority to prevent a vote on an issue just because they do not like it.

The question before the House is a simple one: Will the House be allowed, will we be allowed, to consider the Riggs amendment to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents, 50 cents the first year, 40 cents the second year? Stop these procedural games, these delays. Vote ''yes'' on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the last speaker, this is part of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act. It is not a dilatory tactic. It is to decide whether we want to impose a mandate. I think it is great we are having this informed debate. We are going to hear from other speakers now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, you can get an argument in this body over just about anything, but I think most of us would agree that three strikes, you are out in America's favorite pastime.

I want to talk about the three strikes of the issue at hand, minimum wage. Strike one, it is bad policy. There really is no serious debate that when you increase the cost of labor, you decrease the number of jobs. There really is no serious debate about that anywhere, except here in this Congress.

Strike two, it is bad politics. The people who really take it in the shorts on this are small businessmen. The people that are creating 80 percent of the jobs that we have in this country, they are the ones that are going to take it in the shorts when we increase the minimum wage. There is no debate about that either. That is strike two.

Strike three, it is bad PR. Do you want to know why there is such a high level of cynicism about the way Washington works across this country? It is because Washington continues to say one thing, and do another, and that is exactly what we are about to vote on the Riggs amendment.

Vote ''no'' on the Riggs amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all acknowledge that I did support the unfunded mandates reform legislation which passed this House by an overwhelmingly bipartisan margin during the first 100 days of this session of Congress as part of our Contract With America, so I want to make clear at the outset, I support the general principles of unfunded mandates reform.

However, let me see if I can draw a distinction between what I believe was the purpose of that legislation and the minimum wage amendment that I have offered, which is now pending before the House.

We in the Western United States, especially in northwest California, are pretty familiar with the onerous impact of Federal environmental regulations, as well as other unfunded mandates. Those are mandates that are imposed on State and local governments. In fact, the Unfunded Mandates Review Panel has looked at Federal environmental regulations, such as the Clean Air Act, Endangered Species Act, and

others, and have ruled, issued a report, saying that those Federal environmental regulations do in fact constitute an unfunded or underfunded mandate imposed on State and local governments by Washington, by the Federal Government.

But in this instance, what we are talking about doing is modestly increasing the minimum wage to keep pace with inflation and restore some of the purchasing power to the minimum wage that has been eroded over the years by inflation. My belief is that over time, by increasing the minimum wage and by implementing meaningful welfare reform, we will be moving more people from welfare to work, helping those people obtain again full employment, and, in the long term, become taxpaying, contributing members of society.

Mr. Speaker, over the long term, the increase in the minimum wage, again, if coupled with meaningful welfare reform, is going to produce more taxpayers, and that is going to increase Federal tax receipts over the long term, and that will offset the effects of a so-called unfunded mandate.

The whole idea of an unfunded mandate provision in law today is to protect against mandates being imposed on State and local governments that they must then pay for with their own tax receipts. I do not believe that increasing the minimum wage, helping people make that transition from welfare to work, helping them become taxpaying, contributing members of society, does in fact constitute an unfunded mandate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, when we convened this Congress we and the Nation were so proud that we finally gave unfunded mandates relief to America. We now have an opportunity to reaffirm our conviction that America should not have an unfunded mandate of this magnitude foisted on them.

I take exception to all the arguments that say there is no downside to raising the minimum wage. In addition, of course, to the perverse employment effects on the least advantaged workers in America, there is in fact a cost to be borne in the private sector.

Once again we are contemplating a course of action where Washington gets to feel good about its generosity, while others bear the cost. Once again we get to feign compassion by bleeding our hearts with other people's money.

This is not an acceptable course of action, and I encourage everybody who believes we ought not to be imposing unfunded mandates on the rest of the Nation to vote ''no'' on imposing this on funded mandate on America.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the point of order so we may proceed on the vote on increasing the minimum wage. Human beings have basic needs; they must eat, they must have shelter, they must have clothes. These needs are universal. They apply equally to employees of State and local governments and the private sector.

If workers are to meet these needs without public assistance, they must be able to earn a living wage for their labor. Increasing the minimum wage is not a true unfunded mandate. The failure to ensure a living wage is ultimately far more expensive to local government, State governments, private businesses, and society as a whole than a modest increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly and proudly vote to waive the point of order because it would be an outrage for this House to block a vote on the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] has 6 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the point of order and want to make two points, one my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], pointed out: That Abdul Ugdah will not be able to give jobs to inner-city youths, and that this unfunded mandate of a minimum-wage increase discriminates against blacks and minorities. And for that reason alone, we should vote against it.

But earlier in this year we passed a Contract With America that said we would not impose a tax increase on local taxpayers, we would not impose an unfunded mandate on those local governments. This vote is a vote of integrity, and I call upon my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues to support that bill, all 340 of us, to vote to sustain this point of order and show the voters we were not being dishonest, we were not being politicians when we passed the unfunded mandate bill; that we meant to keep our word then, and today we intend to keep our word and sustain this point of order.

If this vote loses, then I think most Americans will know that we did not mean to uphold the Contract With America when we passed it.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the point of order. I remind my colleagues that 1 year ago we did vote overwhelmingly to uphold it, and it is not just the fact we are losing dollars for the States and cities, it is a vote to place a massive $12.3 billion unfunded Government mandate on private business as well. It is a vote to destroy 620,000 jobs.

And those jobs are jobs that part-time workers, teenagers, welfare recipients, in spite of what my colleague says, and unskilled workers, will never have. Those are the people we ought to be creating jobs for. We ought to be eliminating the costly mandates that we here in Washington shove down the throats of our taxpayers.

This wage increase is bad economics, bad policy, and bad for the American worker. I ask the Congress not to do what is easy but do what is right for America: Vote ''no'' on this. Americans do not want, do not need, and do not deserve unfunded mandates.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to mention that the letter cited by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], from June O'Neill of the Congressional Budget Office, opining that the minimum wage constitutes an unfunded mandate does not take into account the possible passage of the Goodling amendment which brought this about.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize this as an unfunded mandate and to stand on principle. We are telling governments all across America, cities, States, counties, that they must pay a wage but we are not providing the money to pay that wage.

We are doing what we told the American people in the Contract With America we would not do. This is not rocket science, it is simple and straightforward. It is a matter of keeping our word.

An unfunded mandate imposed upon the States is unfair and it is wrong. It not only will cost the employees of Mr. Ugdah their jobs, but it breaks our faith, and anybody who voted against unfunded mandates has to recognize this is a vote of hypocrisy. We must vote to sustain this point of order if we voted to ban unfunded mandates.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, the balance of my time, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona speaks of hypocrisy. Let me point out that he and the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana, who spoke a few moments ago, and the distinguished majority leader, they have voted three times in this Congress to waive the very unfunded mandates rule that they now inject into this debate for the sole purpose of thwarting a minimum-wage increase.

Mr. Speaker, I think the majority leader has at least been candid with

the American people with regard to his position on giving America a raise, for he said he would resist that increase in the minimum wage with every fiber in his body. And it was obvious when he spoke here, and he is a fairly fibrous guy, that he has not only done anything that he could to prevent a minimum-wage increase, he has done everything that he could do to prevent a minimum-wage increase. And this is the latest of those tactics.

Our colleague, his right-hand man, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip, denied there were even families out there that were living on the minimum wage. And, indeed, they are barely living on the minimum wage. And to top it all off, the Chair of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], said, ''I will commit suicide before I vote on a clean minimum-wage bill.''

That is what this is all about. It is do anything, do everything possible in order to thwart the desire of the American people for a raise.

There have been three times in this session that they have voted, every single person, including the gentleman that has raised this point of order, every single person who has spoken in favor of this point of order, there have been three times that they were not so concerned about the mandates bill that they were not willing to waive it.

But this morning they have a wave of a different kind. They propose to wave goodbye to the desire of the working people of this country to have a working wage. We believe, in the American economy, that it does not have to all trickle down. It can bubble up. And the idea is to help some of those people at the bottom of the economic ladder rise upward.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say quickly to my colleague that both the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] have talked about the Unfunded Mandates Relief Act, as has the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. All three of them voted for the act, and I am glad they did. I am glad we are having this debate today.

I would say that the one rule that I know of where we waived a point of order, there were no unfunded mandates in the underlying legislation. And in that case, indeed, Mr. DOGGETT or anyone else could have raised a point of order on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this point of order. This is an unfunded mandate. One billion to municipalities cost $13 billion nationwide.

We agreed to live under the same laws as what we passed. We must live under the laws that we have passed in this Congress. That is why we were sent here, that is what makes us different. Do not try to deceive the American people again.

Support the point of order. This is an unfunded mandate.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that, first, with respect to the minimum wage amendment constituting an unfunded mandate imposed on the public sector, I am not aware of any State or local government that has contacted the Congress to express their reservations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], my good friend and colleague and cosponsor of the minimum wage amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let me say I come to this Congress as a strong supporter of the restriction on unfunded mandates, and I come to this Congress as a former finance officer.

I am strongly opposed to this point of order because I think it stretches that rule beyond recognition. That rule was never intended to freeze in perpetuity our current minimum wage.

If we sustain this point of order, I think it will open the door to many more unfunded mandates.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 16 months there has certainly been some disagreement about what we have done in this new Congress. But I have to tell my colleagues that on our side of the aisle, what we have done here on the House floor every day was what we thought was in the best interest of the American people.

We have been honest with the American people and that is why we passed the unfunded mandate legislation. If we are going to continue to uphold our responsibility to the American people, let us be honest with them today.

Let us vote no, not to waive the point of order against this. Let us stand up and do the right thing once again.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues can see from the CBO position, increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents is a monstrous unfunded mandate, more than a billion dollars to the public sector, which clearly much exceeds our $50 million threshold and more than $12 billion to the private sector.

When 100 percent of the Republicans and 85 percent of the Democrats in the House agreed on the unfunded mandates issue, the American people had good reason to believe that Washington was changing the way it does business. Now, this Memorial Day weekend, do I have to go home and explain to local officials why Congress ignored the unfunded mandates law? This Memorial Day weekend, do I have to go home and try to reassure my constituents that even though Congress broke its promise, the American people should still believe that Washington is being reformed?

I urge the 394 Members who supported the Unfunded Mandates Act, Public Law 104–4, to support our point of order. Increasing the minimum wage is an unfunded mandate. Vote ''no'' on the consideration of this unfunded mandate.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], another original cosponsor of the minimum wage amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and to allow the Riggs amendment to be considered. The Riggs amendment will allow us to vote to increase the minimum wage. Anyone who supports increasing the minimum wage, must vote ''yes'' on this motion.

The bottom line is we are encouraging a ''yes'' vote to increase the minimum wage. We need a ''yes'' vote on this motion.

The bottom line is we are encouraging a ''yes'' vote to increase the minimum wage. We need a ''yes'' vote on this motion.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say briefly, because there has been some confusion in some of the discussion, that a ''no'' vote is the right vote if Members do not want to impose additional mandates on State and local government.

There are also huge private sector mandates here which were required to be analyzed by the Unfunded Mandates Relief Act, but a ''no'' vote is the correct vote if Members do not want to impose these additional mandates.

In closing, I would just say that this is exactly the kind of debate we hoped to have with the Unfunded Mandates Relief Act. We now have it out in the open. This is an unfunded mandate on State and local government. If Members do not want to impose those mandates, they now have the opportunity to stand up and be counted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 267, nays 161, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—267

Abercrombie	Barcia	Berman
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Bevill
Andrews	Becerra	Bilbray
Bachus	Beilenson	Bilirakis
Baesler	Bentsen	Bishop
Baldacci	Bereuter	Blute

Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Buyer
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—161

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Wicker
Wolf
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—5

Engel
Franks (CT)
Hancock
Molinari
Ward

☐ 1102

Mr. ROGERS changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 191, I voted prior to time and the register failed to record the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the record of rollcall vote No. 191. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The amendment having been designated, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and a Member opposed each will control 45 minutes.

Is there a Member who wishes to be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I seek the direction of the Chair because I would like to yield 20 of my 45 minutes of time to the other side, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], and then I would like to further ask if I would be doing that under unanimous consent and ask further unanimous consent that Mr. CLAY be entitled to allocate that 20 minutes as he sees fit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may make that request by unanimous consent.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I do so ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] be granted 20 minutes of his 45 minutes, and further that the gentleman from Missouri may be able to control that time and yield time under his 20 minutes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me just explain to our colleagues and to the American people the very straightforward amendment I am offering today.

My amendment would increase the Federal minimum-wage guarantee from the present $4.25 an hour today by 50 cents to $4.75 on July 1 of this year and then further increase the minimum wage by 40 cents, from $4.75 an hour to $5.15 an hour effective July 1, 1997.

My minimum wage is intended, as I said in my earlier remarks, to increase the minimum wage for inflation, but I want to point out to my colleagues that my amendment will not adjust the minimum wage to a level that would be commensurate with inflation. In fact, if we go back to January 1, 1978, the date that the Congress first amended a minimum wage guarantee for American workers, and took that initial statutory minimum wage of $2.65 an hour and adjusted it for inflation using the Consumer Price Index to the present day, the minimum wage today should be more on a par of $6.64 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], at this point, but I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, before going to Mr. QUINN, that he has been the lead proponent of the minimum-wage increase and he is the primary reason why 76 House Republicans just voted to allow a debate on this floor on the minimum-wage amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN].

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for yielding me 3 minutes this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to speak to all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle today as we move forward to discuss and to vote on eventually the Riggs-Quinn amendment.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 months there has been a lot of hard work done on this issue by a lot of Members in the

Chamber. For the purposes of our side of the aisle and the Republican side, it is an opportunity for me now to thank our leadership who have worked hard and long with us to finally bring this vote, an up or down vote, on raising the minimum wage to a vote on the floor of the House.

I have said since I began in the last 2 months this is a very simple issue; indeed the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and I have put together for our colleagues' consideration today is only 17 lines long; that as we talk about raising the minimum wage for people all across this country and back in our own congressional districts, it is not a complicated matter at all. We have an opportunity right now to talk about the minimum wage not being raised in less than 6 or 7 years, and during that time the cost of living in every other aspect, whether it is gasoline, whether it is food, clothing, sneakers, school books for our kids, the cost of that over these last 6 or 7 years has all gone up, and the minimum wage has stayed the same.

At the same time, in Federal agencies across the country, in statehouses, in counties, everybody is talking about welfare reform, that we should make our best attempt to get people off of welfare and into jobs. I suggest to the membership today, Mr. Speaker, that when someone makes the minimum wage for 40 hours a week, and someone makes $8,840 and they are below the poverty level for this country, that is not making an honest wage.

I suggest to our membership that it is time to give Americans a raise, that we have worked long and hard. We will be debating later on this afternoon different amendments, but it is not a complicated matter.

I urge all of our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Riggs-Quinn-English-Martini amendment, and I want to thank all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for making us and getting us to this point today where we get a vote.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, sound public policy frequently takes a back seat to election year politics—and there is no clearer example of this than the current debate on raising the minimum wage. We have all heard the rhetoric from the other side, where day after day my colleagues have taken to the floor to argue that we need to help working families by increasing the minimum wage. They have painted a picture that the average minimum wage worker is a head of a household who is trying to support a family earning the minimum wage, just $8,840 a year. Well—that picture is phoney—just as phoney as the arguments of those who would vote to increase the minimum wage. According to data from the U.S. Census Bureau, only 11 percent of all workers earning $5.15 an hour or less are the sole supporters of their families. More than 35 percent of minimum wage earners are teenagers or other workers living with their parents and only 2.8 percent are single parents supporting a family.

Raising the minimum wage is not an effective way to help the working poor. President Clinton said so himself just last year. In fact, minimum wage jobs are often the first rung on the ladder of upward mobility. Increasing the wage to $5.15 or higher just moves that rung beyond reach, making it harder for those with few skills and training or limited education to get a first job. Research shows that 63 percent of minimum wage workers earn higher wages within 12 months, and some 40 percent will receive their first raise within 4 months. Not too long ago, an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal that clearly illustrated this point. It was written by a manager of the Angus Barn in Raleigh, NC. She was a single mother with two children, barely surviving on welfare. Today, she manages one of the largest and most popular restaurants in North Carolina. The key to her success was a minimum wage job. This starting job taught her the skills she needed to keep moving up the career ladder and opened the door for her to advance to better and higher paying positions. By raising the starting wage—we will be denying opportunities like this to thousands of workers. And consider that at this same time, we're trying to move unskilled people off welfare and into the workforce—we're eliminating the jobs they will need.

It's well known by economists and lawmakers that higher minimum wages lead to job losses. Dozens of studies show that raising the minimum wage costs entry-level job opportunities, and does not help the poor. Even the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office report indicates that an increase in the starting wage could cause employment losses in the range of 100,000 to 500,000 jobs. Other economic studies point to even higher job losses. If the wage rate is hiked up to a new level, my home state of North Carolina will lose an estimated 19,100 jobs. A 90-cent increase in the wage rate is meaningless for the person who no longer has a job.

A minimum wage increase is the modern day ''magic potion'' of election politics. It makes the political establishment feel good—''see, we've taken care of the problem of low wages'' and it pretends to help people who need help. But, in reality it does more harm than good, costing some low-wage workers their jobs and raising the cost of essential goods which make up the biggest part of these families' budgets. But increasing, the minimum wage, the Congress is hurting job creation and opting for politics over sound policy.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, may want to know that if we pass a minimum wage increase that 345,000 workers in North Carolina will see an increase in their wage. That is a pretty good tradeoff if those jobs are really lost, but I do not think they will be.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Riggs-Quinn amendment increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents.

Since the minimum wage was last increased on April 1, 1991, inflation has eroded its real value by fifty cents. By the end of this year, the purchasing power of the minimum wage will be at its lowest point in 40 years.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that it is not important to raise the minimum wage because the only minimum wage workers are high school students earning extra spending money. That is but one of the many lies and distortions hustled by opponents of the minimum wage. The average minimum wage worker is responsible for one-half of his or her family's income. Half of all minimum wage workers are working full time. Sixty-three percent of all minimum wage workers are at least 20 years old.

The amendment before us will directly impact the wages of 12 million workers; 300,000 people, including 100,000 children, will see their family income raised above the poverty line as a direct result of this amendment. But the benefits of this amendment extend beyond those who will see their wages increased as a direct result of its enactment. As study after study has shown, a modest increase in the minimum wage will strengthen the economy, by increasing the ability of workers to also be consumers.

Finally, this amendment should be adopted as a matter of basic fairness. It is a basic tenet in this country that our citizens should be self-sufficient. Members come to this well time and time again railing against the poor and preaching about self-sufficiency. But how in the world can a person be self-sufficient working full time, earning just $8,500.00 a year? I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Nevertheless, let me caution my colleagues about the Goodling amendments. I strongly oppose his amendment that restores a subminimum wage and robs computer operators and restaurant workers of some of their hard-earned wages. Let me make myself perfectly clear about the other Goodling amendment. As important as it is to increase the minimum wage, I will oppose this legislation on final passage if the Goodling small business

exemption is adopted. I will not support a minimum wage bill that excludes millions of workers from Federal minimum wage and overtime protections.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinghished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the minimum wage increase of 1996, I am pleased to rise in support of the minimum wage amendment to the Employee Commuting Flexibility Act. This measure, increasing the minimum wage by 90 cents over a 2-year period, is a proper step in closing the wage gap in our Nation and enabling our working families to make ends meet.

Many of our employers in my region are already paying more than the current minimum wage. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for their leadership in this effort, and also the leadership on our side of the aisle for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, when this body last addressed this issue in 1989, the bipartisan proposal was supported by 80 percent of all Republican legislators. At that time the minimum wage was $3.35 an hour and increased to $4.25 an hour. According to the Department of Labor, over 4 million workers are paid the minimum wage, and 40 percent of those workers are their family's only wage earner.

Mr. Speaker, it is inherently wrong for Congress to freeze the minimum wage for working families while at the same time increasing congressional pay. During that same time frame, Mr. Speaker, CEO's who have said that this modest proposal will eliminate jobs have allowed their incomes to increase by leaps and bounds.

It is now time for this body to take the same prudent action that this body took in 1989, and to assist those who work hard for an hourly wage which has remained stagnant since 1989. America's working families need a raise. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues do support this long-needed measure.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record that New York will face the loss of 29,900 jobs if the minimum wage is increased. Up to 500,000 jobs will be eliminated nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see this day, but I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. Increasing the minimum wage makes minimum sense.

As a former small businessowner, I remember well what intrusive government mandates did to my business. It hurt the bottom line, it hurt productivity, it hurt competitiveness, and more important, it hurt my ability to create jobs. Mr. Speaker, that is what my Democrat colleagues refuse to talk about. They will not talk about the opportunities lost. They will not talk about the jobs that are not created. They will not talk about those people who cannot get off welfare because they cannot get the chance to get a job that was killed by another Washington mandate. But that is the most important part of this debate. The Democrat Party is to job creation what Dr. Kevorkian is to health care, a job-killer cloaked in kindness.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made this debate an argument of fairness. They say that it is unfair for starting workers to make dramatically less than corporate CEO's. I am not going to respond to that kind of economic mumbo-jumbo. But let me ask this: Is it fair to kill the opportunities of people who want to work but cannot because of this unfunded mandate?

My friend, the gentleman from Texas, will stand up and talk about the number of workers that will not see their wages go up in the State of Texas. How about the number of workers in his own district that will not have a job available for them when they want to go to work? Is it fair to kill jobs in order to cure political headaches? Is it fair to make job creation too expensive for the various small businesses? That is the kind of fairness that liberal Democrats conveniently ignore.

The most amusing aspect of this debate is its timing. When Democrats ran the Congress just 2 years ago and had the White House, not once did they talk about raising the minimum wage. They were too busy raising taxes on middle-class families. But now that they have been thrown out of power, they have seized on this issue as their saving grace. This saving grace for the Democrats is a coup de grace for thousands of entry-level jobs. It is those people who want just a chance to have the opportunity to get a job, a chance to achieve the American dream, who are most victimized by this unfunded mandate.

Mr. Speaker, increasing the minimum wage is the wrong way to provide more opportunities for the American people. It is a political throwaway which will do away with thousands of jobs. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Sugarland, TX knows that in Texas 1,100,000 people will get a minimum wage increase.

He knows why the President did not increase the minimum wage. We were trying to provide health care, and we could not do both on small businesses. Since health care reform did not pass, now we have to try a minimum wage increase.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of increasing the minimum wage. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] indicated that it hurts the bottom line. The bottom line are the families in this country that are only making $8,500 to $8,900 a year, who deserve to be heard and deserve recognition for their work efforts.

Mr. Speaker, two out of every three people who are receiving the minimum wage are adult workers. Four in 10 are raising entire families. They are breadwinners for their whole family on this amount of money. Over a 2-year period, this will cause their wages to go up $1,800. Eighteen hundred dollars for someone making less than $9,000 is substantial. It pays for 7 months' utilities, it can afford a college tuition for a 2-year college, it can bring a family closer together with the American public, who are making much more than any minimum wage efforts.

Mr. Speaker, most important, since 1989 we have not addressed this issue. How many working Americans can say that they have had no raise since 1989?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Riggs amendment to increase the Nation's minimum wage.

Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults, and 4 in 10 are the sole breadwinners of their families. I realize it may be difficult for many Members of this body to fully comprehend the practical impacts of life on a mere $8,500 a year. That's not a lot of money for one person, much less a family struggling to provide basic necessities.

To that family, a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage over the next 2 years for the family breadwinner would generate an additional $1,800 in potential annual income and $1,800 could buy: 7 months of groceries; 1 year of health care costs; 9 months' worth of utility bills; more than a full-year's tuition at a 2-year college; and basic housing costs for almost 4 months.

But the purchasing power available to a minimum wage worker will soon fall to its lowest level in more than 40 years. This means less food on the table for hungry children; less medicine for the cold and flu season; no dental checkups; and a higher portion of income going to pay for the rent and utility bills.

Mr. Speaker, we can debate the statistics on the impacts of increasing minimum wage until we're blue in the face. The bottom line is that we're not just talking about numbers. We are talking about families—responsible, working families, who are just getting by. If this body is really serious about reducing spending on welfare and reforming the system to move

people into the workplace, we must embrace a livable minimum wage. American workers and families deserve no less.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Riggs amendment and oppose the Goodling amendments to eliminate minimum wage protections for millions of American workers.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], another original cosponsor of the minimum wage amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Riggs-Quinn-English-Martini amendment to raise the minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring this debate out of the realm of the abstract and frame it in human terms. In my congressional district in western Pennsylvania, I have seen far too many families supported by one or more members working at minimum wage jobs. These hardworking folks could easily surrender and join the welfare system, but they do not. Instead of taking tax money, they pay it.

We have single mothers who support their kids on a minimum wage job. Some of my district's seniors add a little extra by taking minimum wage jobs. These are not just jobs for teenagers and college kids. Four million Americans work for the minimum wage, and 40 percent of them are their family's only wage earner. That is a lot of hardworking people who need a raise.

The problem facing all of these people is that the minimum wage now buys less, far less than it has at any time in the past 40 years. That means less gas, less groceries, and less rent. It is only fair that at this time we consider a raise. Remember, if the minimum wage is at a 40-year low in buying power, it is at a historic low as a business expense. The reasonable wage increase we offer here today is designed to have a minimal impact on businesses and jobs, and a maximum impact on the working poor.

To our critics, I ask them why they think a reasonable minimum wage hike will cost jobs. We have seen no ill effects in those 15 States that have already raised their minimum wage rates. Pennsylvania's neighbor, New Jersey, appears to have suffered no ill effects in the fast food industry when it raised the minimum wage. To those who still believe we should not raise the minimum wage, I say it is our fundamental responsibility. Remember several things.

□ 1130

The minimum wage provides vital minimum protection for workers, especially those who lack union membership or who have little negotiating strength. Congress serves as the ultimate bargaining representative for those workers.

Let us also look, not only does increasing the minimum wage benefit the employed, it also makes work more attractive to the unemployed, encouraging the transition from welfare to work. This is one of three keys to welfare reform. Let us raise the minimum wage, and in doing so we will guarantee that many on the margins of our economy will have an opportunity through hard work to share in our great bounty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The Chair would note the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has 17 minutes remaining, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] has 38¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record that Pennsylvania will face a loss of 27,400 jobs if the minimum wage is increased.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the biggest single problem facing lower income Americans, especially those with children, is that they face a crippling array of marginal tax rates that almost completely destroys their incentives to try to earn more income. They are virtually trapped at low incomes.

That same array of taxes on additional income will take away most or all of a minimum wage increase from the very people everyone talks about helping—that is, minimum wage earners supporting children.

Childless people are above the poverty line if they work full time at the current minimum wage. They are not usually the folks we shed tears over when we talk about increasing the minimum. It is family heads we are concerned about. But in virtually all cases, parents earning the minimum wage will also receive food stamps, the earned income tax credit, child care subsidies, Medicaid, and possibly housing subsidies, as well as other benefits like school lunch, Head Start, WIC, and energy assistance.

As earnings go up, many of these benefits go down, effectively canceling out most or all of the earnings gain. That is the marginal tax problem, and it hamstrings people all the way up the scale to incomes in the high twenty thousands.

In a forthcoming paper, Gene Steurle and Linda Giannarelli of the Urban Institute show the combined tax effects on a single mother of two children in Pennsylvania, an average State, as her earned income moves through various stages from zero all the way up to 300 percent of the minimum wage. Between full time minimum wage earnings and 150 percent of the minimum wage, she faces a combined tax rate of 101 percent. That is, a 50-percent earnings gain produces a $58 a year drop in disposable income. If she boosts her earnings from 150 percent of the minimum to twice the minimum, she faces a combined 95 percent tax rate on those additional earnings. She is only $175 per year better off at twice the minimum as she is at the minimum wage. Even without a housing subsidy, she faces marginal tax rates of about 73 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage is a cruel hoax on low-skilled parents. First, it puts their jobs in danger. If they keep their jobs, they wind up with little or no more income, but they will face higher prices for many of the things they have to buy. Instead of trying to score political points through Government price-fixing in the labor market, we should be working to provide economic opportunity to all low income Americans by slashing the extortionate tax rates that are destroying their ability to improve their lot.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, who serves on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, would actually see an increase of 210,000 workers who would see a pay increase if we pass the Riggs amendment.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record, Pennsylvania will lose 27,400 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. I have been perplexed. I have asked and I have asked and I have asked Members of the other side of the aisle why this was not done 2 years ago. If they feel so passionate about it, if this is the great means by which we are going to help poor working people, why, when they held the House, when they held the Senate, when they held the White House, they did not bring this to the floor.

Well, I think I know why, because the President at that time said that raising the minimum wage is the wrong way to help poor working people. That is why they did not do it. They knew that this is not really going to help the working poor of this country. The Democratic Leadership Council said the same thing, and still says the same thing, that raising the minimum wage is the wrong way to do this.

Joseph Stiglitz, the President's own former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, when he was an economics professor, this is the man who worked for the President, he said ''only about 10 percent of the people in poverty work at jobs that pay at or near the minimum wage,'' and then he said, as he concluded, ''the minimum wage is not a good way of trying to deal with problems of poverty.''

That is why it was not done. That is why it should not be done now. The reason this is being done is because there is an election in November. It is the wrong way to help the working poor.

I think Gail Robbins, and here is a picture of Gail, is a good example of

why we should not raise the minimum wage. Gail began waitressing at a truck stop when she was 15 years old to escape her abusive parents. She moved on to work at a Howard Johnson's in New Jersey for 47 cents an hour. She is now 55 years old. She is working on her college degree.

She and her husband own a Pizza Inn franchise where she hires disadvantaged individuals at minimum wage. Many of these people are mothers living on food stamps. Gail is adamantly opposed to an increase in the minimum wage because she will no longer be able to offer minimum wage jobs to the people who need them most.

It is a very poor way of really helping the working poor, if that is what our goal is, and I trust it is. Where does it go? According to the U.S. Census Bureau data, more than 35 percent of employees whose wages would be increased by this proposal to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents live with their parents. Surprisingly, maybe not surprisingly, more than 80 percent either live with their parents, live alone, or have a working spouse. Now listen to this. Only 2.8 percent of those who will get an increase under this minimum wage proposal are single parents with children, only 2.8 percent.

So I suggest to my colleagues there is a better way. We can reform, we can refocus and we can retarget the earned income tax credit. We can in fact raise the take home pay of those who most need it, the working poor, those on minimum wage with children, and we can do it in a way that does not have the negative impact of a minimum wage increase.

That 90-cent increase on the minimum wage, where does it go? Well, that person will find that 21 cents they will lose in a reduction in their food stamp eligibility. They will pay 8 cents more out of that 90 cents in FICA taxes. They will lose as much as 14 cents an hour from their earned income tax credit. If they happen to live in public housing, they will pay 27 cents an hour more in their rent at their public housing. That leaves them, under this scenario, about 20 cents out of the 90 cents that we are increasing the minimum wage.

I suggest to my colleagues that common sense and logic would tell us that is the wrong way, if we really care about the working poor. There are compassionate alternatives. Republicans have come up with compassionate alternatives to show that we can help the working poor without costing a half million jobs among those who need them most.

How can we say we care about those who are working minimum wage and then say we are going to, in a political season, to gain a few political points, rob hundreds of thousands of those who need those jobs most of their employment? Tell that single mom with two children, ''You lost your job because we wanted to score political points.''

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleague from Arkansas that over 50 percent of the people over 25 will receive a minimum wage increase. In fact, in the State of Arkansas 158,000 workers will see a minimum wage increase if this bill is passed and the Riggs amendment is passed.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], another original cosponsor of the minimum wage amendment.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Quinn-Riggs-Martini-English amendment raising the minimum wage for America's low-income workers, and also in strong support of the Small Business Job Protection Act.

We have an opportunity today to do something that we have never done before in the Federal Government, simultaneously raise the minimum wage while helping small businesses to create jobs, a win-win situation for the American worker.

A minimum wage increase such as the one we proposed today can and should help our low-wage working families, and the tax and regulatory relief proposed by Chairman ARCHER in the Ways and Means Committee can and should create jobs in our country. As we seek, as a matter of national policy, to replace welfare with work, we can make real work pay in the real world, allowing low-wage workers a measure of dignity and self-sufficiency.

While it is very true that a worker needs a job opportunity first and foremost, and it is important that our economic policies reflect that, it is also fundamentally true that a job opportunity must provide sufficient support, lest we create cross pressures and disincentives to work that ultimately will discourage the very work we seek and foster the welfare culture that has been an unmitigated disaster for America and for too many of our fellow citizens. We know our welfare system does not work. We know it creates victimization, dependency, and ultimately despair. The President should sign our welfare reform plan that replaces welfare with work, but we should also today enhance those efforts by making real work pay.

Let us today strike a blow for hope. We can help small businesses create job opportunities, lower their tax burden and allow them to divert more of their resources to job creation rather than to big government. But we can also help America's struggling workers to view an honest day's work as something far more beneficial to them and their families than the dead end of dependency and welfare. Support the Quinn-Riggs-Martini-English amendment.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that the State of Massachusetts will face a loss of 4,000 jobs if the minimum wage is increased.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], a member of the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are detecting a pattern here. Somebody is going to get up and say that X amount of people lose jobs in a congressional district or State, and somebody on the other side is going to get up and say X amount of people get more money. I would like to say this. Why can the greatest Nation in the world with very smart people not increase take-home pay without costing anybody their job?

I have yet to have anybody come down here and deny the fact that we are going to have between 100,000 and 500,000 people lose their job if we raise the minimum wage. Using their own numbers, 37 percent of the people earning minimum wage are under 20. One gentleman said, well, 19,000 people may lose their job, but three hundred and some thousand will get a pay increase. That is not a good trade-off. Go tell it to the 19,000. If you are at a football stadium this year, remember this. If it is a 100,000-seat stadium, everybody sitting in the stadium is going to be some kid without a job.

We are the greatest nation in the world. We should be able to do better. Because President Clinton has the ability to flip-flop with style and grace on an issue that is going to cost people jobs, that is no reason for my party to follow along.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 second to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from South Carolina, South Carolina would see an increase of 196,000 workers who would see a pay increase. That is a pretty good size football stadium.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that of the 3,660,000 workers in the United States who work for the minimum wage, that 63 percent of that number are women, and 82 percent of that number are white. We are talking about a very large number of women in this country that are going to be affected if we do not do the responsible thing today, and that is to raise the minimum wage.

We have made work an enshrined ethic. As we talk about the debates on welfare reform, we have constantly said the most important thing we can do to reform welfare is to force people to go to work. The Members who oppose raising the minimum wage today are the very first individuals who stand up here and say these individuals on welfare ought to be made to go to

work. Surely if Congress is going to force work, it should be at wages that can reasonably support the family. That is what welfare reform is all about.

□ 1145

The reformers talk about self-sufficiency, personal responsibility, and the ability to support your own family. If we do not raise the minimum wage, these workers earn only $8,840 a year. You cannot support a family on that amount of money.

We have to get real. We have to understand that the wages of these individuals must be raised in order to earn enough to survive. Even at the $5.15 an hour wage, that is only $10,712 a year. It is important also to know that we have Earned Income Tax Credit. Again, this is because we want to honor people who work by giving them a refund of the taxes that they pay. If we raise the minimum wage, that public budget cost will be reduced, obviously. So it is a savings on the budget, as well as the right thing to do for our families.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleagues, on both sides of this issue. I am convinced that everyone in this House sincerely wants to see an improvement for those who are at the lower end of the economic spectrum.

The other night I was snuggling up on United Airlines with my U.S. News and World Report and happened to read the letters to the editor, and saw this very thoughtful piece from Ed Grady from St. Paul Park, MN, where he says:

> The legislated minimum wage is a classic example of a good intention and a bad idea, the idea being that government, by simple decree, can increase the earning power of all marginal workers. This line of thinking runs counter to the basic principles of a free society. Government edicts do not make wages rise; they rearrange and redistribute existing wealth. Wages rise in response to the creation of new wealth through greater productivity. Government cannot create or produce anything.

Mr. Speaker, we should in fact reject this. We should improve the standards of those at the lower end of the economic spectrum by decreasing the tax and regulatory burden imposed on the private sector. Let us proceed as quickly as possible with a responsible measure.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from California, 1.3 million workers will see a pay increase if the minimum wage is passed. The gentleman's quote from U.S. News and World Report is straight out of Adam Smith, but it is more like the Addams Family.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, we have a tradeoff between losing jobs and increasing the earnings of those who still have their jobs. I think that is an honest way of putting this debate. I do not think there is any economic disagreement that if you increase the minimum wage, you do actually lose jobs, and I do not think there is any disagreement that for those who keep their jobs, they will have higher income. So it is a tradeoff between the two.

I have been taking notes on today's debate, and I suspect that my colleague from Texas will say that there are 1.3 million Californians who would benefit from an increase in the minimum wage, and I suspect my colleague from North Carolina would point out there are 63,000 jobs that would be lost in California if there is an increase in the minimum wage. So assuming both numbers are right, I just ask you, does this tradeoff make good sense? Does it make good sense?

If you want to increase the earnings of those people at the bottom of the income level, the way to do it is by an increase in the earned income tax credit, which means all of us pay for it. But if you increase the earnings of the people at the bottom of the income level by increasing the minimum wage, you make those people who offer jobs to those most in need of them pay the freight. You increase the tax on those whose only sin is that they have actually done something to give somebody a job.

People lose jobs with the increase in the minimum wage, but it is not across the board. The increase in the minimum wage has a peculiarly deleterious effect on those starting out, particularly on the young, particularly on minorities. We have heard from Professor Joe Stiglitz, my colleague on the Stanford faculty and now chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors. In his textbook he pointed out, ''In the United States, perhaps the major unemployment effect of minimum wages is on teenagers.''

He is quite right. This was shown in the 1981 Congressional Minimum Wage Commission study that pointed out that what you have is about a 1 to 3 decrease in employment for every 10 percent increase in the minimum wage. So if we look at this as a 21-percent increase in the minimum wage over two years, we would see employment falling between 2 and 6 percent as a conservative estimate among teenagers, among those getting their start in the job force.

Now, what of the poor? It is essential that we show compassion, that we do all we can to help the poor, and it just makes no sense to tell a poor person you do not have a job; but if you did, it would be at a higher wage. Does it?

What makes sense is to say we will keep you employed, and, through the tax base, supported by all of us, as opposed to using a penalty on those who offer the job, we will help your earnings increase.

The numbers that I have are that 214,000 American workers support their families on the minimum wage. Obviously I would like that to be zero. But the question is, are you prepared to benefit the 214,000, by costing others, estimated as more than 500,000, their jobs? Realize that there will not even be the 214,000 benefited after you have increased the minimum wage, there will be fewer left to benefit, because of those who will lose their jobs?

To me, the argument is very clear. we mean to do good, but we are using a very dangerous means to do good. There are better means to do good.

I want to close by a comment to my colleagues who, like myself, consider the title ''moderate'' as a compliment. Moderate Republicans particularly like to pride ourselves on saying that we do not go with the knee-jerk process of thinking; that we try to address each issue on its merits, whether it is gun control, or a woman's right to choose, or the environment. Please, apply your independent, moderate Republican thinking.

And to my Blue Dog Democrat colleagues, apply your independent economic thinking, as well, to realize it is wrong to cost a person a job.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me note that the time to raise the minimum wage is during the period of relatively low unemployment and inflation, as we are currently experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation to increase the minimum wage.

I am well aware of the likely impact of this increase on the Medicaid program, of which nursing home services are the largest part of that spending. Nursing homes employ large numbers of minimum wage workers. Since most nursing home funding is reliant on government-set payment rates, minimum wage increases will have a direct and significant impact on nursing facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned there will be adequate funding to maintain the level of quality we fought so hard for. Current Medicaid law requires that rates which States pay to nursing homes be reasonable and adequate to meet their costs and to be in conformity with applicable State and Federal laws. Certainly the Fair Labor Standards Act is an applicable Federal law.

I feel we should reaffirm for the record that current law requires States to adjust their nursing home reimbursement rates to take into account the increased costs that nursing homes

incur in complying with the increase in the minimum wage.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he agrees with this position.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and would like to say, while the increase in the minimum wage will help in the retention of quality care givers, it is important to me it not be a source of financial strain which may negatively impact on the ability of facilities to provide care to the frail, elderly and the Medicaid program.

We must work together to ensure adequate funding for the States to maintain nursing home standards.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the stagnant wages that are making life more difficult for so many working Americans. I believe that Congress should best address this problem by cutting taxes, balancing the budget, and spurring economic growth. Increasing the minimum wage is an unfunded mandate on American businesses, on the States and the local governments. It is not the way to go.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the right way to get the money to the people who need it. Already those minimum wage earners who have families are eligible for food stamps and the earned income tax credit. All government supplements consider the very least a family of four can earn is currently $7.40 an hour. So the question we hear from the Democrats when they say no one can afford to raise a family on minimum wage, frankly, my colleagues, no one actually is.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying many of us have sponsored a bill by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] in which we decided the best way to handle this issue is let each State decide if they are going to increase their minimum wage and not have it on a Federal level. That is the proposal we should be voting on.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns about the proposal to mandate an increase in the minimum wage and to support the Goodling amendments.

The Democrats have pushed and pushed this political issue, and today they're finally going to finally get what they want: increased unemployment, a multi-billion dollar mandate on the State and local governments, more welfare dependency, higher unemployment and inflationary price increases. All in the name of class warfare. They want to compare the salary of Bill Gates to that of a 18 year old. But they forget that Bill Gates worked for minimum wage too and was glad to get that first job.

This is not the right way to get money to those who need it. Already, those minimum wage earners who have families are eligible for food stamps and the earned income tax credit. All government supplements considered, the very least a family of four can earn is almost double the minimum wage. Why aren't the Democrats acknowledging this? So when you hear Democrats say no one can afford to raise a family on minimum wage, frankly, no one actually has to.

If the Democrats truly want to increase family earnings, if they truly want to help those who need assistance, then I suggest that we do just that—that instead of passing unfunded mandates, we better target the EITC, we reform welfare, and we enact legislation with incentives that encourage job creation, not discourage it.

At least we have a compromise in the Goodling amendment, which offers small businesses incentives and opportunities so that they may offer workers jobs at competitive prices. This, coupled with H.R. 1227 and H.R. 3448 will work to create jobs and help Americans, not hurt them like the unqualified mandated increase in the minimum wage.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said, "the most practical kind of politics is the politics of decency." I urge my colleagues, do not hurt the people that we were elected to help. Oppose the effort to eliminate thousands of jobs, the effort to create inflation, and the effort to worsen our Nation's welfare problem.

Support the Goodling amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment being offered by the Republican Member from California, Mr. RIGGS, is a fine example of what Democrats can do when we are persistent in our demands for justice for workers. The Republican leadership resisted and resisted and resisted. Finally, some Republicans, such as Mr. RIGGS, who have heard from their low wage working families, have been brave enough to say no to NEWT GINGRICH and DICK ARMEY.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to ask all of those Republicans who support this Democratic initiative to stay the course, stay in this fight, and resist the Goodling amendment that will come after this vote. In particular, the Goodling amendment will undermine the minimum wage increase and exclude some 10.5 million workers in certain businesses.

Members cannot give with one hand and then take back with the other hand. Those who claim they are now in support of the minimum wage increase must stay this course if they are to have any credibility.

I sincerely thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and his allies in this effort for joining the Democrats on this most important initiative to increase the minimum wage for those low wage earners who are so deserving of a little bit of support from the Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for those who ask the question why was it not done early, let us get rid of that rhetoric. Then was then, and now is now. Let us do what we can do for American workers. For those who say why do they want it, I would ask my colleagues, have any of my colleagues in their lifetime ever turned down an increase in wages? If offered an increase, if offered one, have my colleagues ever said no, that will not be good for the economy; no, that will not be good for business; no, that will not be good for the American public?

Mr. Speaker, I do not think so. I think all of our lives we have taken whatever increases have come our way. Do not ask anything less of low wage workers in America. Let them have this little bit of a 90-cent increase in wages.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record that California will face a loss of 63,100 jobs if the minimum wage is increased.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

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

Mr. KOBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment that would raise the minimum wage.

Simply put, a wage is a price—the price of labor's services. When we talk about establishing or raising the minimum wage, we are talking about price fixing. And we all should know what price fixing leads to—a distorted marketplace.

So, practically speaking, what will it mean?

Economists may disagree about how many jobs would be lost by raising the minimum wage. But they don't disagree that jobs will be lost. Estimates of the job loss range from 350,000 to 850,000. Whatever the number, one thing is certain: the low-income group that proponents claim this increase would help will surely be the ones to lose their jobs.

I think of the kid working at my corner Texaco station after school to help pay for college. He pumps gas and cleans up while higher paid mechanics work on cars. But his service is marginal, at best. Now, he's likely to be laid off and the mechanics will interrupt their work long enough to take care of other tasks.

I think of the single mother who works at the tailor shop I use at home. It's a second job for her, but it helps pay the rent and food bills. She hasn't done seamstress work for long; her productivity isn't as great as the other women who have been there for years. Will she keep her job when the owner has to increase her wage by 25 percent? Probably not.

Ultimately, my question on this issue is this: If 5 dollars and fifteen cents an hour would reduce poverty, wouldn't $20 an hour eliminate it altogether?

Better yet, why not make everyone rich by making it $50 and hour? We know how foolish that would be. So why do we think legislating a wage of $5.15 an hour makes sense? We should really be looking at things like capital

gains tax reductions, and reduced regulations on businesses that more surely and swiftly will increase both employment and wages.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the minimum wage increase.

□ 1200

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI], an original cosponsor of the minimum wage amendment and a gentleman who has worked hard to bring this measure to the House floor.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American worker and in strong support of raising the minimum wage. As an original cosponsor of the bill to raise the minimum wage, I am pleased that today we are bringing this matter to the floor for a debate and a vote.

To me this is not an issue of politics, but rather simply an issue of fairness. I do not believe this should be a partisan issue, but it is not a coincidence that this issue was raised in an election year; that, despite the fact that for 2 years they, my colleagues on the other side, had every opportunity to pass a minimum wage increase when they controlled both Congress and the White House, they did not.

Nevertheless, we need to stop playing political games and give hard working men and women a raise. Too often these individuals work long hours and often take second jobs, yet they feel like they are running in place. If we really want people to move from welfare to work, as have to make work worthwhile. Americans deserve a fair wage for a hard day's work. Raising the minimum wage will reward those able-bodied individuals who choose to work over welfare by improving their quality of life. Ultimately, that is what this debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in raising the minimum wage, but I also believe we have an obligation to our small businesses, our mom and pop shops throughout America, to ease the Federal tax and regulatory burden placed on them. True, small businesses are often the most vulnerable and have extremely high rates of failure. Increasing the minimum wage, coupled with real small business relief, will ultimately help Americans earn more and keep more of what they earn.

I am pleased that today we will do the right thing by providing millions of American workers a living wage and restore some dignity to the workplace. I urge my colleagues to support the Quinn-Riggs-English-Martini amendment to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I stand in strong support for increasing the minimum wage. We have an opportunity today in America, both Democrats and Republicans, to do something meaningful for millions of working Americans.

I think it is important to note that both Republicans and Democrats are voting for this. This is not a new precedent. My understanding is that in 1990 they also voted together. So we are united in responding to the needs of the American people.

Some who are in opposition, if we would listen to them carefully, we would think they are arguing for the continuation of welfare. They say if indeed we increase the minimum wage, people will lose these benefits. It seems to me that is a counterargument that they have been advocating all the time. We want to make work pay so that people are self-sustaining and not being dependent on the government itself.

Some also say, well, raising the minimum wage certainly is not the only way. I would agree with them, raising the minimum wage is not the only way of raising people out of poverty, but it is one way.

I want to suggest what my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Representative WATERS, said, and that is, ''That was then and now is now.'' Now we have an opportunity to do something that is meaningful. We also can add to that a combination of things, raising the minimum wage as we do the earned income tax credit.

My friend from California says this is a debate between who will lose and who will win. I hope for no adjustment at all, but in my State 300,000 people who are struggling just to put food on the table, to take care of their children, will know the benefit of making work pay because they would indeed have that as a livable wage.

Never do we want anyone to lose their job, but adjustments are made all the time. All the time. Why not make the adjustment for those who make the least in our economy, so that we can say something about the American economy; that America's economy is strong enough that those who make the least can have a livable wage.

Indeed, I know my colleague from North Carolina will say how many people will lose their jobs, but I want to tell him that thousands of people will increase their wages.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, for the gentlewoman's benefit, I want to note that North Carolina will lose about 19,100 jobs, probably from the eastern part of the State.

Mrs. CLAYTON. They would also gain 300,000; 300,000 will gain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from North Carolina controls the time.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the minimum wage increase. We have heard all about the conflicting numbers and the studies, but what were we being told in the election of 1994? What was the Contract With America all about?

Was it not the message the people were sending this Congress that less government is better government? Were they not saying we do not want any more unfunded mandates? And yet this is an unfunded mandate. Did they not say let us get government out of our lives?

We need to lower taxes so that people have more to spend and more to pay and so that the economy will be better. The capital gains tax, for instance, affects 60 percent of the people in America. The minimum wage affects 1 percent. Major regulatory reform would reduce the cost of labor.

It is obvious what this is all about. It is about political election year pandering. Vote ''no'' against the minimum wage amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the inquiry.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I notice that over and over the gentleman from North Carolina has been responding to speakers without seeking time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note the gentleman has been docked for the time.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, which I am sure will be docked.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member on my committee for yielding the time.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is honest about opposing a minimum wage, but in Colorado 145,000 workers will see a pay increase if the Riggs amendment is adopted.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out to my very good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], that according to a poll published in yesterday's USA Today newspaper, 83 percent of the American people support raising the minimum wage; and to my Democratic colleagues that same poll indicates that 83 percent of the American people support the balanced budget amendment and 71 percent of the American people support a 2-year cutoff for welfare without work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Riggs-Quinn amendment to increase the minimum wage by 90 cents over 2 years.

This is a commonsense proposal that is long overdue. It's been 7 years since we last raised the minimum wage, and its purchasing power, adjusted for inflation, has sunk to its lowest level in 40 years.

May I ask my colleagues a simple question? I thought we wanted to move people off welfare? Raising the minimum wage does that by making work more attractive than welfare—allowing the minimum wage to remain stuck where it is provides a strong incentive for someone to remain on welfare instead of joining the work force.

Furthermore, as documented in the often-mentioned Card/Krueger Princeton study on New Jersey's increase in the minimum wage to $5.05, none of the dire predictions of either job loss or job flight ever came to pass—so much for the proverbial ''chicken littles'' of New Jersey who predicted the economic equivalent of ''sky will fall'' if we raised our minimum wage! It didn't. There was no job loss!

With our State's experience still fresh in my mind, I simply do not believe that the national economy will be stifled by the modest minimum wage increase proposed by our colleagues, Mr. RIGGS and Mr. QUINN.

Professors Card and Kerueger are highly respected empirical economists, and opponents of raising the minimum wage should refrain from impugning their credentials.

Why's that? Because roughly 20 other economic studies by numerous other economists have all reached the same conclusion as professors Card and Krueger: namely, raising the minimum wage does not have a significantly negative impact on job growth.

But more important than even which economic study supports this claim or that one, I urge my colleagues to remember that 40 percent of all minimum wage workers are the sole wage earned in their household.

These people are working harder and harder, and falling further behind each year as the purchasing power of their minimum wage continues to decline. These people need our help, and they need it now.

Two-thirds of the teenagers earning the minimum wage live in households with below-average income—please don't lose sight of the human aspect to the debate over increasing the minimum wage.

I would also like to express my support for the underlying legislation which amends the Portal to Portal Act to clarify when an employer is obligated to compensate an employee for using an employer-owned vehicle to travel both to and from work.

As a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee which reported out this legislation by voice vote, I want to commend both Subcommittee Chairman FAWELL and Chairman GOODLING for recognizing the need for a clarification to the current statute. I strongly support the provision establishing an opportunity wage, really a training wage.

This training wage, as it was called back in 1989, is vital to employers, and particularly small businesses, who would otherwise struggle to meet the minimum wage increase.

Unfortunately, as many of my colleagues know, the extremely burdensome reporting requirements of the 1989 training wage led virtually no employers to utilize it, rendering its application useless.

Plain and simple, the training wage will protect both employers and employees. Those individuals just entering the workforce will have the training they need to successfully carry out their new responsibilities, and their employers will have workers whose contributions will enhance company productivity and competitiveness.

Moreover, this training wage will help prevent disruptions in the workplace. This provision puts to rest the red herring, namely that fewer low-skilled workers will be hired while current employees are laid-off.

Fortunately, there will be two separate votes, one on the small business exemption and one on the remaining Goodling package.

The small business exemption, if adopted, will be a poison pill and effectively kill the minimum wage bill. In my opinion, the small business exemption completely nullifies the increase in the minimum wage. It will create a huge loophole so that millions of American workers will not receive a higher minimum wage. Limited data shows that close to 11 million workers are employed by business, that would be covered by this exemption. So, it is quite clear that a significant number of minimum wage workers will not be entitled to the increase being proposed.

And, while I have stated my strong support for the training wage, I cannot support it when attached to the tip credit and computer professional provisions. Regardless of how much money someone is making, if his required pay is determined based on the current minimum wage, then it should be based on the current minimum wage. The law says that the wage has to be adjusted, and it should be!

I want to endorse those provisions of H.R. 3448, the small business tax incentive package, which will be merged with the Portal-to-Portal bill after House passage and sent to the Senate.

There are several very important tax incentives for small businesses contained within H.R. 3448—increased expensing for investing in new plant and equipment; pension simplification proposals; and an expanded tip credit for certain food service employees; are important components of the save and invest in America agenda I have been advocating for years.

Enacting a save and invest in America agenda is essential if the Congress and President are to provide enough economic growth to create good jobs and good wages. Those provisions in H.R. 3448 represent a small, first step in this direction!

But, I am standing here to support the Riggs-Quinn amendment to increase the minimum wage, and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the Card and Krueger study is inaccurate and unreliable. It has just been referenced, and we have to set the record straight. Nobel prize winning economist Gary Becker, on the Card and Krueger New Jersey study, concluded that: ''The Card-Krueger studies are flawed and cannot justify going against the accumulated evidence from many past and present studies that find sizable negative effects of higher minimums [wages] on employment.''

Card and Krueger did a telephone study. They did not follow it up. Subsequent studies have followed it up and have totally rebutted the wrong implications of that study. We should not be basing our judgment on erroneous data.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there are 20 other studies, at least, by eminent economists that substantiate the Princeton study.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, we know this is not really about helping working families. If increasing the minimum wage was such a great idea, why did we not do this back in 1993? I guess the leadership at that time did not think it was important when they were too busy raising taxes on seniors, on businesses.

In fact, let me share with my colleagues the President's words in those days. I know this does not mean much to some, but, in fact, he said then, on February 6, 1993, ''The minimum wage is the wrong way to raise incomes of low-wage earners.''

If my friends think 90 cents per hour is going to save working families, they are only looking at half the story. What we need to provide, of course, is tax relief to our families, not 90 cents an hour.

Let me just add that for every one person this helps, it is going to hurt many more; many more in jobs lost by first-time, inexperienced workers which will increase costs and burdens for our small businesses and finally higher prices to consumers.

If we want to help our working families, increase their income and get the Government out of their wallets. A minimum wage increase may be well intended, but it is wrong-headed. It is a recipe for losing jobs and opportunities and increasing unemployment. Vote ''no'' on the minimum wage.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Michigan, 420,000 workers would see an increase in the minimum wage.

And I would say to my colleague who just spoke, he knows that in 1993 and 1994 we were working on health care and not a minimum wage to try to provide for raising the standard of living, and that is why minimum wage was not increased in 1993 and 1994.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

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

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Riggs amendment to increase

the minimum wage and against the Goodling amendment which would gut our efforts to help working families.

There are perhaps many areas of this Nation where the transition from a blue-collar to a high-technology work force has been accomplished fairly easily. But I represent parts of central and southern Illinois where the loss of jobs in manufacturing and the coal mines has been hard on our people. Good-paying jobs which could sustain a family of four have evaporated right before our eyes, and we are still working to diversify our economy and provide the new jobs which will replace those that have been lost. But for the time being, when you leave a job in the mines and try to support your job on the current minimum wage, you just can't make ends meet.

If we want people to work, if we want to move people from welfare into the work force, if we want families to stay together and more closely resemble the collective unit which we remember from our childhoods, then we have to provide jobs upon which they can sustain their families. This modest increase in the minimum wage will help their purchasing power and increase their staying power in the job market.

Let me be clear—in my district we are blessed to have some of the most progressive and profitable companies in the world and a vibrant small business community providing good jobs with good paychecks and benefits. We are thankful for those jobs, and are trying to do everything we can to create more of them. And we are thankful for the minimum wage jobs which provide people access to the work force, a chance to save money for college, or a second job to stretch the family budget. And where necessary, we need these jobs for people who are the primary source of support for their families.

But the purchasing power of the minimum wage has been stunted by inflation and the rising cost of living, and it's time to help folks working at the minimum wage recover their ability to make a living. When we raise the minimum wage, we help people support their families, we help them take part in the local economy with the ability to buy goods and services, and we give them an incentive to work.

Support this increase in the minimum wage on behalf of the working families of this Nation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK].

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The bottom line is that $170 gross per week is not enough money for anyone to live on. And when we have a minimum wage that is, in fact, at a 40-year, all-time low, it is a point of fact that economically it holds down all wages across this country. It lowers the quality of life for working people all across this Nation and it hurts business because these people cannot be the consumers that they want to be.

When wages fall, buying power drops, and all these Adam Smith economists would then come to use and say, well, we have social problems now. So Federal Government, give us money for more police officers; Federal Government, give us more money for courts; Federal Government, give us more money to build prisons.

We have a better idea before us today, and that is to pay workers a more livable wage. Empower the family unit to sustain and to provide for itself when a member of that family goes out and puts in 40 hours worth of work each week.

It was Henry Ford, that capitalist, who understood he had to pay his workers enough money so that they could buy the cars that he was making in order for this great country to work.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time the floor managers have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has 9¼ minutes remaining; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] has 20½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has 8 minutes remaining.

□ 1215

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I rise in strong support of this modest increase in the minimum wage and for the Small Business Protection Act which passed last night. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Quinn bill, Republican legislation that would go beyond President Clinton's and the minority party's election year two-step. I applaud the gentlemen from California, from New York, from New Jersey and Pennsylvania for their efforts to bring this amendment to the floor.

Like millions of Americans, I have held several minimum wage jobs. As one of 10 children, I would not have been able to afford to attend UMass Amherst without working at McDonald's and department stores like Lechmere and Filene's. But the minimum wage is much more important to families trying to put food on the table and a roof over their heads.

Over half of the minimum wage workers are women, many are their family's only wage earner and must work one minimum wage job just to make ends meet. For them, a 90-cent increase will mean an additional $1,800 per year, $1,800 more for groceries, clothing and rent.

We must replace the failed welfare system in this country. Real incentives to work must exist for people to free themselves from welfare and support their children. Keeping the minimum wage current with inflation as the Riggs-Quinn-English-Martini amendment does will help.

Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage provides a reasonable floor for struggling Americans already working at the minimum wage and those seeking to break free from the trap of welfare to join the work force.

I urge my colleagues to vote for opportunity over stagnation. Vote for freedom over dependency and vote for work over welfare.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], who is vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say to my colleagues that the last time we had a vote on the minimum wage, which was 5 years ago, I voted to increase the minimum wage. I thought I was doing the right thing, and it sure made me feel good. In the intervening years, as I became vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and began to pursue a variety of subjects that had to do with our economy and the welfare of our workers, I have came across information which I would like to share with my colleagues today because today I am not going to vote in support of the minimum wage as I did 5 years ago; I think for good reason.

For example, early in my tenure as vice chair, I came across a study that was done in 1983 by the Joint Economic Committee. There as referenced in this Wall Street Journal article which was published in April of this year, an article written by Bruce Bartlett, a renowned economist, and let me quote one line from this article. It says: ''A survey of earlier studies by the General Accounting Office in 1983, for example, found virtually total agreement that employment is lower than it would have been if no minimum wage existed.''

Mr. Speaker, this is important. It was important to me as I began to look at why we should or should not support a mandated increase in the minimum wage. In the meantime, our committee put this study together. It finds no, zero, zilch, no credible evidence, not one credible piece of evidence that increasing the minimum wage is a benefit to the working people of this country. Not one single study.

The Card-Krueger study has been referenced here on a number of occasions. Let me share with my colleagues that after having hearings on the Card-Krueger study, after consideration of their results and after looking at studies that were done pursuant to it, it was a telephone survey, folks. They called on the telephone to fast food restaurants, and they said to whoever answered the telephone: How many part-time and full-time workers do you have? And the responses were quite astonishing.

As a matter of fact, on one occasion the results point out that the answer was, we have 35 employees. On a follow-up telephone call, which they also recorded, the response from the same restaurant was, just a few months later: We have 35 full-time employees and 30 part-time employees. Their employment had doubled. Everyone knows that that did not happen.

So as we looked at the Card-Krueger study, we became convinced, particularly pursuant to a followup study that

was done by economists Neumark and Wascher from Michigan State University, hat this study simply is not credible. And as I point to these issues, I would like to quote the President from his 1995 State of the Union Address. He said: I believe the weight of the evidence, the weight of the evidence, he said, is that a modest increase does not cost jobs.

We have proven that is not true. Over the years, over the last 50 years there have been more than 100 studies that have concluded unanimously, unanimously that mandating an increase in the minimum wage puts people out of work.

Let me tell my colleagues about these studies. Beginning in 1957 and ending in 1993, there were five studies; all concluded that the minimum wage reduces employment. Beginning in 1973 and ending in 1992, there were 14 studies that concluded the minimum wage reduces employment among teenagers more than it reduces employment among adults.

Beginning in 1971 and ending in 1980, there were seven studies that were done that concluded that the minimum wage reduces employment among black teenage males. There were two studies that were done in the meantime that concluded that the minimum wage hurts blacks generally. There were three studies that concluded that the minimum wage hurts low-wage earners. There were five studies that were done that concluded that the minimum wage reduces employment in low-wage industries such as retailing. There were three studies that were done that concluded that the minimum wage hurts low-wage regions such as the South and in rural areas.

There were six studies that were done that concluded that the minimum wage does little to reduce poverty. There were five studies, four studies that were done that concluded that the minimum wage has reduced employment in foreign countries as well as here.

We found not one credible piece of evidence, we found not one credible piece of evidence anywhere, from academia, from the world of economics that concludes that increasing the minimum wage helps anyone. That is why the gentleman from North Carolina is correct on each occasion that he has stood up and said, in your State, this bill will cost *x* number of jobs. He is absolutely correct. The empirical evidence is unanimous, not questionable, unanimous in support of the gentleman's position.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage appeals to people's sense of fairness because it is the right and the equitable and the timely thing to do. Let me share some facts that lead to that conclusion.

It is a fact that the last time that this Congress voted to raise the minimum wage was 1989. It is a fact that the last time we had an increase in the minimum wage was 1991. It is a fact that 63 percent of the people earning minimum wage are adults 20 or older. It is a fact that the present $4.25 minimum wage is at an historic 40-year low in terms of purchasing power.

What does an increase in the minimum wage do, the previous speaker said. It does not do anything for anyone. Well, an increase in the minimum wage would add $1,800 to a wage earner's income. That is significant.

I urge support of the Quinn-Riggs amendment.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I called Joseph Stiglitz over at the White House the other night. Mr. Stiglitz is chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers for the President. I called him because I was reading his textbook where he said, there is danger in increasing the minimum wage. That textbook that he published a couple years earlier, it said wherever there is a group of people demographically or wherever there are parts of the country in particular distress, whenever the minimum wage is above the equilibrium wage, there is going to be unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, so I asked him: Do you not, do you still agree with that concept? He said: Well, we talked about how much unemployment would result, and we concluded that the unemployment that is going to result from the minimum wage increase is not going to be that significant. The fact is that he agrees, everybody agrees that it causes unemployment.

We seem to be on a trend of saying, since 82 percent of the people think wages should be higher, let us have Government do it. Do we really think that Government control can determine markets, can determine productivity, can ultimately determine the wages of people? I think the answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, George Washington asked the question, and I quote: ''If to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work?'' I wish he were here today to save Congress from doing what really most of us know is wrong: telling our citizens that they cannot work unless the Government approves the salary they make.

If the question to the American people were put such, do you believe that Government should make it illegal for you to work unless you receive $5.15 an hour, do you think that is a good idea for that kind of Government intrusion or not, I think most of the people would say, keep Government out of our lives.

We are telling seniors that want to work in a nursing home overnight they cannot do it anymore unless they get the wage we require. I think it is a bad idea. I think it is a shame we are doing this.

We will be telling teenagers that they cannot get work experience unless the Government approves of their wage.

In effect, Government is saying that people are too stupid to know what their minimal wage requirements are.

My constituents want the Federal Government to stop trying to run their lives. Raising the minimum wage is Government meddling in their lives which could cost them their job.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about studies today. Let me give my colleagues the benefit of my own study. Years past, I owned a small business. We employed up to eight people. They all received the minimum wage. Those who were with us longer received much more. We paid the Social Security tax, unemployment insurance, the workmen's compensation. At the end of the day, we still made a profit, in fact paid off the business in record time.

So, all the woes we are hearing today, I know from personal experience, are not necessarily true. My Republican friends and their inconsistency boggles my mind. On one hand we are told, if we increase the minimum wage, poor people in the country are going to lose food stamps, they are going to lose earned income tax credit. On the other hand, these same Republicans are for cutting food stamps. Last year they tried to take $20 billion out of earned income tax credit. So to the poor I say: You just cannot win for losing with the Republicans. It is amazing.

Last, let me encourage my friends like the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the author of the amendment, when it comes time for the Goodling amendments, I ask you to join me in opposing them. We can see ourselves this afternoon raising the minimum wage on one hand and talking it away with two amendments on the other hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], who is representing the committee position, has the right to close.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support increasing the minimum wage. I have many reasons for doing so. I do not need to go into them all. But some Members of the majority Republican Party are opposing the minimum wage because they say that, if you reform the earned income tax credit, it is a better way to help the working poor.

□ 1230

I say to my colleagues that that is not true. They seem to have forgotten

that last week they voted for a budget resolution which cuts the EITC by $20 billion. Last week they also asked for a $20 billion increase on almost 7 million hard-working Americans, and those are the people who will have higher taxes under the Republican budget, which they have already passed.

If my colleagues will notice, 2.7 million of our hard-working people, these are people who get up early in the morning and go to bed late at night; from zero to $10,000 a year, that is all they make. Look at the cut on these people, and the 1.8 million who make from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, 1.8 million of those will be affected by this cut, 1.9 million of them in the $20,000 or $30,000 a year will be hurt.

If my colleagues notice the chart, the higher one's pay scale is, the less they will be affected by the EITC. Mr. Speaker, that is not fair.

Second, do not let anyone say that minimum wage will not help the average worker. Even with the $500 child tax credit which the Republicans have placed in the budget, it is not going to get them out of this malaise here because even at that they are going to have to pay at least $29 more per year than they were paying now.

My premise to my colleagues is that please do not try to balance out their dislike of the minimum wage by saying, ''Let's correct it with the earned income tax credit.'' The people need both the minimum wage and the earned income tax.

This is a picture of people working hard. Let us not try to hurt them.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], one of the leading proponents of the minimum wage.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for yielding this time to me.

In Psalms we read, ''I would have fainted unless I believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.'' This is an excellent debate, and we are having the opportunity on both sides of the aisle and within both parties to debate this issue and speak from our hearts. From my heart I believe in the Riggs-Quinn-English-Martini amendment to increase the minimum wage 50 cents in July and again 40 cents a year later. In my heart I believe that we have got to have a minimum base for a worker so they are not exploited. In my heart I believe this is the right thing to do.

Now, the debate we have, this is historic because two-thirds of Congress wants to increase the minimum wage, but two-thirds of the majority party does not. What a credit to the majority party that they have brought out a fair bill, and I just have nothing but admiration from my leadership on both sides of the aisle that they have offered this kind of debate.

Now, there is a tradeoff. My colleague from California is right. When we increase the minimum wage, we affect jobs and we affect prices. The issue is how significant is that increase? If we did what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] did and raised it $20, of course we would increase prices and cause large unemployment. But when we do what we did in 1989 and raise the minimum wage 45 cents, and again a year later 45 cents, unemployment went down, maybe it would have gone down even more, prices were basically stabilized. It was a modest increase.

We are at an all-time low in 40 years. The minimum wage in 1968, if it had been indexed for inflation, would be $7.08 today. We are not asking it to be $7.08. We are asking that over a period of 18 months it will be increased by 90 cents.

I just have to say that I am proud of my Republicans, I appreciate the Democrats for pushing this issue. The bottom line is we have the best of both worlds. We have an economic engine, we have the Small Business Protection Act, we have $7.5 billion in this bill for tax writeoffs for small business, for expensing, for targeted tax credits, to hire the least employable, the ones who are on welfare. This is a better bill than just standing alone on the minimum wage. I salute both sides in this debate.

Let us vote this out. Let us increase the minimum wage.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague giving me just a brief moment to respond.

We ought to recognize the tradeoff and put some numbers on it. I think all reasonable commentators have said, ''You lose jobs if you increase the minimum wage, but if you're lucky enough still to have a job, you will do better.''

What are the numbers? The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that 214,000 wage earners support families on a minimum wage, which is less than 2 tenths of 1 percent of all wage earners. So the number that we keep hearing, the 4.7 million who make the minimum wage, is not right. It is rather how many are supporting families on it. Less than 2 tenths of 1 percent benefited. And how many would lose jobs? The best estimates that we have seen are between 500,000 and 700,000.

And so here is the tradeoff. Do we for the political opportunity of this moment sacrifice the employment of half a million in order to increase earnings for the 214,000? I say ''no.''

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in this debate, over the last 16 months the Republicans in Congress have had the courage to come to the floor of the House today and every day over those 16 months to do what we thought was right for the American people. We have had the courage to look past politics and had the courage to bring real change to this floor, real change in this Government to try to help all Americans.

Now, I know today's debate on this minimum wage is a serious debate. It is a debate that is certainly strongly felt by people on both sides of this issue. But I would suggest to all of my colleagues here that everyone in this Congress wants to help low-wage workers. We all want every American's boat to be lifted, but especially those at the bottom of the economic ladder, we all sincerely believe and want to do what we can to help them. But the question is how.

The proponents today bring a government-mandated minimum wage to the floor. What this is going to do, in my view, is going to hurt the very people we are trying to help. It is going to hurt small businesses that are the engine of new job growth in America, and I have to ask myself why would we want to do that when there is another way to help low-wage workers, and that other way is to help the private sector, help them in a strong growing economy so that they can provide more jobs and better wages for the American people because in the end low-wage workers will be much better off by allowing the private sector to do this rather than more government mandates, more government regulations.

Now, Republicans over those last 16 months, we have tried to do this, and we have passed a $500 per child tax credit to help all workers in America. Unfortunately, it was vetoed by the President. We have passed a balanced budget plan in the House and Senate, and it was also vetoed, that would help all workers, especially low-wage workers who are hit with high interest payments on their car loans, their mortgages, if they have them. We could really help. A capital gains tax reduction; yes, capital gains tax rate reduction that would help the economy grow, help small businesses invest more in their business, more in equipment, and guess what would happen? We would have more jobs and we would have higher wages for low-wage workers.

Now, over the last couple of days my friends on the other side of the aisle have had a lot of fun using a quote that was attributed to me that said I would commit suicide before I would vote to artificially raise the minimum wage. Now, why would I make such a quote? Well, I would like to tell all of my colleagues I grew up in Cincinnati with 11 brothers and sisters. I have had about every low-wage, sub-minimum wage job there is, and it was those jobs that were available that allowed me to learn the skills, allowed me the opportunity to learn how to get along in life, and yes, also taught me that maybe I ought to go back to school to improve myself if I were going to improve my lot in life. And, yes, it was because those low-wage jobs were there that, quite frankly, I am here today.

I am a product of the private sector. I started a small business and spend 15 years building it before I came here. Fortunately, I did not have to pay any of my workers the minimum wage. I was successful enough to be able to pay them a good wage, but it was because we had a successful company.

But a lot of small businesses do not have that, and on behalf of myself and my 11 brothers and sisters who had opportunities in America because these jobs were here, I from the bottom of my soul believe that we can help low-wage workers by providing and expanding the economy and help all workers.

Let us do the right thing today and veto and vote ''no'' on this artificial minimum wage increase.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

(Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of raising the minimum wage. It has been over 5 years since working Americans have had a raise. Since April of 1991, the minimum wage has been fixed at $4.25. If left unchanged, the minimum wage will be at its lowest in more than 40 years in real inflation-adjusted terms. Nearly three-fourths of the workers affected by the increase are adults over the age of 20. Between 1981–88, President Reagan adamantly opposed an increase in the Federal minimum wage, the longest period of time for it to remain stagnant. It lost 25 percent of its purchasing power during that time. The purchasing power has dropped 15% since the last increase in 1991. Adjusted for inflation, that is nearly 50 cents. The average minimum wage worker must work 3½ days more in order to pay rent than in 1981, now totalling 17 days.

The average minimum wage worker has to work more than full time, 15 hours more, to stay out of poverty. Forty percent of minimum wage earners are sole breadwinners. Minimum wage workers' earnings account for almost half, 45 percent, of a families total earnings. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that the minimum wage increase could lift 300,000 families out of poverty, including 100,000 children living in poverty.

At $4.25 an hour, a full-time employee working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year earns $8,840. Fifty-nine percent of all minimum wage workers are women. Many of these women are single parents. Ten million Americans working for minimum wage would take home another $1,800.00 a year if a 90-cent increase were enacted.

This 90 cent increase could enable a single mother to pay: for 7 months of groceries, rent or mortgage payments for 4 months, a full year of health coverage, 9 months worth of utilities, and more than a full year's tuition at a 2-year college.

In Louisiana, 313,605 workers, 20 percent of the total work force, are minimum wage earners.

Before working for me, one of my own employees, a divorced mother, with no support from her child's father, had to work three part-time jobs to keep her head above water. Because she was also in college trying to obtain a degree, she was unable to work 8 straight hours a day and go to classes and take care of a child. Not only that, but many employers will not hire a minimum-wage earner for 40 hours a week to keep from having to pay benefits. She is a prime example of a minimum wage earner bringing home $8,840 a year. With a monthly income of less than $700 after taxes, she was in the red every pay period and forced to rely on food stamps and Medicaid to get by.

Expenditures taken from that $700 a month: rent, $225.00; utilities, $60.00; child care, $300.00; telephone, $29.00; incidentals (toiletries, diapers, household items, etc.), $50.00; transportation, $30.00.

Total remaining: $6.00

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the great crisis facing this country today is the decline in real wages for American workers and the proliferation of low-wage jobs. We have millions and millions of workers today who are trying to survive on $4.25 an hour, $5 an hour. They are not making it. Raising the minimum wage is long overdue, and we must do it today.

The situation is so bad and the Federal Government has so much failed to stand up to its responsibility that 10 States in this country on their own, including the State of Vermont, have raised the minimum wage. Now, if the minimum wage is so bad, tell the Republican Governor of New Jersey, who supports their increase in the minimum wage, to roll it back. She will not do it because she knows, as every other Governor knows, that it is vital to raise the minimum wage today.

Lastly, it is incomprehensible to me that I am hearing people talk about abolishing the minimum wage. They really want to see workers in America earning a dollar an hour, $2 an hour, competing against the workers in China who make 20 cents an hour. That is not the future of America.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and my very good friend, fellow Gang of 7 member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], that the legislation which passed yesterday on an overwhelmingly bipartisan measure, I think it had actually or more than 300 votes for final passage, will provide tax incentives to entrepreneurs to start and to grow a business. And that combined with the minimum wage is good policy for America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion and the amendment. I support it not because it is going to change the world, but it is a gesture by this Congress to the fact that this Congress has done things that have been counterproductive to the working class, and I wish my colleagues on this side of the aisle that say they care about the entry-level jobs were as compassionate about the competition that American workers have to have every day against illegal immigration, uncontrolled immigration that the old Congress not only allowed but practically mandated and encouraged, and I just ask my colleagues to be as compassionate about the entry-level jobs, Americans who are waiting for good jobs, I wish they would care as much about the causes for driving down the fair market value of labor in this country that they have allowed along with some Members on this side to be able to do this.

So this is a gesture of saying we have not only not done the right thing, we have consciously caused the fair market value of labor in this country to be depressed by cheap illegal imported labor, and I ask both parties now that say they care about the economy let us take care of that problem, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

(Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1245

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, to understand this debate today and what has happened in this Congress in the last 18 months, we have to consider the case of an individual who owns a building, and that woman who cleans his building at night and is working for minimum wage. Here is what we have done for those two people or to those two people in the last 18 months.

For the person who owns the building we have said, if you have a pension plan and you have what you consider to be surplus income in the plan, you can keep it and spend it on yourself. We have said that when you sell the building, we will give you a tax break or a tax reduction on your profit when you sell the building, and if you choose to move out of the country, renounce your citizenship, and no longer be an American for the purposes of evading taxes, we will let you do it. That is the policy we are following here.

On the other hand, when the woman who cleans the building at night tries to get a 90-cent increase per hour in her wages, that is a great risk to the American economy and a great diversion of public policy that makes no sense.

What makes no sense is that we are even having a serious question about this. The people who sweep our floors, cook our meals, and work in the child care centers in this country need a raise. They have earned it, they deserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I support the increase in the minimum wage. I oppose the amendment that will follow this, which will eviscerate and defeat the increase in the minimum wage. I would urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment

of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let met begin a moment of nonpartisanship by recognizing the small band of our Republican colleagues who have abandoned the position of their party and support the minimum wage. I commend them, because I know their leadership is 100 percent against their position. I encourage all Republicans to join this small band of courageous and correct Republicans. I encourage all Republicans to join the Democrats that are in favor of the minimum wage.

I encourage all Republicans in the House to understand that today the value of the minimum wage is $3.70, not $4.25, but $3.70 in purchase power. But even if it was $4.25, I would remind all of my colleagues that we earn more every 15 days than those workers earn all year. That is, we earn in 15 days on our congressional salaries what minimum wage workers, going to work every day, earn all year long. Surely the Congressional Republicans can come down here and help to increase the wage of those low-income Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today in this country one child out of four lives in poverty. Yet 60 percent of those kids live in a household where one or the other parent works. We should raise their mom's minimum wage. If we want mom and dad off of welfare, make the job worth going to. Raise the minimum wage. That is one, only one way, but that is one good way that we could help to reform welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all our Republican colleagues to join this small band of Republicans here that understands that raising the standard of living for America's workers, not lowering it, is the way to increase employment in this country, is the way to help small business in this country.

Most of our Republican friends seem to think that if we could just lower wages enough, we could create more employment in this country. That has been their debate here. That has been their argument. We have all heard it. In fact, we have heard it for 60 years. It has been six decades now that the vast majority of Republicans, in a kind of political stone-age opposition to minimum wage, have opposed it. Again, I commend this small band of Republicans and encourage all the rest of you to join them.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 2¾ minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, this has been, I think, an enlightening and constructive debate. I want to point out that I expect the vote that will occur on this floor will be very much a bipartisan vote. About an hour ago we had a procedural vote, with 76 Republicans joining 190 Democrats to support that motion, so I anticipate the vote for the minimum wage will also be equally bipartisan.

In the spirit of bipartisanship, I want to remind my Democrat colleagues again of yesterday's USA Today Gallop poll indicating that 83 percent of the American people support the balanced budget amendment and 83 percent of the American people support raising the minimum wage. Seventy-one percent support a 2-year cutoff for welfare without work.

I would ask the Members, in the same spirit of bipartisanship, to stop fighting us tooth and nail in our efforts to balance the budget and reform welfare, and join us in a bipartisan manner to help us pass those critical legislative reforms in the waning days of this session of Congress.

In just a moment, Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a very distinguished economist, who himself happens to be an extraordinarily capable majority leader, speak to close the debate. A few moments ago he spoke about the perverse employment effect of raising the minimum wage. But I want to respectfully suggest that raising the minimum wage allows us to address the perverse incentive that we have in American society today that makes welfare more attractive than work.

Let us raise the minimum wage to help lift people out of poverty, particularly those single mothers who struggle against heroic odds to move from welfare to work. Let us make sure that that entry-level job for a welfare recipient pays more than welfare. We can do this together. We can send a strong message to the American people that we can put partisanship aside and we can get things done in the name of the public good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], our majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, here I am, with every fiber in my being, doing what I thought I would not have to do in this Congress: Speaking on behalf of the most beleaguered, least advantaged, least trained, least skilled, least experienced job aspirants in America, against the folly of raising the minimum wage, which, irrespective of the impact it might have on their incentive to work, I might point out to my colleague, the gentleman from California, creates an enormous reduction in the opportunities for them to find the job; because as we raise the price of unskilled work, we provide a greater incentive to substitute other ways of achieving the task without the employment: Golf carts instead of caddies, dishwashing machines instead of dish washers; any number of events we have seen in the past.

The facts are clear, Mr. Speaker. Study after study after study demonstrates that we have these perverse employment effects where that entry-level job for the most needy worker in America just goes away. It is documented. There is no doubt about that. It is the standard treatment of this subject in every econimc principles textbook in America, including the 1993 edition of the President's own chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors' textbook on page 131.

I have said this before, and I am afraid it seems harsh, but if a college freshman does not grasp this, he is not likely to pass the course. But it is not just an academic question, it is a question of real lives.

I had my first job at less than what is today's minimum wage, at a lower wage. I was sacking groceries for Joe Torson at the age of 14. Joe Torson taught me I had to be to work on time, I had to be clean and neat and orderly, and I had to be well mannered, and I had to do my job and I had to achieve some degree of proficiency. When I did that, he gave me a raise. Then I moved on. I started another job at another time, with another firm, doing another thing. I started at the minimum wage.

They taught me what was the difference between a coffin hoist and a come-along. They taught me how to put on my equipment and climb a pole, and after I could do it I got a raise, and I worked my way through college in the summer.

Then after that, while in school, during the school year when I wanted that supplement for my income that I needed as a young college student, I washed dishes at minimum wage. I could have been replaced with a new Hobart dishwashing machine, and all of us knew that. So nobody stays, or very few people stay.

What if you do stay at the minimum wage and have a child? With the earned income tax credit, with aid to dependent children, with the other benefits that are available to you, nobody is asked to raise a family in America today, with all that we do to supplement the income of the low-wage worker at minimum wage.

This debate has been a fascinating exercise for me. I have often said that Washington harbors a great many people that cannot be trusted with words or numbers. That point has never been more thoroughly well demonstrated than listening to all of the misinformation I have seen around here.

We were approached by our Members and we were asked by a minority of our majority, would we put this vote on the floor. Out of respect for our Members, we said yes, we will do that, but

we will do it after a time in which we have been able to study it, prepare for it, and put it in with the proper safeguards and protections. One of the protections we put in here against the loss of job opportunities for the inexperienced worker is a small business exemption, something that was petitioned to the Democrat majority in 1991 by then-Congressman Espy, had 67 Democrat cosponsors, 150 sponsors, and hey would not allow it on the floor.

A larger share of their conference when they were in the majority that petitioned them for this exemption asked, why was the gentleman from California [Mr. SERRANO] so much in favor of this in 1991; why was the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] so much in favor of this in 1991; Why was the then-Democrat chairman of the Committee on Small Business in favor of that in 1991? Because they knew the harm that was happening in the inner city. They petitioned their leadership.

Now we have brought it out in exactly the same language, with the only change being two protections for those already on minimum wage in those jobs that would get the exemption. The two protections were if you are now receiving it, you cannot be denied it, and you cannot lose your job as a method of avoidance of it; a better amendment than even Congressman Espy had, we brought it on the floor, and we hear all of this noise from the same Democrat leadership that denied their own membership the fundamental right to air their views and have a vote on the floor in 1991, this big panic of rhetoric going up.

I have to tell the Members, I am embarrassed by it. This is a serious business in the lives of real people. We may in fact entertain ourselves, console ourselves that somehow or another we will never see those people who become the broken eggs in the omelet of self-satisfaction that we make for ourselves as we appease the pressures of American union leaders in Washington, DC, in total disregard for real people in their real lives in the real world.

We will probably vote this thing in, but if in fact we end up doing this, I implore my colleagues, have an ounce of decency and consideration for the most beleaguered victims of minimum wage increases, those youngsters caught in inner cities where the jobs are lost, and vote the small business exemption and give them the protection they have. Many of you will not do that. You will make your votes, and you will be satisfied that you have done good.

But let me leave you with this thought. When you walk into the city in the middle of July and you see that youngster that is standing idle because the job they thought they were going to have is not there for them this summer, and you look in the face of that young high school or college student and you say, ''I feel your pain,'' that is only just. You caused it.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage and efforts to increase it, have been the focus of many inaccurate comments by Members in the Republican majority. Some have said that there are no heads of households supporting families on a minimum wage. Others have proclaimed, an increase in the minimum wage would cause jobs to decrease for low-skilled workers.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is an increase in the minimum wage is the only way working Americans will be able to sustain decent living for themselves. The truth is that 12 million Americans, most of them women, would benefit from the minimum wage increase. The truth is that a raise in the minimum wage is the least this Congress can do for Americans, after cuts in education, Medicare, school lunches, and environmental protections.

The fact that we are even having a debate on the merits of a minimum wage increase shows that the majority cares little for those who are struggling. The majority feels the need to debate the merits of a bill that will provide extra pay that would mean 7 months of groceries, a year of health care costs, 9 months of utility bills, or 4 months of housing.

We must stand strong for those who have the least. We must fight for those who are trying to better their situations through good, honest, hard work. We must be sure that a minimum wage is truly a living wage. Since businesses are enjoying record profits, we must ensure that profits are shared with the persons who made the records possible.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I don't favor an increase in the minimum wage. In fact, I am opposed to the whole concept of a minimum wage.

In the private sector, the minimum wage is an interference with employer-employee contractual relations. Big brothers in the Federal bureaucracy aren't happy unless they can control conduct throughout the workplace.

And, recalling my own experience as a county supervisor, I know the minimum wage is just another unfunded mandate. It represents Washington's dictating to States and local governments what they must pay without providing the dollars to accomplish it.

There are economists from coast to coast who have exposed the minimum wage, showing that it doesn't lift people from poverty. Instead, it denies realistic opportunity for first-time workers and those with little experience as well as impairing small businesses.

Minimums, whether in wages or freedoms, are not American ideals. As a society, we should strive for maximums, gained by hard work, not by regulation and restriction.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of an increase in the minimum wage from $4.25 to $5.15 over the next 2 years. This increase in the minimum wage is an essential step toward ensuring that American workers are properly rewarded for their efforts to achieve the American dream.

While a bipartisan majority in the Congress stands ready to give minimum wage earners a raise the House Republican leadership instead wishes to deprive potentially millions of American workers of any minimum wage increase. In what should have been a simple, widely-supported victory for millions of hard working Americans, the Republican majority has demonstrated not only its aversion to any increase in pay for American workers, but also its intention to eliminate, entirely, the protections of the minimum wage for millions of low-income earners. In fact, quoting Speaker GINGRICH's right-hand man, Majority Leader DICK ARMEY, the Republican majority will not only fight any minimum wage increase ''with every fiber of his being,'' a majority of the Republicans would like to do away with the minimum wage altogether.

This is yet another example of the extremist agenda of the Republican leadership. While the average American worker labors day in and day out just to support his or her family, the new congressional leadership has worked just as hard to prevent these Americans from earning a fair, liveable wage. Should Speaker GINGRICH and his foot soldiers be successful in their efforts to prevent a pay raise for American workers, the real purchasing power of the minimum wage will soon be at the lowest it has been in over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, far too many hard-working Americans are not adequately rewarded for their efforts. In recent years, many middle- and low-income American families have faced an incredible economic squeeze. Since 1979, the wealthiest 20 percent of this country has seen its incomes grow my roughly $767 billion. During the same period, middle-income families have seen their wages stagnate, and in certain cases decrease. But the last 10 years of wage stagnation has had a particularly hard impact on the lives of the low-income working families. Since 1979, the value of the current minimum wage for lower-income, working-class families has dropped by almost 29 percent, and, in fact, has declined over 50 cents alone in constant value since its last bipartisan increase only 5 years ago.

Today, the majority of working American families are struggling to provide their families with a decent standard of living. This living-wage increase of over $1,800 in additional earnings per year is an essential, first step in assisting many of the most vulnerable American families obtain the ability to provide their families with proper homes, a good education, and a chance to improve their economic situation.

I am very disappointed that the majority leadership chose to exact a price for the consideration of the most important and widely accepted issue for millions of American workers, by attaching amendments which would not only deny many Americans the benefit of a pay raise, but also completely eliminate the protections of the minimum wage for millions of small business workers.

The first of the Republican majority's proposed amendments would repeal the protections of the minimum wage for small businesses. This amendment to the minimum wage increase would be a dramatic leap backward from current law, effectively exempting virtually all new employees of two-thirds of all firms from major worker protection provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, including minimum wage and overtime pay. Millions of workers who are employed by businesses with gross annual sales under $500,000, would be completely exempted from the protections of the minimum wage law. Mr. Speaker, it is not bad enough that many hard-working Americans would be denied a well-deserved pay-raise under the Republican minimum wage proposal, but this proposal goes even further, exempting millions of American workers from any minimum wage standard, effectively allowing employers to pay their employees whatever wage they desire.

The GOP's second proposal would go further in undermining worker protections, by resurrecting and making permanent a youth subminimum, so-called opportunity wage. This subminimum training wage likely result in age discrimination in hiring practices and could lead to America's youngest workers undermining older workers for subminimum, entry-level positions. Under the Republican proposal, American employers would be able to hire young people for a training period at a subminimum wage, only to replace them with additional young people before they would be required to pay the full minimum wage amount.

Mr. Speaker, we should be passing a simple, clean, minimum wage increase for every American worker. Despite the unbelievable claims of House Republican Whip TOM DELAY, who states that ''working families trying to get by on $4.25 an hour . . . don't really exist,'' a clean raise in the minimum wage would benefit millions of workers across the country, including over 490,000 workers in Pennsylvania alone. Let's justly reward the American workers for their labors and raise the minimum wage for all American workers.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of an increase in the minimum wage. The 90-cent increase that is being considered today by the House of Representatives will begin to address the erosion in American workers' purchasing power. If the minimum wage is not increased, it will fall to its lowest level in 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is essential legislation that directly impacts millions of American workers. Over 500,000 of these workers are in Illinois. Because the majority of American workers who are paid the minimum wage are over 20 years old, the increase will aid these workers in supporting themselves and their families. As we encourage people to find jobs instead of relying on public welfare, we must work to ensure that the minimum wage is a living wage. As a result of the reduction in turnover, the employer's costs of recruiting and retraining are lower.

Raising the minimum wage is expected to immediately lift 300,000 families out of poverty. My colleagues who charge that a 90-cent increase is nominal and unnecessary probably are not aware that a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage could pay for 7 months of groceries, rent or mortgage payments for 4 months, or a full year of health costs. These are real expenses that working people have and that can be addressed by a minimum wage increase.

Many of my colleagues also charge that the minimum wage increase will result in lost jobs. However, many economists dispute this claim. In addition, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 10 million jobs have been created since the last increase in the minimum wage.

These are among the reasons why I strongly support a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the increase.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am pleased to announce that it appears the Democrats and the Republicans have come to an agreement on one thing in the debate about raising the minimum wage: there is agreement that no one can support a family working in a job that pays the current minimum wage. The problem is that to the Repubicans, the glass is half full; to the Democrats, the glass is half empty.

For the minimum wage worker, a 90-cent an hour pay increase means a great deal. It could mean the difference in having a roof over your head—or living in extraordinarily substandard housing. It could mean the difference between providing a healthy, balanced diet for their family—or waiting in line at a soup kitchen so your children could have a square meal. It could mean the difference between having a telephone or being isolated. It could mean the difference between acquiring a second-hand car or relying on expensive public transportation to get to your job, to the doctors, or to the grocery. That's a glass that's fuller than it is without a raise in the minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage is not just a Democrat or Republican issue, and it is not only a labor issue. It is a women's issue. It is an education issue. It is a social and a welfare reform issue.

The Democrats and the Republicans agree that there are no working families living on a minimum wage, because you just can't do it. The Republicans have said that the ''minimum wage families don't really exist.'' They're right. How can they? No one can fully rely on a salary from a minimum wage job at the current rate to buy food, pay rent, travel to work, pay child care and taxes—and still survive.

The Democrats and the Republicans agree that the difference between $4.25 and $5.15 per hour is not a lot. A mere 90 cents an hour difference. The Republicans position is that a mere 90 cents an hour raise won't make that much difference in the life of the minimum wage earner, but the Republicans also say it is a lot if it's coming out of the business owners' profits. What hypocracy! The worker would have about $36.00 a week extra; the business owner would have about $36.00 less profit. The glass is half empty.

To reiterate, raising the minimum wage is a labor issue. The current minimum wage, $4.25 an hour, is pocket change for many working Americans. In Illinois, nearly 11 percent of the wage earners are paid only $4.25 an hour. There are over 12 million Americans nationally who are currently working in jobs that pay the minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage is a women's issue. Women's wages still remain below those of their male counterparts, even for comparable jobs. At the bottom of the job ladder, at least there is an opportunity for equality—equality in receiving the minimum wage. According to the Bureau of the Census, women make up 46 percent of the work force, and 40 percent of those women are working mothers. A single mother working at a minimum wage job who has to pay for child care has a substandard existence. She often cannot pay her bills and needs the additional help of food stamps, and so forth.

President Clinton recently declared a ''National Pay Inequity Awareness Day'' and in his statement he provided information that last year American women earned only 75 cents for every $1 a man brought home, with African-American women and Hispanic women collecting just 66 cents and 57 cents respectively, when compared to the majority male wage earner.

Raising the minimum wage is an education issue. Students are a large population of minimum wage earners. Students who are supplementing their family's income by working are not a thing of the past—they are the foundation of many communities. In 1980, the minimum wage was raised from $2.90 to a whopping $3.10 and since then it has only gone up to $4.25 where it has stayed since 1991. Since 1980, the cost of college has gone up 260 percent but the minimum wage for earners trying to pay their way through school only went up by about 30 percent.

Raising the minimum wage is a social and a welfare reform issue. People have little incentive to work when they have no hope of earning a wage that will allow them to make a decent living and take care of their family. The current minimum wage of only $4.25 an hour means a gross weekly salary for 40 hours of only $170—and that's before taxes and other mandatory deductions.

The Republicans continue to ignore the fact that the current minimum wage of $4.25 an hour makes it easier to perpetuate dependence on social welfare programs like aid to families with dependent children, Medicaid, subsidized child care, and job training.

Yes, my colleagues, the glass is half empty! Raising the minimum wage will not fill the glass, nor will it fill the pockets of the American workers, but it will help change lives. I urge my colleagues to put a little more in the glass and the pockets of the American worker and raise the minimum wage.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Riggs amendment to increase the minimum wage by 90 cents, to $5.15 per hour. I do so for many reasons, mainly because it is only fair to hard-working Americans who are working harder and longer with no gain. I do so because it is the right thing to do, to keep working Americans from having to ask for public assistance because $4.25 won't raise a family and provide for daily necessities and health care—just won't do it.

I vote for an increase in the minimum wage because it will let American workers to share in the gains of rising economies—such as some of the highest profits ever noted for corporate America, at a time when CEO's make 300 percent more in annual income than their highest paid employee, and at a time when the stock market is on an ever increasing upward trend. Let working Americans in on the act.

But one of my very biggest reasons for voting for this minimum wage increase is because we said that we would bring it to a vote, and 84 percent of Americans polled said: Do it. It may startle you to know that 71 percent of Republicans polled also support an increase in the minimum wage.

Early on in this debate, when Democrats said they would demand and insist on this up or down vote to increase the minimum wage, the Republican leadership was quoted as saying many things. The majority leader said I will resist increasing the minimum wage with every fiber of my being. Another in the leadership said: I'll commit suicide first. But we persevered and we have brought the proposal to a vote today.

But the Republicans who oppose this increase also did something else besides threaten to commit suicide or to resist with every fiber of their being. They went to their Ways and Means pharmacy and they concocted an antidote to the Democrats poison pill of a bill to increase the minimum wage.

They met in the dark of night under a full Moon, no doubt, and using potent herbs and verbs, and using the eye of NEWT, and hair and nail clippings from known Democrats who

use the House barber shop—they developed their antidote and they called it the Small Business Job Protection Act, and cried out that if it was not enacted and administered immediately after enactment of a minimum wage hike, then small business would die.

Well, guess what? Democrats are all for helping small businesses—the backbone of our Nation, and its number one source of job creation. We had no problem with the small business job protection antidote. So we nearly all voted for it—it passed by a vote of 414 to 10 on May 22.

Was that sufficient, then, to sway our Republican friends across the aisle to come over to us and help us increase the minimum wage? In other words—did they seek us out to help us create a win-win situation—a situation where Representatives were willing to represent their constituencies—by honoring the efforts of the workers and by honoring the commitment and investment of small businesses in strengthening the economy of the entire country? All at the same time?

No indeed. I have in my office two communications from the National Federation of Independent Businesses [NFIB]—one which says: If you are going to raise the minimum wage, first enact the Small Business Job Protection Act. The other one says, if you vote for the minimum wage, it will be used against you when we report it to constituents in your district—or words to that effect.

Well, you can't have it both ways. I voted for the Small Business Job Protection Act because I do not want a single small business in my district or yours, my colleagues, to suffer. And I am proud to vote for this modest increase in the minimum wage for proud, working Americans who are struggling to stay off welfare and to live lives of dignity and self-respect by working for minimum wage.

I want to reward all that hard work that is taking place across this country—work and productivity by millions of employees of businesses, large and small—I want to honor any work achieved, as the Bible directs us—by the sweat of our brows.

I am ashamed at the betrayal by Republicans to hold out the small business antidote for raising the minimum wage—but once they got our support and our votes—to jerk the rug by fighting the rise in the minimum wage.

Shame, shame, shame on you who vote against this amendment raising the minimum wage after voting for the small business job protection antidote last evening.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I must say I sympathize with my moderate Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle. After months of urging your leadership to allow a straight up-or-down vote on increasing the minimum wage, you thought you had finally won that most basic opportunity. But at the 11th hour, Speaker GINGRICH unleashed a killer amendment that would repeal the minimum wage and overtime pay requirements for up to 10 million Americans.

I continue to be amazed by the Republican leadership's policies that seek to bring us back to the days when workers were routinely exploited, polluters fouled our air and water with abandon, and college was only an option for the privileged few. But today with the Goodling amendment they are at it again, turning the clock back to a darker day.

Make no mistake about it, the Republican leadership doesn't believe hardworking Americans deserve a raise. The record of the Gingrich gang on the minimum wage is undeniable: delay, distort, and derail.

Inflation has been chipping away at the value of the minimum wage since it was last raised 5 years ago. Its value is now at its lowest level in 40 years. Forty years, Mr. Speaker. Americans who work full-time simply cannot live on $8,800 a year.

Making the minimum wage a liveable wage through two 50-cent increases will lift 300,000 families out of poverty, including 100,000 children, and help people move from welfare to work.

An increase in the minimum wage won't solve all of our Nation's economic and social ills. But it is clearly an overdue step in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, let's end the double talk and get a clean, up-or-down vote to give American workers a raise.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of raising the minimum wage, and helping reward the millions of Americans who work hard everyday. It has been 5 years since Congress last increased the minimum wage—5 years with less purchase power to pay for groceries, hospital bills, and car payments. Members of Congress who oppose the minimum wage are simply out of touch. Members of Congress make more money in 1 month with taxpayer dollars than people on minimum wage make in an entire year.

There are thousands of hardworking families in my district in Oregon, and across the country, who deserve this overdue increase in their take home pay. I am proud that Oregon's minimum wage is already higher than the national level. The bill before us today would raise the minimum wage to $5.15 by July, 1997, which would represent a 40-cent increase to Oregon workers. I find it disturbing that amendments have been introduced to repeal minimum wage coverage for 10 million American workers. We must not go backward; we must reward people who work hard with good wages. I urge my colleagues to oppose these amendments.

It is a remarkable fact that almost two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults. In addition, almost 4 in 10 are the sole breadwinners for their family. In light of these facts, I believe that increasing minimum wage is the best welfare reform because it makes work pay. In 1993, I was proud to support an expansion of the earned income tax credit [EITC] which gave tax breaks to low-income families who were working hard. The minimum wage bill before the House today builds on the expansion of the EITC in 1993—which was opposed by every single Republican—and puts more money in the pockets of people who work.

Increasing the minimum wage is the right thing. It will help millions of American families, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of an increase in the minimum wage so that we can give American workers a decent living wage, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, I rise in strong support of an increase in the minimum wage.

I had the privilege of serving on the conference committee for the last minimum wage proposal, which was signed into law in 1989, under a Democratic-controlled Congress. It was the right thing to do then, and it is the right thing to do now—in this positive cycle of our economy. Under President Clinton's leadership, we have developed very strong economic indicators. The deficit is down, new jobs have been created, and inflation is under control. The working people of this country deserve to enjoy the benefits of the economic good news.

Let me share with my colleagues our experience in my home State of New Jersey. I am proud that we have led the Nation in giving workers a livable wage. Despite the predictions of gloom and doom in some quarters, economists at Princeton University surveyed businesses in New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the spring of 1992, after New Jersey raised the minimum wage from $4.25 to $5.05. The results indicated that businesses in New Jersey actually added employees while in Pennsylvania, hiring remained stagnant.

We hear a lot of talk about family values, but what does it say when we fail to pay workers enough to support their families? Despite all the talk about welfare, the fact is that most poor people in this country work. They just cannot make ends meet in low wage jobs.

Let's help lift the standard of living for working families in this Nation, so that they can educate their children, buy their home, and fulfill the American dream. I urge my colleagues to support an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to higher take-home pay and better job opportunities for low-income Americans. We strongly support policies to give low-income Americans increased wages and improved chances to find work. But we are against Government-mandated wage and price controls that destroy jobs and hurt the economy.

President Nixon concluded, after leaving the Presidency, that the wage and price controls initiated during his administration were a serious mistake. During much of the 1970's, the President and Congress imposed harsh wage and price controls on most sectors of the economy. These policies were disastrous for the long-term economy and failed to meet even short-term goals, instead contributing to the ''stagflation''—economic stagnation coupled with runaway inflation—for which the Carter era is known. By destroying economic opportunity, these policies dimmed the American dream for millions.

All this changed in 1981, when, as one of his first actions as President, Ronald Reagan ended the remaining Carter price controls. His action became the first element of a coordinated economic program of deregulation, the end of price and wage controls, elimination of trade barriers, an inflation-fighting monetary policy, and tax cuts to encourage economic growth and increase the take-home pay of all Americans. Ronald Reagan's economic policy ushered in the longest peacetime economic expansion in American history.

Echoing Ronald Reagan, Candidate Bill Clinton promised in 1992 to balance the budget, cut taxes for the middle class, and grow the economy. But once in office, he signed into law the largest tax increase in American history, stifling economic growth. In 1995, the economy grew at a sickly 1.5 percent. Clinton's vetoes of spending cuts insure continued deficits well into the 21st century. Then, having succeeded in implementing this tax-and-spend agenda—without a single Republican

vote in the House or Senate—he sought to nationalize our health care system by placing a bureaucrat in nearly every health care decision, levying taxes on excessive health care benefits, and imposing price controls to ration health care for every American.

Republicans strongly opposed Clinton's effort to impose price controls on one-seventh of our national economy. That principled opposition to Government controls on the health care system contributed measurably to the 1994 election of the first Republican Congress in 40 years.

Government should not—indeed, cannot—rationally determine the prices of labor, goods, or services for health care, energy, or any other industry in a free market economy. In the 1970's, when the Federal Government imposed price controls on gasoline, the result was shortages and long lines. By attempting artificially to fix the price of gasoline, Government ensured we got less of it. Wage controls have precisely the same effect. ''Raise the legal minimum price of labor above the productivity of the least skilled workers,'' the New York Times editorialized when the Democrats controlled Congress, ''and fewer will be hired.'' Their editorial was headlined, ''The Right Minimum Wage: $0.00.'' The politically liberal editorial policy of the New York Times caused them to ask: ''If a higher minimum means fewer jobs, why does it remain on the agenda of some liberals?'' Their answer: the liberal arguments aren't convincing—particularly since ''those at greatest risk from a higher minimum would be young, poor workers, who already face formidable barriers to getting and keeping jobs.''

Because in so many cases the minimum wage jobs that will be lost are the all-important first jobs—the jobs that give young Americans the experience, the discipline, and the references they need to move to better, higher-paying jobs in the future—an imprudent increase in the minimum wage would contribute to cycles of poverty and dependence. Such Government focus on starting wages is especially misguided since low paying, entry-level jobs usually yield rapid pay increases. According to data compiled by the Labor Department, 40 percent of those who start work at the minimum wage will receive a raise within only 4 months. Almost two-thirds will receive a raise within a year. After 12 months' work at the minimum wage, the average pay these workers earn jumps to more than $5.50 an hour—a 31 percent increase.

In a very real sense, the minimum wage is really a starting wage—the pay an unskilled, inexperienced worker can expect on first entering the work force. Once these workers have a foot on the employment ladder, their hard work and abilities are quickly rewarded. But these rewards can only be earned if workers can find that all-important first job. Consider who earns the minimum wage. According to the Labor Department, half are under 25 years of age, often high school or college students. Some 63 percent work part-time, 62 percent are second-income earners. And fully 80 percent live in households with incomes above the poverty level. Even Labor Secretary Robert Reich, in a 1993 memorandum to now-Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, admitted that ''most minimum wage earners are not poor.'' But while undue increases in the minimum wage do little to help the poor, curtailing unskilled employment opportunities will exacerbate poverty.

Bill Clinton himself has argued against raising the minimum wage. In 1993, he called it ''the wrong way to raise the incomes of low-income workers.'' He was right: according to Labor Department statistics, half a million jobs were lost in the 2 years following the last increase in the minimum wage. In the year after the minimum wage was increased, 15.6 percent fewer young men (aged 15–19), and 13 percent fewer women, had jobs. Over three-fourths of the 22,000 members of the American Economics Association believe a minimum wage increase would lead to a loss in jobs. Many estimates of the cost of raising the minimum wage exceed one half of a million jobs lost. One such study, by Michigan State University Professor David Neumark and Federal Reserve economist William Wascher, estimates a loss between 500,000 and 680,000 jobs.

''The primary consequence of the minimum wage law is not an increase in the incomes of the least skilled workers,'' liberal economists William Bumble and Clinton Federal Reserve appointee Alan Blinder recently wrote, ''but a restriction of their employment opportunities.'' An increase would also be an unfunded mandate on every State and locality in America. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the minimum wage increase will cost State and local governments, that is, taxpayers, $1.4 billion over 5 years.

President Clinton did not raise the issue of the minimum wage publicly during 1993 or 1994, when the Democrats controlled the Congress. Congressional Democrats, likewise, failed to hold even a single hearing on the minimum wage during that same period. The Democratic devotion to this issue in 1996 is entirely political—and, as the New York Times editorialized, inexplicable for liberals who care about the working poor.

The snare and delusion of wage and price controls must not distract us from the fundamental economic and fiscal policy reforms necessary to expand our economy and create good job opportunities for all Americans. A balanced budget, tax relief for workers and small business, and regulatory relief from unnecessary Government red tape offer the surest means of steering our economy toward lasting growth. Comprehensive welfare reform that promotes work and breaks the cycle of dependency can go far toward restoring the natural incentives for individual responsibility and personal growth. And redoubled efforts to focus our educational resources in the classroom—where educators, parents, and students exercise control over learning rather than taking dictation from Federal and State governments—can pave the way for a better trained and more employable workforce for the future.

These solid Republican policies will lead us to a better, stronger America. Wage and price controls, in contrast, are premised on the notion that Government fiat can raise wages without cost—a notion that fails both in theory and in fact. It is individual initiative rather than government beneficence that creates wealth, jobs, and a higher standard of living for all Americans.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise.

And it's about time—in the 5 years since the last minimum wage increase, its purchasing power has sunk to a 40 year low.

But rather than schedule a straight up or down vote on a minimum wage increase, the Republican leadership has loaded down this bill with provisions which renew their attacks on working families.

This bill would include a lower required wage for tipped restaurant workers, an overtime exemption for computer workers, and a subminimum training wage for new hires.

Our Republican colleagues just don't seem to get it. They don't seem to understand that a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage means 7 months of groceries, a year of health care costs, 9 months of utility bills, or 4 months of housing.

This is another example of how the other party has lost touch with what most Americans are thinking about the minimum wage. Over 80 percent of Americans not only believe in the minimum wage, but think that it should be raised.

My colleagues, this proposal is one more example of the do-nothing GOP Congress creating more legislative gridlock.

Let's not bury the minimum wage increase in a tangle of legislative language which would result in denying minimum wage protections to millions of working men and women. Let's honor America's working families by increasing the minimum wage.

Vote ''no'' on the Goodling amendment and ''yes'' on a clean minimum wage increase.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

About 12 million people will benefit from a 90 cent increase in the minimum wage according to the Economic Policy Institute, many of whom are my constituents.

An increase in the minimum wage would enable thousands of my constituents to move out of poverty and into the world of work and self-sufficiency. America's working class has been doing without for long enough.

Seventy-eight percent of the American people favor the plan by President Clinton reflected in the Riggs amendment to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents over 2 years.

The minimum wage directly rewards hard work. An increase in the minimum wage would send a signal to millions of Americans that we have not forgotten them, we appreciate and support them.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of increasing the minimum wage for this Nation's working poor. The minimum wage law is designed to help ensure working Americans earn enough to live on. Under the current minimum wage, a full-time worker earns $8,840 a year, well below the poverty level for a single-parent family of three. No person working full-time should have to live in poverty.

The entire country benefits when we encourage self-sufficiency and reduce dependency on welfare. We want work to be more attractive than welfare—increasing the minimum wage helps accomplish that. And while the earned income tax credit would be another good way to help low-income workers, the Republican majority wants to cut the credit, not increase it. That is one reason it is so important that we raise the minimum wage.

Despite the claims of the Republicans who oppose increasing the minimum wage, the minimum wage is not a wage only for teenagers who have part-time jobs and live with their parents. Of those earning minimum

wage, 70 percent are adults 20 years old or older. Under the current minimum wage, these Americans are trying to support themselves on $4.25 per hour.

An increase in the minimum wage is also a pay raise for women. Even though there are fewer women in the workforce than men as a percentage, 63 percent of those earning minimum wage are women. Allowing the current minimum wage, which is at a 40-year low when adjusted for inflation, to remain at an historically low value disproportionately hurts America's working women.

It is time to give working Americans a raise—it's time to increase the minimum wage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, Noes 162, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—266

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Buyer
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—162

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Wicker
Wolf
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—5

Barcia
Becerra
Horn
Molinari
Ward

□ 1319

Mr. DAVIS and Mr. EWING changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the recording of rollcall vote No. 192. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, due to an error, I was incorrectly recorded on the Riggs amendment today, rollcall vote No. 192. I wish the RECORD to reflect I intended to vote ''No'' and emphasize my opposition to raising the minimum wage. That is why I voted against this bill on passage. I just want to remain consistent on this issue.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances, I was unable to be present on the floor for the last vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on increasing the minimum wage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 192, I was unavoidably detained on official business and was not able to vote in support of the Riggs amendment. I strongly support the increase in the minimum wage and, if present, would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of House Report. 104–590.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS.—Section 13(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(a)) is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting ''; or'' and by adding after that paragraph the following:

''(17) any employee who is a computer systems analyst, computer programmer, software engineer, or other similarly skilled worker, whose primary duty is—

''(A) the application of systems analysis techniques and procedures, including consulting with users, to determine hardware, software, or system functional specifications;

''(B) the design, development, documentation, analysis, creation, testing, or modification of computer systems or programs, including prototypes, based on and related to user or system design specifications;

''(C) the design, documentation, testing, creation, or modification of computer programs related to machine operating systems; or

''(D) a combination of duties described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) the performance of which requires the same level of skills, and

who, in the case of an employee who is compensated on an hourly basis, is compensated at a rate of not less than $27.63 an hour.''.

(b) TIP CREDIT.—The next to last sentence of section 3(m) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(m)) is amended to read as follows: ''In determining the wage an employer is required to pay a tipped employee, the amount paid such employee by

the employee's employer shall be an amount equal to—

''(1) the cash wage paid such employee which for purposes of such determination shall be not less than the cash wage required to be paid such an employee on the date of the enactment of this paragraph; and

''(2) an additional amount on account of the tips received by such employee which amount is equal to the difference between the wage specified in paragraph (1) and the cash wage in effect under section 6(a)(1).

The additional amount on account of tips may not exceed the value of the tips actually received by an employee.''.

(c) OPPORTUNITY WAGE.—Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) In lieu of the rate prescribed by subsection(a)(1), any employer may pay any employee of such employer, during the first 90 consecutive calendar days after such employee is initially employed by such employer, a wage which is not less than $4.25 an hour.

''(2) No employer may take any action to displace employees (including partial displacements such as reduction in hours, wages, or employment benefits) for purposes of hiring individuals at the wage authorized in paragraph (1).

''(3) Any employer who violates this subsection shall be considered to have violated section 15(a)(3).

''(4) This subsection shall only apply to an employee who has not attained the age of 20 years.''.

(d) SMALL BUSINESS EXEMPTION.—

(1) SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES.—Section 5(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 205(a)) is amended by striking ''engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce'' each time that it appears and inserting each time the following: ''who are (1) engaged in industrial homework subject to 11(d) and are either (A) engaged in commerce, or (B) engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or (2) employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce''.

(2) MINIMUM WAGE.—Section 6(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)) is amended by striking ''who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce'' and inserting the following: ''who in any workweek is engaged in industrial homework subject to 11(d) and is either engaged in commerce or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce''.

(3) WAGE ORDERS.—Section 8(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 208(a)) is amended by striking ''employers in American Samoa engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''employers in American Samoa''.

(4) MAXIMUM HOURS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(a)) are each amended by striking ''who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce'' and inserting the following: ''who in any workweek is (A) engaged in industrial homework subject to 11(d) and is either (i) engaged in commerce, or (ii) engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or (B) employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce''.

(6) SEX DISCRIMINATION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) are each amended by inserting after ''employees subject to any provisions of this section'' the following: ''or employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce''.

(7) HANDICAPPED WORKERS.—Section 14(c)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214(c)(1)) is amended by inserting after ''injury'' the following: ''and who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or who are employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce''.

(8) PRESERVATION OF COVERAGE.—In the case of an employee who on May 15, 1996, was subject to section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1) and who because of the amendments made by this subsection is not subject to such section, the employer of such employee on such date shall—

(A) pay such employee not less than the minimum wage in effect under such section on May 15, 1996;

(B) pay such employee in accordance with section 7 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 207); and

(C) remain subject to section 12 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 212).

No employer may take any action to displace employees (including partial displacements such as reduction in hours, wages, or employment benefits) for purposes of hiring individuals at less than the wage authorized in subparagraph (A) or to avoid the protections of subparagraphs (B) and (C). Any employer who violates the preceding sentence shall be considered to have violated section 15(a)(3) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] wish to be recognized in opposition?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I do. I yield 14 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield time as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Could the Speaker tell me what the arrangement is now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] has agreed to give 14 minutes of his 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] for purposes of the gentleman from Connecticut being able to control time and yield time. So the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] will control 14 minutes, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will control 16 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier today, after we make the decision to move ahead with raising the minimum wage, then the question comes, what do we do for the most vulnerable, the unskilled, the poorly educated, the dropouts, the teens, the senior citizens, who both need the time and the therapeutic help of a job? Any my response to that was that we do what we have done every time we have raised the minimum wage: We went back to see what it was we could do to alleviate some of the problems that we were going to have in relationship to the unskilled, the poorly educated, the teens, the senior citizens.

So every time we have had a minimum wage discussion, every time we have had a minimum wage increase, we have always gone back and made the exceptions and the exemptions, so that the small businesses could provide those jobs for those most in need, and so small businesses could create those jobs that small businesses must create if as a matter of fact we are going to have a growing economy.

So today, I have an amendment that will do what we have always done in the past when we have had these minimum wage discussions.

I do want to clarify there are two votes on the amendment, a vote on the section dealing with the small business exemption, which I will discuss momentarily, and a separate vote on the rest of the en bloc amendments.

What are these en bloc amendments? First of all, the tip credit. Nothing new, same as we have always done it. The tip credit, the Fair Labor Standards Act currently includes a tip credit whereby employers of tip employees may count tips up to $2.13 an hour, that is under your current law. In the event that the employee does not receive at least that $2.13 and up to the minimum wage, the employer then must pay the difference between the $2.13 and whatever that minimum wage may be. The employer must contribute those additional amounts of wages to make sure that they have reached the minimum wage.

The amendment codifies the current level of tip credit, maintains the minimum wage protection for tip employees in that the employer would still be required to make up the difference in wages between the new minimum wage and $2.13 per hour whenever the tips received by the employee are insufficient to make at least the minimum wage. Most of these people are making $7 to $8 an hour.

Small business exemption: My, we have heard a lot about something that has been around a long, long time in every piece of fair labor standards legislation that comes before us, and that is a small business exemption.

It would address a problem with small business exemption that was created by the 1989 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. In 1989, when the minimum wage was last increased, Congress agreed to increase the small business exemption to $500,000. That is the law. However, the

ultimate legislation that passed inadvertently resulted in situations in which individual employees of small businesses could be covered, even if their employer was otherwise exempt, if their work was involved in interstate commerce. In other words, one employee might be covered while another sitting side-by-side would not. I used the illustration all the time how silly this is. You have a business, and it is mostly done through telephone, and you have two people sitting side-by-side. One is calling out of State, receiving one wage; one is calling in State, receiving a different wage.

Not only that, if you are calling in State one day, you have to keep a record because you get a different wage then, and the next day you are calling out of State, you have to keep that record so that as a matter of fact, you do not get in trouble under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This is what they tried to correct in 1989.

Now, let me tell you, as I have up here, I have Mr. Espy's Dear Colleague letter, and I say that my amendment restores what was the intention of Congress when the small business exemption was increased in 1989. In fact, it uses language that was developed by Representative Espy.

I might also point out that that legislation was endorsed by the arch conservatives, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL], more arch conservatives, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman used my name.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield. I did not use the gentleman's name in vain. I just used his name as it was written in black and white.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls the time.

□ 1330

I have improved upon his legislation initiative because I have grandfathered all of these people who are now inadvertently receiving this money. So when someone tells us someone is going to lose money, they are not going to lose money because they are grandfathered. They are going to continue to receive the inadvertent increases that they presently receive. They are grandfathered.

Not only are they grandfathered, I improved the legislation because I made it very clear that they cannot dismiss someone to get around and have some kind of a loophole. So it is improved legislation.

But there were 67 Democrats, there were 90 Republicans that sponsored that, and we have a whole history of what the committee said. The committee said the act is to create a more uniform small-business exemption. This was not a committee under Republican leadership, this was a committee under Democrat leadership. And it says the act is to create a more uniform small-business exemption. Small enterprises whose total volume of sales or businesses do less than $500,000 would no longer be covered.

Now, we are talking about businesses where the employees are somewhere between 2 and 10 at the most. And if we look at all the exemptions that are presently in the law, we will find that there are not that many left because the self-employed do not fit, we cannot find any chain restaurant that fits into any kind of exemption because they all make more than $500,000, and we cannot take the white-collar workers because they are exempted.

And so the whole argument that we are talking about millions of people is just nonsense.

They go on to say, in eliminating several confusing tests to determine applicability of the act to various industries, the committee continues to demonstrate its support for the principle of a true small-business exemption. The committee believes, and again, this is not our committee I am talking about, I am talking about a Small Business Committee chaired by the Democrat Party, the committee believes that the increase in the minimum wage to restore the eroded value of the wage should be accompanied by a commemsurate increase in the enterprise test threshold.

Representative Austin Murphy, the chairman of the relevant subcommittee, stated, Our substitute sets the exemption ceiling at $500,000 for all businesses, with the exception of hospitals and other care facilities currently outlined in section 3(s)(5) of FLSA, which, incidentally, is unchanged by my amendment.

By the way, let me emphasize that existing employees, as I said before, are grandfathered.

So we have a lot of talk about that particular part of my en bloc amendment which is more talk than substance.

We have two other areas that we covered. In those two areas, one deals with an opportunity wage.

If Members will remember, in the last increase in minimum wage, included in that legislation was an opportunity wage or a training wage. That was two 60-day opportunities. This is much better because this says 90 calendar days, one time. Not two at 120 total, not two at 120 working days. Ninety calendar days, which gives them that opportunity to move up the ladder of success and gives the business the opportunity to train those that I was talking about; no skills, poor education, dropouts. They have that opportunity to train and move up that ladder of success.

I want to make sure Members also understand that in the small-business exemption it is what we do in every piece of legislation. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, one of our most important labor laws, exempts employers with less than 15 employees. The Americans With Disabilities Act contains the same exemption. The Age Discrimination and Employment Act has a larger exemption, exempting up to 20 employees; the WARN Act on plant closings, less than 100 employees; the Family and Medical Leave Act legislation, less than 50 employees. So that is all in there now.

Two other areas. Computer professionals. This is the law at the present time. I am merely restating that law indicating that if they are making 6.5 times the minimum wage, they do not qualify; therefore, they are at $50,000, $55,000 a year. That is not who we are talking about in this minimum wage debate, and so we continue that.

If the amendment is not included, then any minimum-wage increase of $1 would mean they are up another $13,500. The amendment simply maintains the current exemption level for 6.5 times $4.25, or $27.63 per hour.

I did mention the opportunity wage, and, again, it is a starting wage. It would remain at the $4.25, the current level, and it is for those under 20 years of age and it is for the first 90 calendar days.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Goodling amendment effectively denies an increase in the minimum wage to millions of current workers and denies minimum-wage and overtime coverage to millions of new workers.

The small-business exemption eliminates minimum-wage and overtime coverage for more than two-thirds of all businesses in this country. It guarantees that more than 10 million current workers will derive no benefit from future increases in the minimum wage. Employees in the garment industry sweatshops, farm workers, and workers in sheltered workshops are among those who will ultimately lose overtime protection if the Goodling amendment passes.

An estimated 3 million workers in the retail industry and another 4.5 million in the service industry would be exempted from the minimum wage and overtime law. Sixty-seven percent of all retail firms, and an astounding 78 percent of all service firms are exempted by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that this legislation would pass the Senate, and I expect that if it gets to his desk with the small-business exemption attached, that the President will veto the bill. I, for one, will not support final passage of this bill if this provision is part of the bill.

The rest of the Goodling amendment is not much better. The so-called opportunity wage provides that for the first 90 days of employment, 16- to 19-

year-olds can be paid only $4.25 an hour. The provision includes no assurance that teenagers will receive training, and the provision is not limited to a teenager's first job.

Finally, an employer would have a powerful incentive to hire teenagers looking for extra spending cash at the expense of workers who are seeking jobs to support their families. The subminimum wage will trap young, low-wage workers in subminimum employment.

The Goodling amendment also denies tipped employees any benefit from the increase in the wage. It is the employee who will effectively pay for this increase out of his own tips. Yet these workers, among those most in need of a minimum-wage increase, are not only denied this increase but are denied future increases as well under the Goodling amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we should not take two steps back in order to take one step forward. We should not turn our backs on millions of hard-working Americans. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Goodling amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding myself time, I would like to ask a parliamentary inquiry of how the speaker intends to divide the question. It is my understanding that there are four parts to this bill and there will be two votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The Chair will state his intention with regard to putting the question on the amendment presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The amendment will be divided into two parts on the question of its adoption. The Chair intends first to put the question on agreeing to the first part of the amendment comprising subsections (a), (b) and (c) of the new section that is proposed to be added to the bill by the Goodling amendment.

Thereafter, the Chair will put the question on the last part of the amendment, adding a subsection (d).

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the Speaker for answering my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The proponents of the minimum wage on this side of the aisle have asked for time and have graciously received it from my colleague, and I thank him very much for giving us this time to express general support for sections a, b and c of this amendment, but in opposition to part d, which is the $500,000 exemption for small businesses.

Our concern, very plainly put, is we think it is too broad. We believe that there are basically about 4 million people receiving the minimum wage today and of that number about half are affected by the $500,000 or less.

We believe that, ultimately, that when we increase the minimum wage, if we are successful, to the number of $5.15, that we will have another 16 million who will be positively affected in addition to the 4 million. But over half, over half of those individuals, over time, will be exempted from the minimum wage.

So we as proponents are encouraging an increase of the minimum wage at the same time we are opening a very large door in which too many people, regretfully, will be exempt from the minimum wage and the 40-hour workweek with time-and-a-half.

So, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that those Members who had voted for, one, to consider the minimum wage, when they voted to allow the Riggs amendment to come to the floor, and those 77 who voted for the Riggs amendment, will be willing to vote potentially ''yes'' on the first vote, a, b and c, but a definite strong ''no'' on part d, the $500,000 exemption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have spoken loud and clear: 80 percent of them say raise the minimum wage. Raise it now. And make it a clean, uncomplicated vote.

But, the Republican leadership finally found a way to frustrate the wishes of 80 percent of the people.

This amendment is a laundry list designed to exclude millions of Americans from receiving a deserved wage increase.

It won't apply to restaurant employees. It won't apply to anyone under age 20 during the first 90 days of a new job. It won't apply to employees of small businesses that do interstate business. And it won't apply to many high-technology employees eligible for overtime pay.

A raise in the minimum wage is supposed to benefit all workers. It is supposed to help low-income employees provide for themselves and their families. It is not supposed to exclude millions from the increase they desperately need.

Under this Republican amendment, special interests are the sole beneficiaries. And it is the worker and her family that are being hurt again.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH.]

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendments in its total form.

I think even though the House should be commended for the action that we have taken in the majority to raise the minimum wage, the Goodling amendments would show us how quickly we can slip backward.

I do not believe we should be making those people who are employed and part of their compensation is in tips, requiring that the totality of what would, in effect, be this increase in the minimum wage, would have to come out of tips that they earned through the generosity of their customers.

I come from a city that has been claiming to be the most generous in the Nation. However, I would not want anyone to have to be dependent upon the tips of those whom they serve to be the principal basis for their increase in the minimum wage. I think it is wrong, and I think it is a step in the wrong direction.

I also think that when we look at the broad base of this exemption for small businesses, that I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], that it is just too broad.

□ 1345

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], primary proponent of increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as opposing the Goodling amendments, and in particular take a few minutes to talk particularly about Goodling 2. That is the amendment that deals with the $500,000 small business exemption.

Mr. Speaker, people who work a 40-hour workweek ought to earn a livable wage. This amendment in my mind would deny that. Over 3,000,000 American businesses, two-thirds of all the businesses in our country, have an annual income under $500,000. These businesses employ 10½ million workers. That is more than 10 percent of all the workers in America. I think, Mr. Speaker, that, if we have worked as hard as we have worked, we had a bipartisan vote just a few months ago where over 70 Republicans supported the Riggs-Quinn-English-Martini minimum wage vote, we are headed in a bipartisan direction right now. I would urge any of our colleagues who are listening to the debate, any who have been involved these last 2 or 3 weeks, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the Goodling 2 amendment.

In my estimation, and others who have worked hard on the original bill that was dropped about 2 or 3 weeks ago, maybe a month ago, we would simply undo everything we have done by passing the minimum wage. We would exempt the very workers we are trying to help, the people that many times are not represented by organized labor. They are not represented by anybody in most cases but the Members who vote in this House and the Members who will vote in about 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a not vote on the Goodling amendments and in particular Goodling 2, which will be the small business exemption.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my Republican colleague who just spoke in a bipartisan way. We just voted 266 to 162 to raise the minimum wage so that we can get it up from a 40-year low. After months of pressure, this House will vote on raising the minimum wage in just a few minutes.

At a time when the minimum wage is at its lowest buying power in 40 years, we will vote to compensate millions of women and men for their hard work to support themselves and their families. We talk about being family friendly. Nothing is more family friendly than allowing wage earners to support themselves and their children to make work pay in a meaningful way. We will vote to make work pay more than welfare.

Today should be a joyful day for millions of American workers, but what the Republican Congress giveth with one vote, it taketh away with two others. Yet again, we have a situation in which we may give with one hand and take away with the other. These are two of the most cynical amendments, very frankly, and I say it with respect, that I have seen. While we raise the minimum wage with one amendment, another amendment would repeal it for 10,000,000 workers, leaving them with no minimum wage protection at all.

If you are a waitress spending long days on your feet to keep your family off welfare, the Goodling amendment means that you will not get an increase in your wages. You will not get an increase in your wages. If you are doing computer work during the day to put yourself through school, these amendments mean that you will not be paid for the overtime you work. These amendments will exempt thousands of small businesses from the most basic child labor laws and worker protections. That does not mean they will be violated, but they will lose the protection.

Mr. Speaker, American workers are not dumb. As a matter of fact, they are pretty smart. They see that the Goodling amendments would leave this minimum wage bill as a minimum wage emperor who has no clothes. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Goodling amendments. Let us pass a meaningful increase in the minimum wage for the first time in 7 years.

Let us reward work, make it pay, make sure that when people get off welfare, they can support themselves and their children. That is opportunity. That is the American dream. Let us act today to make it reality for millions of Americans.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Respected by cynical. Let me point out, here is what the Democrats said they were doing for small business in 1989, from the committee report, agreed to by many of the Democrats speaking here today. They said:

Small enterprises whose total volume of sales or business done is less than $500,000 would no longer be covered. In eliminating several confusing tests to determine applicability of the act to various industries, the committee continues to demonstrate its support for the principle of a true small business exemption.

That is what Democrats said in 1989, when we had the small business discussion. That is what I am saying today, exactly what they said then. I have not changed my stripes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of some of the provisions the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has offered but against the provision which would exempt all companies with less than $500,000 in gross sales.

One of the speakers previously said that if the first Goodling amendment went through, that people who are computer programmers would not get overtime. That is clearly not the case. What the amendment says is, if you make more than $27.63 an hour, you would not qualify for overtime. We hare having a debate on the minimum wage. That is appropriate. But someone who is making $27.63 an hour is not a minimum wage worker. It is a very different argument here. That provision simply clarifies an oversight in a previous bill which said that if you made $27.63 an hour, you still received overtime.

I think most people would say if you are making that much money, if you are making $50,000 a year, it is not the same as being a waitress or a waiter, it is not the same as working at a convenience store or fast food restaurants. Clearly overtime for someone making $50,000 or more each year is not the same as those entry-level workers making a very, very minimal wage.

I think the other provisions are reasonable as far as they go. Waiters and waitresses who are making less than $5.15 an hour would see their wages increased. I think it is important that that be stressed because it is being glossed over in the debate. Everyone would have to make at least that $5.15 per hour. That is something that has to be insisted on as well.

The training wage for 90 days, I think this is a reasonable compromise. The original proposal was to have an open-ended training wage. I would have voted against that. But to say for just 90 days for teenagers, the people who really do need some job skills, I think is a reasonable compromise, and I think that is worthy of support, too.

However, I will repeat my opposition to the provision exempting all small businesses with less than $500,000. I think that is too open-ended a bill. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the first three and ''no'' on the final provision.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this debate today was supposed to be about raising the minimum wage—about raising the minimum wage—about giving hardworking people at the bottom of the economic ladder a little bit more in their paycheck each week. But it is not. The Republican majority has turned this into a bill repealing the minimum wage. The Goodling amendment would do away with the minimum wage for as many as 10 million working people. If your employer wants to pay you $2 an hour, that is okay with the Republicans.

My colleagues, what the Republicans are doing on this floor today is a shame and a disgrace. It is obscene. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Where is your sense of common decency? What you are doing today is not only unfair and unjust—it is un-American.

We should be here to raise the minimum wage, not repeal it. If ever there was an issue that defined Democrats and Republicans, this is it. Democrats believe that if you work hard 40 hours a week, you should not have to live in poverty. Republicans, extreme Republicans, believe in repealing the minimum wage. If people live in poverty—so be it. Today the extremist Republican majority has shown its true colors.

What you are doing today is wrong. I know it is wrong. You know it is wrong. And the American people know it is wrong.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 15, the Committee on Small Business held a hearing to listen to the concerns of small business owners who would be faced with some very unfavorable choices if the minimum wage is increased—denying unskilled workers the opportunity to learn a job and build their skills, and reducing hours for those currently on their payroll, to make the ledger balance at the end of the week.

One of our witnesses, Mr. Taalib-Din Uqdah, owns a business here in Washington, DC, called Cornrows and Co. He started his business in 1980 with $500. He now employs 12 full-time people, including himself and his wife, and grosses about $500,000 annually. He said in very clear, plain terms that an increase in the minimum wage will force him to deny job opportunities to those in our community that need it the most.

If we mandate an increase in the minimum wage without a useable small business exemption, he cannot afford to hire unskilled applicants at the minimum wage. The cost of their employment would be too great, making it more cost-effective for him to hire a skilled worker.

The amendment offered today by Chairman GOODLING would allow only

very small businesses to use the exemption passed in 1989. The Federal definition of small business generally includes businesses with gross receipts of $3 million a year. The standard in this exemption is just a portion of the small business community—the true Mom and Pop operations on Main Street America. And the protections built into the amendment for those currently earning the minimum wage results in 250,000 to 350,000 workers being affected, not the millions suggested by some Members of this body.

I am amazed by the current lack of concern for very small businesses, and for the hard-to-employ in our society, by some of my colleagues. Just 5 years ago, 150 Members of this House cosponsored legislation to make the exemption for small businesses effective for those grossing $500,000 a year or less.

Contrary to what many believe, an increase in the minimum wage increases the number of people on welfare. It increases the number of people on welfare. That was the experience nationally, after Congress increased the minimum wage in 1988, and a study conducted by Peter Brandon of the University of Wisconsin on the welfare rates of States that increased their minimum wage showed that the average time on welfare was 44 percent longer than in States that did not increase their minimum wage because fewer entry level jobs are available.

I urge the body to support Goodling 2.

□ 1400

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the Goodling amendments. I wish it were not so, but I think the weight of evidence compels me to do so. I think they are well-intended amendments, but the fact of the matter is the threshold exemption for small businesses of annual sales of $500,000 or less would really exempt 10 million workers from minimum-wage standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act, would exempt them from many provisions for overtime compensation, and I do not think that is right. I think we could end up with some people earning a couple of dollars an hour.

Now, my colleagues may say that is farfetched and that would not happen. Let me tell them how it would happen. We are determined in this Congress to end welfare as we know it if we can get the President's cooperation. One of the provisions of the bill that everyone seems to focus on is that we are not going to be on welfare in perpetuity. There will be a time certain when people will have to go off of welfare. Then the question is, where are they going to go to work? Where are the jobs? I would suggest that a lot of businesses could take advantage of that situation by saying to the person who has no choice, ''We will offer you $2 an hour, come work for us, and incidentally, if you are going to work 10 or 12 or 14 hours a day, no overtime.'' I just do not think that is right.

Second, I think the 90-day training wage period is wrong. I think in many cases we are going to have dad losing his job and the son taking the job. I think it is going to be taken advantage of. We know throughout history that these things happened. We wished they did not, but they do.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I simply want to emphasize the fact that I believe that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has presented in all four of these amendments are very reasonable ones, and I think also that I can say that when the minimum wage provision passes, as apparently it will pass as a part of this legislation, that we will have a better minimum wage law, and that basically is what we are all looking for.

All of these amendments that are being suggested are traditional amendments that have been attached in the past to minimum wage and overtime provisions. There is nothing new and startling, and when I hear some of the Members talk so emphatically and to seem to indicate that the end of the world is coming if we do not, for instance, refuse to add the small-business exemption that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has presented, I just cannot quite understand why they are reacting the way they are reacting.

As has been pointed out by others, the small-business exemption for businesses that have gross receipts of under $500,000 is an established part of the provisions right now of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The only problem is that they have been undercut by what everybody, I think unions and everyone else, recognizes as an inadvertent error or a scrivenor's error in 1989 when, as a result of what I call the interstate clause came into being, and any employee, small business or not, I gather, is going to be subject to the interstate clause. If they are doing any business, that might put them under the interstate clause, such as answering the telephone on a long-distance call, that they would be subject to that.

Suffice it to say these are all very reasonable amendments. I would certainly urge my colleagues to endorse them.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I would express my support for the training wage provision as part of the Goodling proposal, but unfortunately I cannot support his whole proposal. Fortunately, there are going to be two votes on this.

I would like to point out that the training wage, I think as it was called back in 1989, is certainly a vital way, particularly for small businesses who would otherwise struggle with the minimum wage, and I do support that, and as I have said, fortunately there are going to be two votes here, my colleagues, so that we can express our support for the training wage, but I must absolutely oppose the small-business exemption in this proposal.

I think it is a poison pill and effectively will kill the minimum wage proposal, not only because the President will probably veto it on that ground, but also because the small-business exemption nullifies the increase in the minimum wage for than half of the workers currently.

So I reluctantly oppose it, but it would significantly reduce the number of workers who are covered by the minimum wage.

I would also like to point out that the exemption would also exempt the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and I do not find that viable.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of the Goodling amendment. Without the Goodling amendments' 90-day opportunity wage for teenagers, I do have some fear that those who are trying to save for college or just entering the workplace and have no job skills will be denied new job opportunities, and without the amendment, struggling small businesses will have increased costs and might very well force many of them to close their doors.

With the Goodling amendment, businesses with less than $500,000 in annual income would be exempt from the minimum wage requirements, and with the Goodling amendment millions of jobs for teenagers will be saved. With the amendment, struggling small businesses and the jobs that they create would also be saved.

As many have said today, Mr. Speaker, a minimum-wage increase costs jobs and raises prices, and as the House appears willing to make a very costly mistake, the Goodling amendment is the only life preserver available for struggling small businesses and low-skilled labor.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the Goodling amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], one of the primary

sponsors of the minimum wage who introduced the bill along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I find myself in a somewhat awkward position of both supporting and opposing my chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

First of all, I very much support the Goodling amendments that deal with the tip credit, the opportunity of training wage and the computer professional changes to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The first two items, I think, go a long ways toward addressing the concerns of small business owners and business franchisees, especially those who happen to own convenience restaurants, and I heard that from some of the convenience restaurant owners in my congressional district.

But on the second item, the small-business exemption, I have to oppose that exemption. I believe it is overly broad. If we are going to grant a small-business exemption under the Federal minimum-wage requirement, it ought to apply only to businesses that are in a startup mode during that first year or two of operation when the survival of the small business is so tenuous.

So I have to oppose the small-business exemption as overly broad, as defeating, as many speakers have already said, the primary purpose of the minimum wage increase, and I would urge my colleagues on the division of the question, vote for the first Goodling amendment, but vote against the second Goodling small-business exemption amendment.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me, and let me just commend my colleagues for the debate that we are having today and for those on the side of the issue on the Republican side of the aisle who are agreeing with us that we need to defeat particularly Goodling amendment No. 2.

I want to talk about that family today out there in America who would be affected by this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere in America today there is a young mother who got up early, got her kids out of bed, got them breakfast, got them ready for school, and then she went out to catch the early bus, and she is going to work a hard, long day, either taking care of our parents at a nursing home or cleaning tables at a diner, or stitching buttons in a factory with 100 degree heat, and at the end of the day she is going to go home, she is going to be bone-tired, she is going to make dinner, she is going to do homework with her kids, and then she is going to put them to bed. Tomorrow she is going to get up, and she is going to do it all over again.

But she has something that we cannot take away from her. She has the pride of work, and her kids are proud of her also because instead of taking welfare, she has chosen work over welfare, she has chosen to be a good role model for her kids. Like 12 million other people who work for the minimum wage today, she believes that her hard work is going to pay off for her in the end.

But instead of helping her build a better future for herself and her children, instead of rewarding her decision to choose work over welfare, this Congress on occasion has had so little respect for the hard work that she does that today we are trying actually to give her a pay cut.

For 4 months some on this side of the aisle, not all, but some, have tried to block us every step of the way as we have tried to raise the minimum wage, and now that the public pressure has become so great that it has forced them to act, now that we have actually a few minutes ago voted to raise the minimum wage by voting for Mr. RIGGS' amendment by 90 cents, they now are coming back with an amendment which will try to repeal the minimum wage for literally millions of Americans who are working today, many like that mother I have just described to my colleagues.

Make no mistake about it. This amendment repeals the minimum wage for millions of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot raise the minimum wage by repealing it. But that is exactly what they are trying to do today. Instead of creating incentives for work, this amendment creates more sweatshops, it lowers wages, it lowers living standards for millions of Americans.

Is this really what we want to do? Is that the message that we are trying to send today in honor of work in this country, that hard work does not pay, that 60 minutes of sweat and toil and bone-aching work are not even worth $4.25 an hour?

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, 85 percent of the American people said, ''Raise the minimum wage, not repeal it.'' The American people do not want us to return to the sweatshop days of old in the present. We want that ended. They want us to raise wages, not roll them back.

I urge my colleagues, let us have some respect for working people in this country, let us take some pride in the people who believe enough in themselves and enough in their futures to choose work over welfare. These people have big dreams, but they do not have big voices. They are counting on us to speak up for them today because, if we do not, nobody else will.

I urge my colleague to say ''no'' to this amendment, say ''no'' to repeal. Help us raise the minimum wage.

□ 1415

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I said that I had supported the increase in the minimum wage in 1991. I did so primarily because the people who earn the minimum wage in my part of the country are, by and large, people who are age 20 and younger. They do that because in the summertime, our tourism industry has a fair demand for young people to come to the New Jersey shore in the summer to take jobs that customarily pay the minimum wage.

I thought I was doing the right thing for them, so I voted to increase the minimum wage. I found, however, that in talking to employers, those employers, during those summers in the intervening time, hired less teenagers than they had previously because we increased the cost of that labor.

This chart on my left demonstrates, I think, conclusively, just as 12 studies that I pointed to earlier, that increasing the minimum wage hurts teenagers more than it does any other segment of our society. This chart shows, on the red line, what the pattern of the minimum wage has been. In the middle 1980s it was quite high. It eroded because of inflation during the late 1980's. Then we increased the minimum wage, as the line shows, in 1991. Then it began to erode again because of inflation.

The blue line shows the unemployment rate of teenagers. Just as the minimum wage requirements decreased, the number of young people who are unemployed also decreases; or, said the other way around, the number of young people who are employed increases. There is a parallel track that goes along.

When we raised the minimum wage in 1991, the rate of unemployment for teenagers shot up and spiked as well. Of course, the same is true, the same downward trend is then true later. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, these are facts. This is not a feel-good vote, this is a factual vote that we need to take very seriously.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the computer professionals' exemption is very simple and does deserve everybody's support. Here it is. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, if you make 6½ times the minimum wage, then the time-and-a-half provisions no longer apply. But, since we increased the minimum wage, we suddenly have kicked up this threshold. So here is how the numbers work out. If you are presently making $55,000, the time-and-a-half provisions do not apply. But after today, unless we amend the bill, if you are making up to $68,500, time-and-a-half still applies.

What is the effect of that? It is time-and-a-half for people who are not doing badly in our society, and if you are working 50 hours a week, that is roughly an 8 percent increase of the total

cost of hiring you in America. For a 60 hour week it is going to be a 17 percent increase. These jobs have, can, do, and will go offshore. This amendment, to me, is awfully compelling.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude and take my last minute with an overwhelmingly strong endorsement of the opportunity wage offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING]. I support all of his amendments, but let me say how strongly I support the opportunity wage. Please, whatever doubt there may be as to the overall effect of the minimum wage, though to me that is not in doubt, it does cost jobs; there is no doubt that it costs jobs for teenagers.

I am going to cite two studies. Professor Stiglitz has been cited often. I refer to his text once again, where he says, ''With the current level of minimum wage, only the very unskilled individuals are affected * * *. In the United States, perhaps the major unemployment effect of minimum wage is on teenagers.

The other is a 1981 study done by Congress, under the control of the other party, which found that a 10 percent increase in the minimum wage reduced teenager employment by between 1 percent and 3 percent. These studies are not in doubt. Please support the Goodling amendment to give teenagers at least this much relief from the minimum wage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I, frankly, do not understand what all the fight is about. I have consistently voted for the increase in the minimum wage I think every time it has come up, the three different times during my tenure here in the Congress. Let us get that out of the way.

But, Mr. Speaker, can I suggest to everybody engaged in this debate, if the second part of the Goodling amendment goes down, you still have a $500,000 exemption. That is in law today. What is the difference, and what are we talking about? What we are talking about is whether or not there is going to be some geographic equity.

Take a look at districts like my own, 220 miles along the Mississippi River, towns 400, 300, 200 population, family businesses. Who is affected by the minimum wage? There is not a corporation in America that is affected by the minimum wage. They all pay above that. The only people affected by this debate are those small family businesses.

What we are suggesting here today in the Goodling amendment is that Larry's Lawnmower Shop in rural Wisconsin, Carol's Catering, or Jerry's Grocery, just because they have a customer that lives 2 miles down the road, but it happens to be over a bridge in Minnesota or Iowa, should not be unfairly impacted. They ought to have the same benefits of the $500,000 exemption that somebody living in the central part of Connecticut, the central part of Pennsylvania, the central part of Missouri ought to have; no more, no less. That is all this is about.

So can we cut out all the rhetoric about the fact that we are somehow going to deny all these people the minimum wage protections they have today? You know and I know that the Goodling amendment does not exclude one person who today has that minimum wage from getting anything lower. It does not allow that family business to displace them. The only thing the Goodling amendment says is that those of us who happen to be Members of Congress from border districts, that we can provide our family-owned businesses the same flexibility and the same geographic equity that the rest of you have. Vote for Goodling I and vote for Goodling II.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me, and I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the Republican leadership for allowing this vote on the minimum wage, but in addition rising to the greater challenge of looking at the minimum wage in the context of this Nation's need to strengthen the small business sector, the only sector that is creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as we move forward, and yesterday's tax package was a big step in the right direction, we have to recognize the reality that productivity and quality are the ultimate guarantors of employment. So in the Goodling amendment, the opportunity wage allows small businesses, now required to pay a higher minimum wage, to pay the current minimum wage as a temporary training wage for teenagers while they develop the productivity and the quality of performance on which the future of their employment depends.

I rise in very strong support of the work opportunity wage for teenagers and the computer professional fix and the tip credit adjustment in the Goodling amendment, because those things are all part of enabling small business to be strong and productive in a very competitive environment, while at the same time we assure to employees a minimum wage that will better meet their needs as full-time employees.

As a strong advocate of the minimum wage, I am urging support of the Goodling amendment to pass a work opportunity wage as I strongly supported the tax package yesterday and its work opportunity tax credit, to provide a wage subsidy for new employees needing a lot of training. But I am discouraged by the almost deceptive nature of the debate around the second Goodling amendment to reform the current law exclusion of very small businesses from the minimum wage.

That small business exclusion policy is law now. It has been broadly supported by Republicans and Democrats over many years. While I do not quite agree with the fix that is being offered to deal with some of its problems, it is misleading to imply that the small business exemption is controversial. Such exaggerated statements as these that have been made on the floor today, simply mislead rather than enlighten the public and our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the first Goodling amendment and passage of the minimum wage increase.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], for yielding me 14 minutes of his 30 minutes. It was a very gracious effort at bipartisanship which I want to thank him for.

I also want to thank the leadership of my party for allowing us to have very honest debates on all these issues, and to have the opportunity to debate our feelings as strongly as we feel. I believe with all my heart and soul in increasing the minimum wage, and while I have little concern about the Goodling amendment, the first part, his three positions on A, B, and C, I urge a strong no vote on part D, the $500,000 exemption.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to point out to my colleagues, before 1989, businesses that were retail services that gross $362,000 or less were excepted from the minimum wage. All other businesses had to have a business of $250,000 or less, and they did not allow for interstate commerce.

When I voted for the increase in the minimum wage, I did not vote to except the interstate business. I voted for the minimum wage, to increase it to $500,000, and still leave in the interstate nonexemption. So I would contend this is not an attempt to fix, it simply widens it too large.

For those 76 who voted to allow the Riggs amendment to be debated, the 77 who voted for the Riggs amendment, the Quinn amendment, the Martini amendment, the English amendment to increase the minimum wage, voting on Goodling II in my judgment is a killer amendment. We do not have the votes to send it to the Senate if that amendment passes. I urge my colleagues to vote no on Goodling II, and I urge my colleagues to stay consistent with their vote to increase the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, if we tell the big lie enough times we will believe it ourselves. If we tell it more, we will have others believe it. It is interesting how this 1 million, 2 million, 30 million, 10 million, figure has been kicked around all day. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1989 when they got the figures that they needed in

order to do exactly what I am offering today, CRS said that there are 250,000 at minimum wage. That is the people we are talking about but none that are working today, because I grandfathered all of those.

Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, when we have to think a little beyond those who are employed. Now is the time we have to think about the unskilled. We have to think about the poorly educated. We have to think about the teens, and we have to think about the senior citizens. What is it that we can do, now that we raise the minimum wage, to make sure that employment is available for them, to make sure they are given an opportunity to improve those skills, to improve their literacy, to be able to be citizens who can be employed and who can make their way up the American dream ladder?

I would ask Members today to forget the rhetoric that they may have heard and think now beyond what they have been concentrating on, which has been those who are making minimum wage now or those who are above minimum wage, and think only about those that every study has indicated will reduce the availability of jobs for the unskilled, for the poorly educated, for the teens, for the senior citizens.

□ 1430

Again, what I am doing in that part 2 that they have talked about is exactly what the majority then wanted to be back in 1989. Let me also mention, when we are talking about a $500,000 cap, when the legislation came before President Kennedy in 1961, that exemption was $1 million. Translated in today's value, that is almost $5 million. Under President Johnson in 1967, it was $500,000, translated today to a value of $2.2 million.

Right on down the line, we are way below them. We are talking about $500,000. Again it is not silly to have two people sitting in the same room doing the same job, receiving different pay, simply because one is calling across the line and the other is calling in-State? How silly must they think we are, or even worse, if one day they are calling in-State, they get one wage, and the next day they are calling out-of-State, and they get a different wage.

I appeal to all of my colleagues, the minimum wage will be raised. Now let us concentrate our efforts on helping the most needy, the most vulnerable that we have in our entire society. We must think about those people, the unskilled, the poorly educated, the teens, the senior citizens.

I encourage all to vote for both amendments, the three en bloc and the one that will be voted on separately. As I understand, the vote will be the three first and then followed by the single amendment. I again appeal to all to consider the most needy, the most vulnerable in our entire society.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I believe that there has been a change in the Republican Party. In 1989, we had 382 votes in this House to increase the minimum wage, and we had President Bush sign the bill.

I have great admiration for the Members like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and others who have stood within their party and argued the case for a minimum wage, and I hope that many of them will vote against the Goodling amendment that exempts so many of these people from the minimum wage, because then I think we have a chance to pass a bill that will increase the minimum wage.

But this used to be a bipartisan issue. There was an understanding in our society that if you worked and you did what the society asks everyone to do, to work for a living, that you would be rewarded with a decent living wage. The Goodling amendment that exempts all these small businesses, in effect, repeals the minimum wage for millions of Americans. Why on God's green Earth would we want to do that?

The argument is that it loses jobs. How does increasing the minimum wage or having a minimum wage lose jobs? This argument has been made every time we have discussed this issue, and we have ever so often increased the minimum wage to keep up with inflation. It has not lost jobs.

Just think about it for a minute. Do you think anyone who gets the minimum wage does not immediately spend it on paying their bills? The money goes right back into the economy and we build the economy from the bottom up, not just from the top down. That person working in the short-order restaurant is going to pay their bills and buy meals in that restaurant, and pay their electric bill and pay their housing bill, and that money courses through the economy and creates economic activity and builds more jobs.

But putting that aside for a moment, do we ever want to get to a point in this country where we say one type of work should be paid 50 cents an hour and something else is more valuable? Look at the people that would be hurt under the Goodling amendment: Workers in manufacturing shops, insurance agency employees, employees of medical practices, security guards, garment workers, building maintenance workers.

Are we to say that somebody that carries around a bedpan in a hospital, cleaning up after people in the hospital, is not worth anything, that they have no meaning in their life; that only if you are a computer operator or an investment broker that you have meaning in this society? We have to honor work. We have to honor people's contribution to this society.

We had a woman here last week who held up the picture of her son, talked about her bills. She went through her bills.

She said, ''At the end of the month, I have no money for food.'' She said, ''I have to put a bill aside every month to pay for food for my children.'' She said, ''He got hurt in football practice, we wound up with an $1,000 bill.'' She said, ''I can't pay it, can't even think about paying it. So when the lawyers called, I told them you can't get something I don't have.''

Then she said a friend came to her and said, ''Go on welfare so you can get Medicaid.'' She said, ''I won't go on welfare. I want to work.''

That is what this is about. The majority leader has said he would fight this increase with every fiber in his being. Let me tell you, we will fight for this increase with every fiber in our being.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the Goodling amendment.

It was my hope that we would not turn the issue of raising the minimum wage into a political football. The weight of public opinion is squarely on the side of raising the minimum wage, but the Republican leadership of this body could not provide a clean bill.

Representative Goodling's amendment would eliminate the existing provision which requires employers of tipped employees to pay at least 50 percent of the statutory minimum wage in cash and replaces it with a provision which locks the cash wage at the current standard of $2.13 an hour. It would also deny any automatic future increases in the minimum wage to those who work and earn tips as a part of their income.

The amendment would strip the interstate commerce provision and allow all businesses with gross annual sales of $500,000 or less to not pay the minimum wage. This amendment would go beyond the pre-1989 exemption which exempted only employees of small retail/service establishments. This would remove a substantial number of previously protected low-wage workers such as those found in garment industry sweatshops, industrial homework, and farmworkers.

The amendment also eliminates the existing provision exempting certain computer professionals from requirements that they receive overtime pay. This would mean that no additional computer professionals will be protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act's time and one-half overtime requirements.

In my Houston, TX, district that would mean a real income drop for computer professionals who would no longer be subject to this protection.

This amendment would make permanent a failed experiment contained in the 1989 amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act that expired in 1993. Where employers were allowed on a temporary basis to pay a rate lower than the minimum wage. This change if widely used would create an incentive to displace older workers. Paying this lower wage to workers under age 20 for 90 days presumes that it must cost them less to live than you or me.

These subminimum wage workers will not get a corresponding break in the cost of livings. They will still have to care for their children and families just as they are required to do today. This change in the Fair Labor Standards Act would restrict these worker's

freedom to seek other employment opportunities that may be presented to them for fear of taking lower pay for a quarter of their first year of employment.

Some would argue that a raise in the minimum wage would result in high unemployment so the Goodling amendment is a good idea. If the proposal was more than a mere 90 cents divided between two years their might be some merit to that position. The real discussion should be about supporting those poor families that choose work over welfare.

The first step to moving people from poverty to selfsustainment is to raise the minimum wage for all workers with malice toward none.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, we just passed the minimum wage amendment and now my Republican colleagues want to take it away from the American worker.

The Goodling amendments are slick strategies to prevent 13 million workers from receiving the 90 cents increase.

These Republican amendments gut the spirit of the minimum wage increase by denying benefits to almost 10 million minimum wage workers in retail and service firms; and teenagers under the age of 20; additionally millions of hardworking waiters and waitresses will be exempted from the wage increase.

Furthermore, millions of additional minimum wage workers will be losers because according to the Labor Department estimates, over two-thirds of American firms will be exempted from paying the minimum wage under these amendments.

It is time the Gingrich Republicans stop playing games with the American worker and give them the full benefit of the minimum wage increase just passed by this a large majority of this House and which is supported by the American people who know workers need a raise.

Vote ''no'' on the Goodling amendment.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the proposed Goodling amendment. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Labor Standards Act has been the law of the land since 1938. The minimum wage, the 40-hour week, and the other provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act have improved the quality of life of American working families immeasurably. And yet, for nearly 60 years, the Republicans in Congress have attempted to fight off or roll back Federal laws and regulations that protect American workers. Today's initiative is just the latest in a series of Republican attacks on American working families.

Up to 10 million Americans could lose their right to earn a minimum wage under this amendment. This is unacceptable.

You can not live on the current minimum wage. You can not raise a family on it. You certainly can not escape poverty earning the minimum wage. Now the Republicans want to eliminate the modest protection that the minimum wage provides for some of the most disadvantaged members of our society—people who are trying to play by the rules, people who work hard, people who already work long hours in difficult jobs.

My Republican colleagues want to gut Federal safety net programs like welfare and Medicaid. They want to reduce eligibility for the earned income tax credit. And now they want to roll back the protection provided by the minimum wage.

I say to my Republican colleagues, the hardworking low-income people of the United States need your help—not the back of your hand. I ask my colleagues to reject this mean-spirited, misguided piece of legislation. Let us pass a clean minimum wage increase.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the question shall be divided between subsection (d) and the remainder of the new section proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question is on the first three subsections of the new section proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 188, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—239

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant

Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra
DeLay
Kingston
McNulty
Molinari
Ward

□ 1456

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the first three subsections of the amendment were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 193, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the recording of rollcall vote No. 193. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on subsection (d) of the new section proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is, is this the small business poison pill amendment that we are about to vote on?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would not interpret the amendment, but would say to the gentleman that the question is on adopting subsection (d) of the new section proposed by the amendment.

The question is on subsection (d) of the new section proposed by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question is taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 229, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—196

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—229

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Collins (MI)
DeLay
Deutsch
Kingston
McNulty
Molinari
Ward

□ 1516

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. DeLay for, with Mr. Deutsch against.

Mr. Kingston for, with Mr. Ward against.

So subsection (d) of the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 194, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the recording of rollcall vote No. 194. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 144, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—281

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute

Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Buyer
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cummings
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—144

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Franks (CT)
Funderburk
Gekas
Geren
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kim
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Montgomery
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quillen
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
White
Wicker
Wolf
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
DeLay
Deutsch
Hoke
Kingston
McNulty
Molinari
Ward

□ 1535

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Deutsch for, with Mr. DeLay against.
Mr. Ward for, with Mr. Kingston against.

Mr. PACKARD changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during the recording of rollcall vote No. 195. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 195, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide tax relief for small businesses, to protect jobs, to create opportunities, to increase the take home pay of workers, to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer owned vehicles, and to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate and to prevent job loss by providing flexibility to employers in complying with minimum wage and overtime requirements under that Act.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 440, the text of H.R. 1227 will be appended to the engrossment of H.R. 3448, and H.R. 1227 is laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2740

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2740.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I asked to speak for purposes of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the schedule for today and the remainder of the week and then next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded legislative business for the week. I am pleased to announce that Members are free to return home for the Memorial Day district work period. The district work period will continue through Monday, May 27, and Tuesday, the 28th. The House will return to business on Wednesday, May 29, at 2 p.m., for legislative business. Please note that we will not have any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on May 29.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday we will consider H.R. 3322, The Omnibus Civilian Science Act, the rule for which has already been adopted.

On Thursday, May 30, the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997, which of course will be subject to a rule.

Next week the House may also consider a privileged resolution from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that holds certain of the President's aides in contempt of Congress for refusing to turn over subpoenaed documents in the Travelgate investigation.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business by 2 p.m. on Friday of next week.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and wish him an enjoyable weekend.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and if I can just inquire, a couple of brief questions to my friend from Texas? We will have votes next Friday then, I take it from the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, we plan on having votes on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman care to inform us when he expects to go