wealthy, those who are in the upper-income brackets. They must receive huge tax breaks.

Ordinary families say, well, that does not sound too fair. If you look back over the last 20 years, we have not had any increase in the wages, those of us in the bottom 60 percentile or 70 percentile of wages in this country, people making $20,000 and $30,000 and $40,000 a year.

So if there are going to be tax breaks given out, the tax breaks should not be given out to the wealthy. We should get the tax breaks, so we can educate our children in high school and grammar school and in college. That is where the tax breaks should go, not to the wealthy.

And if you are going to cut programs, you cannot cut Medicare part B and make Grandma pay an extra $400 a year when she only makes $13,000 a year on average; all of the elderly, senior, retired women, when at the same time you are not going to touch the timber subsidies and the mining subsidies and the grazing subsidies, et cetera, et cetera, that the big business interests get. It has got to be fair.

Grandma or Grandpa, they do not mind sacrificing. God knows, they do not mind sacrificing. They took us through the Depression, they took us through World War II, and they built us into the greatest country in the world in the 1950's and the 1960's, so they do not mind sacrificing. They have sacrificed their whole lives. What they want is fairness. The tax breaks cannot go to the wealthy. The tax breaks have to go to people who can educate their kids. The programs that get cut cannot be for the elderly: Medicare, Medicaid. The programs have to be grazing subsidies and timber subsidies and Star Wars and all the rest of these crazy programs that should not be given Federal subsidies anymore. That is the only fair way of doing it.

The Republicans say, do not worry about it, because if you balance the budget by the year 2000, interest rates are going down 2 points and the oil, the water of prosperity, will flow evenly across all of those in this great country, and we will not have to do anything else for ordinary working people. The reality is that it has not flowed that way for the last 15 years, since Reaganomics began.

We have seen this distortion in terms of who are the beneficiaries of the wealth in our country. The rich are getting richer and the rest are just paying taxes. That is how this system has wound up in this country. Ordinary people are the ones who are afraid that their jobs are not going to produce the income they need for their families.

The fallacy in the Republican argument that interest rates are automatically going down two points—and by the way, the Democrats would wish that that would be the case, too, because we support a balanced budget, just as much as the Republicans do now—is that there is a doctrine. It is called NAIRU. It is called the non-accelerating inflationary rate of unemployment, the non-accelerating inflationary rate of unemployment. That means that the rate of unemployment, once it goes below a certain point, and, for these purposes below about 5.5 percent, about 6 to 8 million Americans unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I will return at a later date to continue my discourse on this subject.

IN HONOR OF MARY BETH BLEGEN, TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a resident of my district, Mary Beth Blegen. She was honored by President Clinton with the National Teacher of the Year Award. This type of recognition is not new to Mary Beth. She has been honored before by the accolades of her community and the success of her students.

Mary Beth lives and teaches in my hometown of Worthington, MN, where she has also written an occasional column for the local paper. On several of these occasions, others in my district have sent me copies of these columns for my benefit and instruction.

I remember one in particular that provided good hometown advice from the local coffee shop on how to balance the budget and dispense with the politics that so often contaminate the process. The restaurant, after all, is a repository of much wisdom in our society, and Worthington is typical of small communities with such restaurants in rural America. Unfortunately, we did not take all of the advice from the restaurant, and our balanced budget has not yet been accomplished.

Mary Beth graciously accepted the Teacher of the Year Award this afternoon in a typical fashion, downplaying her achievement by recognizing the dedication and skill of teachers throughout America. She states that she accepted the award for all of her fellow teachers who are committed to their profession and their students.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that you and other Members of this body join me in congratulating Mary Beth Belgen of Worthington, MN, as National Teacher of the Year. Also join me in congratulating the teachers from the other States throughout the country that were named teachers of the year in their respective areas, and finally, let all of us join in acknowledging that there are thousands, tens of thousands of teachers throughout this Nation who are not being recognized today except by the students whose lives they enrich and whose lives are so important, and education is so important to the future of our Nation.

A DIALOG ON INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is to engage in this effort tonight to have a dialog, if you will, and discussion with several of my colleagues to talk about the minimum wage. I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN], and thank him for participating with us tonight. I would ask him to just kick off this effort tonight for us.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mr. DELAURO], for organizing this very special order on the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I join a number of our colleagues tonight in support of an increase in the minimum wage. Since the President proposed increasing the minimum wage to 5.15 over 2 years, a river of ink has flowed on both sides for this issue. According to the latest national poll, 87 percent of Americans favor an increase in the minimum wage. Howver, some of my colleague in the Republican Party continue to oppose a minimum wage increase, and they even oppose the minimum wage.

In fact, I may have taken the gentlewoman's poster, because this is such a great quote: ''Emotional appeals about working families trying to get by on $4.25 an hour are hard to resist. Fortunately, such families don't really exist.'' That is why my colleague and a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TOM DELAY], I want him to know that I have these families in my district that are trying to get by on $4.25 an hour tonight, Maybe that is our problem. Maybe they have lost touch with what is actually happening out in America, with families trying to get by on $4.25 an hour. There ar families that are trying to do that, and it is a shame that maybe some of our colleagues in Washington do not understand that.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to argue that an increase may lead to higher unemployment and increase the number of welfare recipients. Mr. Speaker, the logic of this just does not match. Ask anybody on the street if increasing the minimum wage will increase welfare recipients. Mr. Speaker, the best welfare reform we can pass is a job that pays a decent wage to get people off welfare.

Additionally, some of these same critics claim that the minimum wage is paid mainly to teenagers, and that an increase would cause layoffs of these teenagers. Americans know that the real value of the minimum wage has steadily declined for the past 15 years, and that minimum wage earners have not seen an increase since April 1, 1991. Fifty-seven years ago Congress