help renew a commitment of the American people to oppose any and all instances of genocide.

□ 1800

ECONOMIC REPERCUSSIONS OF INCREASING MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on how we should increase wages of workers in this country and how we should not increase those wages.

The debate over the minimum wage is a debate really about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I would like to make three points:

First, historically it has been well noted by many economists, Frederich Bastiat pointed out in 1853 that a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services.

Now, what this minimum wage legislation will do is tell, for example, a senior that wants to work part-time at maybe a day-care center, and 48.5 percent of those receiving minimum wages are voluntary part-time workers, that she or he cannot work if the day-care center cannot afford to pay $5.15 per hour.

It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job and learn a skill if that employer cannot pay $5.15 per hour, and if his services are not worth that at the beginning of his employment, prior to training, then he will not have that opportunity.

Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor. So here is a Federal law saying you cannot work, you cannot sell your labor, for less than what the Federal Government mandates is a fair wage.

This is not consistent with a just society or the freedom of individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage is really going to harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in some workers being laid off. So the question is, are we going to pass a law that helps some, because some will benefit from an increase in minimum wage, while at the same time telling a few of those who are no longer going to be employed that they cannot be employed because the employer will not pay them the higher minimum wage that is contemplated to be established?

It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case.

This is just a quick effort to represent the supply and demand for the market for unskilled, entry level jobs. If you have the demand curve going down; in other words, the higher the wages, the less number are going to be employed, and so as the demand curves down to a lower wage and a greater number being employed, and likewise the supply is going to increase so the higher the wages the more people that are going to be looking for those jobs, you end up at the intersection with what is the equilibrium wage. If we raise the minimum wage higher, that means this change will represent that number of people that are going to no longer be employed.

It just makes sense that there are some people in our society at the beginning that will no longer be able to be employed if we raise the minimum wage up to $5.15 an hour. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working for the minimum wage. Increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities.

Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs.

Now, an increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by an estimated 2.2 billion, and those price increases will mostly affect poor people. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low wage industries, and who buys their goods in stores are certainly the poor people. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their businesses.

The way to increase wages is to cut the payroll taxes, cut the capital gains tax, balance the budget, make sure we do not have an increase in inflation, increase the skills of the future work force and current work force, and enact significant regulatory reform.

The debate over minimum wage is a debate about the fundamental principles of government and how our society is to be organized. Unfortunately, the debate has been framed in terms of politics rather than policy. In light of this, I'd like to make three points.

First, as Frederich Bastiat pointed out in 1853, a just government would not interfere in a person's right to contract with someone else for his or her labor services. What this minimum wage legislation will do is to tell the senior that wants to work part-time at the day care center, and 48.5 percent of minimum wage workers are voluntary part-time workers, that she cannot work if the day care center cannot afford to pay her $5.15 an hour. It says to the black teenager that he cannot try to get a first job, and the training that will go along with it, unless he can produce $5.15 per hour worth of services. Those who would support the minimum wage must hold the position that the government can tell you at what rate you can sell your labor services. This is not consistent with a just society of free individuals.

Second, an increase in the minimum wage will harm the poor. Increasing the minimum wage must result in workers being laid off and fewer job opportunities. It is just a matter of how many jobs will be lost. Assuming no job losses is equivalent to assuming a perfectly inelastic demand for unskilled labor, which clearly is not the case. Those that wish to increase the minimum wage assume that a majority of the Congress with the approval of the President may decide that those who lose their jobs, or are denied their first job, must suffer this in order to make others better off. But increasing the minimum wage will not make any dent in the poverty rate. Of the 23.5 million adults in poverty, just over 2 percent are working at minimum wage. And increasing the minimum wage will cost the unskilled their job opportunities. Professors Neumark and Wascher, in their paper in Industrial and Labor Relations Review, estimate a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage will destroy more than one-half million unskilled jobs. The unemployment rate among black teenage males is currently greater than 38 percent, while the national rate for adult males is 5 percent. Who is likely to suffer from the loss of low-skilled jobs?

An increase in the minimum wage of 90 cents will raise prices by $2.2 billion. This price rise will come about because some small businesses in competitive industries will go out of business or produce less. This decrease in supply will show up in the form of higher prices for the goods and services produced in low-wage industries. And who buys their goods at stores staffed by people making minimum wage? Who buys food at restaurants that hire first-time workers? The wealthy are not going to suffer from the higher prices. The wealthy are not going to lose their jobs or their business because of an increase in the minimum wage. But the poor, unskilled, job-seeker, and the small business owner on the edge of making it will suffer. How can we as a Congress claim that we can make the decision that these people must suffer in order for some other people to gain? It is time to admit that this increase in the minimum wage is an unjust interference of the Government in the lives of the working poor which will cause more harm than good.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Once again, I join my colleagues and Armenians around the world to honor over 1.5 million Armenians who were killed in this tragic event.

Like every human tragedy, we must retell this terrible story to our children to teach a lesson: Hatred and bigotry must not be tolerated. Instead, as our world grows smaller every day, we must learn to live together in a global village. We must discover and treasure the differences among peoples around

the world. We must promote tolerance and understanding. Only then will we have peace. When we remember the Armenian genocide we send a strong message to our global community that violence born of hatred and fear is unacceptable.

While reflecting on the tragedy that began in 1915, our thoughts inevitably turn to a present day tragedy: Bosnia. The world is just beginning to comprehend the atrocities that took place there. The international community is working tirelessly to piece this war torn country back together. However, like those lost in the Armenian genocide, no one can bring back the many precious lives that were lost for no valid reason in the Bosnian War.

I represent a large and active Armenian community in my district. They are hard working and proud of their heritage. As Representatives to the United States Congress, it is our duty to commemorate the Armenian genocide in the hope that future generations will never allow such a callous disregard for human rights to occur again.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 81ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1996 marks the 81st anniversary of one of the world's most tragic events—the genocide of the Armenian people by the Young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire. The genocidal process which began in the 1890's, came to a peak in 1915 when the Turkish government began a systematic and willful attempt to wipe out the Armenian population of Anatolia, their historic homeland.

The process continued in 1918 and 1920 when Turkish armies invaded the Armenian Republic in the Caucasus in a heartless attempt to eradicate the remnant of the Armenian people who had taken refuge in a newly freed homeland. The final act of genocide was committed in Smyrna in 1922 when the Turkish Nationalist armies burnt the beautiful coastal city on the Mediterranean and drove its Armenian and Greek population into the sea in full sight of American and other European warships.

In all, over 1.5 million Armenians perished and over 500,000 more were left homeless and driven into exile.

While the Sultan's government, that of Damat Ferit Pasha, directly after World War I held war crime trials and condemned to death the chief perpetrators of that heinous crime against humanity, the vast majority of the culpable were set free. From that day to the present, successive Turk governments have denied the Armenian Genocide and have attempted to spread doubt in the world community.

However, at the time, the United States had consular and embassy officials stationed in strategic locations in the Ottoman Empire and all these officials, including our Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau, reported the intent, the technique, and the results of Ottoman Turkey policy in detail to our own State Department. The records of these officials, demonstrate what the official records of all the European Powers revealed—including Turkey's allies Germany and Austria—that the genocide was a deliberate act on the part of the government to destroy a native ethnic and religious minority whose only crime was to be different.

All victims of man's inhumanity to man have the right to have their fate known and recorded. The survivors have the right to mourn the victims. And the world has the responsibility to see that the crime of genocide does not go unpunished, at the very least to the extent that the perpetrators are held up to universal opprobrium.

Genocide cannot be allowed to be a policy of state. A crime unpunished and unrepented is a crime which can and will be repeated. Even today, as I speak, the present Turkish Government is enforcing a blockade of Armenia blocking American humanitarian assistance from reaching that country. This aid, supported by this Congress, is prevented by the present government of Turkey from being transported to Armenia by land. Such a violation of fundamental principles of humane conduct cannot be allowed to continue.

This issue is not just an abstraction. Every year a substantial number of my constituents who I have known personally for many years, feel deep pain when April 24 comes about. A pain made worse by the fact that it is ignored by most media and the educated public. This is something that we must not let continue.

Take, for example, the Yessaian family, whose story is recorded in the book, ''Out of Turkey,'' which is distributed by Wayne State University Press. Only six members out of a family of 37 survived the Genocide, and of the six, four had left Turkey prior to the onslaught. One of these survivors is alive today and can recall the heart wrenching experience of seeing his mother and his relatives perish before his very eyes. He still experiences nightmares to this very day.

Suren Aprahamian, also a survivor, has written his memoirs ''From Van to Detroit: Surviving the Armenian Genocide,'' which were published in Ann Arbor, MI. He was among the few survivors of an extended family of over 40 and was forced to watch as old men, women, and other children died one by one due to hunger, thirst, slaughter, and exposure.

Hundreds of other tragic stories of survivors have been preserved on oral history tapes which are on file at the Armenian Research Center of the University of Michigan-Dearborn, directed by another of my constituents, Dr. Dennis R. Papazian. These hundreds of stories, recited by innocent victims, provide a human dimension to the chilling horror of this cataclysm.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are still many living survivors in my district. The memory of their tragedy still haunts them. They participate each year in commemoration ceremonies fighting against hope that the world will not forget their anguish. Fighting against hope that the present-day Turkish Government will show signs of remorse for a crime committed by their ancestors. Fighting against hope that the United States Government will again show signs of sympathy as it did in 1915–1920.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide is not just a footnote in history. It is something that many of my constituents feel very deeply about. It is an issue above politics and partisanship. It is a question of morality.

I am painfully aware of other recent and current acts of genocidal activities being carried on around the world. What began as an exception in the Armenian case, and which then shocked the civilized world, seems to be becoming almost commonplace. It is my belief that when governments are allowed to deny genocide with impunity, and its perpetrators escape punishment, it only encourages this dreadful virus to spread further in the international body politic.

Our Nation's strong support for human rights for all people is more important than ever as we witness the systematic extermination of innocent people caught up in ethnic and religious conflict.

We cannot let the Armenian Genocide be forgotten. To do so would be to doom future generations to the same curse. Only through remembering the past, and condemning genocide, can we stop such acts of hatred, cruelty and violence from happening again, again, and again.

□ 1815

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

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

SIEGE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.