

collecting penalties than in getting things fixed. In fact these are his words exactly, when he dressed up like someone sympathetic to small business:

Enforcers will be given authority to waive up to 100 percent of punitive fines for small businesses so that a business person who acts in good faith can put his energy into fixing the problem, not fighting with the regulator. In other words, if they want to spend the fine money fixing the problem, better they should keep it and fix the problem than give it to the Government.

But now the President is wearing another costume. It's his reelection costume, and it's paid for by people who don't want regulatory reform and who could care less about small business. And now the President has not only forgotten what he said when he was wearing that regulatory reformer costume, he's actually opposing what he said.

Take a look at what the Clinton administration is saying on the small business OSHA reform bill. We put his regulatory reforms for small business into a bill, House Report 3234, and now the administration is getting ready to oppose the very proposals it made when the President was wearing the small business costume.

Mr. Speaker, costume changers are great entertainment. But we don't need any more of a costume President.

MINIMUM WAGE AT 40-YEAR LOW; AMERICANS NEED A RAISE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, America need a raise. With the minimum wage at a 40-year low, America needs a raise. But our Republican colleagues, when the housing bill was up, instead of giving us a minimum wage increase they raised rents. And last week, when the wilderness bill was up, instead of giving us a raise in wages, they raised the number of acres that could be exploited with reference to the environment.

Now we reach today and we get another vote on the minimum wage, but what do our Republican colleagues propose? Instead of a real raise that working people can feel in their pocketbooks, they propose to raise the exclusion, exclude more workers from the basic fundamental protection of the minimum wage.

It seems to me these Gingrich-ites do not know up from down. American workers need to go up. They need to be empowered by an increase in the minimum wage, not be excluded from the basic fundamental protection and the sweatshops of getting any minimum wage at all.

Let us reject this Gingrich-ite proposal to exclude more American working families, and let us empower them with a real increase in the minimum wage.

INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE SHACKLES JOB OPPORTUNITIES

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas starts again the endless litany of bromides and class warfare. The fact is we can create jobs in this economy if we free those who create jobs to have more. What we do when we try to take the Government and say, "You will do this or you will do that, Mr. Employer," is we shackle the very job opportunities that my friend from Texas purports to give honest working men and women.

It comes down to this basic premise, and it is one of fairness: Do we empower all in this country to achieve all they can achieve; or would we have Government, through capricious action, tell those who create jobs, "No, you are not entitled to create any more jobs; no, we are going to say to you we are going to penalize you for trying to create job opportunities, and instead it will be the Government who decides who giveth and, of course, the Government who, obviously, taketh away," with historic tax increases from this liberal side of the aisle and their liberal friends at the end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

REPUBLICAN PLAN WOULD EXCLUDE MORE WORKERS FROM MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am sometimes asked what does it mean to be a Democrat, and what it means to be a Democrat is that you care about working people and their concerns and whether they are going to be able to earn a decent wage. That is what this vote is all about today.

All of a sudden the Republican leadership is forced to bring up a vote on the minimum wage, but instead of bringing it up in a clean fashion, what they are really doing is repealing it and making it so that a lot of people right now, who would be getting a minimum wage, even at the low amount that it is, are going to be not eligible, unfortunately, for the minimum wage.

So instead of bringing up a clean bill, where the minimum wage is increased and people have a decent wage, now we see the Republican leadership actually trying to repeal the minimum wage. That is what they are all about.

Just like they talked about repealing Medicare or letting it wither on the vine, now they want to let the minimum wage wither on the vine because they do not care about working people.

I heard what my colleague from Arizona just said. He is against the minimum wage, and that is what is going to happen here today. They are going to

bring up a vote and use it as an excuse instead of raising the minimum wage to eliminate something like 3 to 7 million Americans from having any treatment and getting any minimum wage.

GOODLING AMENDMENT PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY WAGE FOR LOW- SKILLED ENTRY-LEVEL WORKERS

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, we are going to get our first vote on raising the minimum wage today. I am going to vote for it.

I have been concerned that legislation with good motives can have adverse consequences, so I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Goodling amendment. It takes into consideration some specific things that we ought to look at.

Computer experts should not be paid 6.5 times more and then get a raise in their minimum wage. Restaurant workers do get tips. It takes into account that. But I and other people have been concerned about the loss of jobs for low-skilled workers, so, at my suggestion and others', the leadership has included in the Goodling amendment an opportunity wage.

The opportunity wage will encourage hiring of low-skilled entry-level workers by firms while maintaining the protections of the current minimum wage for a short period of time. This amendment is geared to blunt the impact of projected increases on low-skilled workers. The Goodling amendment is a good one. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

IRS IS DOWNRIGHT PETTY

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, at times the IRS is not only arrogant and disgusting, they are downright petty. Check this out.

Louise and Harvey Phillips of Deltona, FL, got a demand letter from the IRS. The letter said, "You owe us money; and if you don't pay in 10 days, we will take legal action against you."

The Phillips' just got tired of the drag, so they wrote a check, ladies and gentlemen, for the entire amount. One red cent. The Phillips then asked, "Why are you so petty?" And the IRS said, "That's none of your business. You will get an answer in 8 weeks."

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. No wonder the American people are taxed off. I think the Congress of the United States of America should tell the IRS to shove that Phillips penny right up their software. I think we should also tell them that the Phillips' of Deltona, FL, just happen to be their boss.

Think about it. Yield back the balance of this 32 cent stamp for a 1 penny settlement with the IRS.