

pain, they cannot sleep, work, or engage in family and social events. Pain is the No. 1 reason that individuals seek health care. Pain is a costly epidemic.

Until recently, pain management has been poorly understood and poorly treated. In recent years, great strides have been made in helping to reduce the toll of pain and suffering. Multidisciplinary organizations, such as the American Academy of Pain Management, have brought together the previously fragmented clinical disciplines and have raised standards for the delivery for pain management.

The American Academy of Pain Management is the largest society of learned clinicians in the United States concerned with pain management. The academy credentials multidisciplinary clinicians in pain management, utilizing rigorous screening steps which help assure that the public can find empathetic and knowledgeable pain management clinicians. In addition to board certification in pain management, the American Academy of Pain Management accredits pain programs, cosponsors the National Pain Data Bank, and conducts continuing education in pain management.

Because of dedicated organizations such as the American Academy of Pain Management, our ability to reduce pain and suffering is improving.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor and recognize the commitment of the multidisciplinary membership of the American Academy of Pain Management and their visionary leadership in providing quality care to so many people.

EMPLOYEE COMMUTING
FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. ENID GREENE

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1996

Ms. GREENE of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I share in the desire of many of my colleagues to help the working poor. However, I voted against the Riggs amendment to increase the minimum wage because I believe it will have negative consequences—particularly for those it portends to help.

First, I believe that increasing the minimum wage will result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of entry-level and low-wage jobs, which are needed not only by young people but also by those who are seeking to reenter the workforce.

Raising the minimum wage is a tax on an employer who is offering someone a job. It is not paid by all Americans, but only by those who seek to employ others. The natural result is that there will be fewer jobs available. Any freshman economics student knows that if you raise the price of something, in this case labor, then demand for it, in this case by employers, will fall.

History indisputably shows that raising the minimum wage costs jobs. In fact, since 1973, Congress has increased the minimum wage 9 times, over 2-year periods. In each case, except one, unemployment increased. The one exception was during the period 1977–79, when the economy was growing robustly at over 5 percent annually. We are not now enjoying such growth.

Second, I believe that increasing the minimum wage will have an inflationary effect, as widespread increases in wage costs necessitate higher prices for goods and services. According to the Progressive Policy Institute, 80 percent of the cost of an increased minimum wage are passed through to consumers in the form of higher prices.

This means that all workers who do not gain from an increase in the minimum wage will lose some of their buying power. This includes the very poorest of Americans, those without jobs on fixed incomes, who will see the value of their benefits diminish. Thus, the poorest of Americans, the unemployed, are in effect taxed to pay higher wages for union workers and those minimum wage workers who are able to keep their jobs.

Third, I believe that a higher minimum wage will be a barrier for individuals trying to move from welfare to work, because employers will refuse to hire inexperienced and/or low-skilled workers at even higher wages. Further, if the intent of those who would increase the minimum wage is to make working more attractive than welfare, their strategy is doomed to failure. The majority of welfare recipients receive a package of benefits that far exceeds the value of even a \$5.15 an hour job. In my own State of Utah, the pretax wage equivalent of welfare is \$9.42 an hour, or \$19,600 a year. Moreover, a recent University of Wisconsin study found that the average time on welfare among States that raised the minimum wage was 44 percent higher than in States that did not.

Instead of a minimum wage hike which carries such a negative consequences, I believe that the needs of the working poor would be better served by a more focused effort aimed at creating jobs and increasing take-home pay. Such a program would be consistent with my belief that reducing the tax burden on working Americans and expanding economic opportunity is the best way to win the war on poverty. It was for this reason that I supported the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act—first passed by the House in April 1995 and then again in November as part of the Balanced Budget Act that was subsequently vetoed by President Clinton. The Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act provisions offered tax relief to senior citizens, families, small business owners, and many others. It would have promoted savings and investment in business, and resulted in the creation of more than 1.5 million new jobs by the year 2000.

A number of plans have emerged that would assist the working poor without costing jobs, including our fiscal year 1997 budget resolution that would provide \$121 billion in net tax relief, fully funding a permanent \$500 per child tax credit, permanent capital gains tax relief, and other pro-job tax incentives.

Representatives TIM HUTCHINSON [R-AR] and CASS BALLENGER [R-NC] have introduced The Minimum Wage for Families Act which would change the earned income tax credit program from a yearly lump sum into monthly payments so it could serve as a supplement to a low wage salary. And Representative DAVID MCINTOSH [R-IN] has proposed that individuals making between \$4.25 and \$5.15 an hour be relieved from having any Social Security or Federal income taxes withheld from their paychecks, while still protecting the Social Security system and the retirement benefits of those workers.

These proposals, while imperfect, at least focus on the right goal: Increasing the take-home pay of working Americans while, promoting, not restricting, new job creation. We should build on these proposals to find a new approach to helping the working poor instead of fueling inflation and costing jobs.

The starting wage is the best paying on-the-job education and training program America has ever seen. Changing it doesn't make sense, particularly where there is overwhelming evidence that the effect of such a change would be to victimize the lowest-skilled workers in our society.

STATEMENT BY MATTHEW DOLE
REGARDING CENSORSHIP

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by Matthew Dole, a high school student from St. Johnsbury, VT. He was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

My name is Matthew Dole. I face censorship every day as I watch movies, try to read a book or even read the newspaper. All people have beliefs on what should be censored, but those should not infringe on others' choices. If you are to ban books, please do it [right], but don't force your opinions upon others.

Proponents of censorship base their argument on the First Amendment. They interpret their Freedom of Speech as freedom to ban books. The opponents also use the First Amendment as a major right, not to be infringed upon. They have the freedom of choice, choice to read or watch whatever they want. They say that the proponents do not have the right to physically remove the books from our libraries and school shelves. People against censorship see it as large government once again challenging the individual, as was done in 1919 with Prohibition, later repealed. They ask for more local control, at the most local in fact—individual decision.

In this, the era of political correctness, people challenge books on today's standards. They do not historicize texts, meaning they don't consider the time or circumstances under which it was written. I have with me today three books that have been banned. The first one is Mark Twain's, "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn." To historicize this book, it was written in 1884, as Twain lived in Mississippi, and he had previously fought as a Confederate in the Civil War. It was banned for racism, and the reason for that was the circumstances under which it was written. The second book is "Catcher in the Rye." This was banned for sexual scenes. I read this last year as a sophomore in high school as part of a Classic American Literature section. The third, and last, book is Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind." This book was again banned for racism, and the reason [is that] if it hadn't had racism in it, it wouldn't have been historically correct. It is a book about the Confederate South, once again; and it was also banned for one word.

As I've said, violence, racism and sex—three touchy, controversial subjects, are the most common reasons for book banning. Will banning the books make these issues disappear? I say, "No." They may, however,

help educate people on these issues. What we must do instead is educate our children early. We can teach them to have opinions, and teach them why they can't read that book, or why they shouldn't read that book. As time passes, they will be able to handle the issues, before being offended. Also, they will be able to personally ban books, TV with the V-chip and movies with the rating system.

There's no "cut and dried" solution to this. If a case in book banning or any other censorship were to reach the Supreme Court, they can interpret the First Amendment. Or if two-thirds of each House vote in Congress, they could rewrite the First Amendment more specifically. And on a more local level, if two-thirds of all state legislatures wanted to, they could call an actual Convention and rewrite it themselves.

Thank you for inviting me, and I hope something can be done on this issue.

Congressman Sanders: Thank you very much, Matthew. Matthew, let me ask you a question, because you have dealt with a very sensitive and controversial issue. So, here's my question: if at town meeting, or better yet a school board meeting, a parent gets up and says, "I read this book. It is vulgar, it has filthy words in it, it has ideas that I don't want my daughter to see; I want that book out of the library." You're a member of the school board—how do you respond to that?

Answer: Tell her that we can ban the book, in a sense, ban by putting it in, maybe, a section, like an adult section or a high school section. This happened at my old school, as a matter of fact, and they did not remove it from the library, and just put it in a separate section. What happened, was a 5th grader was basically in the high school section, reading this book. And I would ask them to educate . . . their kids, and I would ask the teachers also need to educate their kids on why they shouldn't read that book at that age.

Congressman Sanders: In your judgment, what is the danger of somebody defining a book and saying, "This book is terrible, I want it out." What are the long-term repercussions of that approach?

Answer: With these books that I've brought—these are classics, these are used in teaching. If we lose these books, we lose a valuable tool in teaching our youth.

Congressman Sanders: So what you're saying is that what may be vulgar for one person may be a work of art and a classic for somebody else.

Answer: That's right.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH MAY 21, 1996

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to observe Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and to recognize the many contributions Americans of Asian and Pacific ancestry have made to our Nation.

May was selected as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month because several significant events took place in May that impacted the Asian Pacific community, events such as: the first Japanese immigrants arrival to the United States—May 27, 1869; the Central Pacific Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad were joined at Promontory, UT, of which 90 percent of the track from Sacramento to Prom-

ontory was laid by Chinese workers—May 10, 1869; passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, the first U.S. immigration law to discriminate on the basis of race—May 8, 1882; and the Alien Land Law was signed in California prohibiting Asians from buying land—May 19, 1913.

America has been enriched by the many contributions and achievements of the Asian Pacific community. We have all benefited from their struggles, their labor, and their achievement. From the railroads and bridges that were built to the works of art, music, and literature, Asian Pacific American contributions to the United States have been innumerable. For example, the most visited monument in Washington DC, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, was designed by a Chinese-American, Maya Lin; the youngest person to win the French Tennis Open is Michael Chang; and the inventor of Playdoh is a Chinese-American.

In addition, Asian and Pacific Island Americans have fought and died in defense of our country. The most highly decorated infantry troop in our country during World War II was the 442d Infantry Battalion, a troop comprised entirely of Japanese-Americans.

Asian Pacific Americans' accomplishments not only symbolize our rich and diverse heritage, but also highlights shared ideals and unity in a common quest for freedom and dignity.

In the midst of extensive discrimination, both social and legislative, APA's have managed not only to survive, but to build communities and to carry on their rich heritage. Asian Pacific Americans have enriched our country's unique diversity and strengthened us as a Nation.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate May as Older Americans Month. This month is a special time to acknowledge the valuable contributions made by the senior citizens of this Nation, and to recognize their special needs. It is also a time to bring age-related issues to the forefront of America's attention. The population of this country is growing older at an unprecedented rate. By the year 2050, one in five Americans will be over 65 years of age. Older Americans Month gives us an opportunity to think about how we must plan to meet the needs of the rapidly growing number of our Nation's senior citizens.

At the forefront of the issues concerning older Americans is the current debate over the so-called reform of Medicare. Medicare currently provides over 90 percent of Americans over the age of 65 with quality health insurance benefits. There is no private insurance plan in the country that offers the wide range of benefits and affordable care that the Federal Medicare Program provides. Yet in their proposed budget plan, Republicans still want to cut \$167 billion in Medicare and \$72 billion in Medicaid. These cuts are unprecedented, and would have a devastating impact on today's older Americans, as well as destroying

the options of future retiring citizens. Seniors would be forced into private managed care programs which are proven to be more restrictive and make money by denying care. While essential Federal health care benefits will be sacrificed, these cuts are planned to provide tax breaks for the wealthy.

The Republican proposal would abandon the needs of older Americans rather than meet them. This month, and in the months to come, let us recognize the senior citizens of this country, not by cutting their benefits and threatening their future, but by giving them hope in maintaining their health and security.

STATEMENT BY ACACIA FANTO REGARDING THE FINANCING OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to have printed in the RECORD this statement by Acacia Fanto, a high school student from Brattleboro, VT, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

My name is Acacia Fanto, and my topic is property tax funding of public school education.

Primary funding of public school education through property tax is inherently unfair. There are huge differences in property wealth from district to district. Based on this funding system . . . unequal from one area to another. The amount of money spent on education is a significant factor in determining the quality of education. Money is necessary to hire good teachers, buy the latest textbooks, get the latest classroom equipment, and attract good administrators. Despite this, cuts are prevalent everywhere. The biggest cuts are in arts, extracurricular activities and technology.

If money is a significant factor of a good education, and money is the biggest variable from one public school to another, then education quality is not equal in this country. The differences from one district to another are astonishing. There are tremendous disparities based on where you live. The property tax funding system is making it difficult for many areas to meet even basic educational needs, at a time when more and more money is needed for special programs. We need these programs in schools to deal with the problems of today, such as violence, teen pregnancy and broken families. All these necessities take money away from academic programs.

Property tax funding of public school education is not only unfair, but also a regressive funding system, one that often turns homeowners against schools because they don't want, or can't afford, to have their property taxes raised. The property tax funding system is unfair, unequal and ineffective, so alternatives need to be sought. The Robin Hood plan shifts money from wealthy districts to poorer ones, to try to equalize funding. This plan turns the "haves" against the "have-nots," and injects race and class into the equity funding fight. A statewide property tax, or income tax, could turn the problem from a local funding issue to a state one. These solutions would decrease inequalities within a state, but not within the country.

An alternative to the property tax funding system which would provide consistency, and would eliminate the unfairness, inequalities, and the opposition between the "haves" and