Mr. WHITE. A loss of industry or a lack of industry rather because who wants to come and set up business in a place with no educated work force. It's not good for industry, it's not good for business and it's not good for the economy of Vermont.

Ms. BLACK. There there's the cycle that if industry doesn't come because there's not an educated work force, we don't have any incentive for out-of-state families to move in because they realize there's not a future for their children here and then there are even less people in which case there is less of a tax base to help pay for the higher education and less people that will stay.

Mr. WHITE. The University of Vermont, for example, even for an in-state student, as we said, charges more than SUNY at Stonybrook or any of the—U.C. Berkeley. It's very expensive for a Vermont student if they want to stay in state or go to UVM or Castleton or any of the number of state schools. It's just far too expensive, $7200 in tuition.

Ms. BLACK. In state and for students in the southern area of Vermont, North Adams State is almost closer than the University of Vermont and it's almost $2,000 less expensive for an out-of-stater from Vermont than in state in—in Vermont, so why would they stay?

Mr. WHITE. We're exporting basically our best and brightest out of state. In Europe, at least in Germany, they have a system where you can go for free but the only—the only—the drawback to that is you have to be in the top of the top of the top. Not everybody gets an opportunity to go on to university in some European countries.

Ms. BLACK. In the midwestern states there's both state and federal funding. Well, in every state there's both state and federal funding to public higher education, but in Vermont it's a lot lower. And if we had the process where the federal government would match state funds, it would give smaller states like Vermont more of an initiative to fund the higher education.

Anybody who has the ability should be able to go to their state university. I mean, not everybody could get into the top schools, but everybody should have the chance to go to a school for higher education because it's getting harder and harder to get a decent job where you can make any sort of a living without a college education.

Mr. LAFARGE. More and more people are going to college every year, but even people that get say a four-year degree aren't even going to make as high a wage as would be expected, so people who just go to high school are going to be left behind and may be stuck to factory jobs or, you know, just——

Mr. WHITE. The numbers, in fact, show the disparity between even a master's degree—a person with a master's and a person with a four-year degree and a person with a high school degree. It shows the disparity, the numbers which I don't have obviously, but there's a great disparity between the amount of money that each of those people would make.

Twenty percent of our budget is spent on defense. Well, it seems to me that since there are no real wars going on, and not to parrot what everyone else has said, but it seems as though really defense should—shold and could be cut.

Ms. BLACK. I think that even if it would mean raising income taxes and I know people are complaining that taxes are too high and that education is too expensive, but you've got to—you know, the public needs to understand the long-range effect of having education accessible because if they were willing to put up with a small increase in the income tax or the taxes that this money could be drawn from, then if people could go to college, they would—they could make more money and the economy would be increased as a whole and the property values would go up as a whole and in the long term that small increase would not seem as large.

Mr. WHITE. Plus it's cheaper to educate people and to have them get jobs than to support them on welfare or to support them in other ways when they can't find jobs down the line. It's a lot cheaper, it's a better investment.

Ms. BLACK. I think in fact that—I think taxes are high for everybody now and I think hopefully what this raising the taxes would do would be to give aid to the people who couldn't normally attend college and you'd—although I know people who don't have as high incomes don't feel like they want to be paying taxes, it seems as if it would benefit them the most if they could help—if everybody had their taxes raised a small amount, it would benefit them as well.

HONORING THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION, UNITED PARCEL SERVICE

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and dedication of the North Central Region of United Parcel Service in appreciation for their efforts to assist people in moving off of welfare and into positive work experiences.

United Parcel Service has demonstrated outstanding leadership as a private employer who seeks to employ and train individuals who need critical job skills to compete in today's job market.

United Parcel Service is one of the largest users of the Federal Work Opportunity Tax Credit program [WOTC]. The WOTC encourages private companies to seek and train individuals who are making the transition from welfare to work. In fact, for the 1997 year, UPS is on target to hire 861 employees in Illinois who qualify for the Federal program.

United Parcel Service's commitment and impact on the community is not only deserving of congressional recognition, but should serve as a model for others to follow.

At a time when our Nation's leaders are asking the people of this country to make serving their community a core value of citizenship, honoring United Parcel Service is both timely and appropriate.

I urge this body to identify and recognize other private employers in their communities who could also participate in the Work Opportunity Tax Credit Program as United Parcel Service has.

ELIMINATING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, for years certain National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] projects have attracted a great deal of controversy. Americans have been inundated with reports of grotesque live performances, blasphemous art exhibits, and obscene publications—all supported by taxpayer money. Regardless of the reforms Congress has tried to impose on the NEA, taxpayer money continues to filter down and fund controversial art. Now more than ever, we need to put an end to this inefficient cycle by admitting that the Federal Government has no business funding the arts and eliminate the NEA.

I support the arts and recognize their importance to our society. However, I believe it is our responsibility as citizens to keep it thriving on the local level. Yesterday, the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee voted to terminate the NEA. I believe that it is time to place a priority on balancing the budget and relieve the American family's crushing tax burden by eliminating the NEA and other inefficient Federal Programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the arts will continue to thrive without the existence of the NEA. Last year, more than $9 billion was spent on the arts in America by the private sector. The fiscal year 1997 NEA budget of $99.5 million represents only 1 percent of these private sector contributions.

interestingly enough, despite a 40-percent cut in Federal funds over the last 2 years, the arts industry is booming—attendance rates are up, employment in the arts is up, total receipts from performing arts is up. Yet American families, already overtaxed and threatened by looming Federal debt, were forced to pony up $99 million last year for the NEA.

Mr. Speaker, during its time of tight budgetary constraints, I encourage all of my colleagues to make a serious attempt to distinguish between essential and nonessential Government programs. The Federal Government should not be in the business of supporting the arts. The time to eliminate the NEA is now.

REPUBLICAN CHICKEN LITTLES

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, people talk frequently in this House about the need for accountability, but it is too often a case of Members here demanding that others be held accountable. A little self-accountability would go a very long way in this institution, and the recent article by Mark Shields on the minimum wage in the Saturday, June 14 issue of the Washington Post does a good deal to hold Members of Congress accountable for things they have said.

As Mr. Shields points out, when we debated the minimum wage in the previous Congress, many Republican Members predicted that an increase in the minimum wage would be an economic and social disaster. They could hardly have been more wrong. As Mr. Shields shows, while most Republicans opposed the increase in minimum wage and many of the Republican leaders predicted that increasing it would be disastrous, Republicans were wrong.

As Mr. Shields notes, directly contrary to the Republican predictions, which apparently grew organically out of their view of economic reality, today, with the increased minimum wage in effect for 8½ months, we see ''no adverse effect on the employment of young workers

* * * bigger paychecks and * * * a healthier national economy * * *.'' Of course the minimum wage did not cause all of this to happen, although it has played a significant role in the bigger paycheck part of this for people at the low end of the wage scale. But the fact that we are enjoying this continued economic boom, with increased employment at the lowest end of the wage scale, directly contradicts what the Republican Party made its official doctrine during the debate on the minimum wage, and Mr. Shields is right to document the glaring disparity between what they said and reality.

THE GOP'S CHICKEN LITTLES

(By Mark Shields)

When it comes to economic forecasting, conservative Republicans on Capitol Hill give a new respectability to astrology.

Consider the matter of the federal minimum wage. Last summer Congress voted to increase the minimum wage, effective last Oct. 1, from $4.25 an hour to $4.75 (it will rise again next Sept. 1 to $5.15 an hour). Democrats almost unanimously favored the increase, and Republicans almost unanimously opposed it.

But many Republicans did more than merely oppose the hike, they were prophets of doom and gloom: Chicken Little and Gloomy Gus rolled up into a single morose caucus.

House Republican Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) was his usual direct self in panning the increase: ''The Democrat party is to job creation what Dr. Kevorkian is to health care; a job-killer cloaked in kindness.'' A little less restrained was Rep. Jack Kingston (R-Ga.), who accused House Democrats, whom he referred to in floor debate as the ''comrades on the other side,'' of failing to understand that a minimum-wage increase would destroy jobs, adding, ''The folks over there are simply economically ignorant.''

But the Cassandra award belongs to Rep. John Shadegg (R-Ariz.), who declared: ''Raising the minimum wage will put one out of every four minority workers between the ages of 17 and 24 who are out of school and working out of work.''

What was being voted on then was a modest proposal that simply would guarantee that a worker in America who labors 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, would earn about what a member of Congress is paid every three weeks.

Republicans were wrong. The economy, almost eight months after the minimum-wage increase became law, is much better, not worse. The nation's unemployment is at its lowest point in 24 years. The proportion of the population with jobs is the highest in American history. The stock market continues to set new altitude records.

But what about the dire GOP predictions concerning lost jobs? Minimum-wage opponents emphasized that job losses would be heavy in the eating and drinking industry, where nearly one out of three private-sector minimum-wage earners is employed. In the first four months after the minimum wage was raised, employment in eating and drinking businesses grew at a rate four times faster than it had in the year before the increase.

And wait, there is still more good news for the workers this hike was intended to help. Teenage unemployment is measurably lower than where it stood just last September, before the wage increase. In a soon-to-be-released study, the Economic Policy Institute finds that not only has unemployment for teenagers and young adults not been adversely affected in the first eight months following the wage increase but that the benefits have primarily gone to low-income working families.

Minimum-wage workers, contradicting the myths spun by foes of the federal wage law, are not typically the spoiled stepson of the investment banker just picking up gas money for his BMW convertible. Instead, 35 percent of the workers who benefited from the increase are the sole breadwiners in their families. Three out of five of them are women. Seven out of 10 are 20 or older.

That's why it's encouraging to learn that the increase has had its biggest impact upon the earnings of black and Hispanic teens. The benefits of the wage increase have gone overwhelmingly to low-income working families. Nearly 56 percent of the families that have benefited from the wage increase are in the bottom 40 percent of American income.

With no adverse effect on the employment of young workers, with bigger paychecks and with a healthier national economy, about all that's left to say to those pessimistic, it's-five-minutes-to-midnight conservatives is, ''Cheer up, fellas, eventually things will get worse.''

GEORGE PATRICK MACRIS—GUAM'S SMALL BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of Dr. George Patrick Macris, recipient of the State Small Business Person of the Year Award. he was recently honored for his work as president of the Harmon Doctor's Clinic at a luncheon hosted by the U.S. Small Business Administration on June 3, 1997.

Dr. Macris holds a degree in zoology from Rutgers University and a medical degree from Rutgers University Medical School and New Jersey Medical School. He also served as a medical officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve for several years before settling down to private practice in Anchorage, AK.

Since 1991, Mr. Macris has been practicing in Harmon, Guam, where he operates the Harmon Doctor's Clinic, serves as commander in the Naval Reserve, and sits in numerous hospital committees. Moreover, he has been an advocate of health care reform and is currently the Governor appointed and elected chairman of the Guam Health Coordinating Council and a staff member at Guam Memorial Hospital and the U.S. Naval Hospital, Guam.

The Harmon Doctors' Clinic, for which Dr. Macris received his award, is a unique health care facility which provides comprehensive services to both health care professionals and patients. In 1996, it became a designated Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] Civil Surgeon Center and received Communicable Disease Control [CDC] vaccine approval—travel clinic. Currently, the clinic offers medical/health care services in general/internal medicine, diving/hyberbaric medicine, school physical, vaccination and travel clinic, cardiopulmonary diseases, urgent care, x-ray, OSHA/preventative medicine physical and laboratory. Moreover, Dr. Macris intends to expand services to include the only privately owned and operated decompression chamber and cancer treatment center. He has already received positive responses from the American Cancer Institute in establishing a cancer treatment center on Guam.

The clinic has also been successful administratively. It generated revenues in excess of $900,000 and anticipates a 12-percent growth in 1997. The patient base has also grown from 30 to over 11,000 member patients. The clinic employs 17 persons under the direction of Dr. Macris.

Again, I congratulate Dr. Macris for his outstanding leadership in the medical field. His exemplary service and innovative thinking are certainly assets to Guam. Not only have they garnered him recognition from the Small Business Administration, they have also won him Guam's respect and admiration.

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO CHINA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days from now, Members will be asked to vote on one of the toughest issues they will face this year—whether to renew China's most-favored-nation trade status.

I recently had sent to me a copy of a report of a study tour to China by a delegation of former Members of Congress.

I am taking the liberty of reprinting the summary section of this report in the RECORD, in the hope that it may be of some use to Members as they consider the issues involved in the MFN debate in the days ahead.

REPORT OF STUDY TOUR TO CHINA

A delegation of members of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress traveled to China during the period September 1–10, 1996 at the invitation of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National People's Congress. The trip included meetings in Beijing, Xian, Shanghai and Guilin. The delegation was led by the President of the Association, former Representative Louis Frey, Jr. (R–FL) and included: former Senator Daniel B. Brewster (D–MD); former Representatives John N. Erlenborn (R–IL), who is Treasurer of the Association; Beverly B. Byron (D–MD); Lawrence J. Hogan (R–MD); Elizabeth Holtzman (D–NY); John W. Jenrette, Jr. (D–SC); Philip E. Ruppe (R–MI); Richard T. Schulze (R–PA); Carlton R. Sickles (D–MD); and the Executive Director of the Association, Linda A. Reed. Also on the trip were: Marcia Frey; Judy Brewster; Kirk Walsh, husband of Beverly B. Bryon; Mary and Elizabeth Ruppe, daughters of Philip E. Ruppe; Nancy Schulze; and H. Thomas Collins, husband of Linda A. Reed. The members of the delegation paid their own international transportation costs; all expenses in China were covered by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Prior to the trip, members of the delegation received briefings from personnel in the Office of Chinese and Mongolian Affairs at the Department of State and staff of the House International Relations Committee, and had the opportunity to review hundreds of pages of background material on China prepared by the State Department, the Congressional Research Service and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations.

In Beijing, the delegation was given a welcoming banquet by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National People's Congress,