

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,