

enough. Rob is always looking to improve his skills by attending extra sales training and industry workshops.

Rob has a positive attitude and a burning desire to succeed in a difficult industry known for high turnover.

Not only has Rob succeeded at WXYT, he has also been able to find time to serve as president of Michigan State University's business school alumni group. He also leads an annual MSU program called the Minorities in Communications Conference.

Rob David is a proven leader. He is a special person with a knack for success and the personality to go with it.

Congratulations Rob, and keep up the great work.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIONS CLUB OF NEWARK

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 75th Anniversary of The Lions Club of Newark. Friday, May 31, 1996, marks 75 years of continuous service and dedication to the community. The Lions Club is among the world's largest service organizations, working hard to live up to its time-tested motto, "We Serve." Since its inception in May of 1921, the Lions Club of Newark has been a credit to the national organization, providing invaluable services to the youth and the elderly. Through the years, the Lions Club of Newark has also provided constant support for causes benefiting the blind and the sight impaired in addition to numerous local and community charities. It gives me great pleasure to stand here today to applaud the Lions Club of Newark on this great moment in its decorated history.

In an age when people seem more concerned with getting ahead than they do with getting along, and hatred and violence litter our national headlines, it is refreshing and reassuring to take a moment to recognize and celebrate the works of the dedicated members of the Lions Club. They have accepted the challenge of creating a better community for the city of Newark with great courage and strength. Their commitment to the future leaders of our State and our Nation is reflected through the compassion and dedication with which they approach their work. This commitment is equally reflected in the revered Lions toast, "Not Above You, Not Beneath You, But With You."

It is with great pride that I stand before you to honor the valiant members of the Lions Club of Newark on this momentous occasion. For the past 75 years, the Lions Club of Newark has committed itself to charity and service for the good of the greater community. It is a beacon of hope during difficult times, and an inspiration to us all. On this 75th anniversary of the Lions Club of Newark, I stand before you to recognize and applaud the strength of the human spirit.

STATEMENT BY KYLE ANDERSON ON THE UN CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

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 Kyle Anderson, a high school student from Rutland, Vermont, who was speaking at my recent town meeting on issues facing young people.

My topic is the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and its applicability to us as citizens of the United States and for our children in this country.

The world that we live in today is one of waste, want and needless suffering. But in November of 1989, a dramatic step was taken to treat this. On November 20, 1989, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child, a treaty that focuses on the protection, survival, development and well-being of children.

Among the many rights which the Convention gives to children are the following: the right to health care services; the right to education; the right to protection against discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, etc.; the right to protection against abuse, neglect or injury; the right to a name and nationality; the right to express the child's views in matters affecting the child; the right to have the child's interests be a primary consideration in all proceedings concerning the child; the right to be protected from economic exploitation, or hazardous work; the right to be protected against torture, or other cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment; and the right to freedom of thought in conscience, religion and expression.

As an international goal it is certainly important; and immediately after it was drafted, over 100 nations signed it, and then ratified it, obligating themselves to nurture the children of their respective territories. The U.S. wasn't among the original signers, but signed the document on the 16th of February, 1995. But without ratification, the Convention lies dormant. The United States didn't, and still hasn't, fully recognized the importance of the document, or its applicability to us.

Let me show you what I mean. (set up overhead: Cents of the Absurd) Can everybody read that? . . . All right, it says the 1995 State of the World Children Report from UNICEF says that we need to kindle a sense of absurdity at the idea that the world cannot afford to meet the needs of all the world's children for adequate nutrition, basic health care, primary education and clean water. The following figures are offered as kindling: it shows that all we really need to provide basic care in nutrition, primary education, safe water and sanitation, and family planning, for all the children, would be \$34 billion. Now, if you look at what is spent, they give a few statistics, like \$85 billion/yr. is spent on wine, \$160 billion on beer, \$400 billion on cigarettes, \$250 billion on advertising, and \$800 billion on the military—that's worldwide.

For the U.S., (next overhead: Winners & Losers—Federal Spending) here we see a drastic decrease in spending on housing, health care services, employment and training, mass transit, Farmer's Home Administration, child nutrition, especially, and education. All of these things have decreased,

between 1980-1990, and military spending has increased 46%.

The fortunate and unfortunate kids of our age have recognized the need for greater action in the sector of children's well-being. Some of the things that youth has been doing are as follows:

Nov. 20, 1992, in Washington, D.C.—The National Committee on the Rights of the Child: Speaking Truth to Power;

May 4, 1992, at the Statehouse in Montpelier, VT—Rights of the Child Day;

Feb. 10-14, 1993, in New York City and Vermont—New York City and Vermont Student Homes Day;

Nov. 22, 1993, in Clarendon, VT—Youth in Action Conference: Children First;

June 13-19, 1993, in Vienna, Austria—Children's World Conference on Human Rights; and

April 29, 1995, in Montpelier, VT—Empowering Youth to Action.

In closing, I would like to reemphasize the importance of child development. This Convention is a great reminder of our obligation, and a helper in those situations where our priorities are trodden upon, in such areas as: the home, during war, or just all alone on the streets. The Convention will help, and will decrease the suffering. Thank you.

Congressman Sanders: Michael, thank you very much. I have some familiarity with that issue, because I introduced the Resolution in the House, trying to win support of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and Senator Leahy did the same in the Senate, so Vermont has a strong interest in this issue. In your judgment, why has the Congress not ratified the Treaty?

Answer: Well, I really don't know. I thought . . . when Bill Clinton came in, I thought that . . . he's an advocate for this thing, and I was wondering why it hadn't gotten ratified yet, but he needs the help of the Congress . . .

Congressman Sanders: Well, I think in fact, Clinton did sign it but the problem is, it doesn't go into effect until it is ratified, and the Senate has not ratified it. Are you familiar with some of the arguments that the opponents of the Treaty are making?

Answer: No.

Congressman Sanders: Okay. A lot of the arguments center around the fact that they think it would take away from the rights of American citizens, which is incorrect, and that the UN would have too much power over what goes on in the United States—those are some of the arguments that are being used. I think you've raised a very important issue, and I think that the chart, which shows the spending priorities, in our nation and in our world, is very important. And what you're suggesting, is that if we changed our priorities just a little bit, we could wipe our hunger among children, we could end the disgrace of having, in our own country, the highest rate of childhood poverty in the entire industrialized world. Okay, thank you very much for your presentation.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PAIN MANAGEMENT

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1996

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commemorate the emerging field of multidisciplinary pain management.

Millions of Americans suffer from the intractable chronic pain. These pain patients often find that, in addition to suffering unremitting

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,