

heritage. Highlights of the weekend include an African cultural, fashion, and talent show, and honorary awards dinner, and a posthumous dedication ceremony to distinguished family member Jesse Nathaniel Hunt.

I am especially pleased to commemorate the Winder family of Philadelphia, PA, who are serving as key organizers of this special event. Their dedication to their family and community is most impressive, and will certainly be evident in every activity this weekend.

The Washington-Bonapart family motto is: The family is the strongest institution in the world, and its preservation is essential to a prosperous future for all humankind. I could not agree more. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Washington-Bonapart family reunion, which I am certain will be a weekend to remember.

#### RECOGNIZING UNION CITY FOR ITS PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL NIGHT OUT

##### HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 1995*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Union City for its participation in National Night Out, 1995. On August 1, residents in this municipality of the 13th District will join fellow Americans across the country to create a night of celebration free from the fear of crime and drugs.

I wish also to pay tribute to the National Association of Town Watch in New Jersey for sponsoring the event. They have succeeded in developing community awareness within many American cities and towns by bringing concerned citizens to the forefront. Community leaders and law enforcement officers are joining them to send the message that crime will not be permitted to threaten our communities and dictate our lives.

I am proud to say I have dedicated citizens in my district creating safe neighborhoods through education and action. On this night Union City residents and law enforcement officers in participating cities will celebrate with a town-wide block party, contests, dances for community youth, concerts at various senior centers, safety demonstrations, and educational forums. These events are a continuation of past efforts whose full benefits will be felt for years to come in my district.

This admirable project is a nation-wide endeavor supported by over 8,000 communities throughout our 50 States. Their continuing aim is to focus America's attention on the alarming crime rates and the unacceptable level of drug abuse which has affected every community in our Nation. Police-citizen partnerships created by the efforts of these organizations have promoted cooperative crime prevention programs allowing Americans to come from behind their locked doors and join their neighbors in the fight for our Nation's safety.

The "12th Annual National Night Out" comes at a time when the leaders of our Nation are debating the appropriate methods of crime prevention here, in the Nation's Capital. But in Union City and in other communities around our great Nation, the people are taking a stand, defending their streets, their homes, and their families.

Union City officials are to be commended not only for their participation in National Night Out 1995 but also for their concern and their efforts. Their fight for safer communities gives me hope that America can build a crime and drug-free Nation for our children. I salute them today, thank them for their past efforts, and wish them luck in their future crime-fighting endeavors.

#### IN MEMORY OF EDWARD CHARLES BEDDINGFIELD, SR.

##### HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 1995*

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the sorrow of the people of Decatur and the 19th District at the passing of Mr. Edward C. Beddingfield. Ed's passing is a great loss to all that knew him, and the community he devoted his life to helping.

Ed worked for the Pontiac Division of General Motors for 11 years, and dreamed of one day owning his own automobile business. In 1989, Mr. Beddingfield's dream came true when he purchased a Buick dealership in Decatur, IL, and with much ambition and hard work, Edward turned his dealership into a thriving and successful business.

Mr. Speaker, Ed was involved in many things to help make his community a better place to work and live. He was a Millikin University Trustee, a Decatur sanitary district commissioner, and a pillar of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People. He also served as president of Webster-Cantrell Hall's board of directors and on the boards of the First National Bank and the Metro Decatur Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he touched the lives of many children throughout central Illinois through his work with the Y.M.C.A., the Boys Club & Girls Club, and the Decatur-Macon County Opportunities Corp.'s summer jobs program.

Mr. Ed Beddingfield was a true example of a public servant. Mr. Speaker, Ed Beddingfield will not be forgotten. His everlasting love, commitment, and dedication serves as a living monument to his family, friends, and neighbors. I want to take this opportunity to offer my condolences to all the people that knew and loved this fine man.

#### INTRODUCING THE PARENTAL CHOICE IN TELEVISION ACT OF 1995

##### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 1995*

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Representatives JIM MORAN, DAN BURTON, JOHN SPRATT, and I, along with a long list of bipartisan cosponsors from every region of the United States, are introducing the Parental Choice in Television Act of 1995.

We are introducing this bill with the intention of offering it as an amendment when the telecommunications bill comes to the House floor in July.

It is supported by a broad coalition of groups from the PTA to the AMA.

It is supported by 90 percent of the American public.

In short, its time has come.

In my view, there is no more compelling governmental interest in the United States today than providing families a healthy, safe environment in which to raise healthy, productive children.

The fact is that television is one of the most important influences on our children's lives. We might wish it were different, but that won't bring us back to the 1950's when children watched relatively little TV. Today they watch 4 to 7 hours every day. "Electronic teacher" for many children, but what it teaches to young children is scary. The average American child has seen 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence by the time he or she leaves elementary school.

Parents know what's going on. I have held six hearings over the last 2 years on the subject of children and televised violence. In every hearing I have heard both compelling testimony about the harmful effects of negative television on young children, and about the efforts of industry to reduce gratuitous violence. But parents don't care whether the violence is gratuitous or not. When you have young children in your home, you want to reduce all violence to a minimum.

That's why parents are not impressed with the temporary promises of broadcast executives to do better. Parents know that the good deeds of one are quickly undermined by the bad deeds of another.

The pattern is familiar. Parents plea for help in coping with the sheer volume and escalating graphics of TV violence and sexual material. Congress expresses concern. The industry screams "first amendment". The press says they're both right, calling on Congress to hold off and calling on industry to tone things down.

Meanwhile, parents get no help.

Until parents actually have the power to manage their own TV sets using blocking technology, parents will remain dependent on the values and programming choices of executives in Los Angeles and New York who, after all, are trying to maximize viewership, not meet the needs of parents.

In 1993, a USA Today survey found that 68 percent of its readers supported mandating the inclusion of V-chip technology in new TV sets. By 1996, a similar survey found that this number had risen to 90 percent.

Clearly the public is clamoring for solutions which make it easier to control their own TV sets.

That is why we in the House intend to move forward with the V-Chip.

We will give the industry a year to develop a ratings system and activate blocking technology on a voluntary basis, but if they fail to act, then the legislation will require the FCC to:

First, form an advisory committee, including parents and industry, to develop a ratings system to give parents advance warning of material that might be harmful to children;

Second, prescribe rules for transmitting those ratings to TV receivers, and

Third, require TV set manufacturers to include blocking technology in new TV sets so that parents can block programs that are rated, or block programs by time or by program.

We want both the House and the Senate on record as favoring this simple, first-amendment friendly, parent-friendly, child-friendly solution to this ongoing problem.

You will hear arguments from some that this technological way of dealing with the problem of TV violence is akin to "Big Brother." It's exactly the opposite. It's more like "Big Mother" and "Big Father." Parents take control.

And we know this technology works. In this country, the Electronics Industries Association has already developed standards for it. In Canada, a test in homes in Edmonton proved that it works and works well.

This is not a panacea. It will take some time for enough new sets to be purchased to have an impact on the Nielsen ratings and, therefore, an impact on advertisers. But its introduction in the cable world through set-top boxes is likely to be much more rapid. The cable industry has said that it is prepared to move forward with a V-chip approach as long as broadcasters move forward as well.

And the Electronic Industries Association has already agreed to introduce the technology into sets that would allow up to four levels of violence or sexual material to be rated.

Only the broadcasters have remained adamant in their opposition. They are opposed because the V-chip will work so well, not because it won't work. It will take only a small number of parents in key demographic groups using the V-chip to test the willingness of advertisers to support violent programming.

Parents will have the capacity to customize their own sets—to create their own private safe harbor—to protect their own children as they see fit.

I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative.

#### ELIMINATION OF THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

##### HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the elimination of funds for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Board is the primary Federal advocate for American Indian and Alaska Native art and its interconnected economic, cultural, social, and spiritual purposes. I feel strongly that the activities of the Board are in large part responsible for the explosion of interest in contemporary Native American arts and crafts in recent years, laying the ground work for long-term economic benefits to Indian tribes.

The Board is the only Federal program concerned with increasing the economic benefits of American Indian creative work. According to a 1985 Congressionally-mandated Commerce Department study, annual sales of Indian handicrafts and other artwork are over \$1 billion. Many producers reside on their own reservations, however American Indians and tribes control only a small portion of this market. The Board engages in a variety of promotional efforts to change that. For example, the Board's source directory publication is the primary means of establishing direct contact between consumers and Indian producers at

an annualized cost of \$50,000—this publication will end with the termination of the Board.

Federal expenditures for social programs continue to exceed investments for economic growth in Indian country. I feel strongly that the role of the Federal Government must be to encourage tribal self-sufficiency at every opportunity and to prioritize programs which enhance economic growth for tribal communities. Without the Board, the Federal Government will no longer have the capacity to provide economic development assistance for Indian art to the 554 federally-recognized tribes and their thousands of artists and crafts people.

Additionally, the Board has been charged by the Congress with developing regulations and administering, on an ongoing basis, the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-6440), which provides specific legal protection for Indian art producers. This congressional charge of responsibility reflects the unique expertise of the Board relative to marketing Indian arts and crafts. Abolishing the Board will deprive the Secretary of the Interior of the expertise necessary to fulfill this congressional mandate.

The Board maintains outstanding collections of contemporary and historic American Indian and Alaska Native art (23,000 objects), which are a multi-million dollar promotional asset and include over 50 percent of the artwork managed by the Department of the Interior nationwide. The Board's collection's will require continued management and protection and should not be hastily dispersed, as they include objects that some tribes consider sacred, as well as objects of cultural patrimony under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601). Although the board's collections are well cared for, management of museum property in general is currently identified as one of the most critical department material weaknesses under the Federal Financial Manager's Integrity Act. Abolishing the Board will add to, not diminish, this departmental material weakness.

Mr. Speaker, two thirds of these collections are located at the three Indian museums operated by the Board in reservation areas in Montana, Oklahoma, and my State of South Dakota. They are major economic, cultural and educational attractions in their regions. In Browning, MT, annual attendance at the Museum of the Plains Indians averages over 78,000. Annual attendance at the Southern Plains Indian Museum in Anadarko, OK, and the Sioux Indian Museum in Rapid City, SD, averages over 41,000. For \$600,000 per year, the Board maintains its collections and operates these three museums with contemporary exhibitions and sales of the work of emerging Indian artists. These museums, and the museum sales shops operated by local Indian organizations, will close their doors if funding for the Indian Arts and Crafts board is eliminated.

Closing the Sioux Indian Museum in South Dakota will have an especially adverse effect, as the city of Rapid City has just voted \$11,000,000 of local tax funds to build an innovative new museum facility which will include the Board's Sioux Indian Museum collection at no additional cost to the Federal Government. It would have a projected operating deficit of \$169,000 without the Board's continued financial participation in maintaining the Board's own collection. That level of operating deficit will undermine Rapid City's plans to raise \$1.6 million in additional capital from

private foundations required to complete the project, which is expected to attract at least 182,000 annual visitors and to generate a direct spending impact of \$3.6 million annually on the regional economy.

There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota, whose members collectively make up one of the largest native American populations in any State. At the same time, South Dakota has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries. While the elimination of the Board would be a direct blow to the encouragement and development of native American arts and crafts in South Dakota as a sound source for economic growth, I believe the repercussions of the board's termination will be felt nationwide.

#### THE B-2: A PERFECT WEAPON FOR THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD

##### HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Charles Krauthammer that appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post.

I believe that Mr. Krauthammer presents cogent and powerful arguments for continued production of B-2 bombers. He points out that only the B-2, with its long range, can deploy from secure U.S. bases on short notice and is invulnerable to enemy counterattack. It is the kind of weapon the United States needs for the post-cold war world.

I recommend Mr. Krauthammer's article to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1995]

THE B-2 AND THE "CHEAP HAWKS"

(By Charles Krauthammer)

We hear endless blather about how new and complicated the post-Cold War world is. Hence the endless confusion about what weapons to build, forces to deploy, contingency to anticipate. But there are three simple, glaringly obvious facts about this new era:

(1) America is coming home. The day of the overseas base is over. In 1960, the United States had 90 major Air Force bases overseas. Today, we have 17. Decolonization is one reason. Newly emerging countries like the Philippines do not want the kind of Big Brother domination that comes with facilities like Clark Air Base and Subic Bay. The other reason has to do with us: With the Soviets gone, we do not want the huge expense of maintaining a far-flung, global military establishment.

(2) America cannot endure casualties. It is inconceivable that the United States, or any other Western country, could ever again fight a war of attrition like Korea or Vietnam. One reason is the CNN effect. TV brings home the reality of battle with a graphic immediacy unprecedented in human history. The other reason, as strategist Edward Luttwak has pointed out, is demographic: Advanced industrial countries have very small families, and small families are less willing than the large families of the past to risk their only children in combat.

(3) America's next war will be a surprise. Nothing new here. Our last one was too. Who expected Saddam to invade Kuwait? And even after he did, who really expected the