

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### A SALUTE TO BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me this February in celebrating Black History Month. I would like to take a moment to reflect on the courageous leadership and civic duty that has shaped the communities of New York throughout this decade. As we approach a new century, New Yorkers of all ethnic backgrounds will face a new set of economic, social, and political challenges. If we stop and recognize the perseverance of African-Americans in times of change, their record of commitment to the pursuit of prosperity, integrity, and opportunity for their families and friends speaks for itself.

The tireless work of community and religious leaders in guiding African-American communities have done much to improve the quality of life in our city. I am proud to honor this important occasion where African-Americans join hands to acknowledge their accomplishments and their unique contributions to our society and the world.

The level of civic participation in today's culture is depressingly low among average American citizens. However, I am always inspired by the surge of community spirit and leadership from African-Americans in New York. Our society would be a better place if more Americans emulated the civic duty and moral strength of their African-American counterparts. I hope that Black History Month is recognized and honored by citizens of all backgrounds. I honor the work and vision of my African-American colleagues in Congress and throughout New York. May our city continue to be blessed with their leadership.

### HONORING LIVERMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, Money Magazine is generally recognized as one of the most reliable financial guides in the country. That's why, when Money recognized the public schools in Livermore, CA as among the "100 Top Schools in Towns You Can Afford," America took notice.

Livermore is a lovely community situated amid rolling hills and farmland in central California's east bay region. Home of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore is committed to the community values that make for a high quality of life. It is not surprising to me that its school system would be cited for excellence.

Money set demanding criteria as the basis of its selections. Money said the school sys-

tems on its list are rated in the academic top 20 percent of all systems. Money also scored its "Top 100" in the context of housing affordability. In other words, Money combined high scholastic standards with community livability—and Livermore was one of the top 100 school systems out of 16,665 systems in the Nation to meet this stringent test.

It is an honor for me to recognize the parents, teachers, administrators, and students of the Livermore public school system for achieving this exceptional honor. I am proud to represent this remarkable group of people in Congress, and appreciate all they have done to make their schools and community the wonderful places they are.

### AUTISM SOCIETY OF AMERICA CELEBRATES NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Autism Society of America [ASA] in recognition of January as National Autism Awareness Month.

This has been a year of progress and achievement for the ASA. Last spring, in response to a request from Congress, the National Institutes of Health [NIH] held an Autism State-of-the-Science Conference. The conference brought researchers, clinicians and parents together in an effort to evaluate existing science and identify new areas for research.

The conference highlighted the fact that autism affects some 400,000 Americans. While the exact cause of autism is still unknown, conference participants agreed that, at least for some individuals with autism, there appears to be a genetic link—one that could very probably be identified with the work being conducted by the NIH National Center for Human Genome Research.

Undoubtedly the most important outcome of the conference was the conclusion that more research is desperately needed. Autism is a lifelong disability. Its social, emotional, and financial costs are staggering, ranging from \$30,000 to \$100,000 per year per person—millions of dollars for each individual over the course of a normal lifespan. These numbers speak to the need for more research on the possible causes of autism as well as medical, social, and behavioral interventions.

The ASA was the major force behind this conference. Backed by the strength and knowledge of its 18,000 parent members, the ASA has been the primary source of information and referral on autism and the largest collective voice representing the autism community. Founded over three decades ago, its members are now connected through a volunteer network of over 220 chapters in 48 States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Autism Society of America for its 30 years of service and in sharing in their celebration of National Autism Awareness Month.

### TIME TO CLARIFY THE ROLE OF CHURCHES IN THE POLITICAL SPHERE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with my colleague from New York, CHARLIE RANGEL, which will allow churches to carry on a minimal degree of grassroots lobbying and campaign activity without jeopardizing their tax exempt status.

The proposal can best be described in two parts, with the first part focusing on the grassroots lobbying activity of churches. Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code states that "no substantial part of [church] activities [can] consist of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

While this language clearly suggests that some such activity is acceptable, churches have had a hard time determining just exactly what level will pass muster with the Internal Revenue Service. Because of the verbiage "no substantial part," and varying court interpretations as to just exactly what "substantial" means, churches are very shy about engaging in any lobbying activity on issues at all because of the fear that they could lose their tax exempt status. In an effort to give churches a better idea of just exactly how much in the way of resources they can devote to grass roots lobbying, we have drafted a proposal which would give churches and the IRS a bright line test.

Working with legislative counsel, we have crafted a proposal which allows churches to continue to maintain their tax exempt status as long as they do not make lobbying expenditures in a taxable year "in excess of an amount equal to 20 percent of such organization's gross revenue for such year." This "20 percent rule" for lobbying activity parallels another provision in the Code for nonprofits (501(h)).

The second part of the proposal addresses church involvement in actual campaign activity. The Code currently states that churches cannot engage in "any political campaign on behalf of—or in opposition to—any candidate for public office." In other words, a church is prohibited from campaigning for or against a specific candidate.

The current language begs some questions. Is allowing a candidate to come into a church to speak from the pulpit or allowing a meeting of a candidate's volunteers in the church basement really something we want to prohibit? Shouldn't a certain minimal degree of activity be acceptable? Without getting into a

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

lengthy debate on the subject of separation of church and state, I do need to make some observations on that matter at this juncture. As a Ph.D. in American History, I have taken great pains to study our Constitution and the writings of the Founding Fathers. There is no question in my mind that the so-called wall erected to separate church and state was erected to prevent the state from interfering with the activities of the church—not to prevent the church from being involved in the activities of the state. In other words, it is my view that church involvement in the political process is not something that would have been frowned upon at all by the Founding Fathers. Indeed, I would imagine that they might be surprised if there were no such activity.

Frankly, plenty of churches on both the right and left currently allow such activity, and that fact raises the question of selective enforcement by the IRS. If the IRS decides to step up enforcement in this area, are we going to see some churches lose their tax exempt status simply because of a volunteer meeting in the church basement? Will we see a situation where, depending on the political party in power at the time, harassment of churches exclusively on the right or churches exclusively on the left? If the reality is that the IRS currently looks the other way when it comes to such minimal activity, putting a bright line test in law for such minimal activity will put everyone's mind at ease and would seem reasonable.

To address these concerns and questions, the second part of this bill states that it is acceptable for a church to devote up to 5 percent of the organization's gross revenues to campaign on behalf of—or in opposition to—any political campaign or candidate for public office. This would allow for the very limited and modest activities given as examples above.

Finally, I would note that the legislation contains an aggregate limit which states that both the grass roots lobbying activity and the campaign activity combined cannot exceed 20 percent of gross revenues.

It is my hope that this proposal will generate broad bipartisan support, and I encourage my colleagues to join us and cosponsor this legislation.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE CREW OF SPACE SHUTTLE "CHALLENGER"

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the seven crew members of the space shuttle *Challenger*. Ten years ago on January 28, 1986, these brave astronauts fell victim to one of our Nation's most horrific tragedies—the *Challenger* explosion. Indeed, human space exploration is and has always been inherently risky but this should not deter us from reaching for the stars or from exploring this new frontier.

Forty nine space shuttle missions have been successfully completed since 1986. The safety features of the space shuttle have improved substantially since the *Challenger* tragedy. It is possible, NASA officials believe, that if a similar accident happened today, crew members could escape with their own oxygen supply and parachutes.

A healthy shuttle program is fundamental to construction of the international space station—starting in late 1997, which will be the basis of further human exploration of Mars and beyond. NASA plans to launch 26 shuttle flights between 1997 and 2002 to help assemble this station. Additionally, a preliminary plan designed by NASA and the Russian Space Agency envisions using the space shuttle to deliver Russian hardware to resupply the orbiting Mir station. Therefore, the space shuttle program will be instrumental in the enhancement of international cooperation, the forerunner of world space. Furthermore, the reusable space shuttle is the way of the future for launching commercial and military satellites.

As one of the parents of the astronauts remarked, he was "pleased that the crew's footsteps were being followed" and "that their hopes and dreams are marching forward." On the 10th anniversary of this disaster, we must express support for the continuation of the space exploration mission in order to truly honor those seven brave explorers.

#### TRIBUTE TO GERARD KLUPP

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a lifelong friend and resident of Milwaukee, my hometown, Mr. Gerard Klupp, as he is honored as Person of the Year by the South Side Advancement Association at the 49th annual Lincoln Day banquet.

Jerry Klupp is devoted to his family, his God, and his Nation. He is the proud father of two children and grandfather of five and has served his parish, St. Adalbert's, in many capacities. Enlisting in the Air National Guard in 1949, Jerry was activated into the Air Force in 1951, and was honorably discharged in 1953 as a sergeant. He is currently active in his American Legion Post and the AMVETS.

Jerry Klupp is also a successful businessman. Working in his father's business, Frank J. Klupp & Sons, a construction firm, Jerry has had a personal, hands-on influence to many public and private projects, both big and small, in the Milwaukee area.

Many Milwaukee civic organizations have also been graced with Jerry's service over the years. Beneficiaries of Jerry's gifts of time and talents include the South Side Business Club, the Milwaukee Society—Polish National Alliance, the South Side Advancement Association, and Polish Fest.

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Klupp's dedication to his community should serve as an example to us all.

With all of this in mind, I am pleased to present Jerry Klupp with an American flag which has proudly flown over our Nation's Capitol. Keep up the good work, God Bless, and thanks for being a model citizen, Jerry.

#### TELEVISION VIOLENCE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday,

January 17, 1996 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### TELEVISION VIOLENCE

Most of us have seen something offensive on television—portrayals of casual sex, talk shows which glorify all the wrong values, or graphic violence. Adults can, and often do, turn off the set in disgust; but these images can be both powerful and confusing to children. While many parents try to closely monitor what their children watch, in this age of cable television they are frequently confounded by the proliferation of new programs.

TV has become a very strong competitor to families, schools, and other community institutions in shaping young people's attitudes and values about acceptable behavior. Television is cheap, accessible and convenient. Most research on the effects of television on children has centered on violent programming. Congress has also discussed a number of approaches to lessen TV violence.

#### RESEARCH

Virtually every American household has at least one television set, and children are among the most avid viewers. The average pre-schooler and school-aged child watches two to four hours of TV per day. By the time children finish elementary school, they have on average viewed 8,000 murders and over 100,000 additional acts of violence on television. A 1994 report analyzed ten television channels for 18 hours one day and found over 1,800 acts of violence—more than 10 violent scenes per hour, per channel, all day. But perhaps most disturbing is the finding that TV violence is most common on Saturday morning, when children are most likely to be watching.

No one believes that television by itself causes aggression, but research indicates convincingly that violent programming contributes to the problem. Most of the 1,000 or so studies on TV violence show that it can influence viewers of all ages and socioeconomic levels toward more violent and aggressive behavior. Watching the more violent shows can easily lead a person to develop an image of a mean world in which people cannot be trusted and in which violence is commonplace, even acceptable.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE

The public has increasingly demanded that broadcasters show more restraint, but progress was slow. The industry for many years denied that violent programming was harmful to children, and argued that restrictions could limit creativity and interfere with First Amendment protections on free speech. However, the four major television networks agreed in 1993 to place parental warnings on programs that might contain excessive violence. In early 1994, network and cable television executives agreed to have their programming independently monitored for two years.

Meanwhile, pressure for greater government involvement in limiting violent programming has also mounted. The federal government generally has imposed only limited restrictions on the content of television shows. The Supreme Court this month upheld federal regulations that ban indecent programming between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. However, this ban has usually been enforced against programming which is sexually explicit or contains vulgar language—not against violent programming.

Attention has recently focused on the so-called "V-chip," which would allow parents to block violent programming. Under this proposal, television programs would be rated much as movies are. These ratings would be electronically transmitted to the V-chip, a receptor inside the television set. Parents