

more wisely and prudently than through the proposals that have been announced by the President, popular as they are.

I ask that the Gladieux and Reischauer item be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post]

HIGHER TUITION, MORE GRADE INFLATION  
(By Lawrence E. Gladieux and Robert D. Reischauer)

More than any president since Lyndon Johnson, Bill Clinton has linked his presidency to strengthening and broadening American education. He has argued persuasively that the nation needs to increase its investment in education to spur economic growth, expand opportunity and reduce growing income disparities. He has certainly earned the right to try to make education work for him as an issue in his reelection campaign, and that's clearly what he plans to do.

Unfortunately, one way the president has chosen to pursue his goals for education is by competing with the GOP on tax cuts. The centerpiece of his education agenda—tax breaks for families paying college tuition—would be bad tax policy and worse education policy. While tuition tax relief may be wildly popular with voters and leave Republicans speechless, it won't achieve the president's worthy objectives for education, won't help those most in need and will create more problems than it solves.

Under the president's plan, families could choose to deduct up to \$10,000 in tuition from their taxable income or take a tax credit (a direct offset against federal income tax) of \$1,500 for the first year of undergraduate education or training. The credit would be available for a second year if the student maintains a B average.

The vast majority of taxpayers who incur tuition expenses—joint filers with incomes up to \$100,000 and single filers up to \$70,000—would be eligible for these tax breaks. But before the nation invests the \$43 billion that the administration says this plan will cost over the next six years, the public should demand that policy makers answer these questions:

Will tuition tax credit and deductions boost postsecondary enrollment? Not significantly. Most of the benefits would go to families of students who would have attended college anyway. For them, it will be a windfall. That won't lift the country's net investment in education or widen opportunities for higher education. For families who don't have quite enough to send their child to college, the tax relief may come too late to make a difference. While those families could adjust their payroll withholding, most won't. Thus any relief would be realized in year-end tax refunds, long after families needed the money to pay the tuition.

Will they help moderate- and low-income students who have the most difficulty meeting tuition costs? A tax deduction would be of no use to those without taxable income. On the other hand, the proposed \$1,500 tax credit—because it would be "refundable"—would benefit even students and families that owe no taxes. But nearly 4 million low-income students would largely be excluded from the tax credit because they receive Pell Grants which, under the Clinton plan, would be subtracted from their tax-credit eligibility.

Will the plan lead to greater federal intrusion into higher education? The Internal Revenue Service would have to certify the amount of tuition students actually paid, the size of their Pell Grants and whether they maintained B averages. This could impose complex regulatory burdens on universities and further complicate the tax code.

It's no wonder the Treasury Department has long resisted proposals for tuition tax breaks.

Will the program encourage still higher tuition levels and more grade inflation? While the tuition spiral may be moderating slightly, college price increases have averaged more than twice the rate of inflation during the 1990s. With the vast majority of students receiving tax relief, colleges might have less incentive to hold down their tuition increases. Grades, which have been rising almost as rapidly as tuition, might get an extra boost too if professors hesitate to deny their students the B needed to renew the tax credit.

If more than \$40 billion in new resources really can be found to expand access to higher education, is this the best way to invest it? A far better alternative to tuition tax schemes is need-based student financial aid. The existing aid program, imperfect as they may be, are a much more effective way to equalize educational opportunity and increase enrollment rates. More than \$40 billion could go a long way toward restoring the purchasing power of Pell Grants and other proven programs, whose benefits inflation has eroded by as much as 50 percent during the past 15 years. Unlike tuition tax cuts, expanded need-based aid would not drag the IRS into the process of delivering educational benefits. Need-based aid also is less likely to increase inflationary pressure on college prices, because such aid goes to only a portion of the college-going population.

Economists have long argued that the tax code shouldn't be used if the same objective can be met through a direct-expenditure program. Tax incentives for college savings might make sense; parents seem to need more encouragement to put money away for their children's education. But tax relief for current tuition expenditures fails the test.

Maybe Clinton's tuition tax-relief plan, like the Republican across-the-board tax-cut proposals, can be chalked up to election-year pandering that will be forgotten after November. But oft-repeated campaign themes sometimes make it into the policy stream. That was the case in 1992, when candidate Clinton promised student-loan reform and community service that, as president, he turned into constructive initiatives. If re-elected, Clinton again may stick with his campaign mantra. This time, it's tuition tax breaks. This time, he shouldn't. ●

#### HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR THE VILLAGE . . .

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we are hearing a great deal of talk about whether a family should save a child or whether a village should save a child. Obviously, we all should be doing what we can to save children.

The morning after the Democratic convention, I picked up the Chicago Tribune and read one person's moving story. Her name is Bunnie Reidel. I have never met her, but sometime I hope to have the honor of meeting her.

She tells a story that is important for all Americans to hear.

I ask that her story be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR THE VILLAGE . . .

(By Bunnie Reidel)

These days the word "village" makes Republicans hiss and sneer and makes Democrats cheer wildly. Maybe it's because *village* has become the rallying cry for Republican-backed "parental rights" laws. Or maybe because the word is Afrocentric, as is the context from which "It takes a village to raise

a child" is lifted. I don't know. I am sure, however, that parental rights proposals send chills down my spine and if it hadn't been for that much-maligned village, I would not be who I am today. In fact, I'd most likely be dead.

My youth was a living hell at best. I have the distinction of having had not one, but two mothers who were total failures.

My first mother was my biological mother. She became an itinerant farm worker, alcoholic, and finally, murder victim. I was her 12th child and there were three more to follow me. She left the Ozarks of Missouri while she was pregnant with me, with my older sister at her side, stopping just long enough in Tulsa to have me and then move on to California. There she worked the fields, lived off the kindness of loser men and drank her once attractive self into complete ruin. When I was two, she became pregnant again and decided to give me (not my sister or the new baby) up for adoption to her two landlords. I didn't see my older sister, Debra, for another 20 years and I met the original 10 children (left behind in Missouri) 10 years after that.

My second mother, Naomi, thought of herself as being completely antithetical to the first and in many ways she was. She provided a home, clothes, great cooking and regular church attendance. I can count the number of times she hugged me on one hand and count even fewer times she told me she loved me. Our home looked fine from without but was a nightmare within. My father died when I was 8 and Naomi conveniently forgot his admonition that she was not to hit me. So hit me she did. With belts, coat hangers, kicks, hair and ear-pulling, Naomi was determined to beat the hell out of me.

But more than the beatings, I'll never forget the things she said: "You'll never amount to anything," "You're so stupid," "Sometimes I would like to kill you." These verbal tirades were almost worse than the physical beatings because they would last for hours. I'll never forget the time I had a girlfriend spending the night and my mother woke me up at 4 a.m. and railed on me until 7. My friend will never forget it either. Even now, after 25 years, my old friend mentions that episode every time we see each other.

For me, and for so many children like me, the village became our lifesaver. I would leave the house in the morning with swollen, red eyes (from crying myself to sleep the night before) and find haven for a few hours a day with adults who were actually kind, helpful and praised my accomplishments. School was my salvation. It was the teachers I encountered at public school who gave me a glimpse of what life could actually be like. In that glimpse, I saw a world beyond my mother's house, full of wonder and unafraid of inquiry. It was a world where discipline was administered with dignity and self-esteem was valued. Mrs. Nyberg, Mr. Woody, Mrs. Papadakis, Mr. Pessano, Mr. McDonald and Mrs. Edwards were people who broadened my horizons with ideas and information that were unattainable at home. They were people who gave me something to hold onto throughout those dark, ugly days and none of them knew that.

In my neighborhood, there were other examples of caring adults. My Girl Scout leader thought I had a keen, interesting mind and she told me so. The German woman down the street (with the six kids) taught me how to do the twist and offered me graham crackers and hot chocolate. My friend's aunt spent hours with me as I entered my teen years, talking to me like I was really a human being.

I used every excuse I could to go out into the village. I was active in after-school activities and clubs. I began working at 13. I

went away to church camp. I excelled in drama, journalism and forensics. These are the things that kept me from drowning myself in drugs or alcohol. These people and activities kept me from killing myself that one awful night when I was 16 and I had reached the end of my rope. These people and activities gave me the courage to pack a bag and leave home at 17, two weeks before I was ready to start my first semester at the university my mother insisted I could not go to, even though I had a scholarship and grants that completely paid my way. If it hadn't been for that village . . .

Now, many years since Naomi's death and many miles from that home that was not a home, I count on the village as a parent. When my children were little, the village taught me simple things that I had not learned at home; how to breast feed, how to change diapers, how to teach my children to read, how to discipline without violence. As my children have become teenagers and I have become a single parent, the village has become even more critical to my family's health and well-being. There are those loving adults at our church who adore my children, give them new experiences and constant encouragement. There are those caring adults at their school who challenge them to stretch their imaginations and use their intellect. There are those adults in our neighborhood who wave and smile and provide a watchful eye of protection. As a single, custodial parent of children whose father is 3,000 miles away and rarely sees them, I count on the men in the village to provide examples to my son and daughter of what dedicated, responsible men look like.

I know firsthand that not every parent is wise, all-knowing and caretaking. Sometimes it is because they did not receive those things themselves as children; sometimes it is because they are hopelessly lost in their own egos.

Making fun of a promising and true statement, that it does indeed "take a village to raise a child," does not change bad parents into good ones, it only furthers political games at the expense of children. Writing into law that a parent's "rights" are absolute and inalienable (and thereby overturning almost 2,000 state child abuse statutes), will not strengthen families but lead to despair for the most vulnerable members of those families.

The village saved my life.●

#### A CALL TO TONE DOWN THE VIOLENCE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, during our recess Joan Beck, an editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune who also does a column for the Tribune, had a column in which she calls on TV and movie executives to reduce the violence.

It is a subject that I have spent a fair amount of time on, and it is important to creating a more stable society and a brighter future for our children.

This is an area where bi-partisanship should mark our actions. I applaud both Bob Dole and Bill Clinton for being concerned here.

Mr. President, I ask that the article from The Chicago Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A CALL TO TONE DOWN THE VIOLENCE  
(By Joan Beck)

Bob Dole's latest efforts to persuade Hollywood to tone down the amount of violence in

the movies got two thumbs down from most of his critics. They ridiculed his taste in films. They fretted about censorship. And they give him only pro forma applause before ignoring what he was saying.

Bill Clinton last week got TV broadcasters to agree to air a minimum of three hours of educational television for children every week. But his critics carped about government over-regulation. They argued about how to define "educational." And they bristled about TV executives being used to further Clinton's re-election campaign.

But both the president and his Republican challenger are right about the dangers of exposing impressionable children to so much violence on TV and in the movies. The points they are making shouldn't be ignored.

Crime statistics may be down slightly in a few urban areas. But bombings, bomb threats and bomb scares are increasing. Drive-by shootings are being committed by kids on bicycles to young to have cars. One in every three black men in their 20s are either in prison or on probation or parole—up from one in four five years ago. Many urban parks and streets are abandoned at night because people fear for their lives.

Violent behavior has multiple—and interlocking—causes, of course. They include poverty, hopelessness, abuse, poor parenting, illegal drugs, mental illness, alcohol, racism, distorted values, gangs, the absence of violence in movies and TV.

Of these, the easiest and quickest to change may be television and movies.

Adults who enjoy violence as entertainment and the media executives who profit from it argue there is no convincing evidence to link violence in mass media to violence in real life. Like tobacco company honchos, they dismiss stacks of studies showing they are wrong.

But at the same time they claim TV does not promote violent behavior, media executives assure advertisers that commercials will influence millions of viewers. Their marketing departments have piles of research to back them up.

It is tricky to pinpoint how big an effect violence on TV and in the movies has on children and young people. Excessive exposure to filmed violence in childhood may not erupt into homicide and crime until adolescence. Other factors certainly make some children more vulnerable than others to media influences.

But the June issue of the Harvard Mental Health Letter sums up persuasive evidence that does link watching violence in mass media and aggressive behavior. The report is written by L. Rowell Huesmann, professor of psychology and communication, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and Jessica Moise, a doctoral student at the University of Michigan.

More than 100 laboratory studies done over the last 40 years show that at least some children exposed to films of dramatic violence act more aggressively afterward toward inanimate objects and other youngsters, the newsletter says. It adds, "These results have been found in many countries among boys and girls of all social classes, races, ages and levels of intelligence."

In addition, more than 50 field studies made over the last 20 years find that "children who habitually watch more media violence behave more aggressively and accept aggression more readily as a way to solve problems." The connection shows up regardless of age, sex, social class and previous level of aggression, the author says.

Watching violence in the media leads to aggressive behavior in five ways, the Harvard newsletter says. First, children may imitate characters they see in the media, especially if they are admirable and their ac-

tions are rewarded. Then they tend to internalize the behavior and use it automatically in their everyday lives.

Second, violence in the media desensitizes children to the effects of violence. "The more televised violence a child watches, the more acceptable aggressive behavior becomes," says the newsletter. It also makes children expect others to act violently and therefore feel they should, too.

Third, seeing violence in the media helps a child justify to himself his own acts of aggression and relieves any guilt he might feel, freeing him to continue to behave aggressively.

Fourth, watching violent acts on TV and in movies may activate aggressive thoughts and feelings a child already has or serve as a cognitive cue for later violent behavior. And fifth, children who watch a lot of violence can become desensitized to it and the emotional and physiological responses that might turn them away from it become dulled.

"The studies are conclusive," says the Harvard newsletter. "The evidence leaves no room for doubt that exposure to media violence stimulates aggression."

The new V chip that lets parents cut off their children's access to violent programs should help. More high quality, "educational" shows for children on TV is a positive move. And all of us who fear violence and regret the changes we are making to protect ourselves—airline security checks, gated communities, more police, more prisons, more restrictions on ourselves about walking in the parks and on certain streets—can stop supporting violence as entertainment.

We can cut violence on TV and in movies out of our lives and help make it unprofitable for those who sell it. If enough of us refuse to pay to see violent films, studios will make fewer of them. If enough of us change the channel when a violent TV show comes on, broadcasters will get the message.

Cutting back on violence as entertainment won't solve the problem of violence in the real world. But it should help. It's something we can do now, while we try to figure out how to end poverty and keep fathers in the home and create more effective schools and end drug abuse and deal with all the other factors that contribute to violent crime.●

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency, John Bruton, Prime Minister of Ireland, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting on Wednesday, September 11, 1996.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH) laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives: