

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on any given night, you can turn on your television during primetime and watch someone commit assault, murder, or any other act of violence. While you and I know that the violent world depicted nightly on our television screen does not reflect life accurately, all too often our children take what they see as truth.

Children are particularly sensitive to the world around them, as they notice and absorb everything they see and experience. Study after study for decade after decade has confirmed the commonsense intuition that when children view violence their behavior becomes increasingly violent. The American Psychological Association estimates that a typical child will watch 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence before finishing elementary school.

However, the harm caused by viewing violence is broader than the encouraging of violent behavior. Studies have found that viewing violence increases mistrust of others and fear of being a victim of violence, and desensitizes viewers to violence resulting in calloused attitudes and apathetic behavior toward violence.

Over the years, Congress and broadcasters have sporadically tackled this issue. For example, in 1990, Congress passed the Children's Television Act to increase the amount of quality educational programming for children. The recent rewrite of the telecommunications bill included a requirement that television sets be manufactured with a computer chip that would allow parents to screen out programs, rated by the broadcast industry, that are inappropriate for their children. And more recently, the broadcasters have agreed to work out an industrywide compromise on generating a content based rating system. I support these efforts.

Yet I believe more needs to be done. It is useful to put up signs warning others if a river is polluted, but it is even more useful to clean up the river. That is why I am introducing a resolution, with 11 other Members of Congress, expressing the sense of the House that broadcasters should not air excessively violent programming between the hours of 6 a.m. and 10 p.m.

Cleaning up television will not resolve all of the Nation's ills. But as former Education Secretary William J. Bennett points out, in recent years we have seen an explosion in moral pathologies: Abused and abandoned children, out-of-wedlock births, drug use, violent crime, and just plain trashy behavior, as well as the vanishing of the unwritten rules of decency and civility, social strictures, and basic good manners. He attributes this to the fact that the

good requires constant reinforcement, and the bad needs only permission.

Turning the tide, reinforcing the good will ultimately take a massive collective effort, one that engages our families, our civic leaders, our religious leaders, our teachers, our community leaders, all levels of government, neighbors—everyone in society. But the media, too, with its enormous role in the socialization process, must join us in this effort.

CLARIFICATION BY FATHER DRINAN

HON. HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1997

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Jesuit Father and Georgetown University Law Center Prof. Robert F. Drinan has withdrawn statements he made in a New York Times article of June 4, 1996, on legislation to ban so-called partial-birth abortion. At the request of the Most Reverend John R. McNamara, regional bishop for Massachusetts' Merrimack region, I am submitting for the RECORD the text of Father Drinan's statement of May 12, 1997, clarifying his position on abortion.

Articles that I wrote in the New York Times on June 4, 1996, and in the National Catholic Reporter on May 31, 1996, were used in ways I did not intend. I withdraw those statements and any statement that could be understood to cast doubt on the Church's firm condemnation of abortion—a doctrine that I totally support.

Moreover, new information about the true nature and widespread use of partial-birth abortion renders my statements on that issue in 1996 factually incorrect.

I do not believe that every moral evil should be outlawed. I do, however, see abortion—particularly partial-birth abortion—as a grave evil and can understand why Church leaders are urging lawmakers to ban it. I do not want anything to impede that effort. On the contrary, I join in that effort and stand ready to promote laws and public policies that aim to protect vulnerable human life from conception until natural death. I support the Catholic bishops in their efforts to exercise moral leadership in the fight against abortion.

CORRECTING PERCEPTIONS ABOUT GUAM AND THE CNMI

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, recently many Members have expressed interest in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands [CNMI]. Some have described it as a model of economic policy, others as a blemish on the fabric of American values. On March

19, 1997, Mr. DELAY submitted an extension of remarks in which he discussed the economic situation in the CNMI. In the context of these remarks, Mr. DELAY made several comparisons between the CNMI and Guam.

Unfortunately, political, governmental, historical, economic, and demographic differences make such comparisons misleading. For example, in 1995, the total work force in the CNMI was 37,393; 32,522—87 percent—of which were foreign born. Considering the number of foreign guest workers the NMI is importing, their level of unemployment should be very low. However, the unemployment rate among U.S. citizens in the CNMI is over 14 percent while on Guam it is about 8 percent. If the NMI's unemployment rate was any higher it would raise serious questions about the use of their foreign guest worker program.

Because Guam does not have a similar guest worker program and complies with Federal minimum wage and labor standards, one cannot take this or other isolated economic statistics and make direct comparisons between the CNMI and Guam. Guam currently pays the prevailing wage which can be four times the minimum wage. However, Mr. DELAY is correct that Guam's economy is hindered by certain economic policies, but these obstacles originate from the Federal Government, not from Guam itself.

In an effort to correct this situation, the people of Guam, through the Draft Guam Commonwealth Act, are seeking a new relationship with the United States and a comprehensive review of the application of Federal laws on Guam. Through this legislation Guam is working toward removing those Federal obstacles to stimulate economic growth and establishing a new political relationship with the Federal Government.

It is important to note that Guam does not want to use the CNMI as a model of labor, immigration, or economic policy. We do not desire to use greater autonomy and control over immigration to establish a massive guest worker program to fuel a low wage garment industry. Rather we seek to stem the flow of immigration to our island which is suffering as a result of the application of Federal immigration. Guam needs some guest workers, but this program must be consistent with our basic principles of justice and fairness.

Contrary to many reports circulating around Congress, the CNMI is neither a den of labor iniquity or a model of economic freedom. I hope that as the debate surrounding the CNMI continues that members remember the historical context in which the NMI joined the American family and don't turn this into a battle ground for a debate on the national minimum wage issue.

I appreciate Mr. DELAY'S support for increased local control for the territories. I invite all Members who support local control to support Guam's desire for a commonwealth status which is consistent with this position. I look forward to working with Mr. DELAY and other Members of Congress on this critical issue.

● 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 11, 1997, I missed rollcall vote No. 178, as I was presenting an acknowledgment to students from the University of Illinois at Chicago who were participating in the Department of Energy's Future Car Challenge. I was unable to make it back to the Capitol in time to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote No. 178.

A TRIBUTE TO W.D. FARR

HON. BOB SCHAFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. BOB SCHAFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who helped shape the history of water development in eastern Colorado—William Daven "W.D." Farr. Mr. Farr is the epitome of a Colorado pioneer.

W.D. Farr was born in 1910 in Greeley, CO, and worked on his grandfather's homestead. The Farris' success at raising sheep led W.D. to enroll at the University of Wisconsin, which had the best sheep research department in the United States. In 1929, Mr. Farr returned to Greeley to join his father, Harry, in business when his studies were cut short by a severe illness. In 1948, Harry divided the business between his two sons. As the business grew over the years, W.D. acquired ranches and farms, plus land for feedlots.

Mr. Farr's vision in the area of local and regional water planning has been invaluable to the citizens of Greeley contributing to the economic prosperity of the community and the development of long range water project planning. Commitment and service to the Greeley community and the State of Colorado have been priorities in Farr's life. His many accomplishments include, but are not limited to the following:

Board of Director of the Greeley-Loveland Irrigation Company from 1947 to 1955;

Board of Director of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District from 1955 to 1995;

Chairman of the Greeley Water and Sewer Board for 36 years from its inception in 1959 until January of 1996;

First president of the Municipal Subdistrict of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District;

President of the National Cattlemen's Association from 1971 to 1972;

Member of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board of the U.S. Department of the Interior appointed by President Richard Nixon in 1973;

Chairman of the Region 208 Area Wide Planning Commission of the Larimer-Weld Council of Governments in 1974;

Member of the Colorado Water Congress in 1975; and in 1985 named the Wayne Aspinall Water Leader of the Year by the Colorado Water Congress;

Inaugural inductee into the Colorado Business Hall of Fame when it was established in 1991; and

Inducted into the Colorado Agriculture Hall of Fame in 1995.

On Tuesday, June 17, 1997, the Greeley City Council will honor W.D. Farr by passing a city ordinance recognizing his illustrious service to his community, State, and Nation and naming him chairman emeritus of the Greeley Water and Sewer Board. I am pleased to join with the Greeley community in commending W.D. Farr on his numerous and outstanding contributions.

H.R. 1876, A BILL TO CLARIFY THAT COMPONENTS OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS AND APPARATUS SHALL BE PROVIDED THE SAME STATUS AS THE SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS AND APPARATUS

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today we are introducing a bill to clarify the interpretation of language contained in the Florence Agreement, a multilateral international agreement regarding the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. Signed by the United States it allows for the duty-free importation of scientific apparatus into the United States, if used by U.S. approved institutions for educational, scientific, and cultural purposes.

As nations tighten their research budgets, international scientific collaborations involving many nations are becoming more common. Therefore, it is crucial the United States promulgate the same tariff treatment for the importation of component parts of large scientific instruments, as for the scientific instruments themselves. The need for this legislation was demonstrated last year by the difficulties experienced in the Gemini International Telescope project. The U.S. Customs Service narrowly defined the words "scientific instruments or apparatus" not to include "components" of these instruments.

The Gemini project involved two large telescopes under construction in Hawaii and Chile. The project was managed by the Association of Universities in Astronomy [AURA], and involved the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Chile, Argentina, and Brazil. The telescopes contained several components, including an 8-meter mirror manufactured in the United States. The mirrors were shipped to France for polishing before being returned to Hawaii and Chile for final assembly. The U.S. Customs Service initially contended that the mirror was a component, along with the other large components is not eligible for the same tariff free status as the instrument. Chile, however, was not charging duties on the components destined for there. The 104th Congress had to pass specific legislation to provide tariff relief for the Gemini project.

The prevent future problems, this bill addresses the difficulties encountered through the interpretation of the words "instruments or apparatus" by the U.S. Customs Service. It

states that separable components shall be included under the definition of instruments or apparatus, and that therefore they shall be eligible for the same tariff treatment under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States. This bill will ensure that the United States fulfills the Florence Agreement's intent of furthering the exchange of ideas, knowledge, and information through the interchange of scientific instruments and apparatus.

A SAFE PLACE TO LIVE

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1997

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report two good news stories related to the quality of life in my district in southern California. The first, relates to statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Justice which concludes that Ventura County, CA is one of the safest areas to live in the United States. According to the FBI, the county recorded its lowest crime rate in 23 years with a 14.5 percent reduction in the number of crimes for each 1,000 people.

The county Sheriff's department and the Ventura police department report that the 1996 crime rate was the lowest since the early 1970's. The Sheriff's Chief Deputy Bob Brooks recently stated that, "not only has the rate decreased, but the number of crimes reported has also dropped—even as the population almost doubled in the past two decades."

Our second story involves my own hometown of Simi Valley. According to officials in the city of Simi Valley, its 1996 crime rate was low enough to again rank it as the safest city with a population of over 100,000 in California and possibly the safest city of that size in the United States. This success story involving Simi Valley, which has consistently had one of the lowest crime rates in the Nation, is due in large part to the hard work of the members of the city council and the commitment and dedication of Police Chief Randy Adams and the members of his department.

This welcome news was reported by the Nation's law enforcement agencies during the first 6 months of 1996 and released by the FBI in accordance with the Preliminary Uniform Crime Reporting Program.

These statistics demonstrate the commendable job the Ventura County and Simi Valley law enforcement officers are doing to protect our community and its citizens. Murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault have no place in a civilized society and will not be tolerated, especially in Ventura County and its municipalities. The efforts of our uniformed men and women and concerned members of our community have once again shown that we can be safe and secure in our homes and neighborhoods.

While the statistics are promising, we must continue to work to prevent crime, punish habitual offenders, and ensure that victims receive adequate restitution. There is still much to do to maintain this trend of decreasing crime rates. However, this report demonstrates that capable police officers, tough sentencing, positive outreach programs, and people who care have made a tremendous difference and will continue to be effective in the future.