When Mr. MORAN, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. SPRATT and I introduced a new bill in this Congress, 4 Republicans and 25 Democrats joined us.

When a similar proposal was offered by Senator CONRAD in June as an amendment to the Senate counterpart to H.R. 1555, it received the support of 32 Republicans and 41 Democrats, passing 73–26.

On July 10, the President of the United States endorsed this approach, calling the V-chip ''a little thing but a big deal''.

And as you know, the letter we delivered today includes 19 Republicans and 23 Democrats.

So this is a subject of intense interest receiving broad support from both parties.

It is supported by huge majority of the American public, with some polls and reader surveys putting support as high as 90 percent.

Mr. Chairman, its time has come.

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 five 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.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the amendment would do:

First, we will give the industry a year to develop a ratings system and activate blocking technology on a voluntary basis. 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; Please note that the government does not do the ratings.

Second, require that any ratings implemented by a broadcaster be transmitted 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, of 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.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stokes/Boehlert amendment.

The VA–HUD bill drives a stake through the heart of our Nation's environmental laws. The new majority apparently doesn't think cutting EPA's budget by 34 percent is enough—they've weighed the bill down with restrictions on EPA spending which ties their hands in implementing and enforcing critically important programs for the protection of the American people.

The riders on the bill would prohibit EPA from spending any money on programs which protect wetlands, control polluted runoff, prevent raw sewage from being discharged into our waters, implement the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, and then proceed with new standards for arsenic and radioactive pollutants in our drinking water.

Mr. Chairman, more than 35 million people would be exposed to significant levels of arsenic in their drinking water, heightening cancer risks across our Nation.

And while the republicans are proposing that EPA's ability to protect the health of American citizens be decimated, they are giving special favors and granting exemptions to environmental laws to their friends in the oil and gas industry and cement kiln operators.

The Stokes/Boehlert amendment strips the appropriations bill of these legislative riders and enables the EPA, with the limited resources it has left, to implement the laws that the American people want, need and support which protect their air, water, and overall health.

I thank the gentlemen for offering this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LONG BEACH POLYTECHNIC HIGH SCHOOL

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the 100th anniversary of Long Beach Polytechnic High School—a much-loved, venerable institution in Long Beach, CA, which has been producing scholars and champions for the past century.

Poly high, as it is affectionately known, had humble beginnings in the chapel of a local church, but a strong—for the time—starting enrollment. At that time, 1895, Long Beach was a modest village of approximately 2,000 residents. The Federal census counted 2,252 in 1900. Though small in number, these early citizens saw learning as a large part of their children's lives. The first school had begun in 1885, with under a dozen students in a tent loaned by the local postmaster, when the community numbered 12 families. Ten years later, with over 100 elementary school students studying in their own building, an election was held on September 3, 1895, to determine whether a high school district should be formed in Long Beach. The vote in favor was unanimous. Two weeks later—in an era when education beyond the eighth grade was not the norm—43 9th, 10th, and 11th graders began classes with a faculty of two: Professor Walter Bailey and Mrs. Hattie Mason Willard.

Three years later, in 1898, the community's strong desire for a high school education for one and all supported the opening of a separate high school building—the first in Los Angeles County outside of the city of Los Angeles. They even levied a special tax on themselves to raise the $10,000 to cover the city's part of the construction costs.

The new high school was known as American Avenue High School for its location and offered a strong, but limited program primarily aimed at preparing students for college. The quality of instruction was so high that 6 years after opening its doors, the high school was accredited by the University of California, thus permitting its graduates to enter the university without passing special examinations.

By 1910, Long Beach had rapidly grown into a city of 18,000 and its high school was overflowing with students. Residents not only saw a need for a larger high school, but also for an expanded curriculum that would offer technical-vocational courses in addition to the college preparatory classes. They wisely knew that such a school would appeal to many young people who had not been interested in the more traditional type of educational program.

That year, a $240,000 bond issue was passed to build a new type of high school that would offer technical-vocational courses as well as a college preparatory curriculum. In 1911, it opened its doors at the corner of 16th Street and Atlantic Avenue in Long Beach and has stood there ever since as Long Beach Polytechnic High School. In 1910, the site was considered so far on the outskirts of town that ''only jack rabbits were out there.'' This somewhat derisive comment led to the selection of Poly's mascot, the jack rabbit. Bearing the deceptively benign title of the Mighty Jack Rabbits, Poly High's athletic teams have gone on to win numerous championships and to produce many professionals and Olympic athletes.

In addition to offering a well-rounded, polytechnic curriculum designed to meet the needs of all the community's young people, Poly has also provided experiences in self-governing for its students. In the early part of this century, student government was not a common activity in high schools. But a Poly teacher during this era, Miss Jane Harnet, worked to add this important learning activity to the school's courses. In the 1913–14 Poly student yearbook, the Cerulea—from the adjective meaning of the color sky blue—student Stanley Harvey wrote: ''The students of the Long Beach Polytechnic High School have a privilege not generally accorded in most high schools, in that they have an organized student body with both elective and appointive offices who have charge of all assemblies, entertainments, literary activities, etc., provided that they pass the two faculty members of the Commission.''

The Long Beach community's commitment to the finest educational experiences for all students also extended to students of varied backgrounds. Poly High has long-served as a model for providing a first-rate education for a multi-ethnic student body. The student body has been integrated from the school's first days, and Poly High has a decades-long tradition of educating young people to appreciate and respect those of differing backgrounds and cultures. In the years following the Second World War, Japanese-Americans returning from the relocation camps sent their children there—the same school that their parents had attended in the 1920's and 1930's. Those Japanese-American sons and daughters who enrolled in the 1940's and returned to Long Beach saw their children later join a large, racially mixed student body of African-Americans, Anglos, and Latinos. With over 40,000 Cambodians in Long Beach and many Vietnamese and overseas Chinese, Poly High today embraces a large Southeast Asian population as well.

Recently, I visited Poly High and met with the cadet corps as well as students in American Government. What an outstanding group of young Americans. The cadets were energetic, dedicated, and motivated beyond their years.

In many ways, alumni from Poly High follow their school's motto: Enter to learn, go forth to serve. From celebrities such as Van Johnson, Billie Jean King, Marilyn Horne, and young film star Cameron Diaz; to countless community activists to heroes of the First and Second World Wars, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf war; students from Poly have made their mark. One graduate, Lorraine Miller Collins, became Long Beach's major philantrophist—funding the Miller Children's Hospital, a rare book room in the public library, and an international house and Japanese garden at California State University, Long Beach.

I am pleased that my two children are Poly graduates, as are three of my staff members. My wife, Nini, served as president of the parent-teacher association and, for many years, was also a member of the Poly High Community Interracial Committee. The PACE program at Poly has attracted bright students of all ethnicities and races from all parts of the city. The number of college acceptances is proof that this fine high school is truly producing scholars and champions.

Beginning near the end of the 19th century in a small building on the outskirts of town, Poly High has grown through the 20th century to become a leading urban educational institution. Its history is one of community commitment to a quality education for all. Its graduates are models of the value a community receives in return for an early investment in and commitment to education. Today, Long Beach Polytechnic High School stands as testimony to the importance placed on education by the citizens—then and now—of Long Beach, CA.

Congratulations again on your 100th birthday, Poly High, may you have many more years of service to our community, our State, and our Nation.

NASA: LOOKING TO SPACE

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to show my support for NASA and the space station. NASA is a critical investment in America's future. The contributions made by NASA have provided major breakthroughs in science and technology, which in turn, have contributed to long-term economic growth and provided opportunities for future generations.

Technology is rapidly changing, and NASA has been a major part of that change, with its long range research focus. While the private sector should be the principal place for developing new and improved technologies, many of NASA's investments have led to spinoffs which have been successfully incorporated into the marketplace—for example: Virtual reality, color and 3-dimensional graphics, language translators, compact discs, heart rate monitors, water purification and filters, breast cancer detection, microlasers, fireman's air tanks, and emission tests.

Even with these innovations, NASA has remained focused on its one core mission: Space exploration. NASA's mission does not interfere or compete with private industry. NASA stands as a strong example of how government research can compliment private industry research.

I have always had the utmost respect for the research by NASA but in the past I have not always been their strongest ally. I have voted against the NASA budget the space station when I believed NASA was wasting resources and moving away from their core mission. Though it took much prodding from Congress and a major reduction in their budget, I strongly believe NASA is now one of the leanest and most productive agencies of the Federal Government.

Earlier this year, the Budget Committee held hearings on corporate downsizing. At these hearings, we heard from General Electric and Kodak. They told the committee how they successfully downsized their companies while producing more. With their reduced budget, this is exactly what NASA has accomplished. NASA's budget has already been reduced by 35 percent since fiscal year 1993 and has reduced its work force to its lowest level since 1961. The agency has stepped up to the challenge and is accomplishing more while spending less. For example, NASA's new mission control saved millions of dollars by buying and using marketplace computers and technology. I believe NASA is an example that all agencies and departments should follow.

Since I have been in Congress, the space station has been extensively debated. Today, the redesigned station is less expensive and more capable. The new design saves $5 billion in developmental costs, reduces annual operating costs by half, and expands the station's research capabilities. The space station will conduct valuable medical and technological research which can have great benefits for the future. In addition, the station is a cooperative project with Russia, Japan, Canada and member nations of the European Space Agency. This project brings together the world's best and brightest scientists to work for solutions to problems here on Earth.

Congress should not turn its back on the future. It is imperative that America remains first in technological advancements. We need technology to move this country forward. NASA is a sound investment which can help facilitate new technological innovations and discoveries that will lead America into the 21st century.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2076, Making Appropriations for the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for Fiscal Year 1996. This bill will cripple many of our Nations most important governmental functions so that the interests of the American people will not be well served.