

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