1990. The legislation itself does not require any prescribed number of hours or specific types of programming. Its champions in both the House and Senate explained that the criterion should be ''a station's overall service to children'' and that a broadcaster should have the ''greatest possible flexibility in how it discharges its public service obligation to children.'' In so framing the Children's Television Act, its sponsors wisely sought to insulate both the act itself and the regulatory power of the FCC from legal challenges.

For as the courts have repeatedly found, public-interest requirements relating to specific program content create a high risk that such rulings would reflect the FCC's tastes, opinions and value judgments—rather than a neutral public interest. Such requirements must be closely scrutinized, lest they carry the commission too far in the direction of censorship. As the Supreme Court recently concluded, ''The Commission may not impose upon licensees its private notions of what the public ought to hear.''

The draft programming guideline rules ignore Congress's deliberate decision to allow stations flexibility and thereby avoid constitutional challenges. Instead, the draft rules virtually invite such a challenge.

What's going on here? A most worthy goal, children's educational and informational programming, is being cleverly manipulated to revive outdated and discarded ''scarcity'' theories of broadcast regulation. Scarcity justified regulation many years ago, when broadcast TV was the only show in town and a few stations were the only source of video programs.

Today, however, there is a superabundance of over-the-air broadcast outlets. Cable, with its 135 networks, reaches 98 percent of all television homes. Satellite services have grown rapidly, and VCRs are now in 83 percent of all American homes. To top it off, computers and the Internet are becoming an outlet of choice for our children's time and energy.

With this incredible menu of program choices, claims of marketplace failure are outdated and farcical. The main legislative and regulatory thrust today must be toward competition and deregulation, not program content regulation and First Amendment intrusion. Thus, it is increasingly difficult, logically and legally, to justify additional regulation of broadcasting, the only medium providing universal free service.

What to do? First, this controversial draft FCC order should be released right away in its entirety for public comment. Let's fully inform everyone of its contents.

WAKE-UP CALL

This is an unusual step, but this issue is deteriorating into an unusually misguided proceeding. If this draft order were made public, I can't imagine anyone with any sensitivity to the First Amendment supporting it, since it calls for unprecedented government micromanagement of the nation's leading news and information medium. If adopted, these rules would set a precedent that could shackle broadcasting with the prospect of even more extensive content and structural regulation in the future. Public disclosure would serve as a nationwide wake-up call to what is potentially at stake for all communications media.

Many congressmen have, in good faith, signed a letter generally supporting three hours of children's programming. I cannot believe these congressmen would support the adoption of overly rigid rules that threaten to undermine the judicial sustainability of the act itself. A three-hour-per-week guideline for children's educational programming makes sense and is universally supported. But it must be flexible enough to allow broadcasters to do their job—and flexible enough to avoided censorship.

At the risk of violence to the first Amendment, we will not be doing children or their parents any favors by rushing ahead with an overregulatory exercise in micromanagement. Both President Clinton and leaders in Congress have declared that ''the era of big government is over.'' Is that true for everyone but the FCC?

REMEMBERING THE ISRAELI OLYMPIC ATHLETES

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to remember the 11 Israeli Olympic athletes and coaches who were victims of terrorism on September 6, 1972, during the Olympic games in Munich, Germany.

On Sunday, July 28, 1996, the Atlanta Jewish Federation along with the Olympic Committee of Israel will host a memorial service honoring the Olympic competitors who were killed by terrorists in 1972. During this occasion, a sculpture with an eternal flame, the Olympic rings, and the names of the victims will be unveiled as a reminder of the tragedy and loss suffered on that dreadful day 24 years ago.

We remember again today the families and friends of these athletes and coaches who suffered such a terrible loss at the hands of ruthless terrorists.

HONORING THOSE WHO BATTLE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's 13th District is home to many weapons in the battle against domestic violence. On the front lines we have a Montgomery County Victims Services Center, Laurel House, the Montgomery County Womens' Center, and the Montgomery County Commission on Women and Families.

I rise today to compliment another one of these weapons, and to recognize the men and women who make it work.

In 1978, Upper Moreland, PA Police Lt. Carl Robinson conceived the idea of establishing a corps of trained mental health professionals who would accompany police to the sites of domestic violence police calls. Years later, Ms. Bonnie Dalzell, who founded the counseling center at St. Luke's in Glenside, PA, visited police stations in the Upper Moreland area to acquaint police organizations with the mental health services she could provide.

This conversation developed into the Support Police Immediate Response Intervention Team, a nonprofit organization serving the communities of Upper Moreland, Abington, and Jenkintown, PA.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, much of a policeman's work is crisis intervention. Not only has the presence of mental health volunteers freed police to do the police work in cases of domestic violence, it has gone a long way towards safely resolving domestic conflicts.

Domestic violence is one of the greatest enemies of our Nation's families. I have the utmost respect and admiration for the caring people who do their best to help our country's families through domestic crises. This is why, both as a State legislator, and again last year as a Member of the 104th Congress, I introduced legislation supporting community response teams such as the one in Upper Moreland.

I am proud to rise today in recognition and support of compassionate men and women like Ms. Judy Dwyer, who is a responder in the Upper Moreland program of which I rise in appreciation.

I cannot say it enough. Our children and families are under attack. In Pennsylvania's 13th District, local solutions are making the difference, thanks to the vision and ability of people like Lieutenant Robinson, Ms. Dalzell, and Ms. Dwyer.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY: CONGRESS CANNOT AFFORD TO WAIT

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, Congress and President Reagan formed the bipartisan Greenspan Commission which agreed on historic legislation to save Social Security. At that time, the Social Security Administration actuaries warned that the system had an unfunded liability equal to 1.82 percent of taxable payroll. The 1983 law was supposed to solve this problem through the middle of the next century. However, the actuaries now find that the unfunded liability is 2.19 percent of taxable payroll, 20 percent worse than in 1983.

Expressed in 1996 dollars, this liability equals approximately $4 trillion. Put another way, under the current system every beneficiary for the next 75 years will have to absorb a 14 percent cut from baseline benefits for the system to balance. Alternatively, payroll taxes will have to go up by 16 percent to restore long-term solvency. The actuaries say even larger benefit cuts or tax increases will be needed the longer Congress delays.

Traditionally, Congress waits until the last moment to solve such problems, using a crisis environment to convince our constituents and ourselves that sacrifices have to be made. But this approach is unconscionable when waiting until the last minute will force us to adopt a solution that will damage the economy and the lives of vulnerable workers and retirees. Under current law, there will only be two workers paying into the system for each retiree drawing benefits early in the next century. There were 42 workers for every retiree when Social Security was started. On May 15, former Social Security Commissioner Dorcas Hardy estimated Social Security could have insufficient funds as early as 2005. Without meaningful reform soon, very large benefit reductions or tax rate hikes are unavoidable. Fortunately, I believe we can legislate a happy ending.

The Social Security Administration has scored my bill, the Social Security Solvency Act, and found that if everyone participates each worker could invest between 1.81 percent and 10.11 percent of his paycheck in a

personal retirement savings accounts while Social Security benefits continue to flow unimpeded.

My bill may not be perfect, but it offers a way out and I believe Members of Congress and the President can no longer avoid working on a solution to save Social Security. This proposal holds harmless low and medium income workers and also existing retirees. Part I of the bill eliminates the unfunded liability by slowing the growth in benefits in two basic ways. Initial benefits will still rise, after inflation, but they won't almost double as they do under current law. It also imposes some modest means testing of benefits. Further, it gradually raises the retirement age 2 years longer than existing law. Together, these reforms more than eliminate the unfunded liability of the system according to Social Security's actuaries. Under part II, and most importantly, my proposal creates personal retirement savings accounts for working Americans that will be funded from the surplus after all benefits are paid.

Over time, the assets in workers' accounts will grow very rapidly, producing genuine retirement security. The balances in the private accounts are the personal property of the workers. Worker/investors will still receive Social Security checks, although they will be smaller to reflect the amount personally invested. However, the benefits flowing from their personal retirement savings accounts will more than make up the difference. Furthermore, account balances will belong to workers and can be passed on to their heirs, improving the financial security of wives, husbands and their children. Personal retirement savings accounts can be ''cashed-out'' as early as age 60.

With some safeguards, it would be up to each worker to determine how his funds will be invested or whether to fund a personal retirement savings account at all. In fact, workers may elect to remain in the existing system if they wish and collect only Social Security benefits. It will be their option alone whether to place a portion of their paychecks in the hands of professional money managers. However, funds must be invested under the legal limits of the Individual Retirement Accounts [IRA's]. Also, under the proposal managed investment accounts will have to meet some additional investment and reporting requirements.

Another important benefit of this proposal is that it will stabilize fiscal policy. This year, Social Security will take in $64 billion more than it distributes. By 2002, the annual surplus will rise to $104 billion. But in 2025 and beyond, there will be annual cash deficits of $330 billion and rising as far as the eye can see. Under this plan, cash flow in and out of the Social Security System will always be equal. Pressure to cut other spending or to raise taxes will not be required by cash flow problems. Social Security will be depoliticized—as it should be.

Together, we can restore the solvency of America's most popular program and make it even better. H.R. 3758 does that.

CHILD SUPPORT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1996

HON. GREG GANSKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, to day I am introducing the Child Support Enhancement Act of 1996. This legislation will help ensure that deadbeat parents take personal responsibility for their children.

It takes two people to bring a child into the world and it takes two people to raise a child in this world. Unfortunately, in too many cases, one parent believes that their responsibility ends when the baby is born.

While we cant legislate and force parents to read to their children, attend Little League baseball games or show up at birthday parties, we can help make sure there is food in children's mouths and clothes on their backs by encouraging financial responsibility. This is the personal responsibility of both parents.

Too often, the failure of parents to take this responsibility contributes to custodial parents ending up on welfare—unable to make ends meet. Or, they are forced to take on two or more jobs just to keep afloat. This keeps them away from their kids who are already one parent short.

Recent statistics are disturbing. In fiscal year 1993, while $20 billion in child support obligations had been legally established, only $13 billion was collected and paid. Additionally, in fiscal year 1994, the Child Support Enforcement Program collected child support payments for less than 20 percent of its caseload.

I do not believe that child support is merely a legal duty, it is a moral duty.

That is why I am introducing the Child Support Enforcement Act of 1996. This bill authorizes the seizure or interception of judgments or settlements to private individuals in suits brought against the Federal Government. The legislation applies to settlements or judgments in both administrative actions and claims in a court of law.

Currently, State child support enforcement officials and others working on behalf of custodial parents can seize or intercept money in suits against private individuals and State governments, but only in very narrow circumstances can they do this when Uncle Sam is involved.

If a deadbeat parent is going to receive money from the Federal Government, this legislation will help to ensure that the parents children get their slice of this money.

We must continue to close loopholes in the current system and make it easier for child support collectors to do their job. This will make life easier for our Nation's children.

For kids' sake, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

CONGRATULATING MAJ. GEN. PAUL BERGSON, USAR

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Maj. Gen. Paul Bergson, U.S. Army Reserve, on his recent promotion from the rank of brigadier general. I regret that pressing business back home in Texas prevented me from being with Paul at his promotion ceremony, held July 18 at the Pentagon.

I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with Paul for several years through his work with the Asia Pacific Exchange Foundation. I know of no one more dedicated to serving his country and preserving the freedoms on which the United States was founded than Paul.

Currently serving as a military assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Paul has been a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army for more than three decades. His service to the Army and to his country inspires everyone who knows him.

Mr. Speaker, I know you join with me in congratulating Paul on his recent promotion; in wishing him continued success in the U.S. Army Reserve and in his business. Bergson & Company; and in extending to him and to his wonderful wife. Jan, our very best wishes for the future.

THE TERMINALLY ILL'S RIGHT TO BENEFITS ACT

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1996

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that will provide greatly needed financial relief to individuals that are inflicted with a terminal illness. Currently, terminally ill individuals must wait for the standard 5-month waiting period before the first social security disability payment can be received. However, many people with such illnesses tragically pass away before they ever receive any payments.

Sick pay, temporary disability programs, and other private disability pension programs do not often cover a period as long as 5 months, and the gap in income during the waiting period affects terminally ill individuals when they can least afford it. Besides, these people have paid money into the Social Security System through payroll taxes and have a right to receive immediate benefits that would greatly diminish the hardships that are suddenly confronted by the terminally ill.

According to the Social Security Administration, the 5-month waiting period was instituted to ensure that people are sufficiently disabled to qualify for benefits. I strongly feel that terminal patients should, in now way, be made to justify their condition. Moreover, medical science has developed to a point where the art of diagnosing terminally ill, and therefore, disabling conditions, provides a sufficiently reliable picture of the severity of the illness. This bill would define terminally ill patients as one that has an illness which is expected to result in death within the 12 months.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this very important legislation. Unfortunately, many Americans are hit with a merciless terminal illness while in the prime of their lives, and we should grant them their right to collect disability payments that they have earned so that they can worry less about