

below \$40,000. It costs you a \$1.09 a year, per citizen, to fund it. And for every dollar public television and radio get from the Government, they raise \$5 or \$6 from the private sector. So I think that's my first suggestion.

My second suggestion relates to the presence of Senator Conrad here. If we don't believe in censorship, and we do want to tell parents that they have a responsibility, that television, to use Reverend Jackson's phrase that the Vice President mentioned, may be the third parent, but it can't be the first or the second, and that's up to the parents—if we want to say that, but we know we live in a country where most kids live in families where there's one or two parents there working and where we have less comprehensive child care than any other advanced country in the world, the question is how can we get beyond telling parents to do something that they physically cannot do for several hours a day unless they literally do want to be a home without television or monitor their kids in some other way?

There is one technological fix now being debated in the Congress which I think is very important. It's a little simple thing; I think it's a very big deal. In the telecommunications bill, Senator Conrad offered an amendment which ultimately passed with almost three-quarters of the Senate voting for it. So it's a bipartisan proposal that would permit a so-called V-chip to be put in televisions with cables which would allow parents to decide which—not only which channels their children could not watch but within channels, to block certain programming.

This is not censorship; this is parental responsibility. This is giving parents the same access to technology that is coming into your home to all the people who live there, who turn it on. So I would say when that telecommunications bill is ultimately sent to the President's desk, put the V-chip in it and empower the parents who have to work to do their part to be responsible with media. Those are two specific suggestions that I hope will move this debate forward.

Having said what I meant to say, I would like to now go on, Mr. Vice President, to hear the people who really know something about this. I want to thank you all for your care and concern. And let me echo some-

thing the Governor said: There is a huge consensus in this country today that we need to do something that is responsible, that is constructive, that strengthens our families and gives our kids a better future, and that celebrates the fact that this is the media center of the world. And we want it to be that way 10, 20, 50 years from now. But we also want to be that way in a country that is less violent, that has a more wholesome environment for our children to grow up in, where our children are strong and taking advantage of the dominant position the United States enjoys in the world media.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:15 a.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center to participants in Family Re-Union IV: The Family and the Media. In his remarks, he referred to the Vice President's mother, Pauline Gore; Gov. Don Sundquist of Tennessee; Mayor Philip Bredesen of Nashville, TN; and Bill Purcell and Marty Erickson, cohosts of the conference.

### **Remarks at the Closing of Session I of the Family and Media Conference in Nashville**

*July 10, 1995*

I don't want to end on a downer, but I just want to ask you all to think about the implications of what we are discussing here. And I wish we had time for all the audience to ask their questions and make their comments, but let me just point this out.

Almost every major city in America has had a decline in the crime rate in the last 3 or 4 years, but the rate of random violence among very young people is still going up, notwithstanding the decline in the crime rate. That is just one example. After years of making progress on reducing drug use, the rate of apparently random drug use across racial and income lines among quite young people is now going back up again. The rate of perceived risk or the pointlessness of not doing it seems to be going down.

The ultimate answer may be in programs like the "I Have A Future" program and all these one-on-one programs for all these children. But I would ask you just to remember

what one of our psychologists said, which is that most of our young people learn about violence or are affected by it between the ages of 2 and 8. Most of them learn—deal with sex and gender stereotypes between 8 and whenever.

It may be that people between 8 and whenever are more subject to argument at least or counter information or the kind of publicity or you name it on these other issues we can put out. So let's focus at least on the violence. I see no alternative to solving this problem than to reduce the aggregate amount of violence to which these children are subject. And we're going to have to have some help from the media to get that done. I just don't see any alternative to that.

The V-chip is something we ought to do, but if we're going to raise positive role models we also have to reduce the aggregate amount of violence. We must find a systematic way to do it. And in our country, with the first amendment and other things being the way they are, we're going to have to have some voluntary initiatives and some disciplined support from the media in America to get it done.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in Polk Theater at the Tennessee Performing Arts Center.

## **Remarks at the Closing of Session II of the Family and Media Conference in Nashville**

*July 10, 1995*

I just want to say one thing, if I might. Let me, first of all, start by saying thank you to all of you for being here and for caring enough about this subject to be here and for giving us a chance to discuss this issue in a nonpolitical atmosphere of good citizenship. I thank you for that. I also thank you for what you've done.

But I'd like to comment if I could on what's been said and what has not been said and end with something Mr. Selleck said. First of all, we know that we need to support and get more of the kind of programming reflected on the Nickelodeon, the Disney Channel, "Christy," the Fox Children's Network, and public television, and whoever I

left out. We know that, we know we need that.

Secondly, we know we need some guideposts to the future which might be what John Cook talked about or another kind of rating system. And at least some of us would like to see some parents be able to turn some things off now and again, which is why we like the V channel.

Then you get to the next level which is what the gentleman from the Ad Council talked about. And I agree with—we've got to make sure that no matter how far we go with technology we save some private space along the way. Then you get to the question of whether we could systematically move the market system a little bit, to take off on Gary's comment.

His is a significant commitment, the Ad Council has made, for two reasons. One is, \$8 billion over 8 years is \$800 million a year. I'll tell you how much that is; I just sat there and figured it out. In the Presidential elections we spend about \$100 million in the general election, telling you how great we are, how terrible our opponents are. And you see a lot of our ads. So if you spend \$800 million a year and you do it right, you can make an impact. That's not an insignificant thing, and it should be lauded.

But the other suggestion you made, coming back to what Mr. Selleck said, is that the people who do all this should not be defensive; they should be open. They should realize there are no simple answers. A few years ago, there was an attempt to do what Oprah Winfrey's doing on her own on a systematic basis through all different kinds of television shows through education. I saw you out there, John. Do you remember when I came out there to Hollywood and they had me give a little speech, because there was an organized effort to try to say, let's take a year and put some positive message about education in all of our programs, our cops and robbers programs, our cowboy programs, our—everything. In this case, it would be the Internet and all that.

And they did it for a year. I don't know that we had any way of measuring what the results were, but I do know what the gentleman from the Ad Council said makes a lot of sense. What I hope will happen is, in