United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 102d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Wednesday, June 3, 1992*

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 26, 1992)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD H. BRYAN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Is any thing too hard for the Lord? * * *—Genesis 18:14. * * * *with God nothing shall be impossible.*—Luke 1:37.

Eternal God, Lord of the universe, Ruler of the nations, Your penetrating question to Abraham in an impossible situation, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" answers itself. Dr. Luke in his Gospel responds, "* * * with God nothing shall be impossible." Help Your servants in the Senate appreciate the reasonableness, the relevance of this transcendent reality.

In perspective, what is required of the Senators is impossible: Threats of destruction in our great cities, overwhelming deficits in local, State, and Federal budgets, a foundering economy, turmoil and tension in Central Europe—all demanding resolution—complicated by a national election, broiling with controversy, fueling citizen frustration, anger, and cynicism—compounded by a profound sense of human inadequacy.

Gracious, omnipotent God, awaken Your servants to Your availability, adequacy, and love. Grant to them, individually and collectively, a fresh awareness of the possibility of divine intervention when minds and hearts are open to Your control and remedy.

In the name of the Lord who made Heaven and Earth and all things therein. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1992.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD H. BRYAN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BRYAN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for the two leaders is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] is recognized.

Mr. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN and Ms. MIKULSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 2801 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] is recognized under the previous order for 10 minutes.

THE VALUE OF THE PACIFIC YEW TREE AND OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the debate over old growth forests in the Pacific Northwest continues. Congress has yet to find a balanced solution. One issue, however, has emerged upon which most can agree: The Pacific yew tree is a valuable weapon in the fight against cancer, and an abundant supply of its bark must be made available for the production of the cancer-fighting drug taxol.

Some have argued that the discovery of the important properties of taxol and the Pacific yew tree add urgency to the demand to lock up the forests of the Pacific Northwest. This argument lacks logic. When an important natural resource is discovered and its value to human beings is incalculable, the solution is not to lock up the source of that resource, throw away the key, and walk away. The answer is management—careful and sensitive management that ensures a steady supply of the raw material. The discovery of the Pacific yew does not mandate preservation. It mandates wise management.

Taxol from the Pacific yew tree could be used to treat the 12,500 patients who die annually with ovarian cancer. Ask those women whether they would like to see the drug locked away forever in our forests.

In the early 1960's, the bark of the Pacific yew was collected, along with many other species, in an effort by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Cancer Institute to test hundreds of thousands of species for their ability to fight cancer cells and tumors. In 1971, researchers isolated the active ingredient in the bark of the tree and labeled it taxol. In the late seventies, the properties of taxol were studied in the lab where they illustrated the power of the drug in paralyzing the internal structure of cancer cells.

Clinical trials with taxol began in the 1980's. Of 40 women involved in the trial, 11 saw their tumors shrink by more than 50 percent. One patient saw her tumor disappear completely. This response rate of 30 percent was an unexpected success.

For years, the Pacific yew has been referred to as the "weed of the forest." In the process of harvesting Douglas-fir and other softwood species of the Pacific Northwest, the Pacific yew was

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

most commonly discarded and burned as slash. No one knew the Pacific yew had such promise in the medical world. Despite this, last year the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found that the Pacific yew is not at risk of becoming endangered at some time in the future and is not, therefore, a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. The petitioners had attempted to establish that the Pacific yew was in short supply, when in reality its supply is abundant. We simply needed a wake-up call to realize for what the Pacific yew was worth managing.

The potential uses of taxol are obvious. Then why all the fuss?

The Pacific yew is a slow-growing tree that appears predominantly in old growth forests. In order to provide enough of the drug for a single patient, six 100-year-old Pacific yew trees must be stripped of their bark. It takes a bit more than 5,000 yew trees to produce 1 pound of taxol. Fifty-five pounds of taxol is necessary to treat the 12,500 women who die annually of ovarian cancer. This means that 275,000 Pacific yew trees must be harvested annually in order to keep up with the clinical demand.

Obviously, the problem is not protecting and preserving the Pacific yew tree. The problem is ensuring an adequate supply of taxol and, therefore, of the Pacific yew tree. Unfortunately, the process of extracting taxol from the bark of tree is time-consuming. Only 35 of the 55 pounds necessary to treat the ovarian cancer patients will be processed this year. The supplies must be increased.

Mr. President, biodiversity is a popular buzzword used today. Its definition is not widely understood. I interpret biodiversity to mean the existence of a wide variety of genetic material in living organisms around the world. Advocates of biodiversity rarely explain the inherent value in this diversity of genetic material. My assessment is that this is because much of the value placed on biodiversity is aesthetic—that is, humans simply desire to know that there exists a lot of species out there in the world.

Biodiversity also holds a certain potential direct value to human beings and their own survival and the Pacific yew tree illustrates this value. It is truly miraculous that this once discarded "weed of the forest" can have such potential for treating one of mankind's greatest medical enemies. And who knows how many other species hold the key to important medical secrets.

Unfortunately, the reaction among many is to call for the preservation of these valuable natural resources. Preservation will not ensure that the 12,500 dying ovarian cancer patients will get their treatment. Only through careful management and harvesting of this important resource can its full potential be realized. I fully expect that this call for preservation will be heard each time a naturally occurring drug is discovered and its only source is an inaccessible species of one kind or another. If the goal of biodiversity is to provide some benefit to mankind, the call for preservation must shift to a call for management.

The Pacific yew tree is not unlike any other important natural resource. True, it has the potential to save lives and for that reason, it should be managed even more intensively. But, in many respects, the Pacific yew tree is not unlike our national forests, our flowing rivers, or our mineral deposits. Those resources are critical for our housing needs, our power requirements, and our needs for minerals. Just as in the case of the Pacific yew, when these natural resources are recognized as critical to our survival, we must manage them and harness their power. When a resource is important, it makes no sense to lock it up purely for our esthetic enjoyment. We can gain that enjoyment while at the same time taking advantage of the benefits they provide.

Congress should take action now to ensure a steady supply a Pacific yew bark and of taxol to treat the thousands of suffering cancer patients who die each year. It must manage for both the planting and harvesting of the Pacific yew. Congress should also take action to ensure that we do not lock away precious resources in our national forests, on our powerful rivers, and on our treasured public lands. I continue to believe that we can manage these resources in an ecologically sound manner, while serving the needs of human beings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognition.

YOSHIRO FUJIMURA

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, Ralph Waldo Emerson once said it is one of the most beautiful compensations of life that no man can sincerely try to help another without helping himself.

Today I rise to pay tribute to a new friend of mine, whom I did not meet until he was 83 years of age, and whom I and thousands of people lost as a friend in March of this year. The man is Yoshiro Fujimura. He was born in Japan actually 85 years ago and 23 days before his death on March 18, 1992, at 15 minutes past 12 o'clock.

Why do I rise to recognize this man, whom I have known so recently, but who has lived such a full life? Simply because all of his life he lived the Ralph Waldo Emerson comment about life. He was a Japanese Naval Academy graduate, studied at the Naval Staff College, and graduated first in his class back at the early part of the century. He won the Imperial Award for Excellence. He happened to have been assigned to the Japanese Embassy in Germany as the Naval Vice Attaché on December 7, 1941. He remained in that part of the world throughout the Second World War.

Among other things, he conducted secret peace talks with Allen Dulles, head of OSS, in Geneva.

He spent the rest of his life being a friend to people all over the world. He began to change the face of Sri Lanka by growing strawberries and tea and using the proceeds to raise the economic conditions in Sri Lanka. He did much the same in parts of Brazil, and he has done that same thing in the United States.

Mr. Fujimura was honored with the key to Kansas City, MO, for his kindnesses to that community, by President Harry Truman. He received the First Order of Merit from the Brazilian Government, and the Order of the British Empire from the United Kingdom. He was also a registered member and trustee of the Institute of Moralogy in Japan, a group dedicated to promoting international peace.

He was a major industrial figure in his country, and a much beloved figure in his country. He exported a lot of aerospace components and devices to the United States and from this country to Japan. He wanted to be what the world needed and what relations between great countries need—a man and a friend of all countries. I hold him up now as an example not only of a recent friend of mine, but as a person who believed that in human relations lies the secret to relations between the countries. He is going to be honored by friends in Irvine, CA, on June 6. I trust many of us will join in holding him up as a model for the kind of international businessperson that we would all like to see.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAMP SAVAGE

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, on Saturday of this past week, I went to Savage, Minnesota, to honor the 6,000 Japanese-American soldiers who participated in the Pacific theater during World War II had been a well kept military secret until 1973. Last week I was able to attend the 50th anniversary of an important development in American intelligence gathering that should not pass without comment.

Fifty years ago, just a few months after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Savage, MN, became the site of a unique experiment in a little explored area of intelligence gathering. In a converted retirement home, 5,000 Japanese-Americans trained to be secret agents whose mission was to sup-

ply information about a new and perplexing enemy.

Recognizing a desperate need for linguists to do intelligence work after the war broke out, Col. Kai E. Rasmussen recruited these second-generation Japanese-Americans, or Nisei, for an intensive new program that would make them "the eyes and ears of the Allied Forces which fought the Japanese forces in the Pacific battles.

Camp Savage was a success. Through the efforts of these human secret weapons, as President Truman would call them, Gen. Charles Willoughby estimated that the war was shortened by 2 years.

Though their numbers have thinned in the half century since their training, some 350 Nisei and their wives had returned to Minnesota for last week's ceremony. Many told of their experiences after leaving the camp. As part of their duties, the soldiers spied behind enemy lines and translated documents essential to an Allied victory in the Pacific theater.

Another veteran, Harry Fukuhara, told us that in the closing days of the war it was his duty to inform Japanese prisoners of the destruction of Hiroshima. Something called an atomic bomb had leveled the city. His mother and two brothers who lived there somehow survived. A third brother died of radiation sickness.

I might add, Mr. President, that the anniversary of Camp Savage also marked a unique moment in Minnesota history: A time when Americans of very diverse backgrounds came together against a common enemy. Why did the War Department choose Minnesota for such training? Mild weather could not have been a priority. Security certainly was a factor. After all, who would suspect a nest of spies among the elms and white pines of Minnesota?

But another reason had to do with the capacity of Minnesotans to tolerate diversity in the midst of an otherwise homogeneous region. As Maj. John Aiso put it, the criteria was that a community had to be found that would accept Japanese-Americans "for their true worth—American soldiers fighting with their brains for their native America."

Some of these men were already U.S. military members, others volunteered rather than face forced relocation at internment camps built after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. One veteran told of leaving for the war without saying goodbye to loved ones. Another told of returning home to find his parents living in a tent. Their house had been looted and burned. It is a testament to the convictions of these men that the harsh environment of the internment camps and the irrational actions of others was not enough to shake their belief in America.

As President Truman said, Japanese-Americans made the difficult choice to fight against the land of their ancestors. "This they did, knowing that in victory of the American cause was victory for all mankind."

The ceremony last week was an enlightening experience for me and many Minnesotans. We can thank Del and Lucille Stallings, who know that there is great power in remembering, for arranging this event. And in preparation for the ceremony, more than $16,000 was raised by Camp Savage graduates for construction of a Japanese garden to commemorate the camp.

Congress has made an attempt in recent years to redress those Americans who were treated like they were not Americans during World War II. An estimated 75,000 Americans of Japanese descent will benefit from the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. We would never have confronted our national conscience or begun to heal this wound if it were not for my distinguished colleague DANIEL INOUYE and our late colleague and friend to us all here in this Chamber, Spark Matsunaga.

Of course, no dollar amount can compensate for the traumatic experiences of forced internment and relocation. Nor can we put a price on the injustices visited upon Japanese-Americans during the war, but we have made a start.

Japanese-Americans can be proud to know of the incalculable contributions by the soldiers of Camp Savage, and their role in bringing to an end the war.

Mr. President, I rise today to add my voice to those who have already commemorated a pioneering moment in American history.

HEALTH CARE AND ERISA

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, the current gridlock in Washington over how to resolve the health care access and cost crisis is not about to be broken any time soon. This unfortunate state of paralysis reflects deep-seated divisions within both parties and even within the administration as to the best way of resolving this very complex problem.

It is my hope that before the end of this year the President will sign into law the Bentsen-Durenberger small group health insurance market reform bill that passed the Senate earlier this year as part of the tax bill. Small group insurance market reform will represent a very important step in making access to health insurance more affordable for many small employers.

But if that is all we accomplish at the Federal level this year, millions of Americans will still find themselves without the resources to obtain health insurance. We have to do much more, but politics assures that we will continue to run-in-place for some time to come.

Mr. President, although the Federal Government refuses to act to fill the health care void, the States are taking very significant steps aimed at bringing about universal access inside their borders.

Just recently, Minnesota became the first State in the continental United States to adopt legislation taking the citizens of our State a step closer to universal health insurance coverage. Of course, Hawaii has had universal insurance in place for many years.

Vermont recently adopted legislation that will guarantee access to all of its citizens by the mid-1990's. Oregon and California are also taking meaningful steps toward achieving this common goal. Other States are sure to follow.

Mr. President, as the States move forward, they are finding a giant roadblock in financing access for the uninsured. The roadblock that will impede them is the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974—ERISA.

In Minnesota, the capacity of the State to finance a risk pool for the uninsured has been severely handicapped because the State is barred by ERISA from seeking risk-pool financing from the large self-insured benefit plans. Instead, the State must rely solely on premium taxes imposed on private health insurance plans sold primarily to businesses too small to self-insure and gain the protections of ERISA. With more than 60 percent of employees covered by self-insured plans, it is plain to see that the base for this tax is far too small.

In its recently enacted HealthRight access legislation, Minnesota will be relying on a 2-percent hospital surtax and a 2-percent provider tax to partially fund subsidized health insurance premiums for the uninsured. While, in principle, I do not support taxes on hospitals and patients, such taxes at least indirectly require participants in self-insured plans to bear a portion of the cost of underwriting the State's access plan.

But even that approach to financing is seriously jeopardized. Just last week, Judge Alfred Wolin of the U.S. District Court in Newark, NJ, issued a 47-page opinion striking down a hospital surcharge, the proceeds of which were used to finance uncompensated hospital care throughout the State (*United Wire, Metal & Machine Health and Welfare Fund* v. *Morristown Memorial Hospital*, Civ. Act. No. 90-2639, May 27, 1992).

Judge Wolin ruled that the surcharge interfered with self-insured plans and union plans covered by ERISA. He ruled that ERISA's Federal preemption precluded imposition of the State surcharge on such plans. In fact, the opinion could be read to preclude any hospital cost-shifting that requires a self-insured plan to pay costs associated with a hospital's uncompensated care.

Just last year, Congress passed legislation that was ultimately signed into

law that ratified the ability of States to impose uniform taxes on providers to finance a portion of their Medicaid programs. If Judge Wolin's decision is upheld, all of the State provider tax programs would well be struck down.

In my view, Judge Wolin's analysis extends the breadth of the current ERISA preemption too far. But for now, that is a matter that will have to be decided by the court of appeals and the Supreme Court. In the meantime, many States, including Minnesota will have to rethink how they finance their access to Medicaid programs.

Mr. President, when ERISA was adopted 18 years ago it was intended as remedial legislation aimed at protecting the pension and welfare benefits provided company employees. In the intervening years, ERISA has become a shield behind which selfinsured companies can avoid social responsibilities that others must bear. That is not why we adopted ERISA.

ERISA should not stand in the way of legitimate State efforts to expand access to care. In the next few weeks, I hope to introduce legislation that will allow States to apply for Federal ERISA waivers that would permit them to impose nondiscriminatory surcharges on self-insured plans as part of overall health access legislation.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in this legislation so that we do not allow Federal laws to impede the creative health access efforts taking place at the State level.

Finally, Mr. President, there is another aspect of ERISA-protected self-insurance I want to address.

Currently, there is a case pending in the Supreme Court—*Greenberg, Independent Executor of the Estate of John McGann* v. *H&H Music*, No. 91-1283—appealing a decision of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. In this case, the deceased petitioner, while an employee of H&H Music, contracted AIDS. At the time, H&H had a commercial health insurance policy with a $1 million per employee lifetime health benefit.

After the company learned that the petitioner had AIDS, it terminated its health insurance policy and substituted an ERISA-protected self-insurance plan that retained the $1 million lifetime health benefit, but restricted the benefit for AIDS to $5,000.

Petitioner brought suit in Federal district court alleging that the company's action amounted to unlawful discrimination under section 510 of ERISA. The district court, on summary judgment, rejected the petitioner's claim. And the court of appeals affirmed the district court.

Mr. President, a court could read section 510 as precluding this suit. However, while I disagree with the court's interpretation of the law, I think the time has come for the Congress to step in and amend ERISA to insure that disease-specific discrimination is not permissible. What is the point of having health insurance if on the day you get sick, your employer can decide he does not want to pay for your particular disease?

I am also working on legislation that will address this problem. Again, I ask my colleagues to take a good long look at ERISA and work with me to find solutions that will end the unintended inequities that arise from ERISA.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAHAM pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GRADUATION OF AUTHERINE LUCY FOSTER FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 26, the New York Times featured an enlightening article entitled "36 Years After the Hate, Black Student Triumphs." It is the story of Autherine Lucy Foster and the education odyssey that culminated in her graduation from the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa with a master's degree in elementary education. The first black student to ever attend the university, she received her degree on May 9, 36 years after she was threatened and assaulted by rioters on the campus. She graduated along with her daughter, Grazia, who received a degree in corporate finance.

Enrolling for the 1956 spring semester at the University of Alabama, Autherine Lucy began attending classes on February 3. Three days later, an angry demonstration threatening her was organized. That evening, the University of Alabama Board of Trustees suspended Lucy for her safety and for the safety of other students. A court battle soon followed, but ultimately university trustees voted to expel her.

Mrs. Foster, now a 62-year-old English and world history teacher at Ensley Magnet High School in Birmingham, had already earned her bachelor's degree at all-black Miles College when she registered for courses at Alabama. She later taught secondary school in Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama as she moved around with her husband, the Reverend Hugh Foster.

After a speaking engagement on campus in the 1980's, Alabama professors convinced Miss Lucy to reenroll. In 1988, the university overturned her expulsion, which was technically still in effect, and she began pursuing her master's degree.

Mr. President, as a well-known columnist noted recently, "in the ugly light of a burning city, it is apparent that the United States has a long way to go in race relations." Indeed, the Los Angeles riots were a wake-up call to the whole country. However, I am inclined to believe, as the columnist does, that we have already come a great distance. The graduation of Mrs. Autherine Lucy Foster and her daughter from the University of Alabama, as well as that of hundreds of others before them over the years, proves that society and its institutions can and do change for the better.

I am pleased to offer Mrs. Foster and her daughter Grazia my congratulations and warmest best wishes for much continued success. I also commend the reading of the New York Times piece to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. It is the remarkable story of a truly historic journey.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1992]

CAMPUS LIFE: ALABAMA; 36 YEARS AFTER THE HATE, BLACK STUDENT TRIUMPHS

TUSCALOOSA, AL.—The first black student to attend the University of Alabama will receive her master's degree in elementary education in a few weeks, 36 years after she was threatened and assaulted by rioters, and subsequently expelled by the university's board. Her daughter, having quietly completed four years of undergraduate study here, will graduate alongside her.

"I didn't know whom to hate," said the mother, Autherine Lucy Foster, who is now a 62-year-old high school English and world-history teacher at Ensley Magnet High School in Birmingham. "It felt somewhat like you were not really a human being. But had it not been for some at the university, my life might not have been spared at all."

Mrs. Foster, a 1952 graduate of the all-black Miles College in Fairfield, Ala., en-

rolled in the University of Alabama in February 1956 to get what she said she believed was the best education in the state.

"If I graduated from the University of Alabama, I would have had people coming and calling me for a job," Mrs. Foster said in a recent interview. "I did expect to find isolation here. I thought I could survive that. But I did not expect it to go as far as it did."

On the third day of classes, Mrs. Foster, who was then 26 years old, faced crowds of students and townspeople as well as groups from other states who had gathered to protest her presence. At one point, the crowd pelted her with eggs. "There were students behind me saying, 'Let's kill her! Let's kill her!' " she said. From the classroom, she said she could hear the crowd chanting anti-black slogans.

That evening, the board announced that it was suspending her for her safety and that of other students. In a subsequent court battle, her lawyer contended that the university had conspired with rioters to keep her from attending class. The trustees expelled her.

In the spring of 1956, she moved to Texas and married the Rev. Hugh Foster, who is now the pastor of the Missionary Baptist Church in Birmingham. Although she had a certificate to teach English and French in secondary school, Mrs. Foster said she could not find a job at first because of the controversy surrounding her. During interviews, she said, she was told, "You were the infamous Miss Lucy, and we don't want you to come to our school."

She renewed her teaching certificate, though, and over the years taught school while her husband preached in Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama. All the while, she said, she "kept membership in the N.A.A.C.P., went to some meetings, spoke from time to time."

Mrs. Foster was still technically expelled when she arrived on campus in 1988 after two professors invited her to speak to a class about her experience. Asked then if she had ever tried to re-enroll, she said, "No, but I might test the waters."

That prompted several faculty members to try to bring her back. In April 1988, the university board overturned her expulsion.

"Even after I left," Mrs. Foster said, "when I passed the university, I would look at those buildings, and I would say, 'Girl, you've got great aspirations.' I could see myself at that university."

She says that she wanted to return because she believed that the University of Alabama was still the best school in the state.

When she returned, she said, she was admittedly bitter, but "you just refuse to spend time thinking about it."

Her daughter Grazia Foster will receive a bachelor's degree in corporate finance. She is one of 1,755 blacks among the 18,096 students on campus. The says her mother's experience did not make her wary about enrolling at the university in January 1989, the year her mother re-enrolled.

Photos: Autherine Lucy Foster, left, who became the first black student to attend the University of Alabama in 1956, is to receive her master's degree in elementary education from the school. Mrs. Foster is to graduate alongside her daughter Grazia, who is to receive a bachelor's degree in corporate finance. (Mike Clemmer for The New York Times); A newspaper clipping after Mrs. Foster was suspended from the university for her safety and that of other students. She was expelled after a court battle.

THE PARENTS AS TEACHERS PROGRAM

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the recently reported Office of Educational Research and Improvement Act encompasses the components of S. 551, the Parents as Teachers: Family Involvement in Education Act of 1991, of which I was an original cosponsor along with Senator BOND. I applaud the hard work and wisdom of the Labor and Human Resources Committee for establishing a new Parents as Teachers Program with this legislation, which not only allows our Governors to designate organizations in their respective States to coordinate such efforts, but also provides funding for those already acting as parents as teachers programs.

Title III of the act establishes the new Parents as Teachers Program. It provides seed money for States to develop and expand parent and early childhood education programs which will increase parents' knowledge of and confidence in childbearing activities. The focus is on such activities as teaching and nurturing young children; strengthening partnerships between parents and schools; and enhancing the developmental progress of participating children. Alabama, Missouri, Rhode Island, Kansas, Illinois, and a number of other States have implemented innovative early childhood-parent education programs known as Parents as Teachers. It is my hope that other States will follow their lead in ensuring that all children enter school ready and eager to learn.

As I have stated before, there is growing understanding of the importance of the first 3 years of a child's life. It is during this period of development that subtle and overt influences may adversely affect the academic and social growth of the child. I am convinced that the Parents as Teachers Program is one of the most effective systems we have to help parents best nurture and teach their children.

The Parents as Teachers Program may also help to address some of the social problems that plague us, including the nagging problem of child abuse and neglect. Individuals from 27 States have participated in training programs in Missouri. Dr. Martha Semon was the first individual from Alabama to participate. She and Janet G. Horton initiated a pilot program in Mobile, AL, that has been in place for 2 years. It is funded in large part by the children's trust fund, with additional support coming from Scott Paper Co., the College of Medicine at the University of South Alabama, and the Mobile Community Foundation. There are also several private donors. Approximately 90 adults and 50 infants are currently participating.

Ideally, parents as teachers programs will eventually be available nationwide. The program has proven itself effective in helping young people develop their intellectual, verbal, and social skills, all of which are at high risk during infancy, but which are critically important to a child's success in school.

I hope to see all of my colleagues supporting this important legislation. Parental involvement in the education of their children is the key to long-term gains for youngsters of all income brackets. It is also an important first step in empowering people by giving them a real stake in how children are reared, knowing that the success and well-being of their communities are direct results of the values imparted upon their young.

TODAY'S BOXSCORE OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, Senator HELMS is in North Carolina preparing for heart surgery, and he has asked me to submit for the RECORD each day the Senate is in session what the Senator calls the "Congressional Irresponsibility Boxscore."

The information is provided to me by the staff of Senator HELMS. The Senator from North Carolina instituted this daily report on February 26.

The Federal debt run up by the U.S. Congress stood at $3,942,204,041,144.24, as of the close of business on Monday, June 1, 1992.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child owes $15,347.74—thanks to the big spenders in Congress for the past half century. Paying the interest on this massive debt, averaged out, amounts to $1,127.85 per year for each man, woman, and child in America—or, to look at it another way, for each family of four, the tab—to pay the interest alone—comes to $4,511.40 per year.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE'S SPEECH ON BANKRUPTCY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address the need for bankruptcy reform recently, bankruptcy reform was the topic of a speech by Chief Justice Rehnquist, which he gave at the spring meeting of the American Bankruptcy Institute. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the RECORD after the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. As the Chief Justice noted, there will be 1 million new bankruptcy filings this year. This number is more than three times the number of all other civil and criminal cases that will be brought in Federal court combined. In these recessionary times, bankruptcy is receiving enormous public attention, as numerous corporations in a wide variety of industries seek bankruptcy protection.

Additionally, notwithstanding the lesser public attention given to individual bankruptcies, the Chief Justice stated that "1 in every 106 American households filed for bankruptcy in 1991, and some districts report bankruptcy filings for 1 in every 50 households."

Most important, the Chief Justice lent his support to the need to reform the bankruptcy laws. We must make the code address circumstances not foreseen when the current code was enacted in 1978. And we must reduce the excessive transaction costs that now plague the system.

This month, we will consider S. 1985, the Omnibus Bankruptcy Review Act. This bill will create a Bankruptcy Review Commission that will begin the necessary work of making our bankruptcy laws fairer, more certain, and more efficient. The Chief Justice's remarks supply further evidence of the importance of this legislation.

I commend Chief Justice Rehnquist's speech to my colleagues and urge them to support S. 1985 when it comes to the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, ANNUAL SPRING MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BANKRUPTCY INSTITUTE, MAY 18, 1992

Thank you Bob (Bob Feidler—current ABI President) and members of the Institute. It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the nation's capital on the occasion of your annual spring meeting. May I also extend my congratulations as you celebrate the institute's tenth anniversary of leadership and service in the field of bankruptcy. Those of us who make up the federal judiciary are keenly aware of the important contribution your organization has made and continues to make. I need not remind you how much that expertise will be needed as we watch bankruptcy issues move to center stage on both the national and the international arenas. It was not so very long ago that bankruptcy news was confined primarily to the newspapers' business sections. Today, bankruptcy commands front page coverage. This is obviously not good news for the nation's economy, but it has surely raised the "visibility" of the bankruptcy bench and bar.

It has also resulted in a staggering increase in bankruptcy filings. Since implementation of the new Bankruptcy Code in 1979, over six million bankruptcy cases have been filed. Last year alone approximately 950,000 new filings represented an increase of 20 percent over the previous year. This is almost four times the number filed just 12 years ago, and the pace is still accelerating. Estimates suggest there will be another one million bankruptcy filings in 1992, compared to 250,000 civil case filings and 50,000 criminal case filings in the federal courts. These numbers are impressive, and I commend the judges and support personnel of our bankruptcy courts for their efforts to make the system work fairly and efficiently. Their job is a difficult one and promises to become even more so as we see both a continuation of the last few years' filings trends and an increasing complexity in the issues presented by many cases.

Regrettably, the bankruptcy courts are forced to perform these tasks without the necessary complement of judges. The number of bankruptcy judges has increased only 23 percent since 1979, while the system's workload has quadrupled. In some districts, the caseload has increased by 400 percent to 600 percent with little or no increase in authorized judgeships. The average caseload for all bankruptcy judges is over 3,200 cases; some judges now carry a caseload in excess of 10,000 cases. Although not all of these cases require active judicial intervention, those that do strain the system to the point where improvements in efficiency and case handling can no longer keep pace. S. 646, which passed the Senate last summer, would create 32 new bankruptcy judgeships. The Judicial Conference has endorsed this bill and its increase in bankruptcy judgeships. I urge the House to also give it favorable consideration. Even in the rarified chambers of the Supreme Court, this wave of bankruptcy fillings is being felt. Two terms ago, we decided three cases dealing with bankruptcy. Last term, we decided five such cases. During the present term, we will have decided nine such cases. The percentage of our total docket represented by bankruptcy questions has therefore risen from roughly two percent to eight percent in just two years.

Whether we do a good job or not with these cases is a question which many of you are in a better position to decide than I am. The present composition of the Court is such that those of us who had experience in bankruptcy matters in private practice had it under the regime of the Bankruptcy Act of 1898 and the Chandler Act of 1938. The changes between that regime and the present one are substantial, and so this sort of experience with the earlier regime may be a handicap rather than a help in deciding cases of the sort which now come before us. We are in the same position as the political candidate once described by Will Rogers: "There are a lot of things he don't know, and a lot of the things he do know 'ain't so'."

The substantive rules under the old regime differed in material respects from those which obtain under the present regime. I also suspect, though I of course cannot be sure, that the ambience at the practice was quite different then than it is now. In Phoenix, where I practiced, there were several downtown restaurants frequented on occasion at mid-morning coffee-break by lawyers who had offices in nearby buildings. One of these was called the San Carlos, and quite regularly the referee in bankruptcy, as he was then known, would make an appearance there around 10 o'clock in the morning. He would be accompanied by a retinue of two or three lawyers who had offices in the same building as he did; this was the Phoenix bankruptcy bench and bar. Those of us sitting at other tables often speculated as to whether they were in the process of parcelling out trusteeships, receiverships, and appointments as attorneys in bankruptcy proceedings as they had their morning cup of coffee.

The referee in Phoenix at that time was more of what would now be called a "consensus builder" than an actual arbitrator or judge. It was for this reason that those of us who represented secured creditors took advantage of the opportunity under the old regime for a secured creditor in possession to have a plenary hearing before a district judge. I remember one case I had before the referee involving a very nice question relating to the elusive hypothetical bona fide purchaser. My opponent and I argued it to him quite learnedly for about ten minutes each, when he announced that he would take a recess and wanted to see us in chambers. His message in chambers to the two of us was quite simple: You guys have latched on to a very difficult question, I don't know the answer to it; you'd better settle the case. Faced with the prospect of indefinite inaction on his part, we did just that.

How different it is today. Numbers alone cannot tell the whole story. Over the last decade we have seen how bankruptcy has directly touched the lives of countless Americans, since most of the filings represent those made by individuals. There has been tremendous growth in consumer debt and estimates suggest that between 15 and 20 million Americans are involved in bankruptcy proceedings as either debtors or creditors. One in every 106 American households filed for bankruptcy in 1991, and some districts report bankruptcy filings for one in every fifty households. These personal bankruptcies have an effect that may extend beyond those who enter the system by filing a petition. Some analysis have attributed the nationwide "credit crunch" to the escalation in bankruptcy filings. Small business loans are down, and Chapter 7 bankruptcy losses have become the second largest cost of business for consumer lenders.

Although most numerous in numbers, the individual bankruptcies neither provide the living for many of the private practitioners here today, nor do they receive much publicity on their individual merits. Both of those come from Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. Newspaper headlines inform us that there are pervasive economic problems in industries such as airlines, oil, retailing, real estate, and some manufacturing sectors. In light of these economic conditions, Chapter 11 has become a major tool for restructuring corporate America, with broad implications for employees, retirees, business competitors, and the economy as a whole. Perhaps it is stating the obvious to say that not everyone approves of this wave of high visibility Chapter 11 proceedings. Indeed, Chapter 11 has many detractors and some go so far as to reject the notion that financially troubled firms should be able to reorganize instead of liquidating. They argue that Chapter 11 has a pro-debtor, pro-incumbent management bias that does not foster efficient allocations of assets. I suspect the debate over these arguments will make the pending bankruptcy reform efforts a lively undertaking.

In addition to the sheer volume of Chapter 11 work, bankruptcy courts are also assuming more responsibility as they are called upon to solve non-traditional bankruptcy problems. This changing role is most visible as bankruptcy courts tackle the mass tort liability cases now making their way through the bankruptcy system. The movement of mass tort litigation into the bankruptcy courts has opened a new arena whereby a Chapter 11 reorganization not only discharges mass tort claims, but it also serves as a vehicle to organize consensual settlements and administer compensation to tort claimants. The Johns-Manville and the A.H. Robins cases represent two instances where the bankruptcy courts undertook this new role. The successes and failures of these efforts bear careful study as we focus on varying means for handling mass torts.

The bankruptcy courts have also been in the forefront of a national reaction to the high costs of litigation. Attorney's fees are under scrutiny everywhere, but recent bankruptcy-related concern has been fueled by the impressive amounts of professional fees in some of the major Chapter 11 reorganizations, as well as accounts of bankruptcy lawyers billing 24-hour days, choosing first class

travel, and imposing billing rates that top $500 an hour. Although those phenomena are hardly restricted to the bankruptcy bar, they have become a potent subject for controversy when combined with the increasing criticism that lawyers' and experts' fees often swallow up large portions of an estate's assets, leaving little behind for creditors.

There is a good deal of dissatisfaction in the United States generally with the fees charged by attorneys. But the client who is dissatisfied with the fee charged by an attorney on a contractual basis has, in one sense, brought the problem on himself by not asking for more explicit arrangements; the client also has the option next time of shopping around to find an attorney whose fees are more to his liking. The losing defendant who is required to pay the plaintiff's attorneys fees does not have the luxury, but in the case of the losing defendant there is at least a finding that the defendant has injured the plaintiff. But in the case of a bankruptcy estate, none of these ameliorating factors come into play, and the common perception is that the payment of attorneys fees out of the estate diminishes by just that much the amount that creditors may recover. This is an area of the law in which I think the arguments are strongest for reducing transactional costs if it is humanly possible to do so—an area where transactional costs demonstrably and directly diminish the amount available to pay legitimate claims. In any revision of the Bankruptcy Code, careful thought should be given to lessening such transactional costs, if necessary by shortening, combining, or otherwise simplifying these procedures.

As reform efforts come to the fore, I trust that this body will continue to contribute to the ongoing reappraisal of our bankruptcy system, whether it be through the proposed commission of some other vehicle. In his first address as Chief Justice to the American Law Institute, Charles Evans Hughes spoke of that organization as "a roundup of intelligent discontent." He was referring to the ALI's law reform efforts and its role as a constant prod to improve the administration of justice. It seems to me that this organization can play a similar role in its chosen area of speciality, providing a level-headed, disciplined and reasoned contribution to bankruptcy law reform.

In one area—that of better understanding between the state and federal court systems, the ABI has already taken an important step and I urge you to give continued efforts to this area. I am pleased to tell you about the success of the first National Conference on State-Federal Judicial Relationships, held last month in Orlando, Florida. There, over 300 representatives of the state and federal judiciary met to discuss, first, the issues which cause friction between the systems, and second, methods for achieving better cooperation. I have been told that the Conference created a warm receptivity to further cooperative efforts, an overwhelming mutual respect, and a large agenda for future work.

As one of its purposes, the Conference sought to determine which activities of the federal courts currently provide the greatest friction point between the state and federal systems. Surprisingly, the consensus choice was not habeas corpus or diversity jurisdiction, although these continue to be a fertile source for disagreement. Instead, the work of the bankruptcy courts was widely recognized as the major friction point. I suppose that is not surprising when one considers in combination the number of bankruptcy cases in the system and the breadth of the Bankruptcy Code's automatic stay provisions. Even under the best of conditions, a state judge or administrative official may be expected to resent having put time into a matter only to see it automatically foreclosed by the filling of a bankruptcy petition, or worse yet, to see a state court litigant hauled into bankruptcy court and fined for willfully violating the Code's stay provisions. Moreover, state court counsel and the state judge may be unfamiliar with the code's procedures for lifting the automatic stay, or may not understand the justification for the wide scope of matters brought within the automatic stay provisions. The ABI has made a fine initial contribution with its booklet on "Bankruptcy Issues for State Trial Court Judges" and its programs for state judges. There are many other opportunities for you to enhance mutual understanding, including the local state-federal judicial councils that I hope can be revitalized by the efforts begun in Orlando. These councils were first formed with the encouragement of Chief Justice Burger in the early 70's. Although some continue to work actively, others have fallen into disuse. Their revitalization can create organized entities, on a local level, to facilitate cooperative state-federal education efforts.

The Bankruptcy Code was enacted almost fifteen years ago, but like many other changes in the law it takes years after enactment for such a measure to fully impress itself on bench, bar, and citizenry. The intervening period of time has shown how important is the work of the bankruptcy bench and bar, both in good economic times and bad economic times. I hope this organization, with its representations of all segments of the bankruptcy bench and bar, will continue, and perhaps to function even more than it has, as an overseer of the way the bankruptcy laws work. We need organizations performing this function in every area of the law, and I can think of none in which it is more important than in the area of bankruptcy.

TRIBUTE TO COL. WILLIAM H. MONAY

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I rise to note the passing of a distinguished and decorated World War II hero, Col. William H. Monay.

Colonel Monay was a native of Pittsburg, KS, but has resided in my home State of Utah for many years. He had a long and outstanding career in the U.S. Air Force and was highly decorated for his bravery and service.

Following 4 years of engineering training at the University of Utah, William Monay was commissioned a second lieutenant from the Air Force ROTC in May 1931. He entered active duty in April 1941, arriving in the Philippines a week before the attack on Pearl Harbor. Shortly after the outbreak of the war, he distinguished himself as the commander of a guerrilla detachment. During this period he was wounded and subsequently received the Purple Heart Medal.

His successful direction of the construction of a hidden airbase in the Philippines during the early months of World War II was legendary, and allowed critical bombing raids to be completed by the heavily outnumbered American and Filipino forces. During this crucial time, Colonel Monay was the officer who personally arranged the transportation for Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur and his family to leave the Philippines after the attack at Pearl Harbor and the imminent fall of Luzon to the Japanese.

Following the war, Colonel Monay continued in the Air Force and was stationed from Alabama to Alaska. He served as director of maintenance at Hill Air Force Base in Utah from 1950 to 1952.

Upon retiring from the Air Force in 1959, Colonel Monay was appointed to be the vice president and general manager of the Aircraft Engineering and Maintenance Co. Later, he served as chief administrative officer for the Utah State Department of Highways.

I am proud to pay tribute to Col. William H. Monay for his lifetime devoted to service to his country, State, and community. I want to personally acknowledge the contributions of this fine man, and extend my condolences to his wife, Norma, his family and friends. He leaves behind an example and reputation that will be remembered for many years to come.

DAN DOHERTY

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, last Wednesday, Dan Doherty who served on the staff of the U.S. Senate for over 20 years died. When Dan was so suddenly—and untimely from our viewpoint—taken from us, we all lost a wonderful friend.

No words will take away the hurt we feel from his loss. But because of the kind of person Dan was, I think it is altogether fitting that we not just mourn his death, but celebrate his life.

In one way or another, Dan's life touched many of us. Whether we knew him as a husband, father, grandfather, brother, colleague, or friend, the memories of Dan that we carry with us can never be erased.

I was in Toledo on Wednesday when the word came that Dan had died. And after the initial shock, what a flood of memories.

Dan had come to work in my office in 1977. I was a new Senator, and Dan, who had worked for United Press International in Wyoming and for Senator Gale McGee, was a seasoned veteran.

He worked for the old Senate Postal Committee prior to its inclusion into the Governmental Affairs Committee and was acknowledged to be the postal expert on Capitol Hill. If you wanted to know something about postal matters whether it was rate structures or fairness, see Dan.

Dan's work with me went way beyond postal matters, he really knew how Capitol Hill worked. Everybody knew and liked Dan, he knew the people—knew the procedures, the system—he

could get things done and we need more of that.

He handled my legislative duties, shared in a reelection race, and a Presidential campaign. During long Senate sessions, he was there with information, counsel, and advice. In a few words—I depended on Dan and in 7 years he never let me down.

In 1984, Dan underwent heart surgery and in 1985 became executive director of the Alliance of Non-Profit Mailers. I did not see him as often after that, but was always glad to have him stop in the office.

Today we live with sound bites and single word descriptions of people who are referred to as self-centered, mean, spiteful, grasping, arrogant, selfish, or boastful. Not Dan Doherty, he was the opposite, caring, thoughtful, self-effacing, gentle, considerate, quiet, and kind.

Dan was loyal and dedicated, thoroughly professional and absolutely dependable. If Dan said he would do it, you could take it to the bank that it would get done.

To Dan's wife Emily and his family, may God carry you through this rough time. To Dan, we are grateful that we knew you and for what you meant to each of us. Most of all, we miss you, Dan, and we always will.

SKIP HADDAD

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I attended the funeral of Skip Haddad last Wednesday in Toledo, OH. Skip, a member of my staff, was killed in an automobile accident on Saturday, May 23, 1992. In addition to the funeral, Reverend Halverson, the Chaplain of the Senate, led a memorial service for Skip in the Capitol Chapel so members of my Washington, DC, staff could pay their respects.

When Skip Haddad was so suddenly snatched away from us, Toledo lost a booster, the Democratic Party lost a soldier, and we all lost a friend. No words offered will remove the pain we feel from his loss. In one way or another, Skip's life touched each of us. Whether we knew Skip as a son, a brother, a colleague, or a friend, each of us carried special memories of him that cannot be erased.

Skip came to work for me in July 9, 1991. Though my association with him was brief, I quickly came to appreciate him not just for his political skills, but for the kind of person he was. Thoroughly dependable and absolutely professional, Skip was as dedicated and loyal an employee as I have ever had. Because he cared more for people than for money, he dedicated his career to public service and volunteered his time and talents in the political arena. In Toledo, no Democratic campaign was official until Skip Haddad signed onto it.

Skip was a kind and gentle man in a business that is not always that way. He neither ducked responsibility nor tried to shift blame. He stood up for his values, without making others uncomfortable about theirs. He was a true public servant, always finding time to assist those whose lives were the hardest and whose problems were the most difficult.

Prior to serving in my office, Skip worked for Representative MARCY KAPTUR and former Ohio Secretary of State Sherrod Brown. He worked on the Gephardt for President campaign in 1988, and earned the John P. Kelly "Democrat of the Year" Award in 1991. Skip's involvement in the Toledo community extended far beyond the political. Among his pursuits was his involvement in the Village Players, where he provided lighting, sound, and other technical services.

Skip Haddad's life was wonderful—so incredibly full for one so unfairly brief. All of us who were fortunate to know Skip are grateful for the way he touched and enriched our lives. We will miss him.

INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have finally figured out the Democrat strategy for solving this Nation's unemployment problem: Appoint as many special counsels as it takes to absorb the entire jobless pool.

The latest proposal to waste taxpayers money, and keep a few fat-cat politically correct lawyers lavishly employed, is the call by some House Democrats for a special counsel, to probe the issue of American pre-Desert Storm dealings with Iraq.

I suppose the next proposal would be to find out why American intelligence dealt with Ho Chi Minh back in the Second World War—except that happened while a Democrat was President, so it is off-limits for congressional scrutiny.

Anyway, the special counsel for Saddam would be added to the illustrious and expensive roster which now includes the endless Walsh probe; the pointless October Surprise Probe; the boundless BCCI probe; and the contentious POW/MIA probe.

And since I have not read through all my news clips today, there are probably a few more that have been proposed in the past few hours.

In fact, in light of the polls we are seeing these days, I presume that Mr. Clinton's party is soon going to start proposing some investigations of Ross Perot. He must have done something wrong. He's more popular than they are.

Mr. President, with all these investigations, the ones that might truly advance the public interest are never proposed or implemented. For example, it might be in the interest of America's national security to inquire as to how, why, and on what authority an individual Member of the House of Representatives decided to release classified documents on United States-Iraq relations to the public, by putting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We have laws against that in this country. We have rules against that in the Senate. Apparently they do not in the House.

Anyway, Mr. President, enough is enough. Enough witch-hunting. Enough desperate searches for dirt on President Bush or those close to him. Enough efforts to distract attention from scandals at the Democrat-run House bank, or House post office.

Enough taxpayer dollars are wasted and I think the American people, one reason they are frustrated and looking for new leadership in Congress and the executive branch is they are tired of these games that we play and the dollars that we spend in playing the games. If we did not spend anything, they would not be so upset. But all these little investigations cost a few million dollars. Which leads me to the second point.

LAVISH IRAN-CONTRA INVESTIGATION DRAGS ON AND ON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for several years now, I have been suggesting that the time has come for Special Prosecutor Lawrence Walsh to shut down his costly, lavish, and unnecessary Iran-Contra investigation.

And every time I make this suggestion, I have high hopes it will be the last time I do so. I have high hopes that Mr. Walsh will finally face facts: That after 5½ years, after billing the taxpayers more than $30 million—$30 million—enough is enough.

Each time, however, the American people have been disappointed. Because each time, Mr. Walsh stumbles upon some other blind alley in which to steer his investigation, and the bill to the taxpayers just keeps getting bigger and bigger and bigger.

The latest blind alley were the unethical tactics designed to intimidate former Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger.

Mr. Walsh's agents told Mr. Weinberger that unless he testified that President Reagan was involved in violations of the law during Iran-Contra, they would see that Secretary Weinberger was indicted by the grand jury.

If Mr. Walsh's hit men had done their homework, they would have discovered that Mr. Weinberger was one of the Reagan administration's most vocal opponents of Iran-Contra, and that he played no role in it.

To Mr. Weinberger's credit, he and his attorneys would not buckle into the special prosecutor's blackmail.

I do not blame Mr. Walsh for the fact that his investigation has ended in failure. He warned Congress that if they provided immunity to Colonel North

and Admiral Poindexter, then any successful criminal prosecution would be difficult.

What I do blame Mr. Walsh for is turning this investigation into the "Everready rabbit," it just keeps going and going and going.

And recent news articles have suggested that it will keep on going, because Mr. Walsh has his sights set on indicting former President Reagan, no matter how much it costs the taxpayers, and apparently, no matter how ugly the tactics.

Perhaps he sees this as the only way in which he could justify the massive expenses he has racked up in his cushy Washington, DC, office.

Mr. President, since Mr. Walsh began his investigation, the Reagan administration has left office, the Ayatollah Khomeini has died, the Sandanistas were voted out of office, and the Contras disbanded.

As the Washington Times pointed out in a recent editorial:

To continue Mr. Walsh's operation beyond those events was rather like resuming the investigation of the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's. * * *

Let us face it, Lawrence Walsh's failed investigation is fit for Oliver Stone, not Uncle Sam. If Mr. Walsh wants the final word in this case, he should take his wacky theories to Mr. Stone, and the two of them can spend their own money—and not the taxpayer's money—on making a movie.

TRIBUTE TO HILLSIDE HIGH SCHOOL, DURHAM, NC

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the students and faculty of Hillside High School in the Durham City Schools of North Carolina. Of a group of 624 participating schools, they were recently judged to be the No. 1 school in the Nation in the 6th annual American Set a Good Example Contest, a nationwide effort created by the Concerned Businessmen's Association of America. The contest is designed to involve youth actively in a campaign to get drugs off the school grounds, to encourage young people to take ownership of their education and to use commonsense standards of right and wrong, and to teach young people to lead by setting good examples for other youth in their schools and communities.

Across the country, our young are missing educational opportunities. In this moment of crisis, it is refreshing to witness the commitment and determination of Hillside students and faculty. Throughout the 1991–92 school year, they have initiated several projects that demonstrate both competence and a too-often-forgotten concern for the lives of others. Whether it be volunteering at a nearby elementary school, hosting a family day to bring parents into the school, building homes through Habitat for Humanity, or publicly recognizing exemplary students, Hillside has established a high level of citizenship, honesty, and leadership. Their success in this national competition is evidence that our Nation's future is in responsible, caring hands.

I commend Durham Mayor Harry Rodenhizer and North Carolina Gov. James Martin who have, in honor of this achievement, proclaimed June and July 1992 as "Set a Good Example Month," respectively. I applaud the Durham City School Board of Education, Richard Hicks, the school principal, Missouri Morris the school assistant principal, and other faculty members for guiding these students to such excellence. I salute the younger Hornets—the students—for inspiring their community and the country to demand and do more. You have indeed set a good example.

Again, I extend my heartfelt congratulations. Keep up the good work.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would inform the Senator from Hawaii that morning business is closed.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1991

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1504, which the clerk will now report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1504) to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Byrd amendment No. 1859, to require the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations to prohibit the broadcasting of indecent programming.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will further inform the Senate that under the previous order the Lott amendment is now in order and is limited and controlled under the following circumstances. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] is allowed 30 minutes; the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], 30 minutes; and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], 15 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1865

(Purpose: To freeze the authorization levels for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting at present levels)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I now ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. COATS, and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 1865.

On page 6, strike lines 12 through 15 and insert:

"(3) by inserting ', $275,000,000 for fiscal years 1994, 1995 and 1996.'"

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am recognized at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator, under the previous order, has 30 minutes under his control.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me begin by stating simply what this amendment would do. It would freeze funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at the current levels of $275 million for the 3-year authorization period, saving over that period of time close to $300 million. Actually it is $285 million.

I want to emphasize at the beginning that we need to know that this is a 3-year authorization bill and it comes to a total of over a billion dollars—in fact, $1.1 billion-plus—so this is a substantial authorization. I know it is the authorization, and the argument will be made it is only an authorization and the Appropriations Committee will come back and review that and will, as they have usually done, fund it at some lower level.

I maintain what we should do is provide a steady level of authorization at the existing level. And I think if you check the record, you will find it is about at the level that the Appropriations Committee will actually appropriate. They have a long history of not going to the full authorization level. But at this time in the history of our country and in view of the $400 billion deficit that we face this year, and the $4 trillion national debt, it seems to me that a little restraint is in order. Surely it should begin here, now, with this bill.

This is not about Big Bird. It is a question of whether or not we can cut the bill a little bit.

I want to emphasize also at the beginning that this is not intended at all on my part to diminish the very important role that educational TV plays. There are some very, very positive stories that can be told about what the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has done, and PBS, and the National Public Radio. In my own State of Mississippi I thoroughly enjoy listening to the public radio music. I do not enjoy a lot of the news or the commentary—the editorials—but it does provide an option that you might not get otherwise.

And I want to say I am very proud of the very fine job that our Mississippi Educational Network does. They show real discretion.

There has already been debate in the media and here on the floor of the Sen-

ate, and there will be more debate, about the objectivity, the fairness, the balance, the practices in hiring—there are all kinds of problems with this organization. I do not think there is any question that they have had some mismanagement, some problems, balance has been questioned by the right and by the left. I think that needs to be addressed. I am very much concerned about what I see and hear on the public broadcasting stations and in national radio. I can cite a lot of examples, like others. But that is not the thrust of this amendment. I am not questioning, here, their balance, or their practices, and their news, and their editorial policy. That is for other amendments and other days. I am focusing on the question of cost.

Here we are, about to engage in the next few weeks in what may be, hopefully, a historic debate about whether or not we should have a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. And I have to ask myself, are we going to be so hypocritical that with every bill that comes through this body, we add more spending? Right before Memorial Day recess it was $1.5 billion more that was added to a genuine disaster emergency. But we added $1.5 billion on top of that, and the Senate voted that is OK, we will just add it to the deficit. Only 37 Senators voted against adding that amount to the national deficit. Now here we come again with a significant increase in authorizations—a 50-percent increase—going from $275 million to, I believe, $310 million and then $375 million, and in the third year, which is fiscal year 1996, $425 million.

So I just have to question that. But I want to cite a couple examples of some of the problems that we have had in my own State. We have a very good executive director of our Mississippi educational TV, a fellow named A.J. Jaeger. He has been very diligent in writing me letters, sending memos and faxes about his experiences in Mississippi and working with the national system.

I want to read parts of a letter I have from him because I think it sums up some of his concerns and the concerns of others.

He says his primary goal as executive director "has been to provide balanced, 'family-friendly' programming—on Mississippi ETV and on Public Radio in Mississippi—to every household" in our State. "Because I have chosen to monitor carefully and to preempt objectionable programs, we have not experienced the problems with Public Broadcasting Service programming that other States have encountered. I chose not to run "Tongues Untied," "Stop the Church," and other programs unsuited for Mississippi family viewing.

"However," he says, "the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is in no way responsible for any of my complaints about the system. CPB acts as an insulator to protect the integrity of program decisionmaking and, through its community service grants, ensures that we have the funds to purchase our evening and weekend programming."

He goes on to say, "I cannot say the same kind words for PBS and National Public Radio. As I noted in my memorandum to you last week, I have frequently protested—to the president of NPR, to its board members, to the news division—about the quality and character of the journalism practiced by NPR, whose segments are more difficult to anticipate and preempt than those on television.

"Until 2 years ago, the national PBS affiliates chose the programming that went on the system. This was a representative procedure which gave each area of the country and each State and many cities an opportunity to express their preferences and put their best foot forward. Now one person, the executive vice president for national programming, dictates what programs will be on the system. Consequently, the PBS program stream comes almost entirely from the large producing stations—Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Los Angeles—and the system fails to represent the less urban and rural sections of the country. I personally find this regrettable, since much of the strength and talent of our country comes from these areas.

"It is very demoralizing and frustrating for my production staff to realize that, no matter how fine a program we produce, it will never air nationally," and he cites just one program, "Return to the River," which echoes Mark Twain's assessment that the Mississippi River Basin is the body of the Nation and showcases an enormous historical, social, cultural and artistic contribution.

Participants in that program included Shelby Foote, B.B. King, Alex Haley, Justin Wilson, Eudora Welty, great authors and musicians, and yet it will never stand a chance the way the system presently works.

So there are clearly major problems with how these systems are being operated right now, and the executive director in my State feels he is not being treated fairly and he is very concerned about the programming. But he does say that he would like a steady and reliable stream of funding so they can plan with certainty. Of course, he is concerned about any limitation on future funding.

But, Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today is not about all these issues that I have been referring to at PBS and Public Radio. It is about fiscal responsibility, deficit spending, and priorities. Where are we going to spend our moneys? What are our priorities? It is not about Big Bird and "Sesame Street" being in jeopardy. So let us put that aside.

This is about increasing the 3-year budget of CPB by 50 percent. This comes at a time when our Nation is running deficits that are out of control and the people are crying for leadership and fiscal restraint. We cannot continue to hand out 50-percent increases when the Federal deficit is running at the levels we are seeing right now.

The opponents of this amendment will say for the sake of our children we should increase CPB's budget. But as many of us have said in these very Chambers, we can no longer mortgage the future of our children by increasing the deficit. It must stop for the sake of our children. They are the ones who are going to pay the price for all these increased funding bills that we are passing through the Congress week after week after week.

The people understand the value of educational programming, and we support it; I support it. But the people of my State and the Nation demand fiscal responsibility, and I am sure that they would celebrate any show of fiscal responsibility that would be passed by this body.

Earlier this spring, I asked the people of my State in an unscientific form about the issues facing the country, what they were concerned about; 85.1 percent said we need to reduce the deficit instead of increasing domestic spending; and 89 percent said they support a balanced budget amendment. You cannot have a balanced budget amendment, you cannot balance the budget if you continue to have authorization that goes up by 50 percent over 3 years.

So this amendment would try to strike a balance by promoting educational programming, while maintaining some restraint and fiscal responsibility. Educational programming for children, yes. But funding for pundits and commentary for the elite is something else and that is a lot of what is involved here.

It is a relevant question to ask whether Congress should reward CPB with this increase in view of the problems they have had, the questions about management and financial practices, and they are out there. It is also reasonable to ask these groups who are receiving Federal money who are supposedly nonprofit charitable organizations whether they are doing some things they really should not be doing in view of the fact they are getting Federal funds, including enormous salaries.

For instance, the Children's Television Workshop president is paid $624,000 a year. I presume he does not get Federal money for that. But that program, which is a very healthy one, has a president that gets $624,000 a year. What is the source? It is what is required to be filed with IRS.

The director of New York's public television station, WNET, is paid $304,000 a year. Another public television station director, KCET received

$242,000. A stagehand at WNET was paid $103,000. My staff has been trying to fill out applications. They are trying to get on as stagehands, $103,000. Yet the supporters of PBS are claiming they are in desperate financial condition and they need this increased Federal funding.

I want the record to show, Mr. President, that Children's Television Network, which receives $4 million now of taxpayers' money, and I am sure that would be anticipated to go up under the increased authorization for funding that we have in this bill, that network grosses $100 million a year—$100 million. This is a pretty successful entity—and it has an investment portfolio in stocks and bonds of $52 million. They are grossing $100 million. They have savings of $52 million. And we are giving them Federal funds? I do not understand that.

Is the taxpayers' money being spent wisely? I have my doubts. Is there wasteful spending? I feel very sure. Should Congress grant CPB a 50-percent increase in funding? No.

Let me again emphasize, this amendment is about fiscal responsibility and priorities; $275 million, is not chicken feed. That is enough dough to do the job and have some left over for the cookie monster. There is plenty of funding here. I do not want to cut it off. This is not an amendment to eliminate funding. This is just to level funding. I think the American people would understand that on every program. We are saying, look, we are not going to cut you even though we would like to in certain areas. Let us just level funding. What do we do?

If the appropriations are provided, it would cost us $300 million more unless we adopt this amendment.

So I say to my colleagues, let us talk about priorities. At a time when military bases are closing all over this country, causing economic disruption, loss of jobs, loss of revenue, cities are burning. Health care and education, some would say are in shambles and needs more funding, and we are going to put another $300 million into the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Could we not better use that money somewhere else? Could we not use it on urban and rural poverty programs? My own State needs more job training. We need another Job Corps training center to try to help people who have dropped out, lost their job, to be trained to do something. Give me just a little piece of this $300 million—$16 million to put another Job Corps center in the poorest State in the Nation.

But instead we are debating whether to increase funding for something that clearly amounts, for the most part, although not entirely, to an upper-middle-class entitlement program.

Yes, we need it in the rural areas, whether it is Alaska or Hawaii, and my own State of Mississippi. But my question is, How much is enough? Senator HELMS, who at this very hour is being operated on and having a heart bypass, I am sure, if he were here, would be asking that same question today and he would be offering this amendment or one like it to try to keep some fiscal responsibility, some restraint.

Opponents will maybe say this is a drop in the bucket, this is a small amount of money for a worthwhile program. Where I come from $300 million is not a drop in the bucket. A $1.1 billion program is not small potatoes. So I do not think that argument will sell either.

I do not agree with everything that has been said about these programs by the media, pro and con. But George Will, a columnist, has had a lot to say about it. I saw one quote that caught my attention. He said:

> If something as marginal as public television successfully defends its subsidies, cuts can only come at the expense of Americans less affluent, educated, articulate, and skillful at lobbying than public television's aggressively moralistic constituency, and public television will be a paradigm of Government's role as servant of the comfortable and defender of the strong at the expense of the future.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues today to exercise just a little restraint. Let us not allow a 50-percent increase over these 3 years. We are going to give them the certainty of 3-year authorizations at $275 million. That is enough. That is enough. Frankly, I do not think we should be increasing any program at this time—not increasing. Let us try to hold the line or let us rearrange our priorities, but let us not be increasing the funding for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting by $300 million.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes, 51 seconds.

Mr. LOTT. I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERREY). The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend from Mississippi because I believe that public broadcasting provides an important service to the country. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

The funding levels contained in this bill are intended to give CPB and public broadcast stations the ability to overcome the effects of inflation. The amendment would not consider inflation increases in the cost of production and acquisition of programming. In addition, the proposed funding levels will enable the CPB to increase the funding available to TV and radio stations in smaller communities and rural areas and increase the number of communities that have access to public radio.

Finally, this funding will enable public television stations to increase substantially the instructional and educational programming that is provided to schools and universities in this country.

During this debate, I believe there has been too little discussion of the enormous contribution to education made by public television. Nationwide public television represents the largest contributor of video and televised instructional material for schools, colleges, and home viewers in the country. For 30 years, public TV stations have provided their local schools and State educational institutions with technical expertise and quality programs to supplement classroom instruction. Public TV stations have an impressive record of working with educational institutions to address specific education needs. Local stations and PBS are harnessing the power of TV to improve educational opportunity across the country. Public television reaches over 29 million students in nearly 70,000 schools, grades K through 12; 1.8 million teachers use public television's education services. Annually, 1,500 instructional programs, including math and science, are distributed via satellite and many more are distributed by local stations.

Public television also makes higher education accessible for working adults who cannot attend college in traditional ways. Two-thirds of America's 3,000 colleges now use PBS courses. Two million adults earned college credit from public TV in the last decade with an increase of 7 percent this year. Fully 819 hours of television credit courses are being delivered this year. At the preschool level, public TV will soon be providing training for Headstart teachers via satellite. Most of the recipients of this instruction will be in remote Alaskan villages and in native American and migrant labor populations. This is a further indication of how public TV can break down educational barriers. Public TV's nonclassroom programming for children, including such gems as "Sesame Street" and "Reading Rainbow," are unmatched anywhere on the television dial. Public TV is truly the dominant source of quality children's programming available to all Americans, regardless of their income or where they live. Moreover, public TV has a history of innovations that broaden the reach of television.

For the hearing-impaired, public TV originated closed captioning.

For the sight-impaired, public TV uses Descriptive Video Service [DVS], an optional audio narration.

And for Spanish-speakers, the "MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour" airs in

many communities with a Spanish-language soundtrack.

Public TV provides additional services to those who subscribe to cable. But even more importantly, it serves millions more who do not subscribe to cable. Public TV is available in many more U.S. homes than any cable-originated channel. Public TV reaches 98 percent of U.S. households. In comparison, about 61 percent of U.S. households have cable service—and that percentage is not likely to exceed two-thirds in the foreseeable future.

Mr. President, our President has indicated that he wanted to go down in history as the education President. This Congress has dedicated itself to be the education Congress. All candidates for the Presidency have indicated they want to be the education President. This is an education bill, Mr. President. It does more for education than any other service that we have provided in this Congress.

And now, if I may speak on public radio.

Public radio is more than a broadcast signal to local communities. It is an asset whose value cannot be measured in ratings points or power output. Public radio stations provide information on community issues, are active in education, and bring together disparate groups through community outreach. National programming highlights the concerns of the larger society, while local stations focus on how national concerns are reflected at home.

The stations' ability to reach across boundaries of geography, class, and ethnicity enables them to bring people together to work on community issues. Public radio stations are playing an increasingly important role in their local communities.

Public radio's news and information programming is preferred by listeners who believe sound-bite journalism does not meet the needs of our complex world. NPR news and information programming attracts 9.1 million listeners weekly.

More people today hear a single story on NPR's "Morning Edition" or "All Things Considered" than heard public radio during an entire week in the early 1970's.

Rural and minority stations face special problems. Many have relatively small audiences that cannot fully support them.

In 1988, Congress encouraged public radio to pursue the goal of reaching unserved and underserved audiences. Since then, with very few resources public radio has worked diligently on public radio expansion through membership policies and grant programs.

Since 1991, public radio has been focused on reaching unserved and underserved audiences with an emphasis on increasing opportunities for stations, serving minority and rural audiences, and stations in markets with a limited economic base.

Both CPB and NPR have programs intended to make it easier for stations to receive CPB support and acquire national programming. CPB's sole service grants, program acquisition assistance grants, and station development grants have assisted 45 stations since fiscal year 1991.

NPR's dues adjustment policy for rural, minority, and expansion stations and the auxiliary member policy have allowed 42 stations to carry NPR programs that would otherwise have been unable to do so.

With the encouragement of the Commerce Committee, CPB and the public radio community have just completed a comprehensive review of CPB station grants and the criteria for distributing CPB funds.

The review identified ways to target additional resources to rural stations and stations serving minority audiences. CPB's commitment of more than $5.7 million to achieve this goal will ensure continued investment in expanding service to unserved populations and continued support for diversifying the program package for unserved and underserved audiences. This builds on the $1.35 million committed to this effort in fiscal year 1992 and $1.59 million planned for fiscal year 1993.

Mr. President, CPB and the public radio community have met the challenge of the 1988 act. This expansion effort has not been without risk and cost to the existing system. In 1990–91, stations were held to an average increase of $1,000 in CPB grants, 0.9 percent.

Maintaining the health of existing stations is essential to the economic vitality of the system. We cannot expand the system by putting at risk stations in which Congress and the American people have invested substantial funds over the past 20 years.

In sum, there is still much work to be done and the funding levels in S. 1504 will enable the CPB and the public radio and television stations to expand their educational and community services. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN Mr. President, I am happy to rise in support of the committee report, and the distinguished chairman has spoken so thoughtfully and carefully.

I also would like to note for my friend from Mississippi that all of us share his concerns which are for Senator HELMS, who is not here, of course, who might be offering this amendment, and we wish him every possible fortune and health.

I would like to take just a moment to go back a quarter century, Mr. President, to the debate on this floor between two giants of the Senate, John Pastore of Rhode Island, and Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. They were on either side of the aisle, but united in the enterprise of creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Remember, this is a bipartisan measure, one of those things that makes the Senate feel good about itself and makes us all feel good about our country. This is even before Big Bird was a fantasy in the eye of Joan Ganz Cooney but it was not before Hugh Scott had some vision of what might come to pass. That wonderful man stood up here, and talked about television of the time. He described it as ranging from the mediocre to the moronic. He sort of welcomed the idea of Federal support for the public stations that the FCC had already created.

I would like to read these two paragraphs from what he said:

> There is a vast national apology going on in this country for the television. This I do not say in derogation of the great networks or of the other people who present programs. I certainly praise educational and instructional television.

He also said:

> But I should like to see public television begin to satirize. I should like to see the days of Addison, Swift, and Pope revived in this country if that be possible.
>
> I would hope that public television could bring to this country the gift of satire.

And then he quotes Robert Burns:

> O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!

I dare to think that on this floor, Mr. President, in the last several years, Hugh Scott's vision has come to pass, although not precisely through the mode of public television, but rather C–SPAN. Anybody watching this body debate issues of public education and support for matters of public television would see some satire on display, or I think Addison and Swift and Pope might have though that they did.

Here we are with one of the few real winners that we have come up with in a quarter century. A quarter century ago, this was enacted and we loved it. How many children are there in this country that could not recognize Big Bird? It is part of our childhood already. It is part of our children's childhood, and we will very shortly be showing our grandchild "Sesame Street." It changed the way we think about ourselves, and for the better, and it has enormous support.

I do not know how much this is understood. So let me, Mr. President, introduce you to what needs no introduction, the tote bag, the celebrated viewer-supported broadcasting tote bag. The chairman recognizes that; we all do. And how we all contributed; we all have. The chairman has; you may be sure he will, too. All of us have; a lot of us have.

Six million people sent contributions last year to public television and public radio: 4.9 million for public tele-

vision and 1.3 million for public radio. They are taxing themselves, and I grant these are people who will write a check. That means a certain level of security. They are taxing themselves so those kids in those slums who do not send checks can watch those programs, and they do.

If you had any idea of the viewing that takes place in our Mott Havens, Bedford-Stuyvesants, and East Harlems. That television, that tube is on, and it is going to be watched. And save for these programs, well, from the mediocre to the moronic understates the case today. Those kids do not have cable and they do not have check books. But 6 million people, 4.9 million in the case of television, sent checks in so they could watch.

And here the chairman, the most distinguished chairman of this committee, has proposed modest increases to, among other things, allow for the networks to expand.

There are new stations coming on all the time. People want this. The Federal Government puts up a little bit of the money, but the rest of the money comes from the neighborhoods. We ought to support that. We are getting so much more back in the way of product than we pay for. It is one of the rare Federal programs that has support everywhere. I hope that it will have support on this floor.

I want to make one little detail clear; it is a telling detail. It was remarked just a moment ago that the head of channel 13 in New York was earning $304,000 a year. That was an honest mistake, I am sure. In fact, his salary was recently raised to $225,000 from $199,500. An increase he has asked to be rescinded. But let me tell you—in slightly different terms—what Mr. William F. Baker, president of channel 13, WNET, in New York, makes. He makes near three-quarters of a million dollars less than he made on his last job. He took almost a $750,000 pay cut to go to the New York station. Mr. William F. Baker is a man who cares, and he makes one-quarter what he made as head of the Westinghouse Group W. There are not many people around who would cut their salaries by three-quarters because they think there is something children need and illiterate adults need and the American family needs, and he is willing to do it. Those are the kinds of people you have in public television. Let us support them. If we cannot lend our individual contributions, what do you say we support the chairman and defeat this amendment.

Mr. President, I would ask at this point that a number of letters I have received in support of the funding levels in the bill be included.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING STATIONS OF NEW YORK,
Albany, NY, March 16, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC,

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: The trustees of New York's public television stations want you to know how grateful we are for your affirmative vote for cloture on S. 1504, the Public Broadcasting Act. We are deeply appreciative.

May we ask for your assistance once again. As you know, when S. 1504 reaches the floor for debate a series of amendments will be proposed. To some these amendments may appear reasonable or at worst benign. They are neither. They will damage public broadcasting in New York State and nationwide.

Some of the these amendments are expected to deal with accountability and financial reporting. As the fiduciary agents for public television stations in New York allow us to point out how unnecessary it is for additional federal regulations to be imposed on our already intensely scrutinized enterprise.

Public broadcasting is scrutinized first by, and is most accountable to, the public. The public can monitor every minute of every broadcast day simply by touching a button on their TV set. They vote for or against our programs by switching them on or off. And then, the ultimate vote, by responding, or not responding, to our appeals for financial support. Since individual Americans contributed $294,824,000 to public broadcasting last year, the public's vote for public broadcasting is in. It's an enthusiastic Aye.

That does not mean that each viewer, ourselves included, approves of every broadcast 365 days a year. It does mean that they approve of public television's overall schedule and know that overwhelmingly that schedule provides programs of exceptional value to them. That is does so is the reason we serve as trustees of New York's public television stations.

In addition to our stations' accountability to the ultimate arbiter, the public, they also are accountable to:

The FCC—Detailed reports demonstrating that stations are serving the public interest regularly must be filed with the FCC. Failure to serve that interest can cost a station its broadcast license.

New York State—Our stations report to the State quarterly, in addition to an annual report, on both their programming and finances. These reports, detailing programming, amount spent on instructional programs for classroom use, sources of stations funds, etc. are audited by the State Education Department. The annual report is audited by independent accounting firms before submission. Additional reports containing similar information must be filed with New York State's Charities Bureau and is available for public scrutiny.

Department of Commerce—Stations which receive funds from DOC's Public Telecommunication Facilities Fund for equipment are audited on the use of those funds.

Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB)—Stations must submit annual independent audits to CPB for review. In addition, CPB performs audits of all licensees on a regular schedule, and more frequently on those receiving large amounts of funding. These audits are not only financial, they're also performance audits: compliance with EEOC regulations, educational efforts, etc.

The U.S. General Accounting Office—All stations are subject to GAO audits of all their books and records. Moreover, by federal law, CPB has an Inspector General who audits stations activities on behalf of the GAO and the Congress.

The Public (again)—Stations must maintain financial records as part of their public inspection files. Our stations publish and distribute annual financial reports and some report this information on the air and provide viewers with opportunities to call in questions about both programming and station finances.

Finally, and not least, as station trustees we provided on-going oversight of our stations' activities. That our stations serve our communities (and your constituents) well is attested to by the fact that some 560,000 individual New Yorkers regularly contribute to our stations, along with thousands of businesses ranging from corner bake shops to corporate giants such as G.E., IBM, and Xerox.

Our stations do not need, and can scarcely afford, additional oversight and regulation. Given cuts of 45 percent in New York State support over two years our stations' financial condition is fragile. To impose additional and unneeded administrative and financial burdens on our stations can have no other consequence than the diversion of scarce resources from our stations' programming, education, and outreach efforts.

Public broadcasting in New York State is a community-controlled institution. It's essential that we keep it that way. Surely the Senate of the United States has matters of more pressing national concern than adding to the regulatory overload already borne by our stations.

We therefore need your help. When debate begins on S. 1504 we ask that you rise in opposition to the amendments that will be proposed. Whatever their siren call, however plausible these amendments appear to be, they will do damage to public broadcasting in New York State. Of that we are certain, and we believe that as overseers of New York's public television stations we are better positioned to make that judgment than Senators who will propose the amendment.

With deepest gratitude for your help.

Sincerely,

THIRTEEN/WNET/NEW YORK

Chairman: Henry Kravis, Partner, Kohlberg, Kravis, Roberts & Co.

Honory Chairmen: William M. Ellinghaus, Former President and COO, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Ethan Allen Hitchcock, Esq., Webster & Sheffield.

Honorary Trustee: Dr. Frank Stanton.

Trustees:

Luis Alvarez, President, National Urban Fellows, Inc.

William F. Baker, President, Thirteen/WNET.

Richard I. Beattie, Esq., Chairman, Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett.

Simon Michael Bessie, Former Vice President, Harper Collins.

Edgar Bronfman, Jr., President & CEO, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

George Brooker, President, Webb & Brooker, Inc.

Walter L. Cronkite.

Elaine W. Conway.

Joan Ganz Cooney, Chairman, Executive Committee, Children's Television Workshop.

John S. Crowley, Managing Director, Saugatuck Capital Company.

Joyce B. Dinkins.

Donald Elliott, Esq., Webster & Sheffield.

John Elliott, Jr., Chairman Emeritus, Ogilvy & Mather.

Joseph A. Fernandez, Chancellor, NYS Board of Education.

Jerome L. Greene, Esq.
Beverly Sills Greenough.
H. John Greeniaus, President & CEO, Nabisco Brands, Inc.
Edward L. Hennessy, Jr., Former Chairman & CEO, Allied-Signal, Inc.
Robert Wood Johnson IV, President, The Johnson Company.
Frederick H. Joseph, Chairman & CEO, Drexel, Burnham, Lambert, Inc.
Stephen M. Kellen, President, Arnhold and S. Bleichroeder, Inc.
Ralph S. Larsen, Chairman & CEO, Johnson & Johnson.
Reginald F. Lewis, Chairman, TLC, L.T.
Hon. Anthony D. Marshall.
George D. O'Neill, President, The Meriwether Capital Corporation.
Mrs. Miles (Jean) Pennybacker.
Steven Rattner, General Partner, Lazard Freres & Company.
Mrs. Abraham (Casey) Ribicoff.
Mrs. Felix (Liz) Rohatyn.
Elihu Rose, Partner, Rose Associates, Inc.
Lee Radziwill Ross, Special Promotion Director, Giorgio Armani Boutique.
Robert E. Rubin, Co-Chairman, Goldman, Sachs & Company.
Richard R. Shinn, Executive Vice Chairman, New York Stock Exchange.
Stanley S. Shuman, Executive Vice President & Managing Director, Allen & Company, Inc.
William C. Steere, Jr., President & CEO Pfizer, Inc.
Alfred R. Stern, Kingston Investors Corporation.
Donald Stewart, President, The College Board.
Morris Tanenbaum, Former Vice Chairman, AT&T.
Mrs. Cyrus R. (Gay) Vance.
Rosalind P. Walter.
Mortimer B. Zuckerman, Chairman, Boston Properties.

WLIW/PLAINVIEW, L.I.

Chairman: Robert A. McBride, Senior Vice President, Chemical Bank.
1st Vice Chairman: Dr. Elliott Landon, Superintendent of Schools, Long Beach City School District.
2nd Vice Chairman: Peter D. Klein, Executive Vice President, Klein & Eversoll, Inc.
Treasurer: Norman B. Adams, Partner, Price Waterhouse.
Secretary: Robert P. Quinn.
Trustees:
Larry Austin, President, Austin Travel Corp.
John R. Buran, Vice President & L.I. Retail Banking Director, Citibank, N.A.
Marie D'Amato-Rizzi, Senior Vice President, Chemical Bank.
Anne W. Ellis.
Roger L. Flore, General Agent, Mass. Mutual Life Insurance.
Dennis P. Garabedian, Partner, Ernst & Young.
Msgr. Thomas J. Hartman, Director of Radio & TV Telicare.
Cleveland Johnson, Jr., Regional Director, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services.
Frank N. Liguori, Chairman of the Board, The Olsten Corporation.
Thomas A. Nicolette, President, KNOGO North America.
Phyllis Hill Slater, President, Hill Slater.
James M. Smith, President & CEO, AIL Systems, Inc.
Donald J. Stewart, President, Realty Factors Ltd.
Terry Townsend, Publisher, Long Island Business News.
Edith E. Westermann.

WMHT/SCHENECTADY

Chairman: Carles Touhey, Managing Partner, Latham Four Partnership.
Vice Chairman: Matthew Bender IV, Consultant.
Treasurer: John J. Puig, First Vice President, First Albany Corporation.
Secretary: William F. Bortis, President, LUYK Advertising, Inc.
Trustees:
Lorinda Ackley, President, Taconic Telephone Corp.
Dorothy Boroson.
Joseph J. Bulmer, Ph.D., President, Hudson Valley Community College.
Herbert A. Chesbrough, President & Executive Director, Saratoga Performing Arts Center.
Elia Hidalgo Christensen, Director, Division of Affirmative Careers, NYS Dept. of Civil Service.
Linda C. Christensen, Vice President, Trustco Bank New York.
Phyllis E. Dake, Executive Vice President, Stewart's Ice Cream Co.
Leonard K. Doviak, Manager, Communication and Public Affairs, General Electric Company.
Francis Edwards, Senior Vice President, Garden Way, Inc.
Albert F. Freihofer, Vice President, Chas. Freihofer Baking Co. Inc.
William E. Haley, Jr., President, WMHT/Channel 17.
Marcia T. Liebich.
Helen M. Moserve, Publisher, Taconic Newspapers.
Earle B. Mullen.
Anne T. Palamountain.
Katherine S. Rozendaal.
James F. Salmon, Attorney, Salmon & Salmon.
Larry C. Schrader, Ph.D., Principal, West Sand Lake School.
Herbert T. Singer, Retired Chairman, Amsterdam Printing & Litho Corp.
Gary Smith, Manager, The Desmond.
Jeanne Edna Thelwell, Attorney.
Monte I. Trammer, President & Publisher, The Saratogian.

WCNY/SYRACUSE

Chairman: David H. Northrup, Jr., Vice-Chairman, Cambridge Capital Corporation.
1st Vice Chairman: Ronald R. Young, Vice President, Marketing, Agway Petroleum Corporation.
2nd Vice Chairman: Barrett L. Jones, Senior Executive Vice President and Central Region Executive, Key Bank of Central NY, N.A.
Secretary: W. Carroll Coyne, Partner, Hancock & Estabrook.
Assistant Secretary: Chester D. Amond.
Treasurer: Judith C. Mower, J.C. Mower Consultants, Inc.
Assistant Treasurer: Richard A. Konys, M.D., Surgical Associations of Upstate New York—CGH.
Trustees:
Robert F. Baldwin, Jr., Principal of the Firm, Green & Seifter.
Robert J. Barbero, Chairman and CEO, Gray-Syracuse, Incorporated.
Mary Alice Bellardini, Mayor, Village of Homer.
William Buck, Oswego County Legislator.
Charles P. Darrow.
Roy Dexheimer, District Superintendent, Tompkins-Seneca-Tioga Counties BOCES.
Chary Griffin.
Dennis J. Hall, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Carlisle Companies, Inc.
Marilyn Higgins-Rohde, Senior Vice President, Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce.
Elijah Huling, Jr., Professor of Law, Syracuse University.
Janice K. Liddell, Executive Director, CONTACT—Syracuse, Inc.
J. Kemper Matt, President, Dupli Envelope and Graphics.
William D. Matthews, Chairman and CEO, Oneida Ltd.
Gilliam M. McAuliffe, Vice President, Consumer Affairs, Fay's Incorporated.
Bernadette Menondez-Russell, Dean, Center for Arts, Humanities and Social Science, Onondaga Community College.
Ann C. Michel, President, Knowledge Systems & Research.
Charles B. Morgan, First Vice President, Dean Witter Reynolds.
Michael I. Schafer, President, Mohawk Valley Community College.
George J. Schunck, President, The Young Agency, Inc.
Mary Ann Shaw, Associate of the Chancellor, Syracuse University.
Barry M. Shulman, President/Partner, Scolaro, Shulman, Cohen, Lawler & Burstein, P.C.
Robert R. Sprole II, President, Therm, Incorporated.
Stephen J. Suhowatsky, President and CEO, Syracuse Supply Company.
Sandra L. Townes, Syracuse City Court Judge.
William M. Tuck, President, Crouse-Hinds.
Dwight E. Vicks, Jr., President, Vicks Lithograph & Printing.
Isaac E. C. Walker, District Manager, Xerox Corporation.
Jack H. Webb, President, Chase Lincoln First Bank, N.A.
Henry P. Williams, Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City School District.

WXXI/ROCHESTER

Chairman: Robert E. Brown, Attorney at Law and Partner, Boylan, Brown, Code, Fowler, Randall and Wilson.
Vice-Chairman: Jane Plitt, President, JP Associates.
Treasurer: Thomas F. McHugh, Executive Director, Rochester Housing Authority.
Secretary: Cortland L. Brovitz, Courtland L. Brovitz & Co.
Trustees:
Theodore J. Altier, Altier Shoes.
Lawrence Chesler, Vice President & General Counsel, Computer Consoles, Inc.
Janis Dowd.
Natacha Dykman.
Brian E. Hickey, Regional President, Marine Midland Bank.
Cleve Killingsworth, Jr., Sr. Vice President, Blue Cross and Blue Shield.
William A. Koch.
Bruce R. Kost, President, Parkleigh Enterprises, Inc.
Eleanor McLear.
Carol S. O'Connor, Executive Director, YWCA of Rochester.
Sr. Marie Michelle Peartree, President, St. Ann's.
Dr. William L. Pickett, President, St. John Fisher College.
Sydney R. Rubin, Esq., Harris, Beach, Wilcox, Rubin and Levey.
Edwin G. Saphar, Saphar and Associates, Inc.
John G. Spence, Manager, Support Services, Eastman Kodak Company.
Willis Sprattling.
Josephine S. Trubek, General Counsel and Secretary, Rochester Telephone Corporation.
Joyce W. Underberg.

Dr. John E. Van de Wetering, President, State University College at Brockport.
Linda Carnell Weinstein.
Rose Mary Villarrubia.
Gaynell Wethers, Director of Minority Affairs, Nazareth College
Karin Wieder, Artist-in-Residence Program, Rochester City Schools.
Mary-Frances Winters, President, Winters Group, Inc.

WNED/BUFFALO

Chairman: Uran J. Pauly, Senior Associate, Career Planning and Placement, SUNYAB.
Honorary Chairman: Lawrence R. Goodyear, Hodgson, Russ, Andrews, Woods, & Goodyear.
Vice Chairman: Robert M. Greene, Esq., Phillips, Lytle, Hitchcock, Blaine & Huber.
Honorary Vice Chairmen: Fred R. Dentinger, Vice President, Sales, Riedman Corporation. Kevin I. Sullivan, President, Medaille College. Sue M. Wardynski.
Secretary: Frank B. Mesiah, Regional Administrator, NYS Department of Labor.
Assistant Secretary: John C. Barber, Esq., Hodgson, Russ, Andrews, Woods & Goodyear.
Treasurer: Marguerite Dispenza, President, Automobile Club of Western New York.
Trustees:
Clement R. Arrison, President, Mark IV Industries, Inc.
Thomas R. Beecher, Jr., President Beecher Securities Corp.
Dr. Ellen Grant Bishop, Commissioner of Mental Health, Erie County.
Bettye Blackman.
Sr. Angela Bontempo, D.C., President, Sisters of Charity Hospital.
Byron W. Brown, Director, E.E.O., Erie County.
Kate Bukowski, Manager Information Services, Computer Task Group.
J. Michael Collins, President WNED.
M. Jane Dickman.
Dr. Kenneth Dyl, Superintendent, Cleveland Hill U.F.S.D.
Frank L. Eberl, President, Unistrut Buffalo, Inc.
Maxwell E. Ellis, Czajkowski Ellis Anderson, Inc.
Richard D. Fors, Jr., President, Resser Management Corp.
Frank C. Harding.
Leah Coles Hodges.
Kevin T. Keane, President, Astronics Corp.
Kenneth C. Kirsch.
Mary Ann Lauricella, President Lauricella Public Relations Co.
Robert Mariano, Chief Executive Officer, Norstar Bank.
Mary S. Martino, Director of Advancement Planning, Canisius College.
Salvatore Martoche, Esq., Hiscock and Barclay.
Gerard C. Miller, Senior Vice President National, Fuel Gas Dist. Corp.
Doland F. Newman, Chairman, NOCO Energy Corp.
Michael A. Rivera, Senior Associate, Career Planning and Placement SUNYAB.
Morton H. Stovroff.
Richard L. Verity, Vice President, Resser Management.
George L. Wessel, President, Buffalo AFL–CIO Council.
Keith B. Wiley, President, Wiley and Company, Inc.
Peter P. Zaleski, President, Key Bank of Western New York
Leslie Zemsky.

WSKG/BINGHAMTON

Chairman: Tom Morgan, Financial Advisor, Shearson-Lehman-Hutton.
Vice Chairman: Robert Ivers, Design Management Consultant, Corning Glass.
Secretary/Treasurer: Thomas Bell, Vice President of Corporate Operations, Universal Instruments.
Trustees:
David L. Birchehnough, Regional CEO, Chase Lincoln First Bank.
Charles G. Brink, President (ret.), Binghamton Industrial Supply Co.
John Covelli, Conductor, Binghamton Symphony Orchestra.
Joseph Dahm, Manager (ret.) Community Relations, IBM.
Katherine Fitzgerald, Partner, Hinman, Howard & Kattell.
Charlotte Gregory, Superintendent of Schools, Bath Central Schools.
William Hawkins, Training Spec., Human Resources, New York State Electric & Gas.
Vida Hill, Retired Teacher.
John M. Keeler, Partner, Hinman, Howard & Kattell.
Laura Keeling, President & CEO, Broome County Urban League.
Chandler Y. Keller, Attorney-at-Law, Night & Keller.
Edward Levene, President, United Auto Parts.
F. David Mistretta, Vice President/General Counsel, Security Mutual Life Insurance.
Barbara Oldwine, Writer & TV Host.
Joann Rasmussen, Development Officer (ret.), Executive Service Corp.
Walter Rich, President & CEO, Delaware Otsego Corporation.
Alice Wales, Volunteer.
Philip S. Wilder, Jr., President, Hartwick College.
Jerome Ziegler, Professor, Cornell University.
Michael J. Ziegler, President & CEO, WSKG Public TV/Radio.

WCFE/PLATTSBURGH

Chairman: Gil Duken, Principal, Broad Street Elementary School.
1st Vice Chairman: Margaret Roy, Real Estate.
Secretary: Lambert Heyniger, Foundation Officer (ret.).
Treasurer: Roger Forrence, Owner, Forrence Orchards.
Trustees:
Christopher Booth, Owner, Booth's Distinctive Gifts.
Carol Cahoon, Beaconsfield, Quebec, Canada.
Dr. H. David Chamberlain, President, Paul Smiths College.
John Coolidge, Owner, Coolidge Moving & Storage.
Dr. Jay Fennell, President, Clinton Community College.
Dr. Jane Gore, Professor, Human Resources, SUNY-Plattsburgh.
Ruth Hart, Community Activist.
John Ianelli, Former Plattsburgh Mayor.
Pamela Leturmy.
Rolando Miranda, Teacher.
Diana Nicholson, Consultant to Aviation Industry, Montreal, Canada.
Mark Rabin.
Carl Rabstejnek, Student.
Dr. Francis Trudeau, President, Trudeau Institute.

WNPE/WATERTOWN

Chairman: Allen L. Smith.
Vice-Chairman: Thomas Hanley, Vice President, Norstar Bank.
President: William J. Saiff, Jr., President/General Manager, WNPE/WNPI TV.
Treasurer: Cataldo Morgia, Senior Vice President, Shearson Lehman Bros., Inc.
Secretary: Judy Chittenden.
Trustees:
Charles Bohlen, District Superintendent, Jefferson-Lewis BOCES.
Douglas Brodie.
Thomas E. Brown.
W. Henry Case.
Michael E. Cooper,
Richard DelGuidice, Dean of Liberal Studies, State University of New York.
Msgr. Lawrence Deno, Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education, Diocese of Ogdensburg.
John Feeley.
Donald A. Foster, Executive Director, Jefferson County Economic Development Corp.
Juliann Gluck, Assistant Vice President, Marine Midland Bank.
John T. Henderson, President, Jefferson Community College.
Urban Hirschey, Climax Manufacturing.
Kim Martusewicz.
Robert H. Murphy, President/General Manager, Pepsi Cola Bottling Co. of Watertown.
Beverly Nortz.
Ellen S. Post.
Edmund Russell.
Merton Van Sant.
Donald L. Woolf.

THIRTEEN/WNET
New York, NY, June 2, 1992.

From: Bill Baker.
Re: Federal funding used for educational efforts.
To: Senator Patrick Moynihan.

Senator, as per our conversation I have asked the General Managers of the other nine public television stations to provide me with a percent of how much of their allocation of federal funds is committed to educational efforts.

Percent of total amount of Federal dollars spent on educational efforts

WNET	25
WXXI	25
WMHT	25
WNYC	25
WCNY	30
WNED	40
WNPE	65
WCFE	70
WLIW	70
WSKG	88

As you can see, almost all the stations throughout the state use approximately a third of the federal dollars allocated for educational purposes.

I am also sending you some background information on the programs we provide as part of our overall educational outreach effort.

I hope this information proves to be useful to you in today's debate. I appreciate your assistance in this matter. Thank you from all of us.

THIRTEEN/WNET
New York, NY.

THIRTEEN/WNET: BUILDING ALLIANCES FOR EDUCATION

Thirteen/WNET is the flagship station for the Public Broadcasting Service and the leading producer of programming for public television. Broadcasting to the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, Thirteen provides quality programming that is as diverse as the region itself. The daily schedule offers viewers series and programs covering a wide range of topics, including information and public affairs, science and nature, culture and entertainment, education and learning, and children and the family.

But Thirteen is more than just a number on the dial. As one of the metropolitan area's leading cultural and educational institutions, Thirteen complements its programming with outreach and educational activities that connect it closely with the community. The Teacher Training Institute is one such activity. Others include the Teen Leadership Institute, the Student Arts Festival, the annual AIDS educational hotline/helpline, a subway campaign to encourage adult literacy, screenings for special interest groups and seminars on a variety of topics for community organizations.

Since its founding in 1962, Thirteen has demonstrated television's potential as a source of lifelong learning. In addition to airing a wealth of educational programming for children and young people ranging from *Sesame Street* to *DeGrassi High*, Thirteen broadcasts 1200 hours of Instructional Television (ITV) designed for classroom use. Beyond that, programs targeted for a broader audience open up new worlds of information for viewers of all ages.

Thirteen/WNET has been a valued tool of many educators for 29 years. Today, the educational services of public television go far beyond the boundaries of traditional Instructional Television (ITV) programs, embracing new technology and focusing on lifelong learning. Public television is expanding the learning environment beyond the traditional lecture and textbook by making the home and workplace extensions of the classroom.

Listed on the following pages are some of the major areas of activity in the Educational Resources Center.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION (ITV)

Thirteen devotes over 1200 hours each school year to broadcasting more than 100 Instructional Television (ITV) series. These programs, designed especially for the classroom, correlate with existing curricula to reinforce and enhance the learning experience. ITV is a powerful teaching tool, bringing into the classroom people of many cultures, historical reenactments, dramatizations of literature, illustrations of difficult concepts and aids in the instruction of basic skills.

LEARNING LINK

Learning Link provides schools in the tri-state area with the tools to make technology an integrated part of the curriculum. An electronic communications and information system, Learning Link was created specifically for the education community. Members access the system via computer and modem, forming an interactive network that shares information and resources.

Learning Link combines computer technology with Instructional Television (ITV) information and print materials, to help teachers find, evaluate and utilize educational resources. This combination expands the traditional boundaries of the classroom, connecting and empowering educators.

ADULT LEARNING AND ILLITERACY

Thirteen's commitment to lifelong learning includes offering educational programming targeted to adults who need to certify educational competence, as well as programs aimed at increasing literacy for Americans of all ages, such as:

Telecourses, an alternative route for adults to get college credit. Different telecourses are aired each semester with enrollment available from designated area colleges.

GED on TV, 43 programs focusing on reading comprehension, writing and mathematics. Ged en Espanol started airing on Thirteen in the fall of 1991.

Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS), a collaborative effort between PBS and Capital Cities/ABC launched in 1986 to reduce illiteracy. It has resulted in 425 local Task Forces operating in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada. This year, the focus is on mentoring youth-at-risk.

Learn To Read, part of Thirteen's commitment to Project Literacy U.S. An at-home study course for adults, the series airs Monday–Friday from 6:00 to 6:30 a.m. and 11:00 to 11:30 a.m. Learn To Read, hosted by Wally "Famous" Amos, delivers 30 half-hour programs designed to teach basic reading skills to the adult non-reader.

DISTANCE LEARNING/STAR SCHOOLS

The Satellite Educational Resources Consortium represents an initiative to deal directly with a major problem facing the United States: how to make quality education in math, science and foreign languages equally and equitably available to all students across the country, regardless of their geographic location and socio-economic status. Live, interactive instruction is brought to local high schools via satellite, microwave or cable technology, allowing a course to be taught to students in many areas of the country at the same time. The students interact immediately with their instructor via telephone, computers and keypad technologies.

THIRTEENVISION

ThirteenVision is an Instructional Television service operated on a separate channel—one of a family of high frequency, "narrowcast" signals which have been reserved by the Federal Communications Commission for instructional purposes. Thirteen has targeted the education and literacy needs of adult learners, especially those with basic skills deficiencies and/or poor English skills. The first 12 ThirteenVision sites include community colleges, adult education centers, schools, and such "nontraditional" locations as correctional facilities and community social service centers.

TEACHER AWARDS

Thirteen's annual UTIE (Utilization of Television in Education) Awards, which recognize effective and imaginative use of television in the classroom, most recently went to five educators from Queens; Brooklyn; Somerville, New Jersey; and Stamford and Guilford, Connecticut. In addition, 38 teachers from across the Empire State received grants through the New York State Public Television Mini-Grant Program, a new fund designed to encourage diverse and creative uses of video technology to enhance student learning.

TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE

To help enhance science education in the classroom, Thirteen and Texaco launched the Teacher Training Institute for Science, Television and Technology. Focusing on successful teaching strategies that integrate the use of video into science and environmental education curricula, the Institute aims to establish a network of teachers who can serve as mentors in their schools, and spread the use of instructional television and technology throughout the tri-state area. Based on the premise of teachers teaching teachers, the yearlong project kicked off in the Summer 1990 with training sessions for over 250 elementary and secondary school educators. After a successful evaluation, TTI is being rolled out in ten national locations during 1991–92.

EDUCATIONAL PRINT OUTREACH

Educational print materials produced to accompany major series included Viewer's Guides for Crisis: Urban Education and Can't Afford to Grow Old; Teacher's Guides for Great Performances' "Show Boat," The American Experience, Black Stars in Orbit, Crisis: Who Will Do Science?, Innovation, Moyers; The Power of the Word, and Nature; and a telecourse for Art of the Western World, which has been adopted by 100 colleges. These materials have wide-ranging impact; the 110,000 packages distributed for Black Stars in Orbit, for example, reached a potential audience of 7.9 million students.

STUDENT ARTS FESTIVAL

The Student Arts Festival, begun in 1978, is an annual project involving youth from the tri-state region with the visual arts—to simulate thinking, to provide a forum for creativity and to offer a showcase for selected artwork. Building on the successes of the Festival, in 1990, the Student Arts Festival was expanded to include a video component as well as fine art and photography. Today the Festival is the metropolitan region's leading showcase of art and video created by young people.

TEEN LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE

The Teen Leadership Institute was established in 1989 to help high school juniors prepare for leadership roles. Drawing on two acclaimed Thirteen/WNET presentations, The Power of Choice and Ethics in America, it provides an opportunity for students and teachers from throughout the tri-state area to probe their values and the conflicts those values sometimes create. It is a year-round youth outreach project which challenges high school student leaders to play an active role in addressing current social issues with their peers. The Institute in 1991 examined race relations while encouraging the development of leadership skills including; effective communication, conflict resolution, critical reasoning and decision-making.

VIDEOLINK

Videolink extends educational resources to community centers with after-school and summer programs in some of New York's most deprived neighborhoods. Instructional videos and equipment, computer technology, and educational print materials address such areas as school curricula, multiculturalism, self-esteem, and collaborative learning.

Videolink is underway at ten specially-chosen community sites from a roster of thirty potential ones, including settlement houses, neighborhood clubs, and youth-service programs for children at risk of drug abuse and neglect. The initial goal is to provide a wide array of instructional television programming, training activities, and technological resources to urban community centers in need of learning tools for disadvantaged youth.

NEW EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES

INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA

Thirteen will shortly launch a new effort to develop and publish programs, designed specifically for the exciting new computer-based multimedia technologies. In conjunction with this initiative, Thirteen will also be setting up a special Multimedia Center where area educators can see and learn about the latest developments in new educational multimedia products and software.

THE MEDIA LITERACY PROJECT

Educators and parents need the tools to help young people decipher and interpret the images and information they see and hear on television. In response to these needs, Thirteen proposes The Media Literacy Project—a new and innovative curriculum for school and home nationwide—that combines an ac-

tive learner approach to education with the most acclaimed, new video technology for classroom use—the interactive videodisc.

The project encompasses a kindergarten through 12 critical viewing curriculum to give young people the ability to explore, select, understand, and critically evaluate the constructions of television with emphasis on the social, political and commercial implications of the medium's messages and information. The project will be designed for cross-curricula use in existing subject areas from English to social studies, or as a separate elective or mini-course.

For more information, call Educational Resources Center 212–560–2030.

THIRTEEN/WNET,
New York, NY, May 8, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Thank you for taking the time to visit with me on May 4th. As I said to you at the Carlyle, we anticipate that the Senate will consider soon S. 1504, the "Public Telecommunications Act of 1991." This measure will authorize funding levels for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) for Fiscal Years 1994 through 1996. We also anticipate that one of the proposed amendments to be offered would freeze, or significantly reduce, authorized funding levels for the Corporation.

I hope that you can support us in our efforts to defeat such an amendment if offered. The funding levels currently contained in S. 1504 will enable public broadcasting to continue its efforts to provide high-quality educational, informational and cultural programming for all Americans. Increased funding will also allow public television to provide educational services such as:

Programs and services that ensure that children arrive at school ready to learn;

Programs that train childcare providers to play a greater role in preschool education;

Programs that build greater awareness of, and involvement in, pressing community issues;

New technologies that are more accessible to schools and teachers;

Programs that train teachers and educators in the use of new educational telecommunications technologies; and,

New instructional programming available for use in schools. .

One excellent example is the Thirteen/WNET Teacher Training Institute, which brings together elementary and secondary school teachers to develop creative approaches to teaching with instructional television. So far, in the New York area alone, this project has reached 2,500 teachers and 13,000 students. With additional support from CPB and others, this project is being expanded; and it is expected that, by the end of this year, 15,000 teachers around the country will have received training as part of this project.

I appreciate your offer to keep me informed of the status of S. 1504, and particularly any efforts to reduce authorized levels for public broadcasting. Please feel free to contact me at your convenience if I can provide any additional information. As always, we at WNET remain deeply appreciative of your support.

Sincerely,

BILL BAKER.

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART,
New York, NY, April 13, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: It has recently come to my attention that the Senate is likely to soon vote for the reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Independent production is the conduit through which we express our passions, stretch our imagination, test our ideas. It is an effective vehicle for the powerful, diverse and rich voice of a new generation in this country. It is exactly the kind of creative activity that leads to increased communication and greater understanding of the human condition.

I urge you to support the Independent Television Service, which I understand has come under fire during Senate debates over Corporation of Public Broadcasting reauthorization. There are more independent filmmakers in the state of New York than anywhere in the country. In ITVS' short history, New York's talented independent producers have particularly benefited from this resource. ITVS is an important part of public televisions's future and of the future of New York's creative community as well. Let ITVS help independents use television to reach out to audiences who have been left out, and explore a medium that is vastly underutilized. None of the programs have even aired yet—let us evaluate their impact and contributions fairly.

America's independent filmmakers are a valuable resource, saluted and rewarded around the world. Let us support them here at home.

Sincerely,

AGNES GUND.

WCNY, PUBLIC BROADCASTING
IN CENTRAL NEW YORK,
Syracuse, NY, May 27, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
The State Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Your support of public broadcasting has been greatly appreciated. The beneficiaries will be the people it is our mission to serve.

I thought you would be interested in the enclosed column by WCNY's President and CEO, Richard Russell. I believe it addresses an aspect of public broadcasting which should have received more attention during the current debate about CPB funding.

If we can be of any assistance in providing you additional information about our educational services or any other aspect of WCNY, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Again, thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. DUNN,
Director,
Planning/Corporate Communications.

[From the Sunday Observer-Dispatch, May 24, 1992]

CRITICS OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING IGNORE ITS EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

(By Richard W. Russell)

The attacks on public broadcasting by columnists like George Will and politicians like Sen. Jesse Helms are unwarranted, narrow and wrong. By focusing almost exclusively upon the relatively few hours devoted to the performance arts, drama and selected public affairs programs with which they disagree, they ignore the vital educational and community programs and services public broadcasters are providing—programs and services which have little or no advertising or commercial value and will never be offered by commercial companies.

Yes, lip service is given to "Sesame Street and Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" (who could attack Big Bird or Fred Rogers?) But no mention is made of the underlying educational mission of public broadcasting. Perhaps it was a mistake to change the name from Educational Broadcasting to Public Broadcasting back in the 1960s. Whatever the name the original purpose remains.

Public Broadcasting is here to help educate, motivate and uplift an American public, which, by all accounts, finds its educational system wanting. We at WCNY are proud of the job we are doing. But we have allocated few of our precious resources to promotion. And so, even our most ardent defenders point to programs like "Nova," "Masterpiece Theatre" and, of course, "Sesame Street." Those prime time presentations are worth paying for, and almost all their support actually comes from membership and business dollars.

However, such programs—even masterpieces like "The Civil War" are but the tip of the public broadcasting iceberg.

Have you ever heard about those daytime programs which go under the heading of Instructional Television? Each week during the school year, WCNY broadcasts 25 hours of programs designed primarily for in-school use. Selected and scheduled with the advice of local educators, those programs are utilized by Central New York teachers in over 650 schools.

College students benefit, too. Many have gained college credit through the use of telecourses broadcast on WCNY. And, this month, WCNY's Director of Educational Services is meeting with Utica/Rome higher education representatives to expand the utilization of these telecourses.

George Will says public broadcasting serves an elitist segment of society. There is nothing elitist about the children who watch "Lamb Chops Play-Along," "Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego?" or "Sesame Street." There is nothing elitist about the shop foreman at a local industry who plans to utilize a recent Sunday evening program about creativity in the work place.

And there is nothing elitist about the thousands of Central New Yorkers who contributed over 23,000 hours of volunteer time to WCNY this past year. George Will, Jesse Helms and their vocal friends should talk to these volunteers and hear how much they value the contributions of public broadcasting to the quality of their families' lives. Mr. Will should talk to the librarians who know how many kids have been motivated to read because of "Reading Rainbow."

Public broadcasting has made a difference for over a quarter century. WCNY will continue to make a difference because close to 30,000 individuals and families in Central New York care enough to support us financially. And we'll make a difference because, as a public broadcaster, our bottom line is comprised of programming and service.

(Richard W. Russell is president and chief executive officer of WCNY–TV/FM.)

WMHT TV 17, WMHX TV 45, WMHT FM 89.1, WRHV FM 88.7, WMHT RISE 57,
Schenectady, NY, April 9, 1992.

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I thought you would be interested in this column which ran this week in The Capital District Business Review. It's the most recent endorsement in our local press of the importance of continued federal funding for public broadcasting.

Public approval and financial support for public broadcasting is at an all-time high—but federal funding remains an essential source of revenue for all public stations. Our

resources are already strained to the utmost. New and cumbersome reporting structures will seriously jeopardize a program delivery system which already has sufficient oversight at the state and local level.

On behalf of the viewers and listeners you represent, I ask you to vote in favor of S. 1504 and oppose any amendments to change the present accounting regulations.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. HALEY, Jr.,
President and General Manager.

[From the Capital District Business Review, Apr. 6–12, 1992]

CONGRESS PULLING PLUG ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

(By Jay Silverman)

Did you watch "The Civil War" on TV? Are you a regular viewer of "The McNeil/Lehrer Newshour," "Wall Street Week," "Computer Chronicles" or "Washington Week in Review"? How about your spouse and children? Do they watch "Sesame Street," "Live from Lincoln Center," "Reading Rainbow" or "Great Performances"?

These programs all come to you via public television. Locally, that's WMHT/Channel 17. But those shows may not be on your home screen for much longer if some top elected officials have their way.

Public television is an essential alternative to the purely market-driven, commercial use of this country's most powerful communications tool—television. Its programming is based on the value of the program to the viewer, not on the number of viewers delivered to advertisers or accumulated for cable subscription services.

But some of TV and radio's most popular programs, the networks that generate them, and the radio and television stations (WAMC–FM, WMHT–FM and TV, locally) that carry them are in danger of losing the federal funding that supports them.

Congress is discussing a bill reauthorizing the funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for fiscal years 1994–96, known as the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991 (S1504). This is the basic law authorizing federal support of public broadcasting in the United States.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in turn, distributes money to hundreds of Public Broadcasting Service and National Public Radio licensees across the country through annual grants that account for about 17 percent of individual stations' annual income.

Losing that funding would mean death for some stations; for others, it would require a severe curtainment of operations. For you and me, it would mean the loss of tremendously valuable assets—media that should continue to exist without restrictions hampering their creativity and vitality.

What does public broadcasting cost you and me? Well, the funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is $1.06 for both public television and radio—80 pennies for TV and 26 cents for radio.

WMHT receives $800,000 annually from the Feds toward a $6 million budget.

The House version of S1504 passed on a voice vote last year. However, now that the bill is before Senate, seven conservative senators—Jesse Helms and Robert Dole among them—are proposing amendments that would increase federal interference in public broadcasting.

If passed, the amendment would establish a new range of reporting requirements and an additional requirement that stations and other grant recipients keep track of every government dollar spent on every program.

Why this push for greater control? These senators object to "taxpayer's dollars" being used to produce controversial programming such as "Tongues Untied," a documentary on gay black males, and "Maria's Story," which, according to the senators, glorified the lives of Salvadaoran guerrillas.

At first blush, these requirements for accountability seem fair.

Fact is, however, that New York state's public broadcasting stations, which are chartered by the state Board of Regents, have oversight from the state Education Department. And more importantly, stations like WMHT are accountable to local people and local tastes through the boards of trustees that hold their licenses.

These new reporting restrictions—oops, requirements—are both burdensome and redundant. It will make it more costly for stations to operate and hamper their abilities to develop programs.

The proposed amendments also include restrictions on program content, involving when certain programs can be aired. This should be dealt with locally, rather than through some asinine federal regulation.

Given the oversight public television has from local stations and the Federal Communications Commission, is there really any need to have some federal bureaucrat overseeing additional content-based restrictions? Are we not grown up enough to change the station or turn off the set?

Are we satisfied with public television? It certainly would appear so. For 25 years, we the public, have provided the lion's share of the funding nationwide for the enterprise called public broadcasting. At WMHT, WAMC and nationally, contributions are at an all-time high. WMHT's most recent 23-day membership drive generated 2,623 new members, giving the station about 32,000 members.

Clearly, the system works. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting deserves continued funding without cumbersome federal regulations and oversight.

WESTERN NEW YORK
PUBLIC BROADCASTING ASSOCIATION,
Buffalo, NY, May 8, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I understand a debate and vote on the authorization bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for FY 1994–1996 will be held next week. (It was approved by the House in late 1991.)

As you know, six Senators, led by Senators DOLE and HELM, have made this into a controversial bill. They have questioned the balance and objectivity of public broadcasting and have even suggested that commercial broadcasters might be willing to provide such services as broadcasts to the schools, service to GED students, undertaking broadcast literacy projects, etc. Unfortunately, many recent statements have been based on inaccurate or incomplete information and/or understanding of what public broadcasting is and how it works.

At a time when our State funding has been cut by 44% in just two years, continued Federal funding is imperative if all our citizens are to receive public TV and radio services free of charge. The new authorization bill contains funds for additional services to be provided to education, at a time when that institution is so badly in need of help.

I know that leadership of the Commerce Committee has met with the several concern Senators, with a view toward working out a compromise with some amendments and colloquy language which would allow the legislation to proceed while at the same time underlining public TV's responsibilities in the area of objectivity.

We understand additional amendments are liable to be offered by individual members. I want to ask you to support only those amendments which have the support of the Committee leadership. They are the amendments which both advocates and opponents have agreed on. Please resist any other amendments, however well-intentioned they might seem.

We would also appreciate it if you would make a floor statement of your longstanding and strong support for public broadcasting.

May I ask on behalf of our 70,000 members if you will be able to help us?

Sincerely,

J. MICHAEL COLLINS,
President.

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT/
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, NY, May 12, 1992.

Re. S. 1504.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: The print and electronic press have been replete of late with argument, debate and some discussion regarding the merits of funding the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) which in turn funds in part our nation's public television and public radio stations. I would like to add my opinion to the discussion and request your help in resolving this situation. I regard the funding that comes to New York State public television and public radio stations as an important part of the resources available to maintain educational quality in New York State. Because I feel that way, I am grateful for your affirmative vote in March for cloture on S. 1504, the Public Broadcasting Act. That action was quite helpful.

Now I ask for your continued support for this legislation as it comes to debate on the Senate floor. It is important to support continued federal financing of public broadcasting quite simply because it is an important, even essential element in the educational resources available to New York State citizens. Your support on the floor would be especially appreciated. Please don't permit ideologic smoke screens to obscure the reality of the need for public broadcasting, especially public television's educational services. Public television provides educational resources both on screen and through community outreach at all levels of education—preschool, K–12, college credit courses, high school equivalency (GED), literacy education, inservice teacher training and other professional staff development.

Please remember that New York State's public television and radio stations—especially WNET/New York City—depend heavily on CPB funding for production. These resources help keep New York City the communications capital of the world.

Finally, please don't allow the proposed legislation to be battered by the addition of amendments which would constrain the free expression of ideas and the healthy flow of programming.

Thank you for your consideration of my recommended support for the public broadcasting bill, S. 1504. Thank you too for your continued support of education issues and

legislation. It is vital to the public health of New York State.

Sincerely,

THOMAS SOBAL.

ROCHESTER, NY,
May 15, 1992.

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PAT: A number of people here in Rochester has asked me to be in touch with you with respect to the Corporate for Public Broadcasting Reauthorization Bill S. 1504. I gather that there has been a good deal of discussion about this Bill, and that they center on proposed amendments concerning funding amounts, accountability, balance, objectivity and other such things.

As you undoubtedly know, WXXI here in Rochester is a strong and vital part of our community. We value all aspects of its broadcasting activities, and urge your active support on behalf of the CPB. It seems to us that those who are attacking it are doing so for reasons which fail to recognize the impact of public broadcasting on all aspects of our Community. This idea that somehow public broadcasting is an elitist activity just does not hold water. One need only look at the programs in our schools to understand that this is not so.

I understand from Bill Pearce that the disclosure amendment that has been suggested provides for an expanded public inspection file that demonstrates how CPB spends its federal funds. He tells me that WXXI can live with this amendment. He also tells me that WXXI supports the Objectivity and Balance Amendment since it changes very little our station's existing procedures to ensure balance. In a political world, a compromise is appropriate, and this amendment is supported as a compromise to facilitate passage of S. 1504.

Finally, as I am sure you know, Bill Pearce is a fine man who has done a super job in our community. I believe that he has been in touch with your people. We here in Rochester value him and his thinking very much and support him in his endeavors to maintain the role and responsibility to public broadcasting.

Many thanks and best personal regards,

Sincerely,

DAVID L. HOFFBERG.

WSKG PUBLIC BROADCASTING,
Binghamton, NY.

Office of Senator Moynihan. ATTN: Richard Eaton, Administrative Aide.

From: Michael J. Ziegler.

Date: May 18, 1992.

I thought you might be interested in this Op Ed piece which recently appeared in Binghamton. I hope we can count on the senator's support when S. 1504 comes to the floor for a vote. It is vitally important that amendments, even apparently innocuous ones, are not attached to the bill. In particular the possible McConnell amendment, if passed, will seriously undermine the goals of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act—to have CPB serve as a heat shield between the government funding and public television (PTV) program content decisions—by giving the impression that PTV is directly funded and controlled by the government. This could call into serious question the integrity of programs like the MacNeil/Lehrer News- hour as well as WSKG's extensive local news and public affairs programs.

Please don't hesitate to call me if you'd like to discuss our position on this bill further.

[From the Press & Sun-Bulletin, May 4, 1992]

GEORGE WILL HAS WRONG VIEW OF BIG BIRD

(By Michael J. Ziegler)

Against my often positive reaction to George Will's columns, my response to his April 23 piece ("Big Bird Doesn't Need a Subsidy") was astonishment. The column was neither accurate nor honest. Even allowing for a certain conservative bias in his view, it was astonishingly shallow, badly researched, and illogical.

Mr. Will made three critical errors in his piece:

That the programs on public broadcasting are commercially valuable and ought to be sold to commercial broadcasters or cable interests.

That the reserves of the Children's Television Workshop (CTW, producer of *Sesame Street*) are obscenely large and make it inappropriate for that organization to receive any federal funding.

That the audience of public broadcasting is well-educated and wealthy, not really needing public broadcasting, and well-off enough to pay for it if they must have it.

In response, I would say simply that if the programs could be successful on commercial TV, they would already be there. I trust the functioning of the capitalist marketplace (as surely Mr. Will should) enough to be certain that if *The Civil War*, or *Nova*, or *Great Performances*, or *Sesame Street* were commercially viable, they would be seen elsewhere. There is a reason why the great programs of public broadcasting aren't seen on ABC or A&E: They don't deliver enough eyeballs to commercials to have a chance in that medium.

From personal experience, I know that most of the standouts on public TV were first "pitched" to commercial broadcasters, without success. And, when we do come up with a winner that might be useful commercially, it rapidly moves, or a clone is created. *The Muppet Show* came to life that way, and lapsed into obscurity after a few seasons on a commercial network. Virtually all the specialty cable channels which have tried to build a commercial success upon PBS look-alike programs are languishing, for sale, or out of business. And they reach only a small fraction of the audience public television serves.

Which leads to the second point Mr. Will makes in error. Children's Television Workshop does have large reserves. They give it the staying power to keep programs alive, unlike the fate of the Muppets on commercial TV. The reserves make it possible for WSKG to buy *Sesame Street* and other CTW programs at a third or less of the actual production cost. The reserves pay for the research that results in new programs being created and current programs constantly freshened. They also make possible outreach efforts that no commercial funds would ever pay for, such as the $10,000 grant WSKG has just received to pilot a project which will train day care workers to use *Sesame Street* with great educational effectiveness in their homes and schools.

The careful and responsible marketing (contrast it to the Ninja Turtles binge) of *Sesame Street* characters produces this reserve, and it could be far larger if CTW were to take the gloves off and promote their products as aggressively and as exploitatively as they would if they were profit driven.

Withholding federal funding to CTW because of its careful success would end all the commercially unattractive services and programs they provide, and in effect would be punishing them for their success.

The most insidious logic in Mr. Will's arguments lies in his thoughtless confusion between the public broadcasting audience and the public broadcasting contributors. Of course they are different, and thank God they are. The contributors are up-scale educationally and financially, as have been most philanthropists over the years. But the audience is not. The viewers and listeners virtually mirror the population of the United States. For example, 30.8 percent of all U.S. households have an income between $20,000 and $39,000 anually compared with 30.7 percent of the public TV audience.

As Bruce Christensen, president of PBS, said in response to the Will piece, "Public Television is for everyone. Its audience reflects the nation as a whole in terms of income, education level, race, occupation, age and sex. Mr. Will likely finds it hard to believe that anyone beneath his education or income level would watch intelligent public TV programming. But they do."

Viewers and listeners do not have to give, and if they don't, no one will know. But many do: Viewers and listeners make up the largest single source of funding.

One can but hope that George Will will think in a more balanced and objective manner (a characteristic that he excoriates public TV for the absence of) before he passes final judgment on public broadcasting. Or perhaps he should change advisors and reject the spurious logic of such "intellectual giants" as Jesse Helms.

The writer is president of WSKG, this area's public broadcasting radio and television outlet.

WXXI TELEVISION,
Rochester, NY, May 11, 1992.

Re Corporation for Public Broadcasting Reauthorization.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: On May 12th, the Senate will re-visit the CPB Reauthorization Bill S.1504. Proposed amendments have held up funding the CPB for fiscal years 1994-1996 for several months and your support tomorrow on the Senate floor is crucial in the passage of this Bill. We strongly urge you to support this Bill, but with the funding levels restored to the levels provided in the Bill passed by the House.

We understand amendments to the Bill have been proposed. The following constitutes WXXI's position regarding the proposed amendments:

The Disclosure amendment, which provides for an expanded public inspection file to demonstrate how CPB spends its federal funds, is unnecessary in our opinion. However, WXXI would not oppose the amendment if its inclusion is necessary for CPB funding.

The Objectivity and Balance amendment would impose a requirement that WXXI already meets, and therefore the amendment would have very little effect on WXXI. We support the amendment as a compromise to facilitate passage of S.1504.

WXXI does not support the Funding Levels amendment, which may freeze annual funding at $275 million for all three years. We would prefer restoration of the funding to $310 million in 1994, $375 million in 1995 and $425 million in 1996, the levels of the Bill already passed by the House. The new monies are designated to enhance programming in areas such as pre-school and classroom education, and adult illiteracy.

These monies are urgently needed to allow WXXI to continue providing the quality pro-

gramming that the Rochester community has enjoyed in the past. We trust that you will continue your support for CPB.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. BROWN,
Chairman.

ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT VIDEO AND FILMMAKERS, INC.,
New York, NY, April 2, 1992.

Re S. 1504.

Hon. DANIEL MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I am writing you as President of the nationwide 5,000 member Association of Independent Video and Film Makers (AIVF), an organization that includes several thousand New York residents.

I have been told that in conference committee recently Senator Dole asked if there is anyone in the Senate who supports the Independent Television Service (ITVS). Please tell Senator Inouye that you support ITVS, a vital part of S. 1504, Reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

You may recall that for a decade after the 1978 Telecommunications Act was passed there was increasing evidence that independent producers were significantly excluded from funding, although the Act specifically provided for that funding. It was only after extensive efforts by the members of our organization and many others, that the Senate and House determined our claims were just and valid, and therefore enacted legislation that led to the creation of ITVS. Then extensive negotiations with CPB, which had resisted the ITVS, finally led to an agreement which is only now in place. After well over 2,000 producers submitted proposals the first 25 grants were recently announced. Half of those grants are for New York residents.

The ITVS represents the true mandate and what we believe is the most important element of public television in this country—the opportunity for the diverse viewpoints and visions of America to be seen and heard. Senators Helms and Dole, who are reported to be holding up S. 1504, must know that that diversity cannot be narrowly defined or always meet the standards of those who hold differing views. Risks may be taken to encourage that diversity, so long restricted by the media—until ITVS. Now, with ITVS, there is a new and important ground-breaking change for public television. It needs your support and the support of your colleagues so that it can flourish. When it does it will be for the benefit of the American people, who will learn much from these new programs, who will truly be in a better position to engage in the essential dialogue of our democratic system, a system which can only flourish if the diverse visions and views of its citizens has the opportunity to express itself. They will be able to do so with ITVS. That is why you and your colleagues agreed to set it up. Please keep it alive!

Yours very truly,

ROBERT RICHTER,
President.

WCNY TV,
Syracuse, NY, March 13, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: We though you would like to see the enclosed editorial from today's Syracuse Post-Standard.

Your support of public broadcasting is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. DUNN,
Director, Corporate Communications.

[From the Post-Standard, Mar. 13, 1992]

TARGET: PUBLIC TV

The culture cops are at it again.

Last year they attacked the National Endowment for the Arts. In February, Pat Buchanan, Sen. Jesse Helms and Co. persuaded a gun-shy President George Bush to let go NEA chief John Frohnmayer, a dangerous radical cleverly disguised as a GOP moderate.

Now the Watchdogs of Degeneracy have set their sights on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, whose three-year federal appropriation is up for reconsideration by the Congress.

The right-wing critics don't want tax dollars to be spent on any cultural enterprises they don't approve of. When it comes to controversial programming, like public TV's film "Tongues Untied" about gay black life, they grow apoplectic. They also complain about "liberal bias." One alleged example: Bill Moyers, that dangerous liberal, is going to cover the 1992 presidential election for PBS.

Ridiculous as their campaign may sound, the critics have managed to shelve the CPB funding measure. Which says something about our craven political climate. When politics starts calling the shots in culture and art, the quality of life in the nation faces a subtle but insidious threat.

In their unholy quest for a culture free from diversity, free from experiment and risk, the right-wingers may simply be pandering for political gain. More frightening is the possibility they really believe the hogwash they are spouting.

They should visit Berlin and catch the current exhibition of "Degenerate Art," originally staged by Adolf Hitler and Co. back in 1937.

"Hitler believed art had to reflect conventional ideas of beauty and nobility," said Christoph Stoelzl, one of the new exhibit's organizers. Sound familiar?

Hitler and his propaganda czar, Josef Goebbels, raided German museums for examples of what they thought was pornographic, subversive, anti-German art. The Nazis stuck red tags on works of subsidized artists, noting they had been "paid for by the taxes of German working people." Sound familiar?

Exhibited were paintings by "degenerates" like Paul Klee, Wassily Kandinsky and Marc Chagall, who wouldn't raise a decibel of protest today. There was also art by Otto Dix, George Grosz and Max Beckmann—strong stuff that some viewers in 1992 would still consider "degenerate."

But the point is not to please everyone. "Modern art is about individuality," said Stoelzl. "No one perception of reality can be accepted as an absolute truth. The Nazis knew they had to crush that idea in order to survive."

Speaking at the show's opening, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher called the Nazi culture crackdown "a step toward the catastrophe that produced the mass murder of European Jews and the war of extermination against Germany's neighbors."

The parliament spent $2.5 million to support the exhibit—a notable gesture when Bonn must also underwrite the huge cost of rebuilding the former East Germany. That support, without strings, is a key to sustaining cultural vitality.

"Political freedom is possible only in a free culture," said Genscher. "Artistic and cultural freedom means, above all, freedom from all government influence."

Get the message, Jesse?

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
April 22, 1992.

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I am writing you in my capacity as Chairman of the Board of Advisors of the National Public Radio Station WBFO at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

I urge you most strongly to support the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991 (S1504, House Bill HR2977) which pertains to the reauthorization of Public Broadcasting.

For many years, well prior to my being appointed Chairman of the Advisory Board, I have been a devoted listener to National Public Radio (NPR). In most communities, commercial radio services offer little analysis or commentary on significant national and international events. Most commercial radio news is provided as short "news bites". I believe that this is a serious deficiency in radio service which NPR programming can ameliorate with its innovative and indepth looks at important issues.

Funding for Public Broadcasting in general, and local stations in particular, is critical and the future of some local public radio/TV stations may be in jeopardy if Federal funding is reduced significantly.

I respectfully request and urge you to support the increased funding for Public Broadcasting and oppose any amendments which

(a) could infringe on a local station's right to determine the programming which best serves a local community,

(b) would interfere in any program content or editorial decision making or

(c) would require the transfer of accountability for programming decisions to be moved from the local stations to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in Washington.

I should be delighted to offer additional comments on this issue should you require further information. Thanking you in anticipation of your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

ALAN J. DRINNAN, M.D., D.D.S.,
Professor and Chairman, Department of Oral Medicine; Chairman, Advisory Board, WBFO-88.7 FM.

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORP.,
Syracuse, NY, March 31, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is again under consideration. I strongly support continued funding.

On a local basis, I have been fortunate to Chair the Board of Directors of WCNY, which is the Public Broadcasting television and radio station in Central New York. The Board consists of community leaders from all walks of life. A conscientious job of prudent spending and management oversight is followed.

The variety and quality of programming, produced locally and purchased, meets an important need in our community. Our local widely supports the station operations through membership drives, participation in auctions and other fund raisers, and utilization of the services offered.

Please continue to support funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). In addition, I hope you will support during any debate of these measures continued funding in order to influence your colleagues.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
JOHN M. ENDRIES.

COMPUTER CONSOLES, INC.,
Rochester, NY, May 11, 1992.

Re Corporation for Public Broadcasting Reauthorization.

Hon. PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: I am taking the liberty of writing to you as both a business person and as a trustee of WXXI Public Broadcasting Council, headquartered in Rochester, New York.

As you know, the Senate will revisit the CPB Reauthorization Bill S. 1504 on Tuesday, May 12. This funding is vital to our Public Broadcasting stations.

The following is my opinion with respect to the identified amendments.

A. We can accept the Disclosure amendment.

B. With respect to the Objectivity and Balance amendment, we support the amendment as a compromise to facility passage of S. 1504.

C. The Funding Levels amendment may propose a freeze on annual funding at $275 million for all three years. We do not support this amendment and respectfully request that you do all in your power to effectuate the passage of the CPB funding as originally proposed and passed in the House.

Thank you for your anticipated support.
Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE CHESLER.

THE FRIENDS OF THIRTEEN, INC.,
New York, NY, May 28, 1992.

DEAR SENATOR: We volunteers hope that you saw this open letter—if not we have enclosed a copy.

Just a reminder! We are counting on your good judgment on this important issue.

Good education is the major goal of public broadcasting, which means knowing all sides of an issue. Making choices based on knowledge is not easy but, it certainly is important.

Public broadcasting is there to help.

Please don't short change the American Public.

All the Volunteers are Counting on you,
BEVERLY W. LUNDQUIST,
The Friends of THIRTEEN, Inc.

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1992]

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PLEASE HEAR US!

We are the National Friends of Public Broadcasting. Our purpose is to encourage and act as a resource for local volunteer groups that work with public broadcasting stations in their communities. We help develop support for public broadcasting at the local level. Our goal is to develop an informed constituency that will serve both the station and the community.

We are representative of over 250,000 volunteers across America.

The National Friends of Public Broadcasting was incorporated in July 1970. For over 20 years, hundreds of thousands of volunteers have given of their time, money, energy, creativity, and love to ensure that public broadcasting remain a part of their lives.

Please don't play games, political or otherwise, with public broadcasting! It is a vital resource that serves all Americans well.

Continue to fund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Let us continue our important volunteer work in education, outreach, membership and fundraising in partnership with you.

Our volunteers are actively working for public broadcasting across America in Michigan, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida, Illinois, Connecticut, Texas, Montana, Louisiana, Indiana, New York, Ohio, Alabama, Georgia, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin, California, Oklahoma, Arizona, Kentucky, Kansas, Vermont, South Dakota, Minnesota, Colorado, South Carolina, Virgin Islands, Tennessee, Maryland, Utah, Washington, Missouri, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico, North Dakota, Iowa, Washington D.C., Nevada, Idaho, Alaska, Maine, Nebraska, North Carolina, Arkansas, Wyoming, New Jersey, New Hampshire, West Virginia, Hawaii and Mississippi.

The Board of Trustees of the National Friends of Public Broadcasting
Diane Papedo, Chairman, Denver, CO.
Sandy Johnston, Washington, D.C.
Jan Mitchell, Wilmette, IL.
Donna Davies, Chicago, IL.
Wickliffe R. Powell, Ashland, KY.
Dottie Kemps, Los Angeles, CA.
Joan Moore, Lake Oswego, OR.
Elizabeth Campbell, Washington, D.C.
Elaine Peterson, Brookfield, WI.
Charlotte Hill, Las Vegas, NV.
Suzie Robinson, Denver, CO.
Marilyn Olsen, Indianapolis, IN.
Millie Haynie, Des Moines, IA.
Elaine Conway, Bronxville, NY.
Louisa Hunter, Brooklyn, NY.
Carol Welch, East Lansing, MI.
National Friends of Public Broadcasting, c/o KRMA-TV; Channel Six, 1261 Glenarm Place, Denver, Colorado, 80204–2100.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I have a few moments left that I would like to reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the chairman yield me some time?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield all the time the Senator wants.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to make sure that the Senate understands what we are doing. It was the distinguished former Senator from Arizona, Barry Goldwater, and I who sought forward funding on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. What we are doing now is authorizing the amounts for 1994, 1995, and 1996 to be appropriated.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it appears on page 20 of the report that accompanies this bill that we are authorizing to be appropriated an amount equal to 40 percent of the total of non-Federal financial support received by public broadcasting entities during the fiscal year second preceding each of the fiscal years. In other words, the limit on the amount of money that we really make available is 40 percent of the amount that is raised from the private sector in the 2 years preceding the amount of the appropriation. As members of the Appropriations Committee will note, the Congress really has never fully funded CPB, despite its authorization. I do think that we ought to notice that the non-Federal moneys are rapidly increasing. As a matter of fact, on page 8 of our report, we make this statement:

The committee is pleased that public broadcasters in recent years have been able to raise $5 to $6 additional to match each Federal $1 they have received.

That demonstrates that public support for public broadcasting is increasing at a rate far greater than our proposed increase in authorization. Remember now, we cannot appropriate more than 40 percent, and the amount shall not exceed the amount that is listed for the years in the amendment. Those amounts will be $385 million in 1993—that is already in existing law—$310 million for 1994; $375 million for 1995; and $425 million for 1996.

In view of the increasing non-Federal support for public broadcasting, why should we authorize less than the amount of this increase? As a matter of fact, Senators should be aware that we authorized $200 million in 1981. We are just going up, really. By 1996, 15 years later, it will be slightly more than a 100-percent increase in the amount authorized to match 40 percent of the non-Federal contributions.

I say that when we look at the forward funding concept, we ought to recognize the increased public support. We have tried to encourage the private sector to support public broadcasting. And it is doing so. As a matter of fact, beyond corporate contributions, individuals are coming forth with even more support for public broadcasting, and to cut the amount of this increase in the authorization for the Federal matching moneys to be appropriated would be a signal to the private sector, and to individuals, that Congress really does not seek additional money from them to support this function.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, I do not think there is a State in the Union in which public broadcasting means more than in my State of Alaska. We have an area one-fifth the size of the United States, and we have many areas yet that are totally unserved. I pointed this out to the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. There are many unserved and underserved areas in this country. As the chairman of our committee has indicated, we are trying to direct CPB to follow the basic authorization for the CPB, and give emphasis to those areas.

As the Senator from New York has just said, I find it very interesting when I go throughout my State and go to Eskimo villages or Indian villages and find that they now know what Big Bird is. I do not know why they should be denied the exposure to this basic educational tool that is available to the inner city. I welcome it in the inner city, but it is needed more out there where there is no other means of communication.

I urge the Senate to defeat this amendment, because I think we have adequate control on an annual basis over the amounts actually appropriated. Again, I call to the Senate's attention the fact that we have not

fully funded the past authorizations, but there is no question that the private sector, the individual contributions, are increasing rapidly.

Why should we deny the sector that is supported by the Federal taxpayers? And I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that one of the reasons he is here is the areas that are underserved and unserved have very little capability to contribute to public broadcasting.

You want to go out to the Eskimo villages; they have 85 percent unemployment and have had that for a substantial period of time, and ask them to increase their contribution? We put up 40 percent so this Corporation for Public Broadcasting can, in fact, go into the unserved and underserved areas of this country.

I urge the Senate not to do this. As the moneys start coming in from the urban areas, from the major international corporations and the sources of charitable contributions to support Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the funds should come from the taxpayers to support the availability of these services into the rural areas of this country, too. This is basically an authorization for provision of taxpayers' money to support delivering these same service to, say, the unserved and underserved areas of this country.

I have the unfortunate honor to represent a substantial portion of that. My State's economy is going down very rapidly. I have called attention to that on the floor of the Senate many times. Congress, in my opinion, unfortunately continues to block the development of the resource base of my State into the Eskimo country, in particular on the North Slope where we have vast deposits of oil and gas, we believe that could be obtained at very little harm, if any, to our environment, and certainly with greater protections than exist anywhere else in the world.

We are forcing our oil industry and our mining industry offshore. These people are losing their only opportunities for employment, and at the very time that they are losing their opportunities for employment, along comes an amendment that would deny them the increase in the moneys that would be necessary to continue the educational efforts of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in the rural areas of America.

I oppose this amendment very strenuously. It is no news to my good friend from Mississippi. I voiced this opposition in our caucus concerning that. But I think that it is incumbent upon this body, not only on the Democratic side of the aisle, but on the Republican side of the aisle, to remember the history of Senator Goldwater. Barry Goldwater supported the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It has continued in the vein that he intended it to continue, and I believe that those of us who want to show that same spirit on a bipartisan basis should vote to sustain the committee's recommendation for this modest increase, modest increase that will occur 3, 4, and 5 years from now. There is no reason to cut that authorization, Mr. President.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Well said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes and seven seconds.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I commend him for his leadership and for the effort he has made in bringing this bill to the point that it is today.

Let me also commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska. He has spoken in a way that I think many of us from rural areas can fully appreciate. Certainly in rural areas, we have a significant degree of appreciation for the role that public broadcasting has played, and he has spoken eloquently and very compellingly for the need for support among those of us from rural areas.

The Corporation of Public Broadcasting was established in 1967 to develop a public television and radio network in the United States that would provide educational, informational, and cultural programming for all Americans. Congress and the American public, rural and urban people alike, fully recognized the important role this new service could play, and endorsed it. For 23 years Congress has strongly supported this effort.

Our confidence in and commitment to that enterprise is richly rewarded. It has fulfilled its promise. It has done what it said it was going to do. It has reached out in ways that have been unparalleled in the private sector. Today, public broadcasting provides quality programming and community outreach services to 98 percent of America for television, 98 percent. You are going into the heart of Alaska, into the middle of an Indian reservation, down into the middle of deserts, into the heart of the big city, into all parts of this country. And in so doing, public television has educated, informed and provided cultural opportunities that the American people had never before experienced.

And virtually the same can be said for radio; 86 percent of the services provided through public broadcasting reach rural and urban areas alike.

Why is this important? It is important because public broadcasting provides the American people with access to services, as I said, that they have never otherwise enjoyed. It enriches their experience and the quality of their lives in the process. That is something that no one can deny.

To listen to many of the critics of public broadcasting, one would think that the CPB funds are spent primarily on interesting, yet perhaps extraneous, entertainment. In truth, public broadcasting is important not only for the programs that are broadcast in living rooms across America, but also for the contributions that it makes to education, community awareness, and technological innovation.

At a time when both policymakers and the public are agreed on the urgency and magnitude of the need to strengthen education in America, public broadcasting provides a cost-effective way to achieve important national education goals that might not otherwise be realized. From its early commitment to promoting the use of its programming in the classroom and as teaching tools for lifelong learning, to the initiation 2 years ago of a multiyear plan to expand the role of public broadcasting in delivering new educational programming and services, CPB, in partnership with the stations, form an essential element of a national strategy to restore American education to world prominence once again.

My distinguished colleague from South Carolina has done a thorough job in explaining the CPB reauthorization bill and making the case for the funding levels contained in the committee bill. I will not restate that case. I would, however, like to reinforce what public broadcasting has meant to rural America.

Public broadcasting was envisioned as a means of providing a wide variety of opportunities and services to all citizens. This ambitious mission is a particular challenge in rural areas, which have the lowest cable penetration and will likely be the last to receive fiber optics. Yet it is a challenge that public broadcasting has attacked with enthusiasm and vision. From its inception, public TV, and radio have worked to make sure our society is never divided into information "haves" and "have nots," whether based on geography or any other factors.

In rural areas, the lack of population density, specialized expertise and financial resources, coupled with sheer geographic expanse, makes distance learning and other advantages of public television and radio especially suited to meeting a myriad of educational, informational and cultural needs. As a Senator from one of the more rural areas of our country, I can attest to the success of public broadcasting's efforts to use its telecommunications infrastructure and creative resources to improve rural opportunity and quality of life. Rather than conceding the argument that technology must inevitably

encourage the flow of citizens from rural areas to urban centers, public broadcasting in general, and South Dakota Public Broadcasting in particular, are using telecommunication technology to solve rural problems.

This effort starts with elementary and secondary education. Schools in small towns and rural locations cannot cost-effectively offer a sufficient variety of courses important for dealing with the complexities of the modern world. Public TV's technology is making a difference in filling that void.

Over 240 public television stations in the Nation are broadcasting instructional video programming specifically for use in classrooms. In my State, South Dakota Public Broadcasting has been working with the State's Technology in Education Office in scheduling and delivering 5 hours of instructional television on a daily basis, as well as overnight block feeds for VCR recording. This programming is available to more than 127,000 K through 12 students in 72 local school districts in South Dakota.

My State's school districts are using this technology, and its benefits are appreciated by students, parents, and educators. Since the debate over the CPB reauthorization bill began several months ago, I have been hearing from my constituents about the educational benefits of public broadcasting and their concerns that freezing or reducing funding for CPB will subsequently deny them access to new technology and educational programming.

Public broadcasting's partnership with education extends beyond basic elementary education. Public television is helping over a quarter of a million people per year earn college credit. A quarter of a million people have access to services provided by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting specifically to enhance their educational opportunities.

South Dakota Public Broadcasting, in conjunction with the University of South Dakota, provides distance educational opportunities to nontraditional students through the use of college-level telecourses. Annually, about 1,000 students are enrolled in a telecourse offering, representing about 51 percent of South Dakota communities.

I must say, Mr. President, that is in particular one reason why those of us from rural areas are very concerned about the degradation in service, about the cutback in the availability of opportunities in those area, where there is not any alternative, where they cannot walk across the street to attend a classroom, where they cannot visit a local lecture hall to hear a speaker they would not otherwise have the opportunity to hear.

Public broadcasting has also become an important vehicle for the delivery of specialized adult training. Like any other community, towns in rural America require certified and well-trained professionals to provide essential services such as child care, education, social work, and health care. Farmers and rural small businessmen need access to new technologies and the latest information. Yet, in South Dakota and other rural areas, the lack of population density, specialized expertise, and financial resources—coupled with long distances—makes it increasingly difficult for health care professionals to have access to recertification training, and small businessmen and farmers to have access to instruction about the latest technological innovations.

Public TV provides health care professionals, school teachers, child care providers, social workers, law enforcement authorities and other service providers with a wide variety of courses, workshops, seminars, and videoconferences at their workplaces and local educational institutions. Also, in cooperation with land-grant colleges across the United States, public broadcasting has developed the Agricultural Satellite Corp. [Ag * Sat], which transmits college credit instruction and videoconferences to agribusiness workplaces and cooperative extension offices throughout the country. Similarly, the PBS Business Channel enables rural businesses access to much of the same instructional and information services previously available only to those who live in metropolitan areas. Federal funding is vital for the continuation of these services to rural America.

Finally, for those concerned about the future of rural America, it should be noted that federal funding is especially important to small public broadcasting stations, which typically are public program providers to rural areas. Language in the reauthorization of CPB, being considered in this bill, would encourage an even greater allocation to rural public stations, especially radio stations.

For all of these reasons, access to education, opportunities for cultural services that would never otherwise be provided, and improvement in the quality of life in rural America in particular, I urge my colleagues to support the funding levels recommended in the Commerce Committee bill, and to defeat the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. This measure is a sound investment in the education and cultural future of our country, and it deserves the Senate's support.

With that, I again thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes and forty-seven seconds.

Mr. LOTT. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator LOTT, from Mississippi for his leadership on this amendment.

This amendment is not about whether or not the Corporation for Public Broadcasting does a good job. Certainly in many areas it does. I also compliment my friends, Senator INOUYE from Hawaii and Senator MOYNIHAN, for their strong statements on some of the very good accomplishments that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has made.

While some of my colleagues have argued that increased funding is necessary to maintain these successes, I do not agree. This amendment will still allow the CPB to operate effectively. The Lott amendment is simply saying we should keep funding at the same level it was last year, which means no increase or decrease.

The bill that we have before us authorizes a 50-percent increase in funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is a tremendously large increase.

Last year we actually appropriated $253 million, and this bill authorizes $319 million for fiscal year 1993. In 1992, $251 million is authorized, not counting funds for the CPB satellite. It would authorize a level to $310 million, increase that $375 million for 1995 and $425 million for 1996, a 50-percent increase to go from $250 million up to $425 million.

So I am bewildered. I know that later this month, I hope later this month, we are going to be debating a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. One which I hope will pass the Senate because I know that some people in this body are opposed to the amendment. So I hope we can garner the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

I tell my colleagues, and I will tell the American people, we cannot balance the budget if we continue to have very large increase in spending programs such as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This may be a decent program but it is not meritorious, in my opinion, of a 50-percent increase. A 50-percent increase over the next 3 years is extremely large, that is ridiculous.

I would hope that my colleagues would look at the amount of money we are spending today, about $1½ trillion, or the equivalent of $6,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. We should start showing some discipline and restraint in the total amount of money that we spend. We should start freezing or limiting the growth of spending and not expand spending in the categories of this bill, which is almost 30 percent in the first year increasing to 50 percent over the 3-year authorization.

The pending legislation is not prudent or fiscally responsible. I hope that my colleagues would adopt the Lott amendment. The amendment does not gut the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It does not eliminate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It does not say we want to sell it or privatize it, although many parts of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are quite meritorious and probably would be quite successful in the private sector.

The Lott amendment does not repeal salaries that are being paid right now to the Children's Television Network whose president is now making about $641,000. Senator LOTT does not repeal that. Basically he says they should be on the same spending level for the next 3 years, a freeze, or the same level that we have had last year. I think that is a good amendment. It is one that is supported by the administration and one I hope my colleagues would adopt.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOFFORD). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I yield myself 1 minute.

In the spirit of the senior Senator from Alaska, who spoke so carefully and well, may I point out that if you go back to 1981 when the authorization was $180 million and you bring that number forward in constant dollars, it comes to some $270 million, today which is less than the current authorization.

We have barely kept up with this matter. We have not increased, and we ought to do in this modest way suggested because the networks are expanding. There are places in Alaska that still don't get their radio, their TV. The Senator from Alaska just told me that in Alaska the per capita contribution in some of those villages is $20 per person. That is a statement of need as well as commitment.

May I say on an important point, the business of salaries keeps being raised. Nobody in public television makes money like that. The television workshop, Children's Television Workshop, has been able to produce all the television it has done by marketing their products in the private enterprise market. The profits from that go into their television, and the person who does the marketing makes the marketer's price. That is what they are worth. But the profits go into public television.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield? I made a statement on the record and I would like to know if I was correct. I made a statement that the president of the Children's Television Network is being paid $641,000. Could the Senator tell me if I am correct? If I am incorrect I want to apologize and correct the RECORD.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. No, it is the salary made by that person in charge of selling franchises and such like in the private market to make profits that the workshop can use in producing television. Not the president. Since there has been much discussion of the salaries of the presidents of WNET and the Children's Television Workshop, I ask unanimous consent that letters be included in the RECORD that will clarify the matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S TELEVISION WORKSHOP,
New York, NY, June 3, 1992.

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: In response to your request for salary information regarding Children's Television Workshop (CTW), a not-for-profit educational corporation in New York, the following should set the record straight:

CTW's President, David Britt, received $184,431;

William F. Whaley, President of CTW's Products Group made $641,224, he reports directly to the President and is instrumental in generating more than $20 million to provide self-support revenues for the Workshop to contribute to Sesame Street and other educational activities. His salary is based on a performance-based incentive program and is reviewed by corporation specialists.

Al Hyslop $207,013 (no longer employed by CTW) was in charge of CTW's domestic television production, his replacement was paid $135,000.

It should be pointed out that CTW itself does not receive direct pass-through grants from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) but instead is a grant recipient for specific projects. Grants from CPB have never exceeded 3% of CTW'S annual budget.

Sesame Street has not received any direct federal money in over a decade.

Sincerely,

GARY E. KNELL,
Vice President.

THIRTEEN-WNET,
New York, NY, June 3, 1992.

Hon. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
Senate Russell Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOYNIHAN: Per your request, I wish to inform you that my current salary as president and chief executive officer of WNET public television in New York is $225,000 per year. The station recently ended a two-year wage freeze on all nonunion employees, including myself, and at that time my salary was increased from $199,500.

My salary is still under review by the compensation committee. At the last meeting of the committee I requested a salary reduction, which is currently being considered. However, the committee, made up of leading community members, strongly felt that, since my compensation is well below industry standards for New York, I should consider taking the salary increase.

Over a year ago, I made a commitment to the station's capital campaign of $100,000.

My last W-2 forms from my previous place of employment, where I was president of a major commercial television business and chairman of a satellite corporation, totaled $930,000.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. BAKER,
President.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do have at least one additional request for time in my remaining minutes, but I would like to respond to some of the comments that have been made here and then yield to the distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE, in a few minutes when he does return to the floor.

With regard to the argument about barely keeping up with inflation, Mr. President, what about the people, the taxpayers? They barely kept up with inflation. In fact, they have lost ground. Why? A lot of reasons. One of them is because of the tax burden that we have put on them through the Federal Government. I do not think that argument is one that really holds water. S. 1504 still represents an increase of 50 percent over the next 3 years.

Now with regard to salaries, I do not begrudge these people making $600,000, $300,000, $200,000; that is great, in the private sector. But I just question whether or not the taxpayers should be contributing to those kinds of salaries. There is a parallel here over the problems with the United Way. Maybe Federal funds do not go directly to these salaries, but if they want to have more money to put in to rural areas and improving their programming maybe that would be a place to begin. So I think this is a valid argument about some of the salaries being totally out of line.

As far as 6 million people contributing to Public Broadcasting Services, that is great. I would like for the private contributions to be the way they get their principal funding.

Again, we are not cutting off funding. We are saying $275 million a year for 3 years. Let us encourage people to contribute more. Let us encourage corporations to contribute more.

Now, for those that would be interested and concerned, I want to say that the administration has problems with this bill in its present form and they support this amendment that would put into place the funding that the administration requested.

With regard to the argument that this has a great and distinguished past, I think in many ways that is true. It was innovative. I am sure the debate was magnificent when the two distinguished Senators, Senator PASTORE and Senator HUGH SCOTT, came up with the idea. I think we probably really needed it then, and there is still a place for it. But that was 25 years ago.

There is a lot that has changed, a lot that has happened in the past 25 years in television. Cable has brought us a revolution of diversity. You can get whatever you are looking for educationally. Whether it is here in Washington, DC, or in the rural areas, whether it is by cable or satellite, a tremendous diversity of programming

is available that you did not have 25 years ago. Programming that is educational, informative, and cultural. Times have changed and marched forward.

I question the need for the increase in funding. When we consider that there is also tremendous duplication. I understand that there are 6 PBS stations in the New York market. There are seven PBS stations in the Washington, DC, area. Obviously, there is duplication here. Let us spread it out a little bit. Maybe we could cut back on that duplication in the major metropolitan areas and use it to get better services in Alaska, Hawaii, Mississippi, and in other places where we need it.

There is an extravagant number of people employed. In fact, I saw a transcript from an April 27 radio talk show in Detroit where a former employee said about the Public Broadcasting System: "There is a tremendous amount of dead wood there. People that I knew used to joke around and call the station their retirement city. You have as many as two or three people assigned to doing the same task when you really only need a part-time person for that task."

So let us cut down on the duplication of a number of stations serving the same market, and let us see if we cannot get by in some areas with fewer people.

Also, they have not learned their lesson over there. After the uproar that was ignited by the PBS show, "Tongues Untied," we learn now that on June 24 they are going to have another program that is going to horrify, I think, many people in this country, called "The Lost Language of Cranes."

Again, my amendment is not directed at what they have been doing, in balance and fairness and the content of some of their programs. But one way to get the message through to them—that you need to shape your act up, you are paying too high salaries, you have too much duplication, times have changed and the programs you are running are highly questionable, in many instances—is to at least freeze their funding.

My colleagues, if we cannot at least control the increase for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, we should surrender. We cannot control the spending of the Federal Government. Every program that comes through here has merit to one group or another or one individual or another. But we have to have some control. Certainly, with the history that we have with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, what they have been doing and what they are doing, this is a place where we can at least freeze the funding.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 1 minute and 27 seconds.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to yield the remainder of the time I have to the distinguished leader. I presume he might need some additional time. Perhaps he could use his leader time and use the remainder of our time to conclude debate in support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader also has time on this bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to be making a rather lengthy statement here which will take about an hour.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. INOUYE. My colleague from Alabama has been waiting for some time. Can I give him some time?

Mr. DOLE. Certainly.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield the reminder of time on the amendment and whatever time is necessary from the bill to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I appreciate that very much. I will make mine very brief, but I appreciate both the minority leader and Senator INOUYE'S yielding me this time.

My State of Alabama is unique in regards to public television.

Alabama Public Television as the Nation's first statewide noncommercial television network in the United States. Because of this, I feel compelled to add my voice to this debate on S. 1504 and to extol the virtues of Alabama's public broadcasting system of which Alabamians are intensely proud and to which they remain extremely dedicated.

As with all other public television and radio stations, Alabama's stations are locally operated by nonprofit community associations, universities and by State or local government authorities. This local base means that stations respond to the special needs of their particular communities through programming choices and outreach projects.

In Alabama, for example, approximately 48 percent of those individuals over the age of 25 have not earned a high school diploma or passed a high school equivalency exam. In response to this crisis, Alabama Public Television has made a strong commitment to improving adult basic education.

As a result, as many as 2,000 Alabama households tune in to their local public television station each day to watch GED preparation and literacy classes. Since 1990, an estimated 4,500 Alabamians have prepared for the GED exam by watching the 43-part GED series on public television and using the accompanying workbooks.

In addition to taking on the challenges of some of the State's longstanding problems such as adult education, Alabama public television has also quickly responded to the growing need for quality child care. For example, in April, Alabama Public Television's Educational Services Coordinator gave a presentation on using "Mister Rogers" to the Gulf Coast Day Care Association in Mobile. As a result, all 73 members of the association have ordered the "Mister Rogers Plan & Play Book" which provides information on each program and suggestions for related activities to do with the children. This group of child care professionals join day care centers already using "Mister Rogers" in Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, Huntsville, and Montgomery.

In addition to airing programming designed for a nationwide audience, Alabama produces its own programs of specific interest to its residents. Among those such programs, one with widespread popularity is Alabama Public Television's "For the Record." This program provides in-depth coverage of the State legislature including live floor action from both Houses, special reports from around the statehouse and analysis with guest experts at the APT studio, to give viewers a better understanding of how their State government operates.

Whether Alabamians tune in to locally produced radio and television shows or to those created elsewhere, one thing seems clear. They are pleased with the operational decisions being made by the Alabama public broadcasting stations, proud of their partnership in this endeavor and thankful to have this source of programming.

Among the many people who have written to me recently in support of public broadcasting, one constituent writing from Dothan commented that, "local decisions about which programs to air are best left at the local level." She went on to say that "Alabama Public Television has its hand on the pulse of Alabama" and that "local decisionmaking allows APT to address the needs of this State's citizens."

A couple writing from Birmingham remarked that public broadcasting is "something we can all be proud of because it represents a partnership between the Federal Government and people like us who help pay for it to have for all the people an educational and entertainment facility of such fine quality."

And finally, as another constituent put it, "without public television, we would see very little of excellence."

I could continue with similar passages from dozens of other letters I have received on this issue. But with individual Alabamians donating 23 percent of APT's annual budget, almost twice as much as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting contributes, it seems clear to me that Alabamians do not find this programming offensive or biased, that they do not object to Federal contributions to the service or that they believe comparable programming exists elsewhere.

To the contrary, 25 years after its inauguration, public broadcasting has been embraced by this country and its citizens for fulfilling its original mandate and for withstanding alterations in that mandate to better serve the changing needs of the American people.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to look beyond the Potomac debate over public broadcasting to the role which public television and radio actually plays in the lives of the people in their home States. If that role is as strong as the one it plays in the lives of Alabamians, they will have good reason to support this reauthorization.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes from the bill to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, what we are hearing today is a debate on the funding level for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other affiliate organizations. That is, in fact, a veil. What we are really about here is whether there should be a continued national commitment to public radio and television. What is under attack is a system that has served this Nation well for two generations.

The questions that have been raised are: Is there still a need for this national system? Have we exhausted the rationale that led to its initial establishment?

In my State of Florida while I had the good fortune to serve as Governor, we had a program of expanding public radio and television to make it available to all sections of our State. I am pleased to report that, with the significant assistance of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, that plan has been virtually completed.

Our State benefits from the contributions that citizens from Pennsylvania and other States have made to provide us with that full system.

Mr. President, I do not believe that today we should say that other areas of the country, such as Alaska, which have not fulfilled a full service of public radio and television should be denied. We recognize that we are voting today on an authorization level. The actual level of funding that will be required to carry out an intelligent national program will be made on a year-to-year basis in the appropriations process. But I believe that there is still a commanding case for the relevance of a national position in public radio and television.

First, national programs continue to pay for the essential development of the type of informational and educational and artistic programming that would not be available through any other means. Most Americans looked with great pleasure and edification upon the Civil War series in the fall of last year. It took longer, Mr. President, to produce that program than it took to fight the Civil War. It was only because of the kind of financial support which was available through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that that unique program has now become a part of our culture.

Second, public television has helped create the market for these expanding new means of communications. It is exactly because public television demonstrated that there was an audience for programs of nature, programs of education, science, that then made it possible for there to be the commercialization of those through networks such as A&E.

I applaud and hope that there will be further expansion of these but, rather than indicate the lack of further necessity for PBS, they underscore one of the great achievements of public broadcasting, particularly, Mr. President, in the area of children's broadcasting. There has, in fact, unfortunately been a retreat from children's broadcasting in many of the commercial channels. It has only been the public broadcasting that has brought a sustained commitment to enhanced quality of children's broadcasting.

Public broadcasting is open to all. Even today, with the great expansion of cable television, a third or more of American homes do not have access to cable TV, either because of technology or because of economics. Public broadcasting is available to all American families.

Finally, Mr. President, public broadcasting has served as a great unifying force for America. At a time when we need to better understand each other, when we need to be able to appreciate our differences without having those differences become sources of division, public television has filled that need. America needs public television today in somewhat different but equally significant way to that which justified its establishment two generations ago.

So, Mr. President, stripping away the veiled arguments of what should be the appropriate authorization level, what is at stake here is the issue of a continued national commitment to excellence in broadcasting through public broadcasting.

I am confident that this generation, that this session of Representatives of the American people will make the same judgment that our predecessors have made; and that is that America's needs require the alternative television that is available through public broadcasting and that it deserves the modest Federal support which it is currently receiving and which it would receive under the authorizations which would be adopted by the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. President, the debate on public broadcasting has become oversimplified. Big Bird has become the major issue, and we have found ourselves left with two choices: Hands off Big Bird or throw Big Bird off the air. Realistically, this issue is much more complex and meaningful.

I have always been a strong supporter of the vital service provided by public broadcasting. I start my day with "Morning Edition" on National Public Radio and typically end it with a rerun of MacNeil-Lehrer.

It is a statement of the strength and vigor of a free society that a government can support without attempting to control institutions like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I find the programming on these stations to be informative, thorough, international, and credible.

On Friday's, when I begin to get homesick, I turn to Red Barber and hear his familiar voice from Tallahassee, FL.

"Sesame Street" was an essential part of my daughters' education and development while growing up in Miami and Tallahassee. I hope that my two granddaughters—one living in Tallahassee and the other in Miami—will also have this opportunity.

I am pleased and honored to share the same grandchild with the noted historian David McCullogh. Many of you have probably read or read about his new book, "Truman." David McCullogh also narrated the riveting "Civil War" documentary shown on public television. This program was not only of great quality but also had mass appeal and taught volumes about this conflict to many generations.

Some critics argue that public broadcasting caters to a narrow audience that is economically and intellectually up-scale. To the contrary, the "Civil War" audience spanned economic, racial, and geographic boundaries.

In Florida, public television has displayed diverse programming in its stations throughout the State.

Even more important than its diversity is the appropriateness of the programming, because so much of it is produced at the local level and designed for local viewers. WJCT-TV in Jacksonville produced the "The Black Family," a weekly series produced by a black woman, featuring black professionals, and dealing with issues of concern to the black community.

Miami's WPBT-TV created "Dreams of Freedom," which won the Southeastern Educational Communication Association Award. This program explored Cuban immigration into south Florida.

Through the use of archival footage, the program showed events in Cuba that led to the massive influx of Cubans into the United States in the early 1960's. The program also profiled various families living in south Florida and showed how they have put their lives back together after being uprooted from their homeland.

Just as communities around Florida produce radio and TV shows targeted to their viewers, local stations nationwide make independent broadcasting decisions based on grassroots familiarity with community tastes and needs.

Each station has a local advisory board and relies heavily on local dollars.

I have heard from many of my constituents who support public broadcasting. Since January, over 600 Floridians have written to me and asked for my support for public broadcasting and for this bill. I am pleased today to stand before the Senate to affirm my commitment to public broadcasting.

I would also like to share two of these constituent letters with my Senate colleagues.

Lee Evans-DiSalvo from St. Petersburg, FL, helped prepare her children for kindergarten by having them watch "Sesame Street" and other children's shows on public television.

As Ms. Evans-DiSalvo stated in her letter:

> Granted, there are a lot of quality programs for kids on other stations, too, but even if I let my children watch a program I consider entertaining and enriching at 4 p.m., they are often subjected to advertising for either a horror film that the station will show later that night, or clips from summer films that are R rated.
>
> It is impossible to actually control what one's children see on regular stations. It is only on PBS that I can be assured that there will be no violent images or profanity.

Public broadcasting is also unique in its adaption of new technology to serve both the hearing and sight impaired, as well as viewers whose native language is not English. Henry Tuck from Largo, FL, writes:

> I am a legally blind citizen who depends upon the public broadcasting system to keep me informed of local, State, national, and international news.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two letters printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, public television is diverse. Its programs come from a wide range of producers and reach a wide range of audiences. The programs offer the audiences exposure to the diverse events and ideas that make up our world. Stations all over America are able to create programs with essential material for people of all ages.

Critics also contend that public television is no longer needed because of the increase in cable channels with comparable programming.

First, public broadcasting stations on cable are among the most appreciated and watched selections.

Moreover, I submit that the emergence of such excellent networks such as Arts & Entertainment, Bravo, and Discovery came about precisely because of public broadcasting. Public broadcasting has served as the laboratory from which much that cable offers has developed.

The success of PBS programs such as "National Geographic," "Nova," and "Cosmos" paved the way for the development of commercial programming like that found on the Discovery Channel. With similar programming and viewers, public television helped to demonstrate the clear demand for television shows about science and nature.

Likewise, cultural programming on public broadcasting such as "Masterpiece Theatre," opera productions and the ballet led to cable stations like Arts & Entertainment and Bravo.

These public broadcasting programs assured their cable counterparts that they would be commercially successful.

Programs like "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company" proved the effectiveness of educational programming and created a demand for similar programming to expand and diversify. In this environment, excellent initiatives like cable in the classroom have flourished.

Who knows what the next generation of public-television-inspired cable productions will be? We do know that the role of public broadcasting in creating innovative programming cannot be understated.

George Will, in his eloquent but flawed criticism of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, has argued that public broadcasting is elitist and reaches only the top socioeconomic segment of America. He uses WETA, Washington's public station, as an example, saying its contributors have an average household income of $94,583.

He misses the point, though, because he fails to distinguish between those who watch and those who contribute to public broadcasting. In fact, during the average week, 87 million people—about one-third of all Americans—view public television, as opposed to the 6 million that contribute money to public television annually.

In many areas cable television is not available. Others simply cannot afford it. Public broadcasting is available over-the-air, free to all citizens—not just those who are wired and can afford to pay for cable.

Public broadcasting reaches 98 percent of U.S. households, while at least 40 percent do not have or cannot get cable services. People are not required to support public broadcasting through individual contributions in order to have access to that programming. The fact that over 6 million people contribute is a strong indication of the value that the American public places on their ability to have access to this type of programming.

Public television does not cater to the elite audience that it is sometimes associated with. Approximately 30 percent of the public television audience has an annual income of less than $20,000 and approximately 60 percent of the audience has an annual income of less than $40,000.

The many cable services and other broadcast services in existence today are profitmaking entities concerned with the bottom line. As sophisticated and informative as much of cable programming has happily become, virtually every decision must be made with the profit margin in mind. This is not a criticism, it is merely a fact of business. Public broadcasting is still the only noncommercial broadcasting source available to viewers, especially parents with young children who do not wish to have their children exposed to hundreds of thousands of commercials each year.

Public television offers an alternative to viewers. It offers a mix of programming that is not available on a consistent basis from other television broadcasters or distributors. Moreover, it provides educational, informational, and cultural programming free of charge to all who care to watch.

Because public television is not driven by the need to expose audiences repeatedly to commercial messages from program sponsors, it can risk new or innovative forms of programming. This includes long form documentaries, experimental drama, or other material that may not appeal to a wide audience on a consistent basis.

While Federal support for public broadcasting accounts for approximately 23 percent of the average public radio station's annual operating budget, and just 9.3 percent of the average public television station's annual operating budget, these funds are critical to the stability and viability of the public broadcasting system. The bulk of these funds are used by stations to produce and acquire programming, finance production equipment and facilities, launch community outreach services in connection with public service programming, or pay for satellite interconnection services.

Federal funds serve an essential purpose. Besides being a substantial portion of the overall public broadcasting budget, they are the magnet that draws other funds to the system.

What philanthropic organization wants to pay administrative staff salary or equip an office when it could instead help underwrite a series as popular and respected as the "Civil War" documentary?

The Federal contribution can be used to establish the infrastructure, so producers can go out and market ideas to potential contributors.

Federal support also adds credibility in seeking private funding for innovative productions and unestablished filmmakers.

American governmental support for public broadcasting pales in compari-

son to other countries. In the United Kingdom, Government support for public broadcasting reaches $37.31 per capita. In Canada and Japan, that same support reaches $48.86 and $19.76 per capita, respectively for fiscal year 1990. This compares to the United States figure of $6.34 for the same period.

The time has come for the United States to stand behind the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. But in order for this to occur, it is our responsibility on the Federal level to support the funding efforts proposed by S. 1504.

EXHIBIT 1

LARGO, FL,
May 22, 1992.

Senator BOB GRAHAM,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAHAM: I am a legally blind citizen who contributes and supports WUSF-FM89.7. Their programs are excellent and I depend upon the public broadcasting system to keep me informed on local, state, national and international news. I enjoy their classical music and other cultural resources.

As my Senator, I trust you will support the Federal funding of public broadcasting while community-based stations have control over the programming provided to their audience.

WUSF-FM is too important a community resource to be crippled by loss of funding.

Yours truly,

HENRY W. TUCK.

ST. PETERSBURG, FL,
May 21, 1992.

Senator BOB GRAHAM,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRAHAM: This letter is in regards to the upcoming vote regarding funding for Public Broadcasting. Please cast your vote to support Federal funding of public broadcasting. PBS offers such quality programming, available to all who wish to watch, without having to pay for cable TV. It is inconceivable to me how some Senators are arguing against public funding for PBS because surveys have shown that it is used mainly by the middle and upper classes. These are the same senators, mind you, that consistently vote against the lower-income groups in federal funding for social services. Here, they switch sides and try to portray public broadcasting somehow as an elite option available only to the few. It is available to all. By choice, people choose to watch it.

I didn't put my children into pre-school until one year before kindergarten, even though there is a lot of pressure to start children nowadays in pre-school at the age of two. I didn't want them to miss out on what other children were learning in pre-school, but by watching "Sesame Street" and other children's shows on an almost daily basis, I could see what other children were doing, what is normally taught to young children, and all that without a lot of commercials or violence thrown at them. Granted, there are a lot of quality programs for kids on other stations, too, but even if I let my children watch a program I consider entertaining and enriching at 4:00 p.m., they are often subjected to advertising for either a horror film that the station will show later that night, or clips from summer films that are R-rated. It is impossible to actually control what one's children see on regular stations. It is only on PBS that I can be assured that there will be no violent images or profanity.

Please urge others to dismiss any doubts that they may have regarding continued Federal funding for public broadcasting, and may control of it be left at the local level. Our local station does an excellent job of programming, with a wide variety of needs met through the choices they provide.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

LEE EVANS-DISALVO.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is it, 1 minute 30 seconds remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately a minute on the amendment and time on the bill.

Mr. DOLE. That is right, I do have time on the bill.

Mr. President, I will take a couple of minutes because I am going to make an exhaustive statement later on. I hope people will just read the statement—I am certain not many people listen—but I hope they will read the statement later. All these great things about public television may be true, but there are also some great excesses that ought to be dealt with. We are going to deal with some in this bill, thanks to the cooperation of the managers on both sides. But I want to address particularly the Lott amendment now and rise in support of that amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote for that amendment.

We are asking to increase spending for this program by 50 percent. The amendment by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi would keep that at $275,000, certainly not a paltry amount. But this amendment is not about quality programming or helping rural areas receive public television and radio, and it is not about killing Big Bird. I get all these liberal commentators talking about how we are going to kill Big Bird and all these things they do not know anything about.

This amendment is simply about priorities. Can limited Federal resources be better spent to house and clothe disadvantaged Americans? Can it be better spent on health care and education? Or, for a nominal idea, can we save it and reduce the Federal deficit?

I voted for cuts in spending in a wide variety of Federal programs and, quite simply, the Congress spends too much money on worthy causes and the spending drives up the deficit and the debt drives down economic recovery.

The amendment does not constitute slashing funding for public broadcasting. It says we cannot afford the increase; we ought to freeze it. We talk about freezes. This will be a good place to start. We are going to have a balanced budget debate before long. A lot of people are going to vote for spending and a balanced budget amendment. People back home say, "I have a Senator who believes in balancing the budget," but they do not look at the RECORD where he or she voted for all the spending. I intend to vote for that amendment. We tried everything else. Nothing has worked.

This would be a great place to start. If you are for the balanced budget amendment, this will be a little litmus test right here. It is a chance to demonstrate you mean it. When you talk about balancing the budget and spending particularly in a program where we have, as I will lay out in detail line by line—and they are facts that cannot be refuted—some of the excessive salaries being made by a lot of people in CPB, excessive profits being made in the private sector, and all these things that are going on that are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act and you cannot find out what is really going on, it really opened my eyes.

I voted against what is called educational television in 1967 because I had a fear in 1967 this is what was going to happen. It was going to get bigger and bigger and bigger and serve a certain elite class of Americans. I hope in my later statement that some who have said there is nothing wrong with this great program will just take a look at it. It is one reason we have the deficit, because we do not spend enough time looking at some of the details. If we cannot save money in public broadcasting, how are we going to save any in health programs, education, agriculture, or other areas?

It seems to me this is sort of a preliminary bout, a preliminary event; this is a warmup for the balanced budget amendment. This will be a good chance to show which team you are on.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for offering the amendment.

Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

The bill before the Senate, S. 1504, would increase the authorization for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by nearly 50 percent. The Lott amendment would keep the level for the CPB at $275 million, certainly not a paltry amount.

The amendment is not about quality programming, helping rural areas to receive public television and radio, and it is not about killing Big Bird. This amendment is simply about priorities. Can limited Federal resources be better spent to house, clothe, and feed disadvantaged Americans? Can it be better spent on health and education? Or, for a novel idea, would it be better to save it, to reduce the Federal deficit?

I have voted for cuts in spending in a wide variety in Federal programs. Quite simply, the Congress spends too much money on worthy causes and that spending keeps driving up the deficit and the debt and drives down economic recovery.

The amendment before the Senate does not constitute slashing funding

for public broadcasting, it just says we cannot afford to increase spending for the CPB for nearly 50 percent over 3 years.

We have heard a lot about the balanced budget amendment, and we hope to be able to consider the balanced budget amendment here on the floor of the Senate in the very near future. I intend to vote for that amendment, since little else we have tried has succeeded in halting the deficit spending practices that we have all grown so accustomed to.

Where, if the balanced budget amendment is adopted, would my colleagues find the spending reductions to reach a balanced budget? We can start by saving nearly $300 million right here, today, with the vote on this amendment.

If we cannot save just a little money in public broadcasting, how will we find the courage to find savings in health programs, in education programs, in farm programs?

So, this is a good test vote, a vote which will clearly separate the spenders from the savers. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Lott amendment. Let us put a little dent in the deficit. It will not balance the budget, but we can start toward that goal today.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I yield myself time off the bill, and I do so because I regret deeply disagreeing with my leader and good friend. If this is a test of the balanced budget amendment, I think that the balanced budget amendment is not going to pass, because I say again, the money we appropriate on this subject cannot by law exceed 40 percent of the amount that is contributed from the private sector.

I urge the Senators to read it again. We authorize an amount equal to 40 percent of the total amount of non-Federal financial support received by public broadcasting entities during the fiscal year second preceding each such fiscal year that we appropriate money, which means we take 40 percent of what was contributed in 1992 and we appropriate for 1994, but not exceeding the amount authorized in 1994.

So if we put a freeze on this now, we are going to freeze the need for private contributions.

My State has appropriated $5,496,900 this year to assist public broadcasting. We even have what we call RATNET, the Rural Alaska Television Network, where we pay the cost of bringing down from satellites programming so they reach these Indian and Eskimo villages. That includes Big Bird.

But beyond that, the point is that even with the support of the Federal Government, it is not sufficient in rural States. I think most rural States are supplementing this public broadcasting concept today. But the trouble with the argument of my friend about the balanced budget is that we are going to start balancing the budget by putting a freeze on an authorization that will in effect limit the private-sector contribution because they are not going to continue to increase their support if we do not continue to pay the 40 percent, which represents the Federal contribution for the areas that cannot support it. As the Senator from New York said, many of my communities support public broadcasting to the tune of about $20 per person. But when you have 500 people in a town or village, even $20 per person per year is not enough money to pay for a 1-hour hookup on a satellite.

Now, the concept of saying we are going to balance the budget on the backs of those people in rural areas in America who need television and need public radio in order to keep up with the times and to be part of this system of ours I think is absolutely wrong. It is time for us to face up to the fact if we want to balance the budget—and I hope we will—you cannot balance the budget by restraining public support, non-Federal support, for concepts like public broadcasting.

I challenge the Senate to find another area where we limit the amount we are going to spend of the taxpayers' money to a percentage of the money that comes from non-Federal sources for something that we acknowledge is a public obligation, and that is to provide for a system which will assist in education and providing current news and information to these isolated areas.

I rest my case. But I say if this is the concept of what a balanced budget means, then take my name off that bill, because I want to see us do things like this. I want to see us contribute taxpayers' money according to the indication of public support of public television, and not the other way around.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 4 minutes 4 seconds.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise simply to thank the Senator from Alaska for his statement and ask that we consider the implications. There are villages in Alaska where the per capita contribution to public television is $20 per person.

Now, if you got that out of Philadelphia or New York, it is a lot of money. It is not enough to get a half hour's television now. It is what this bill is about. I very much hope the managers will be sustained.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the top 20 Nielsen TV household markets which was prepared by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that shows the CPB-supported public television stations be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also want to correct a misunderstanding. I stated that the director of New York's Public Television Station WNET, is paid $304,000 a year. Instead of director, it should be an executive producer at WNET is paid $304,000. The distinguished Senator from New York correctly pointed out that the president of New York's WNET makes $225,000.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING, CPB-SUPPORTED PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS LOCATED IN THE TOP 20 NIELSEN TV HOUSEHOLD MARKETS FALL, 1991

Market and station call letters	Station city and State
1 New York:	
WEDW	Bridgeport, CT.
WLIW	Garden City-Plainview, NY.
WNET	New York-Newark, NJ, NY.
WNJB	New Brunswick-Warren, NJ.
WNJM	Montclair-Little Falls, NJ.
WNYE	Brooklyn, NY.
2 Los Angeles:	
KCET	Los Angeles, CA.
KLCS	Los Angeles, CA.
KOCE	Huntington Beach, CA.
KVCR	San Bernardino, CA.
3 Chicago:	
WTTW	Chicago, IL.
WYCC	Chicago, IL.
WYIN	Gary-Merrillville, IN.
4 Philadelphia:	
WHYY	Wilmington-Phila PA, DE.
WLVT	Allentown, PA.
WNJS	Camden-Waterford Works, NJ.
WNJT	Trenton, NJ.
WYBE	Philadelphia, PA.
5 San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose:	
KCSM	San Mateo, CA.
KMTP	San Francisco, CA.
KQED	San Francisco, CA.
KRCB	Cotati-Rohnert Park, CA.
KTEH	San Jose, CA.
6 Boston:	
WEKW	Keene, NH.
WENH	Durham, NH.
WGBH	Boston, MA
7 Washington, DC:	
WETA	Washington, DC.
WFPT	Frederick, MD.
WGPT	Oakland, MD.
WHMM	Washington, DC.
WNVC	Fairfax, VA.
WNVT	Goldvein-Falls Church, VA.
WWPB	Hagerstown, MD.
8 Dallas-Fort Worth: KERA	Dallas, TX.
9 Detroit: WTVS	Detroit, MI.
10 Houston: KUHT	Houston, TX.
11 Atlanta:	
WGTV	Atlanta, GA.
WPBA	Atlanta, GA.
12 Cleveland:	
WEAO	Akron, OH.
WVIZ	Cleveland, OH.
13 Seattle-Tacoma:	
KCTS	Seattle, WA.
KTPS	Tacoma, WA.
14 Tampa-St. Petersburg-Sarasota:	
WEDU	Tampa, FL.
WUSF	Tampa, FL.
15 Minneapolis-St. Paul:	
KAWB	Brainerd, MN.
KAWE	Bemidji, MN.
KTCA	St. Paul-Minneapolis, MN.
KWCM	Appleton, MN.
16 Miami-Fort Lauderdale:	
WLRN	Miami, FL.
WPBT	Miami, FL.
17 Pittsburgh:	
WQED	Pittsburgh, PA.
WQEX	Pittsburgh, PA.
18 St. Louis: KETC	St. Louis, MO.
19 Sacramento-Stockton-Modesto: KVIE	Sacramento, CA.
20 Phoenix: KAET	Phoenix, AZ.

(At the request of Mr. DOLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:)

• Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am grateful to Senator LOTT and Senator DOLE for offering this important amendment in my absence. I have been working with Senator DOLE and others for months in an attempt to bring

more accountability and balance to PBS and NPR.

Perhaps I should reiterate—for the purpose of emphasis—what this debate is not about: It is not about Big Bird, nor is "Sesame Street" involved.

The issue is fiscal responsibility.

This bill, S. 1504, increases by 50 percent the 3-year budget for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB], which funds PBS and NPR. The pending amendment will freeze the CPB budget at the 1994 level of $275 million. This is the amount requested by the President.

Mr. President, the Federal debt run up by Congress stood at $3,942,204,041,144.24 as of the close of business on Monday, June 1, 1992. The interest on this debt amounts to over $5.5 billion a week. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child owes $15,347.74—thanks to the big spenders in Congress.

Mr. President, the American people are fed up with runaway spending. They expect—and demand—that Congress take action and exercise fiscal responsibility and fiscal restraint. The American people want a balanced budget.

But, Mr. President, here we go again with a $1.2 billion a year bill for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This is roughly a 50-percent increase over amounts authorized over the past 3 years.

When will Congress learn that the Federal Government can't spend money it doesn't have? As all of us have stated on many occasions, Congress is mortgaging the future of our children.

Mr. President, the pending amendment freezes the CPB budget for the next 3 years. It is simple and straightforward. We just can't continue to hand out 50 percent increases, when the Federal budget deficit exceeds $400 billion.

The supporters of PBS claim that the PBS stations are in desperate financial conditions and that they need even more Federal funds. Nevertheless, it is a fact that one of the directors of a PBS station is paid a salary of $242,000.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that there is rampant waste and duplication in the PBS and NPR systems. As a matter of fact, there are six PBS stations in the New York market; there are seven PBS stations in the Washington, DC, area. Obviously, there is some duplication here. Maybe PBS should cut out some of these stations instead of asking Congress for a 50-percent increase in funding.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is a tremendous amount of waste at the PBS stations. Let me quote from a former employee of a PBS station. This comes from an April 27 radio talk show in Detroit, he said:

> There is a tremendous, tremendous amount of dead wood there. People that I knew used to joke around and call [the PBS station] Retirement City. * * * You might have two or three people assigned to doing the same task * * * when you only need a part-time person to do that task.

This former PBS employee makes a very good point. Maybe PBS should first clean up its own act.

Finally, there is the independent operation called ITVS, which is supposed to fund the production of the more controversial programs. According to the House report, this crowd spent $1.5 million on administrative costs, including $100,000 on travel alone.

Mr. President, these are merely a few examples of the questionable ways that the taxpayers' money is being spent.

Many have expressed concern about the lack of accountability of Federal funds, and a gross imbalance in programming. A report by an independent research group asserted that PBS "lacked ideological balance," which may be the understatement of the year.

Mr. President, we have worked out two amendments addressing the accountability and bias issues. Perhaps these amendments will do some good, but I'm not convinced that the people at CPB and PBS will change their ways. In my opinion, this is their last chance.

For the sake of the children and of the country, Congress must get the Federal budget deficit under control. The Senate can show that it is serious about controlling spending by voting to freeze the CPB budget. It may be that we will hear the usual cry that this budget cannot be cut because PBS is so important. That happens to be precisely the same line we hear about every Federal program.

Mr. President, it is time to stand up and be counted. Congress must show that it is willing to take responsible action to control the deficit. Voting for the pending amendment is a good first step in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask that several articles and letters be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

SPECIAL PLEADING FOR PUBLIC TV

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

You learn in college that if you're asked an exam question you can't answer, then answer the question you can answer and pretend it is the exam question. Sharon Percy Rockefeller—president of WETA, Washington's public TV station—must have done well in college. When columnist George Will proposed ending federal subsidies for public TV, Rockefeller fired off two blistering replies that managed to evade the central issue posed by Will.

It is this: How can we end federal budget deficits unless we eliminate nonessential programs like broadcast subsidies? (The answer: We can't.)

Every special pleader, like Rockefeller, wants to ignore the larger picture. In her replies, she never mentions the deficits. A+ for debating skills; F for honesty. There are principled reasons to support federal subsidies for public TV. There are also principled reasons (to which I subscribe) to oppose them. But we should be beyond this sort of delicate debate. The truth is, as Will argued, that TV subsidies are a governmental frill we can no longer afford.

It's hard to argue that America doesn't have enough TV or that it's a basic function of government to satisfy every programming taste underserved by commercial stations. It's also hard to envision that public broadcasting's best-known programs ("Sesame Street," "MacNeil/Lehrer," "Wall Street Week" or "All Things Considered") would vanish without subsidies. They could—if need be—find commercial support. (Indeed, some of these programs now feature announcements of corporate sponsorship that are first cousins to commercials.) Nor would ending subsidies doom public broadcasting. Only 17 percent of its income comes from the federal government, down from 27 percent in 1980.

Naturally, Rockefeller invokes children in defense of public TV, citing (aside from "Sesame Street") programs such as "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" and "Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego?" I've got three small children, ages 2 to 7. These are good programs. But let's not delude ourselves: They haven't fundamentally improved the lot of poor children. And if these programs have educational value, they can be funded through the Department of Education. What we don't need are broad-based subsidies that underwrite more conversations with Bill Moyers.

Now, the point here is not to expose Rockefeller's considerable skills to deceive. It is to highlight the central issue: the budget deficits. Recall that the deficit in fiscal 1992 exceeds $350 billion and that the Congressional Budget Office projects deficits of at least 3 percent of the economy's output into the 21st century. That's about $180 billion in today's dollars. And these projections assume an economic recovery and a continued decline of defense spending (as a share of output), while excluding the one-time costs of the savings and loan bailout.

Almost every politician in America wants to be passionately against the deficits without being for any spending cuts or tax increases. This explains the appeal of a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Supporting it allows politicians to oppose the deficit while postponing any specific actions. It also explains the appeal of Ross Perot: a man who promises dramatic changes without elaborating how he will achieve them.

The trouble is that the budget deficits can't be closed without raising specific taxes or cutting specific programs. If every existing program is sacrosanct, then the cause is hopeless. Suggestions to prune such programs as TV subsidies typically evoke this reply: Don't bother, because they're too small to matter. Superficially, this is true. Axing the $251 million operating budget of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting wouldn't visibly dent the deficit.

But the argument fails on two counts. First, many other programs resemble TV subsidies: Whatever their original justification, they no longer serve an important national need. They have constituencies and supporters, who advertise public benefits that are at best modest and at worst fictional. Amtrak. Farm subsidies. Art subsidies. Water subsidies. There's a long list. In an ideal world, we might be able to afford them. But not in today's world. There are

also hordes of programs where spending could be tightened. Together, the potential savings probably amount to $15 billion to $25 billion: not enough to end the deficits, but not trivial.

And second, it will be impossible to enact meaningful tax increases (an essential part of any deficit solution) until the public perceives spending is being disciplined. Here's the crux of the deficit deadlock. Republicans propose spending cuts that Democrats reject, causing Republicans to reject tax increases. But both parties are pleased, because neither truly wants to raise taxes or cut spending. The paralysis is sustained by special pleaders like Rockefeller who have a vested interest in the status quo: that is, massive deficits without political pressures to cut the least-justified programs.

The very size of the deficit has now become an excuse for irresponsibility, because no single step is sufficient to make a major difference in the deficit. The effect is to prevent government from responding to new needs. A case in point: Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.)—husband of Sharon—last year chaired a national commission on children. The commission made some expensive proposals (for example: a tax cut for families with children) that were simultaneously praised and dismissed as unrealistic. The reason: no money. If Sen. Rockefeller wonders why, he should look across the breakfast table.

Everyone is happy to deplore "special interests" in the abstract without the discomfort of naming names or identifying programs. The attitude is live and let live: I'll keep my favorite program, you keep yours. We can no longer tolerate this casual cynicism. People like Sharon Rockefeller enjoy unwarranted public sympathy because they defend programs deemed "worthy." In fact, she and her ilk are prime defenders of the deficits. Irresponsibility has become respectable, even chic. Until it isn't, there's no chance of making any headway.

[From the Boston Globe, May 10, 1992]

BROADCASTING: WHAT PRICE PBS?

(By Laurence Jarvik)

Could public broadcasting survive in the marketplace without federal subsidy? US Rep. Dick Armey (R-Texas) thinks so. He has introduced a bill to eliminate federal funding for public television. While it might seem hard for regular viewers of desperate pledge-week beg-a-thons to believe, there is strong evidence that Armey is right. Not only is public broadcasting "good for you," it also seems to be a good business proposition. Despite perpetual pleas of poverty, public broadcasting is already a lucrative venture on both a local and national level.

In the most recent commercial development, WGBH has announced a 10 percent investment in a chain of shops called WGBH Learningsmith. The proprietor, Marshall Smith, told the Globe in March: "The products we sell make people feel good about themselves." Among the commercial benefits he mentioned from the public-television connection were "instant credibility," "public relations" and "promotion." Smith has predicted a boom year for his shops.

WGBH already has a retailing contract with Minnesota Public Radio for the Signals mail-order catalog. With its Wireless catalog and other ventures using the public-broadcasting mailing lists and market niche, Minnesota Public Radio's trading company grossed some $77 million last year, selling such items as "She Who Must Be Obeyed" sweatshirts ($25), a sterling silver "Zen Tranquility Ball" ($29) and "Handcrafted Wooden Cats" ($15). Using revenues from this operation, the Minnesota broadcaster recently purchased a commercial radio station for $12 million and converted it to non-commercial status, earning the ire of Minnesota Association of Broadcasters head Jim Wychor, who objected to what he saw as unfair competition for advertisers.

WGBH also reports considerable direct revenues from its activities. In 1989-'90, according to the latest IRS form available, the station earned $69,343,382 from programming grants and contracts alone. It also grossed $1,751,042 from GBH Magazine, $1,345,109 from captioning and related production services, and $1,522,058 from royalties. The WGBH kitty included a stock and bond portfolio worth some $3,540,647 and land, buildings and investments worth an additional $19,204,773 after depreciation. The tax form also listed a collection of 29 silver spoons worth $2,550 among the station's assets.

BUSINESS BOOMING NATIONALLY

Meanwhile, business is booming on a national level. PBS Home Video, the videocassette marketing arm of public television, has grossed some $30 million in sales of cassettes distributed by Pacific Arts Video, a private company owned by former Monkee Michael Nesmith. Children's Television Workshop, the parent company for "Sesame Street," has a $58 million stock and bond portfolio, which it calls an "endowment," and grosses some $100 million a year in royalty, licensing and subscription revenues on some $1 billion worth of products affiliated with the television program. One division president at CTW earned over $640,000 a year during 1988-'89. In order to handle the formidable worldwide cash flow from its various business ventures, CTW has seven private companies, five of them operating on a for-profit basis. The company spends more than a million dollars a year on lobbying Congress.

In addition to creating multinational conglomerates like CTW, the present public-broadcasting setup has also created individual multimillionaires who are adept at using the cross-promotional opportunities afforded by a bureaucratic system impenetrable to all but initiates. Although Bill Moyers, for example, will not disclose the details of his financial arrangements, he has acknowledged raising some $15 million for his private production company, Public Affairs Television, Inc. David Horowitz, head of the public-broadcasting watchdog Committee on Media Integrity, has termed the system used by Moyers and other individual "nonprofiteers" in public broadcasting "reverse money-laundering." In one case, he charged that Moyers had provided his private company with $4 million from the MacArthur Foundation through a process where the funds were cleansed of their nonprofit status through a complicated and perfectly legal series of pass-throughs.

When I wrote to Moyers to check Horowitz's claims about his finances, he answered that his company "is an independently-owned production company—like so many others in the field—and our business affairs are none of your business."

Perhaps Moyers' reluctance to bare his balance sheets is rooted in the commitment of public television to providing a "non-commercial" service. For Moyers and other public-television producers do in fact sell merchandise through 1-800 numbers featured in "book tags," with their distributors often paying a commission to the host station. A commercial sponsor, General Motors, was in large measure responsible for the production of Ken Burns' "The Civil War." A commercial distributor, Time-Life, handles the videocassette market for the series. Yet because of the official status of public broadcasting, such commercial realities must be denied, and market forces are restrained from producing maximum revenues for the system.

Instead, an almost Orwellian Newspeak has developed to cover the existence of what is in reality a black market: Direct-marketing promotions are called "tags," sponsors are called "underwriters," spot advertising dubbed "enhanced underwriting," the network is called a "service" and on-air promotion of profitable products is presented as charity. A glance at any best-seller list reveals the link between exposure on public broadcasting and book sales, for example. To disguise the reality of private profiteering from a public trust, public-broadcasting executives engage in a pattern of institutional stonewalling and even deception—piously claiming to be "noncommercial" while hiding financial documents from the prying eyes of those outside the system.

THE CHANGED TV LANDSCAPE

The reason is straightforward. The original mission of public broadcasting (as defined by the 1967 Carnegie Commission) stated that the service would provide "all that is of human interest that is not at the moment appropriate or available for support by advertising and which is not arranged for formal instruction." Such language may have been appropriate for 1967, the era of a mass medium targeted to reach the lowest common denominator with the least objectionable programming. In the network era, perhaps no advertisers were interested in the "high-minded" market offered by public television's demographics.

But with the arrival of the multichannel world of cable, satellite and home video, the television landscape has changed dramatically, and so has the type of programming advertisers are willing to support. Indeed, among the greatest beneficiaries of the demographic approach to advertising has been public television, whose "halo effect" with the affluent and educated is of great appeal to sponsors.

Despite the lure of the PBS audience to sponsors, and an increase in membership from 2.6 million in 1980 to 5.2 million in 1991, the public broadcasting system has not adopted a free-market approach that would enable it to fulfill its potential. In fact, last year viewing audiences for PBS shows declined by 12 percent. The reason lies in the bureaucratic morass surrounding the public broadcasting system. Decisions are still make in a style described by independent documentary filmmaker Fred Wiseman in 1988 congressional testimony as "a mess." Adding "there is a wide consensus on the failure of the present system," he suggested that public television be reformed along the lines of Britian's Channel Four—a private commercial channel devoted to quality programming. Wiseman noted with alarm that "most competent professionals would not consider working in public television in its present form."

Since Wiseman's testimony, public television has gone from bad to worse. The scandal-marred Independent Television Service, allocated $24 million, has not produced one minute of programming in almost four years of existence, despite spending over $1,500,000 on overhead and administrative expenses, including $100,000 on travel alone. A grant from the Markle Foundation for election coverage was withdrawn and given instead to CNN.

59-059 O—97 Vol. 138 (Pt. 10) 2

Texaco announced it would sponsor a new performing arts series on the Bravo cable channel, and then dropped its support for "Great Performances." Ted Turner outbid PBS for David Attenborough's nature series "The Trials of Life." Summing up the dismal record of PBS, Entertainment Weekly's Ken Tucker savaged the "dreary old series and banal new offerings" in a recent article headlined "Has PBS Lost Its Edge?"

WILL 'PRIVATIZING' WORK?

The best way for public broadcasting to regain its edge is to shake free of the stranglehold exerted by those politicians in control of congressional purse strings, Democrat and Republican alike. So long as Congress pays the bills for public television, it will be tempted to interfere with what is produced and broadcast. Hodding Carter once described public broadcasting "as the perfect American screwed-up system, combining the worst of both worlds—bureaucratic Washington and opportunistic capitalism."

There is a better way. Public television could be owned by its viewers. Instead of making donations, contributors could be making investments, buying stock in a company and participating to the fullest extent possible in corporate management. As a publicly-held company, with its capital raised from markets instead of the American taxpayer, public broadcasting would enjoy truly insulated funding, free of congressional strings. It couldn't be held hostage to special-interest groups every time it needed reauthorization. No outraged senators would use their privileges to embarrass highly paid producers, stars or station executives. Liberated from the strings attached to tax dollars, the viewers of public television could directly support cultural and educational programming, taking a tax deduction for business losses and sharing in the success of profitable programming.

Is such a transformation possible? Indeed, it is. Privatization of broadcasting has worked in Italy, Spain, France and England. It is spreading to the formerly socialist states of eastern Europe, even to the former Soviet Union itself. It is time to give market forces a chance to work in American public television.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 23, 1992]

BIG BIRD DOESN'T NEED TAX HANDOUTS

(By Bob Dole)

Why are taxpayers subsidizing an organization that grosses $100 million a year and has an investment portfolio worth another $52 million?

It's a good question, because that's just what happens when Congress sends your tax dollars to the Children's Television Workshop, the so-called nonprofit production company behind "Sesame Street." Now, we all love Big Bird and the Cookie Monster, but do they really need a $14-million annual taxpayer subsidy when "Sesame Street" merchandising power rakes in piles of retail cash?

It's one example of the problems in public broadcasting, an effort launched 25 years ago with high ideals but that today, after billions of taxpayer dollars, is no longer the altruistic alternative we were promised.

The Senate has opened debate on future funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), the umbrella bureaucracy that oversees public television and radio. The CPB wants Congress to authorize a 50% increase in federal funding, to $1.1 billion for 1994–1996. This sort of full funding two years in advance is rare—even the National Institutes of Health and the Education Department don't get this red-carpet treatment.

That's why a recent campaign of misinformation and hysteria on Santa Monica public radio station KCRW is so puzzling. Yes, several Republican senators placed a temporary "hold" on the CPB funding bill. What KCRW didn't tell you during its fundraising frenzy is that there is no crisis—what with National Public Radio and the Public Broadcasting Service fully funded through 1993—and that "holds" are routine in the Senate. They were invoked by members of both parties on two-thirds of the approximately 250 spending bills reported out of committee last session. (I didn't get one complaint from KCRW when liberal senators used holds to block Reagan nominees.) Republican senators have merely ensured that CPB's big-money bill will be debated in the light of day.

In my view, any time the taxpayers are asked to fork over $1.1 billion, they have a right to know how it is being spent. Unfortunately, when it comes to public broadcasting, accounting for taxpayer dollars turns into a wild-goose chase.

From the lavish offices of highly paid public television executives in Los Angeles, New York, Boston and Washington, the message is, "We're doing a great job, so don't ask any questions. And keep that taxpayer money pouring in." Taking a look at some of their salaries, expenses and benefits, you can see why they don't want too much sunshine breaking through their cloud cover: a $641,000 package for the Children's Television Workshop's president; $207,000 for its vice president; $309,000 for the executive producer at New York City's public television station WNET, $242,000 for the president of Los Angeles' KCET, not to mention $2.1 million for public-television lobbyists.

Then there is the multimillion-dollar satellite network the taxpayers recently bought for public broadcasting. Apparently, PBS and its affiliated companies and stations are now making money by renting time on the satellite.

My concerns are not with the local public stations, but rather with the East and West Coast power brokers who dominate programming. Of the $44 million in taxpayer dollars used for program development for 341 PBS stations, half goes to only two stations—WGBH in Boston and WNET in New York. Another $10 million goes to producers affiliated with WNET, to three other stations and to PBS itself. No wonder folks in Kansas think public television reflects big-city bias.

With public television and radio, you have to pay even if you're not watching or listening. It's your tax dollars feeding the meter. That doesn't mean we should use taxpayer funds for a conservative network—that would be as wrong as wasting public money for liberal cheerleaders.

Public television was a much-needed alternative to the pap that dominated commercial television decades ago. But now Americans enjoy a staggering array of programming, none of it taxpayer-subsidized. Whether it's the Arts & Entertainment Network, the Discovery Channel, Bravo, ESPN, the so-called super stations, CNN, the local video store or library, Americans enjoy almost unlimited choices for information and entertainment. Public television holds no monopoly on quality.

At the very least, the public broadcasting Establishment needs fine-tuning. Is it time to let the marketplace take control? If "Sesame Street," "Masterpiece Theater," Mister Rogers or the Civil War series were offered on the open market, they would flourish—without tax money.

So stay tuned—the debate over public broadcasting is in the public interest.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1992]

WHO WOULD KILL BIG BIRD?

(By George F. Will)

Is nothing scared? Evidently not. Even public television is being questioned by some conservatives who evidently do not understand the importance of being earnest.

Some troglodyte Neanderthal Puritan Yahoo philistine reactionary inquisitorial Victorian barbarian blue-nosed Cromwellian know-nothing Savonarolas—that is, conservatives, as the public television lobby sees them—are wondering why taxpayers should give another $1.1 billion to public television.

A good question.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting was born 25 years ago as a final filigree on the Great Society. It already has a quarter of a billion of federal funds for 1992 and another quarter of a billion in 1993. At issue today is a 50 percent increase to $1.1 billion for 1994–96. The caliber of the defense of the CPB can be seen in Sen. Gore's *cri de coeur*. "How many senators here have children who have watched 'Sesame Street' and 'Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'? . . . . This is one thing that works in this country."

How apt: A wealthy legislator in a chamber well-stocked with people like him, calling for subsidies for his children's programming because it "works," whatever that means.

Does Big Bird need a subsidy? He is a product of Children's Television Workshop, a multi-media giant grossing more than $100 million from programming, publications and licensing fees.

The original argument for public television was that over-the-air broadcasting allows only a few competitors who are driven to seek a broad—and low—common denominator. That argument has been obviated by technology—by cable and the onset of "narrowcasting" to many small segments of the American audience.

Public television's advocates argue that almost all households can receive it, whereas only 60 percent of households are wired for cable. But leaving aside the continuing spread of cable, a crucial question is: How many people who do not have cable because they cannot afford it are watching public television? Not many. Public television's audience always has been economically and intellectually up-scale.

The original rationale for public television was wonderfully sealed against questioning. It was that government had to subsidize such programming precisely because so few people wanted it. The argument goes like this: If the public were more discerning, there would be no need for government subsidies—but, then, a discerning public would not object to government subsidies. After all, by definition, a discerning public discerns the merits of government as a provider of services.

The CPB provides 16 percent of the funding for public television stations. But those stations claim 5.2 million voluntary donors. If each would give another $70 a year (less than the average cable subscriber pays for three months of service), they would raise the $1.1 billion without requiring taxpayers to subsidize their entertainment.

Dr. Laurence Jarvik of the Heritage Foundation has another idea about what to do with the CPB: Sell it. Jarvik believes, reasonably, that there are ample cable, broad-

cast and home video markets for magnificent work like Ken Burns' "Civil War" series. Therefore private investors could make and syndicate such quality programming. Today, Jarvik says, public television is "a solution in search of a problem."

Walter Goodman of The New York Times asks: "Is Dr. Jarvik so satisfied with commercial TV that he can see no room for further innovations?" The answer is: No, but does Goodman believe that any possibility of "innovation" in any sector of society justifies a federal subsidy? If not, what makes television special?

Politically, what is special is public television's audience. For example, WETA, Washington's public station, says its contributors have an average household income of $94,583. They would have $94,513 after sending WETA an extra $70 to keep the senators' children wholesomely entertained.

WETA's audience would be an advertiser's dream. Indeed it is a dream for those who advertise in WETA's magazine. Thus government is entangled in subsidizing competition against private print as well as broadcasting enterprises.

The public television lobby is, in part, another example of government-as-an-interest group. It is government lobbying itself. It is an effective lobby because it is in most congressional districts—wherever there are public stations and audiences. Public television audiences are, like the members of the American Medical Association, the National Association of Manufacturers and many other muscular lobbies, largely affluent, educated and articulate.

Public television is a paradigm of America's welfare state gone awry. It is another middle-class—actually, upper-middle-class—entitlement. If you doubt the entitlement mentality of the public television lobby, hear its indignant rhetoric equating any questioning of their subsidy with censorship. The public television lobby consists disproportionately of people with the financial and educational means to provide their own entertainment, but who have the political competence to bend public power to their private advantage.

Think of it this way: The relationship of CPB spending to affluent America is approximately that of agriculture subsidies to agribusiness.

FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, June 1, 1992.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: Once again, I am compelled to write to you about what I see as abuses of taxpayers' money by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

In May, PBS broadcast a documentary called "What Kids Want to Know About Sex and Growing Up." Produced by the Children's Television Workshop, the show is an attack on traditional family values in the guise of a pseudo-scientific presentation. Among the more egregious elements:

The material is aimed at children as young as 8 years old. Why, in a time when teen sex is devastating lives across the nation, would we introduce 8-year-olds to hard-core, graphic sexual information designed to destroy their innocence?

Children are urged to use condoms without being informed about condoms' high failure rate (15.7%, according to Planned Parenthood) to halt pregnancy. Abstinence is mentioned in passing as the only "foolproof" method to avoid an unwanted pregnancy or sexually transmitted disease, leaving the impression that condoms are a reasonably reliable second choice.

None of the instructors use the word "marriage" in any context. Sex is portrayed strictly as a physical act, without the larger moral and social contexts that constitute the real "facts of life." "Husbands" and "wives" are not mentioned, just "partners."

Children are told that masturbation is completely harmless, which would be news to millions of kids whose parents and churches beg to differ. The program does not address the psychological implications of adults encouraging children to masturbate. This presentation amounts to sexual harassment of children.

Parents are invisible, as are clergy or any other adults who would normally articulate moral and familial ramifications of sexuality. Only near the end of the video does parental guidance merit a throwaway mention; a girl is shown climbing into her mother's car, saying: "Mom, I have a few questions."

Homosexuality is misrepresented as essentially the same experience as heterosexuality. Children are told that homosexuals typically make love "when they care about each other." While this may be true in some cases, it is not the norm. The most reliable studies about and by homosexuals show that the typical homosexual is quite promiscuous. In fact, the largest study done of homosexual males ("Homosexualities" by Bell and Weinberg, 1978) finds that nearly half have 500 or more sex partners and that 28% have more than 1,000 partners. A recent American medical Association study shows that homosexual youths are 23 times as likely to have a sexually transmitted disease than heterosexual youths, and other recent studies show a higher incidence among homosexuals of hepatitis, gonorrhea, syphilis, and other sexually transmitted diseases. In San Francisco, where "safe sex" has been preached for years, 50% of the homosexual male population is now HIV-positive.

Clearly, the homosexual lifestyle is dangerous and should not be promoted as a healthy alternative to children.

Having a baby is illustrated through an exercise in which teens carry around a bag of flour—yes, a bag of flour—for a week and then talk about how it cramps their style. While it might be useful to tell teens about the very real burdens of parenthood, the segment functions as a commercial for abortion, since the bag of flour offers no feedback or rewards whatever. Parenthood, it seems, is all "hassle." Just as the show dehumanizes sexuality, it dehumanizes babies, subordinating life itself to the cold sexual imperative.

The lengthy segment on boys is conducted by Robert Selverstone, introduced as a sex educator from Westport, Connecticut. Mr. Selverstone, however, is a past president of the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), whose stated purpose is to promote "child sexuality." A 1987 SIECUS report has this advice: "We should teach teens about oral sex and mutual masturbation in order to help them delay the onset of sexual intercourse and its resulting consequences. . . . [We] have fantasized about a national 'petting project' for teenagers. . . . We need to tell teenagers that the safest sex doesn't necessarily have to mean no sex. . . . A partial list of safe sex practices for teens could include: Talking—Flirting—Dancing—Hugging—Kissing—Necking—Massaging—Caressing—Undressing each other—Masturbation alone—Masturbation in front of a partner—Mutual masturbation."

Senator, I shudder to think how SIECUS does its research on teens, but reasonable people would agree that kids who keep their clothes on have a better chance of avoiding premature sexual activity than those who take their clothes off. SIECUS, which has been peddling premarital sex and homosexuality since its founding in the early '70s by the disciples of the now-discredited sex researcher Alfred C. Kinsey, should not be entrusted with the teaching of sexuality to anyone, much less children.

We have heard a lot about how federal tax dollars are essential to keep "educational" programs like "Sesame Street" on the air. But if presenting the SIECUS agenda to children via Children's Television Workshop is an example, this is miseducation at its worst.

Furthermore, Senator, you should be aware that the Independent Television Service, which is receiving millions of dollars in federal grants, is conducting a competition to produce a series called "Television Families." According to its own statement, ITVS is seeking programs that will "test the boundaries, both of form and content, that have defined the family's role on television."

These include: "new alternative households, new patterns for adoption and birth. . . . new articulations of rights for children." The agenda here is obvious. It incorporates and goes beyond "Murphy Brown's" glorification of single motherhood. The term "alternative households" is often used to describe homosexual households. "New patterns" of adoption is a reference to adoption of children by homosexuals. "Children's rights" is the anti-parent philosophy in which the state knows best when it comes to handing out condoms, referring children to abortionists or undermining the authority of parents.

ITVS itself reiterates Vice President Quayle's sensible statements regarding the power of television to affect cultural mores: "Ironically, one of the factors that has greatly contributed to this changing landscape is television itself. Its constructs and images have profoundly influenced our notions of family and its very presence in our homes has led to new patterns of family interaction."

Typical projects funded by ITVS include a $245,000 grant to Marlon Riggs, who wrote and directed the pro-homosexual "Tongues Untied," which was so offensive that more than 100 PBS stations refused to air it, and a $70,000 grant to a lesbian filmmaker for a documentary on "lesbian and gay life in the South." Marlon Riggs sums up the ITVS philosophy in an interview: "Our collective struggle. . . . [is to] fundamentally redefine the dominant political and media discourse." A writer for the avant-guarde journal *Afterimage* says that the struggle to save ITVS and other far-left instruments is part of a cultural war: "Indeed, the far-right moral 'consensus' must be thoroughly dispelled."

The purpose? "To keep our queer culture vital."

Senator, the American people should not be subsidizing a propaganda machine designed to destroy traditional values. We need to end ITVS' funding, and to rein in a rogue Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I ask that you support any efforts along these lines.

Thanks again, Senator, for shining a light on public broadcasting. That agency has been operating in the dark too long.

Sincerely,

GARY L. BAUER,
President.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment

No. 1865, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 75, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Bond	Gramm	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Roth
Coats	Kassebaum	Simpson
Cohen	Lott	Smith
Craig	Mack	Symms
Danforth	McCain	Wallop
Dole	McConnell	
Garn	Nickles	

NAYS—75

Adams	Exon	Mikulski
Akaka	Ford	Mitchell
Baucus	Fowler	Moynihan
Bentsen	Glenn	Murkowski
Biden	Gore	Nunn
Bingaman	Gorton	Packwood
Boren	Graham	Pell
Bradley	Grassley	Pryor
Breaux	Harkin	Reid
Bryan	Hatfield	Riegle
Bumpers	Heflin	Robb
Burdick	Hollings	Rockefeller
Burns	Inouye	Rudman
Byrd	Jeffords	Sanford
Chafee	Kasten	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kennedy	Sasser
Conrad	Kerrey	Shelby
Cranston	Kerry	Simon
D'Amato	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Lautenberg	Stevens
DeConcini	Leahy	Thurmond
Dixon	Levin	Warner
Dodd	Lieberman	Wellstone
Domenici	Lugar	Wirth
Durenberger	Metzenbaum	Wofford

NOT VOTING—3

Helms	Johnston	Seymour

So the amendment (No. 1865) was rejected.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1859

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question now occurs on the Byrd amendment, No. 1859. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN] and the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] are necessarily absent.

I furher announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Adams	Durenberger	McConnell
Akaka	Exon	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Mitchell
Bentsen	Fowler	Moynihan
Biden	Garn	Murkowski
Bingaman	Glenn	Nickles
Bond	Gore	Nunn
Boren	Gorton	Packwood
Bradley	Graham	Pell
Breaux	Gramm	Pressler
Brown	Grassley	Pryor
Bryan	Harkin	Reid
Bumpers	Hatch	Riegle
Burdick	Hatfield	Robb
Burns	Heflin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hollings	Roth
Chafee	Inouye	Sanford
Coats	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kasten	Sasser
Cohen	Kennedy	Shelby
Conrad	Kerrey	Simon
Craig	Kerry	Simpson
Cranston	Kohl	Smith
D'Amato	Lautenberg	Specter
Danforth	Leahy	Stevens
Daschle	Levin	Symms
DeConcini	Lieberman	Thurmond
Dixon	Lott	Wallop
Dodd	Lugar	Warner
Dole	Mack	Wellstone
Domenici	McCain	Wofford

NAYS—3

Jeffords	Metzenbaum	Wirth

NOT VOTING—4

Helms	Rudman
Johnston	Seymour

So the amendment (No. 1859) was agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO].

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be might be permitted to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the Senator is recognized as if in morning business.

KILLING FIELDS OF KOSOVA

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, for months and months and months, I and other Senators have been sounding alarm bells about the "Butcher of Belgrade," Slobodan Milosevic.

It took a vicious aggression against newly independent Croatia, and a full-scale war aimed at annihilating the fledgling nation of Bosnia-Hercegovina, to convince many around the world—and, sadly, many in our own Government—that we were not just crying wolf.

Milosevic deserves a prize place in that "Hall of Shame" where the deeds of the likes of Adolf Hitler and Saddam Hussein are enshrined.

If we ever put up a museum of megalomaniacs, Milosevic will get his own wing.

And so—even as the world reacts in outrage to Milosevic's crimes—his guns still fire on Dubrovnik, and his storm troopers still ravage the tiny nation of Bosnia.

Mr. President, let me say something that, in light of the terrible scenes from Croatia and Bosnia—scenes of cities and towns in flame; of men, women, and children, dead and dying on the streets—let me say something that, in light of those sickening scenes, may sound unbelievable: you have not seen anything yet!

Because Milosevic's assaults on the nations of Croatia and Bosnia were only the "dress rehearsal" for the greater drama of building his, "greater Serbia." The climactic scenes are being planned and prepared for, now. And they are going to be played out in the near forgotten region of Kosova.

Kosova.

It used to be an autonomous province within the former Yugoslavia. It actually used to enjoy some semblance of autonomy, in the form of its own parliamentary assembly, and a local government that was made up of people who were more than just stooges for Belgrade.

But that, of course, was intolerable to Milosevic. And so, long before Yugoslavia fell apart and Milosevic went to war against Croatia and Bosnia, he staged a silent war against the people of Kosova. A war which led to the de facto abrogation of Kosova's autonomy; shutting down of the assembly; imprisonment, torture, and harassment of thousands; the murder of unknown scores of hundreds; and the purposeful economic devastation of an entire region.

And what did the people of Kosova do to incite Milosevic's enmity? The truth is, that they were born. Born not as Serbs and supporters of Milosevic, but born as ethnic Albanians, proud of their ancient culture; desirous of their human rights; and aspiring to a chance for a normal life for themselves and their children.

Two million people were subject to this awful mistake. They were born Albanian, in a place called Kosova, that Milosevic coveted for his greater Serbia.

And now Milosevic plans and plots for the final conquest of Kosova.

Mark my words: As soon as the fighting ends in Bosnia—and perhaps even before that—Serbian forces will seek to gobble up Kosova, exterminate or drive out the Albanians, and put the final piece into Milosevic's greater Serbian empire.

Albanians by the thousands and thousands will be slaughtered. Albanians by the hundreds of thousands will flee for their lives. An Albanian nation of 2 million people will, for all practical purposes, cease to exist.

That is what Milosevic has in mind. That is what he has on the drawing board.

He has sown the seeds in Croatia and Bosnia. And he will harvest his greater Serbia in the killing fields of Kosova.

Mr. President, the world pretty much stood by and watched while Milosevic tried to dismember Croatia. He's still trying.

Until the past few weeks, the world also stood by and watched while he rolled over Bosnia.

Finally, we have started to take some real action. Finally, we have summoned up the humanity to face up to what was really happening in Bosnia, and summoned up the courage to impose a total economic embargo on Milosevic.

I do not want to be a total pessimist. Maybe there is hope that the embargo will work. Certainly the cutoff of oil, if it holds, could at least slow down Milosevic's war machine. Maybe Bosnia can still, somehow be saved.

I will continue to hope and pray for that to happen. And, as I have since the beginning, I will continue to speak out for us to take whatever action that proves necessary—up to and including, yes, the use of arms under a U.S.-sponsored military intervention—to stop Milosevic; to save the millions of lives that are at stake and at risk.

But no matter how the ongoing conflicts of Croatia and Bosnia are resolved, Milosevic's eye still remains adamantly focused on Kosova. He intends to have it, sooner or later.

As we work for peace and a restoration of sovereignty for Croatia and Bosnia, we cannot forget or bargain away the fate of the 2 million Albanians of Kosova.

They are the next course on Milosevic's menu.

We cannot give Milosevic a green light, explicitly or implicitly, knowingly or inadvertently, to consume Kosova and its people.

Whatever agreement we reach must include real, binding assurances that the people of Kosova will have real peace; will have their rights, including the right of self-determination; they have a right to a future for themselves and their children.

The fate of 2 million people is in the balance. The killing fields of Kosova will be their future—unless we, the United States, the free world, and civilized people everywhere act, and act now.

Mr. President, we finally acted. The United States of America has acted, pursuing a course that brought about sanctions against Milosevic. We should have undertaken that course a long time ago. We should be ashamed that it took us as long as it did to summon up the courage to put an embargo in place against a dictator and a killer. We should hang our heads in shame.

The State Department was absolutely negligent and derelict in its duty and in its job to stand up for human rights. It was pussyfooting around. It was trying to buy time with this killer, with this maniac. And we saw repeatedly, just as we did with Saddam Hussein, someone who was bound and determined to bring about through violence, territorial expansion. We could have saved lives. We could have made a difference, but we did not.

I hope we do not do the same thing here. I hope we do not say you withdraw your troops after the embargo's teeth begin to sink in and we will look the other way as you annihilate the two million ethnic Albanians. They constitute 90 percent of the population in Kosova and what was their crime? Having been born as Albanians.

I did not think in this day and age to have been born as anything—black, white, Christian, Moslem—should constitute a reason for your extermination. I have to tell you something, the United States should not be proud of its lack of action in what used to be known as Yugoslavia.

I have talked to the Secretary of State, to the Deputy Secretary, and I was told that this is a European matter. Why? Why we delegated our responsibility for standing up for what is morally right?

We should have ended our relationship with him a year ago. We had ample warning. A delegation of Senators went there and saw for our own eyes the human rights violations that took place. To simply say this is a European matter and to continue with business as usual is not good enough for a great Nation such as ours. That is what is happening with far too much frequency. I hope that we do not see this tragedy repeat itself.

Had we brought about this economic embargo against Milosevic a year ago, he would have understood we were serious. Now we are talking of possibly backing up the United Nations, and using troops. It is a shameful moment in our history, that tens of thousands are killed, that hundreds of thousands, maybe millions are made refugees, because we did not have the courage to even bring about some kind of diplomatic sanctions against a killer and a thug who belongs, yes, with the likes of Hitler.

I do not know if we have ever learned. I will not keep quiet and watch this continue to take place.

I want to say this now. If the State Department does not focus on the rights of the people of Kosova, the blood that will flow when Milosevic's killing machine turns on them—the blood of the Albanian people will rest in their hands.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1991

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is time on the bill, S. 1504, with the Senator from Kansas controlling 58 minutes, the Senator from Hawaii controlling 80 minutes, the Senator from Alaska controlling 26 minutes.

The Republican leader also has 10 minutes of leader time remaining.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I have indicated to my colleagues, Senators STEVENS and INOUYE, that I have a lengthy statement on public broadcasting funding. I know this would be a good time for them to do what they need to do. Then I will be off the amendment following this statement.

But I just hope staff members, or Members who may be in their offices—not that I particularly want them to listen to me, but we have spent a lot of time trying to bring together facts. So far I have heard a lot of debate but not many facts. It seems now and then we ought to have a fact or two, at least when we talk about something I think is very important. So I am pleased we are back on the public broadcasting bill, eager to give this issue the kind of review it deserves.

It does deserve to be reviewed from time to time. Let us face it, when it comes to the public broadcasting establishment, healthy debate has been long overdue. I must say, my peek into the operations of public broadcasting network has been a real eye opener. Thanks to the good work of several of my colleagues and our staffs, we have unearthed enough facts to begin asking the right questions, the kind of informed questions taxpayers expect us to ask when it comes to deciding whether any federally funded program deserves a 50-percent increase, whether it is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Pentagon, the Department of Agriculture and, yes, even the Con-

gress. I am pleased our questions have led to a series of good faith discussions between my staff and officials of every public broadcasting entity. As a result of those discussions, I am cautiously optimistic the public broadcasting establishment will better fulfill its congressionally mandated responsibilities of accountability and balance. That is what this debate is all about—accountability and balance. The American people from time to time want accountability from us and from every other Government agency or agency that is subsidized by the Government.

So that is what we are going to debate. That is what I am going to talk about in my statement—accountabilty, balance, and 50 percent increase for the Corporation of Public Broadcasting that will boost it $1.1 billion for the years 1994 to 1996. Let us face, it, $1.1 billion is a lot of money. In fact, it is enough money to rebuild Los Angeles if you think about it. Remember, it was in this Chamber just a few weeks ago we debated emergency aid for our cities in the wake of the riot in Los Angeles, and the debate is still going on. Big city mayors and Members of Congress are blasting President Bush for not spending enough. We are told $1 billion is not good enough, so Congress has added on another $1.5 billion to the so-called L.A. package.

The only problem is generally when Congress adds on $1.5 billion, we do not pay for it; we say it is up to the President to find a way to pay for it. We ought to help find a way to pay for it. Nobody wants to find a way to pay for the extra funding. Just use the Government credit card again, charge it up to your children, charge it up to your grandchildren, or whatever, just do not bother us. That is a detail, $1.5 billion; it is a detail.

No one is suggesting inner cities do not need help. Far from it. But everyone needs more help these days, and for every problem, someone is going to offer a gold-plated solution and, of course, we are the experts right here in the Congress.

The fact is that America is broke. We simply cannot pay for all the good things we have to have. We simply cannot afford all the good things for the inner cities, our military bases, our farms, our schools, hospitals, the unemployed, America's highways, mass transit, the elderly, and, yes, even for all the good things for public broadcasting. No doubt about it, it is easy to imagine all the good things we could do if we did not have to worry about the deficit, which is now over $4 trillion, that is trillion with a T, not billion with a B, $4 trillion. But the truth is, by the end of this year, it is going to exceed $4 trillion. It is $4 trillion now; it is going to get bigger. The bottom line will not go away no matter how hard we try to rationalize: Do not worry about it, it is money we owe ourselves, and all those phony arguments as many advocates of federally funded programs rationalize it, gloss over it, and say another billion will not make any difference; it is $4 trillion, why would $10 billion make a difference or $15 billion make a difference?

They tell us our programs only costs the taxpayers about a dollar a year. They tell us it is a real bargain, only 20 cents or 10 bucks per taxpayer. Pretty soon the taxpayers are going to be buried under all those bargains he or she cannot afford. I talk about costs to the taxpayers of this particular program.

So let us also keep in mind that this funding is not for this year and it is not for next year. This is funding that does not even go into effect until fiscal year 1994. It is so-called advance funding, privileged financing very few other programs ever get. Let us be clear, public broadcasting is going to be funded as it has every year since Congress created it. The question is how much? Is it going to be $1.1 billion, the 50 percent increase CPB wants, or something more in line with our deficit crisis such as the President's recommended $825 million? Let me repeat, the President of the United States says public broadcasting should get $825 million. He did not say pull the plug. He said give public radio and TV $825 million. The last time I checked, that is a lot of money. It is more than public broadcasting gets right now.

No one will argue we are going to balance the budget on the backs of public television and radio. If we are going to start to get a handle on the deficit, we have to start some day in this Chamber making tough choices.

We had a vote about a month ago now, sort of a test of wills, and we only had 24 Senators, including the Presiding Officer, support the amendment to even get a handle on spending; 24 out of 100. I have heard many of the other 76 out there advocating a balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto, and all the other things that make it seem easy without having to vote. When it comes to making the tough choices, then we have trouble getting 25 percent of this body on both sides of the aisle.

So I think most Americans say, well, if they are going to give you $825 million and you want $1.1 billion, that ought to be pretty easy. Considering that only 17 percent of public broadcasting funds come from the Federal Government, the public TV and radio will certainly survive on an $825 million tax diet. No doubt about it, there has been a tremendous interest generated by this issue ever since it was scheduled for action this session. I had one caller who said she would kill me if we did not fund PBS. I hope she is tuned in. But there has been a lot of disinformation, a lot of misinformation. So I am going to try to set the record straight.

One more time. I am a supporter of public broadcasting. I watch the programming. I watch a lot of it. I have contributed to pledge drives. I also helped secure Federal funding to expand public broadcasting services in central and western Kansas, the kind of rural areas that deserve much more attention and many more dollars from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, national public radio, and the public broadcasting service.

No doubt about it, I am aware, as other colleagues are aware, of the educational and cultural benefits public broadcasting can bring to rural America, and all America, for that fact. In my view, this debate should focus on the two fundamental standards against which taxpayer-supported broadcasting must be measured. As I said 5 minutes ago, that is accountability: How do you spend the money, where does it go, who makes the money, and balance. There are the very same standards mandated by Congress 25 years ago when it created public broadcasting. But when it comes to meeting these standards, we see public broadcasting falling short much of the time.

We see a system that, for all its successes, still looks out of touch with mainstream America. It is a confusing, clumsy, and inefficient bureaucracy with no power at the top and too much funding flowing to a privileged few. Underscore "privileged few." It is a taxpayer-subsidized system that has allowed itself to be compromised by chummy in-house wheeling and dealing and troubling ventures into the world of private profit and commercial exploitation. It is a system that for too long has grown accustomed to "don't ask any questions about taxpayers' attitude" money. It is a system that claims it is dedicated to quality programs, but apparently is comfortable spending $500 million a year on programming and another $700 million a year on administration—$700 million on administration. Paying for quality programming is one thing, but I do not believe the taxpayers are too excited about paying for quality bureaucracy, which they call administration, $700 million to administer a $500 million program.

We are not talking about the Cookie Monster and Big Bird and Mister Rogers and the kids on the Electric Company. What we are really talking about is a taxpayer-funded multibillion-dollar corporation which reaches into almost every home in America. Make no mistake, it is still a broadcasting system that can dazzle us with quality and excellence as we saw in Ken Burns' magnificent "Civil War" series. But as good as it can be, some of us believe it can be even better: More responsive, more diverse, more balanced, and more accountable.

In the late 1960's, when I was a young Congressman, the proponents of educational television, as we called it back then, sold Congress an ambitious pub-

lic broadcasting system on the strength of assurances that it would not become just another bureaucracy.

On the contrary, this new broadcasting alternative was going to be committed to fairness and balance and never allow itself to become the captive of ideology or partisanship.

It sounded too good to be true, which is why I voted against it at the time, in 1967.

Today, we are still waiting for all those wonderful promises to come true. We are in the middle of an explosion of communications creativity, and PBS seems to be out of step. Look at the way it spends its money. Funding, which has grown, I might add, way past anything we imagined back in 1967, is centralized in a $100 million program fund distributed by Washington. Programs on the national PBS feed are produced by only 7—only 7—of more than 340 local stations in the network. Of these seven, two stations, New York and Boston, produced by far the lion's share. Now let me repeat that.

We have 340 local stations and only 7 are doing any programming. Only seven. What does this mean? Well, let us take a parochial example. I am from a small rural State. It means stations in my home State of Kansas received no national programming grants from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting last year and Kansans were forced to eat from a menu of public television produced by stations which exclusively reflect what many of us regard as an Eastern elite mentality.

In fact, one frustrated official recently confided in my office that he just could not air some of the programming PBS is producing back East, and in effect forcing them to take it.

I also received a letter from another frustrated producer at the public TV station in upstate New York. Speaking strictly as a producer, he told me of the chilly reception CPB gave his creative and exciting proposal for an educational series about America's multicultural heritage, democracy, and civic responsibility, and I quote what he said. "We can't get the time of day from CPB," he wrote, despite the backing of a who's who of education and civic organizations, including NEA and the PTA, the National Council for Social Studies, the National Science Teachers Association, and the National Civic League.

I am not a television producer, but why some of these smaller television stations cannot get a piece of the action for a change, instead of the well-heeled Big Seven and their friends and their families?

In my view, public broadcasting's funding system should not look like an inverted pyramid, with a huge base at the top for the big boys and the big cities, and a tiny little point at the bottom for the little guys. No wonder local stations are constantly begging viewers for more money; they are on a starvation diet.

All the time we take in this body, all the hours, and hours, and hours we spend talking about the rich and the fat cats and all these big corporations, nobody ever says a word about the Big Seven, who get part of their money from the taxpayers from my State and other States. You kind of wonder if there is a double standard because of audience, because of people who contribute, or because somebody has not taken time to look at what public broadcasting has become.

So they have these little stations on a starvation diet. I think local stations deserve better, and could be getting their fair share if less money was going for big salaries and big buildings and big egos.

I am going to ask to put in the RECORD at this point a list of selected salaries. I am going to list just a few here because I think everybody believes we are overpaid in this body, and they are probably right, but I want to point out some of the salaries in public broadcasting that people probably never focus on, and also the benefits from the world of public broadcasting.

Educational Broadcasting Corp., WNET in New York, NY: Lester Crystal, executive producer, gets $309,375 in compensation plus a package of $92,000-plus in benefits; George Page, a director, gets $184,000-plus, plus $55,000 in benefits; Robert Lipsyte gets $180,000-plus, plus $54,000 and more in benefits; Irene Keisman, executive director, $129,000, almost $130,000, plus $38,000 in benefits. And on it goes.

I ask unanimous consent that be made a part of the RECORD.

In fact, the table is on both the front and back. Just a couple others: William Baker, president trustee, $204,000; a senior vice president, $126,000. They have a lot of vice presidents, all make $80,000, $118,000, big salaries, plus a big package of benefits.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORP. (WNET), NEW YORK, NY, SALARIES OF SELECTED UPPER MANAGEMENT

	Compensation	Benefits
Lester Crystal, executive producer	$309,375	$92,813
George Page, director	184,717	55,415
Robert Lipsyte, host	180,808	54,242
Irene S. Keisman, executive director	129,935	38,981
Rhoda Grauer, executive producer	118,260	35 478

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORP. (WNET), NEW YORK, NY, SALARIES AND BENEFITS OF SELECTED OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES

	Compensation	Benefits
William F. Baker, president, trustee	$204,356	$61,306
George L. Miles, executive vice president	190,042	57,013
H. Melvin Ming, senior vice president, finance	143,604	43,081
Robert Kotlowitz, vice president arts and humanities	97,479	29,244
Eleanor S. Applewhaite, senior vice president, general counsel	70,865	21,260
Gary E. Knell, senior vice president, general counsel	38,364	11,509

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORP. (WNET), NEW YORK, NY, SALARIES AND BENEFITS OF SELECTED OFFICERS AND TRUSTEES—Continued

	Compensation	Benefits
Ruth Ann Burns, senior vice president, public affairs	118,471	35,541
Robert J. Kunath, senior vice president, marketing	88,462	26,539
Daniel R. Bechtel, vice president marketing	55,503	16,651
Donald Sussman, senior vice president and broadcast ops	113,693	34,108
Edward A. Campo, vice president and controller	101,499	30,450
Arnold Labaton, senior vice president	113,693	40,560
Lawrence R. Lynn, senior vice president	126,849	38,055
Harry J. Chancy, vice president	90,371	27,111
Patricia Delaney, vice president	93,862	28,159
Stella Giammasi, vice president	88,175	26,453

Source: Form 990, Fiscal Year 1989–90.

Educational Broadcasting Corp. (WNET), New York, NY, Statement of Revenue and Expenses

Government Grants to WNET Totaled $30,050,230

CPB contributed $16.7 million of this total. Other moneys comprising total taxpayer funding:	
National Endowment for the Arts	$115,857
National Endowment for the Humanities	155,051
The State of New York	9,924,129
The Energy Ass'n of New York	110,188
National Science Foundation	220,283
New York State Dept. of Education	15,000
New Jersey Council of the Arts	420,982
The State of New Jersey	138,604
N.A.S.A	69,000
The U.S. Postal Service	43,000
Other	6,800

Note.—Total revenue for FY 1989 was $104,649,048.

WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION [WETA], WASHINGTON, DC, SALARIES OF SELECTED OFFICERS, DIRECTORS AND TRUSTEES

	Compensation	Benefits
Ward B. Chamberlin, vice chairman of the board	$156,650	$14,465
Michael Cunningham, senior vice president finance	114,200	10,409
Salaries of other selected employees:		
Paul Duke	130,008	13,893
Gerald Slater	118,503	11,850

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS

	Compensation	Benefits
Bruce Christensen, president and chief executive officer.	$102,749.93	11 percent of salary.
Neil Mahrer, executive vice president and chief operating officer.	98,000.16 (bonus $5,000).	Do.
Paula Jameson, corporate secretary, senior vice president.	97,550.08 (bonus $2,400).	Do.
Peter Downey, senior vice president, program support.	97,000.08 (bonus $2,500).	Do.

Source: Form 990, Fiscal Year 1989–90.

SALARIES OF SOME PBS OFFICIALS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY

	Compensation	Benefits
KCTS Television, Seattle, WA (form 990, 1990):		
Burnhill Clark president and chief executive officer	$136,112	$8,507
Tom Howe, senior vice president	84,346	5,272
Walter Parsons, senior vice president	84,173	5,261
KCET Community Television of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA (form 990, 1989):		
A.B. Baggett, director, national public affairs	98,498	10,796
P. Brynen, senior marketing representative	88,558	5,256

SALARIES OF SOME PBS OFFICIALS FROM AROUND THE COUNTRY—Continued

	Compensation	Benefits
P. Brynen, senior marketing representative	88,558	5,256
D.D. Swofford, engineer	73,907	1,799
R. Franklin, director of cultural programming	73,555	7,674
R.R. Stewart, engineer	72,783	8,763
T. Conroy, vice president, marketing	93,689	13,453+4,200
D. Crippins, senior vice president, education	96,689	13,453+5,200
G. Ferrell, senior vice president, finance/chief financial officer	107,028	14,212+5,200
P. Geller, senior vice president, national producer	109,135	14,574+5,200
W. Kobin, president and chief executive officer	220,470	21,994+2,879
S. Kulczycki, senior vice president and station manager	130,271	15,926+5,200
W. Landers, vice president, engineering	103,540	13,965+4,200
G. Schroeder, senior vice president/general counsel	109,135	12,388+5,200
D. Youpa, executive vice president	149,798	17,401+2,900
Public Television Playhouse, Inc. (American Playhouse Series) New York, NY (form 1990, 1989):		
David M. Davis, president	132,742	39,823
Lindsay Law, vice president, executive producer	117,875	35,363
Roberta L. Tross, vice president, business and legal	91,258	27,377
Janet E. Young, assistant secretary	33,363	10,009
Lynn Marie Hoist, director, program development	50,388	15,116
Roger Lee Downey, coordinating producer	46,242	13,873
Nondas Voll, associate producer	40,200	12,060
Lynn M. Doherty, manager, program development	30,240	9,072
Chicago Educational Television Association Chicago, IL (form 990, 1988):		
William McCarter, president/general manager	131,482	25,970
John Callaway, director, current affairs	121,999	11,449
Ray Nordstrand, president, radio	115,110	9,836
John Rahmann, executive vice president	104,557	19,536
Richard Marschner, director, national marketage	97,430	5,360

Mr. DOLE. Many of these same public broadcasting powers tell us that their programming is for everyone. I am going to ask the question: Is it for everyone?

The Viewer magazine of WETA, Washington, DC's public TV station, attracts advertisers with some pretty staggering statistics. According to WETA, its contributors have an average household net worth of $627,000—$627,000; just one of us. And an average investment portfolio of $249,000. One out of eight contributors is a millionaire; 1 out of 7 has a wine cellar in his or her house; and 1 out of 3 spent time in Europe in the past 3 years. This is the target audience for PBS' primetime programs.

As a WETA fundraiser told Washingtonian magazine, the big corporate giants that underwrite the most popular shows "know that during prime time, public television can deliver the demographic they want: affluent, highly educated, the movers and shakers, the socially conscious and well informed."

What about the rest of us?

Another revealing statistic comes from PBS itself. In a promotion for one of its shows, the fine, science-oriented "Newton's Apple," its promotion for "Newton's Apple" proudly boasts:

> The typical viewer of "Newton's Apple" is a skilled or professional man, age 18–49, living in a household with children, and with an annual household income of over $30,000. The composition of the "Newton's Apple" audience tracks closely with regard to education, occupation and the age of the head of household. The program is viewed slightly more heavily, compared to the overall U.S. income distribution, by those with incomes between $20,000–$40,000, and even more heavily (six percentage points above the national average) by families with incomes over $40,000.

That is his quote, not mine.

In other words, the quality of the show is somehow validated by the earning power—earning power—of its audience, its upscale, targeted audience: all those making even more than $40,000, as the show promo proudly boasts. By the way, this excellent science show is underwritten by the 3M Co., another public-funded TV show funded not by the taxpayers and not by some pledge drive, but by American business.

Let me assure you, I am not here arguing for the broadcasting equivalent of affirmative action for the people of my State or any other State. My point is, rather, that local communities seem to have less and less influence on the public television system that their tax dollars support. It is not just in Kansas but in dozens of other States as well, where the people have no alternative but to pay their money and take their chances.

And I know the argument: Well, just turn it off if you do not like it. Turn it off.

But you still have to pay. They do not turn off the taxes. You still have to pay.

The meter never stops ticking, and of course maybe some of the programs that keep rolling in from New York, and Boston, and Chicago, and Washington could occasionally reflect the tastes and interests of mainstream America, too, if you just watch long enough.

Another problem there is it seems to be more sensitive to the interests of its close friends than it ought to be. I am talking about the whole system.

I have been distressed to learn about the relationship between PBS and profit-making companies such as Bill Moyers' Public Affairs TV and Alvin Perlmutter, Inc., a spin-off form by one of Moyers' producers. These companies are capitalized with taxpayer dollars, but their profits go into deep private pockets. Sweetheart deals are for lovers, not for Government agencies.

And put aside again for a moment the issue of the quality of the programming these and other similar companies have produced. We can agree that many of these shows do represent quality, but that is not the point. Let us face it: The media can wisecrack about "Big Bird," public TV defenders can filibuster forever with their quality programming rhetoric, and conservatives can complain and complain about liberals.

But can we not work together and do the taxpayers a big favor by directing some sunshine onto this so-called insider trading going on within PBS, the big dollar deals, and the big dollar profits?

You cannot find out. Do not you have a right to find out as taxpayers where the money is being spent? We know they are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

What concerns me is that these multimillion dollar companies have been capitalized by tax-supported funds from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and tax-exempt funds from charitable corporations but avoid the tax man themselves because their grants are funneled through stations in the public television system. What a scam. After producing their programs, many of these companies then turn around and merchandise retail spin-offs from their publicly supported work in the form of video cassettes, books, and other items, often receiving free air time to boot from the public television stations on which their work has appeared. And not only is this profit never returned to the Government which has created it, but these companies continue to come begging for taxpayer dollars year after year for more and more, and more.

The revenue from the spinoffs of programs such as "The Power of Myth," "The Civil War", and "The Frugal Gourmet", to name three very different examples, runs into millions of dollars—again, we are talking about pure capitalism, and pure profit.

Obviously, I am not opposed to entrepreneurs building their net worth through ingenuity and hard work. Far from it. But I am opposed to publicly funded entrepreneurship. The sort of enterprise I have just described should be supported perhaps by loans from the Small Business Administration, but not annual subsidies from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

CHILDREN'S TELEVISION WORKSHOP

Probably the best—or worst—example of public dollars funding a profit-making giant is the children's television workshop, the so-called nonprofit corporation behind "Sesame Street." First, Let's set the record straight—"Sesame Street" is one of the finest programs ever produced for television. It's characters are known the world over, and it has without question made a big contribution to education. But that does not mean the taxpayers have to make a big contribution, too.

Look at the facts—the dollars and cents behind "Sesame Street" and the Children's Television Workshop—and then ask the obvious: Why is Congress insisting that the taxpayers send their hard-earned dollars to a Corporation that has a stock and bond portfolio worth $51 million?

How much is $51 million? How many businesses have $51 million in their stock and bond portfolio?

Why is Congress demanding that the taxpayers send their hard-earned dollars to a Corporation that reported to the IRS an estimated total revenue for

1990 at $100 million? Why is Congress asking the taxpayers to continue to fund a Corporation that pays its divisional president William W. Whaley $641,224, and its chairman of the board more than a quarter of a million dollars in salary and benefits? Despite all these staggering big-time, big-business profits for a tax exempt outfit, the taxpayers still have to shell out nearly $15 million a year in Government grants. Now, "Sesame Street" does a great job teaching kids to count, but they do not teach anybody to count that high.

Nobody can count that high. They do not teach you how to count that high. They never ask you how big the subsidy is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of financial statistics about the Children's Television Workshop be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S TELEVISION WORKSHOP
FACTSHEET

1. In 1991 CTW revenues are estimated at $100 million on total worldwide sales of $1,000,000,000.

2. In it's 1988–1989 IRS form 990 (the latest available), CTW—the private non-profit corporation which produces Sesame Street—reported total revenues of $58,620,514.

3. Government grants accounted for $14,833,812.

4. CTW reported a stock and bond portfolio worth $51,260,822.

5. Reported interest on savings and temporary cash investments totalled $2,329,603.

6. Dividend and securities interest totalled $2,265,368.

7. Reported program production expenditures totalled only $23,003,482.

8. For FY86–FY89 reported lobbying totalled $4,000,000 nontaxable amount.

9. Grassroots lobbying in that period totalled $1,500,000 ceiling amount.

10. Product royalties were $8,954,586.

11. Program sales were $1,837,893.

12. Games and toys were $15,126,819.

13. Gross related business receipts were $35,219,887.

14. Divisional President William Whaley was paid a salary of $641,224, plus benefits of $30,000.

15. Divisional Vice President Alfred Hyslop was paid a salary of $207,013, plus benefits of $19,911.

16. Writer-Director Polkat Productions was paid $394,365.

17. Writer-Director Pec-A-Lomer, Inc. was paid $235,891.

18. Chairman Joan Ganz Cooney was paid $222,557 plus $30,000 in benefits for 96% of her time.

19. President David V.B. Britt was paid $184,431, plus $27,665 in benefits for 94% of his time.

20. CTW reported the following wholly-owned subsidiaries and affiliates; CTW Communications, Inc. (for-profit); CTW Development Co., Inc. (for-profit); CTW Productions, Inc. (for-profit); Distinguished Productions, Inc. (for-profit); Sesame Street, Inc. (for-profit); the Electric Company (non-profit) and Sesame Street, Inc. (for-profit).

Children's Television Workshop Statement of Support, Revenue and Expenses

Support and Revenue:	
Direct public support	$6,969,581
Government grants	14,833,812
Total	21,803,292
Program service revenue	11,448,855
Interest on savings and temporary cash investments	2,329,603
Dividends and interest from securities	2,265,368
Gross rents	38,527
Minus rental income	73,851
Net rental income	−35,324
Gross amount from sale of assets other than inventory	9,583,661
Minus cost or other basis and sales expenses	9,412,519
Subtotal	71,142
Gross sales minus returns and allowances	27,264,503
Minus cost of goods sold	21,653,854
Gross profit	5,610,658
Other revenue	15,126,819
Total revenue	58,620,514
Expenses:	
Program services	39,688,751
Management and general	5,954,957
Fundraising	190,028
Payments to affiliates	−318,361
Total expenses	45,515,375
Fund balances:	
Excess (deficit) for the year	13,105,139
Fund balances or net worth at beginning of year	37,279,367
Other charges in fund balances or net worth	1,243,552
Total fund balances	51,628,058

Source: IRS Form 990, fiscal year 1988/89.

Mr. DOLE. Let me just read one or two. In 1991, the Children's Television Workshop revenues estimated $100 million, on a total worldwide sales of $1 billion.

The 1988 through 1989 IRS form 990 the latest data available reported total revenues estimated $58,620,514.

Government grants were about $14 million.

Stock and bond portfolios, as I said, over $51 million.

Reported interest on savings and temporary cash investments total about $2.5 million.

Dividend and securities interests total $2.2 million.

Plus, they spent $1.5 million on grassroots lobbying, product royalties are about $9 million. This is big business.

RUSSIAN "SESAME STREET"? NYET, NOT WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS

Before we leave our friends at "Sesame Street", let's add one more word of caution. As we speak, Congress and the President are trying to deal with the collapse of the Soviet Empire, trying to address the critical needs of the former Soviet Republics and their peoples.

From a superpower, they have fallen to almost Third World status, in desperate need of all the basics we take for granted: Food, medicine, shelter. But guess what some public broadcasters see as another "basic" for the Russian people—you guessed it, "Sesame Street". It seems the Children's Television Workshop wants a piece of America's emergency Soviet aid package; $20 million to be exact, so it can bring "Sesame Street" to Russian TV screens—that's $20 million right out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Well, let me say this—that $20 million handout, that hoped-for gift from the taxpayers—is not going to happen. I do not think it is going to happen. If the Children's Television Workshop wants to put Big Bird on Russian TV, it can dip into their lavish investment portfolio, or its $1 billion in worldwide sales. Just leave the taxpayers out of it for a change.

Whenever you say that, you are going to be criticized. I can give you a stack of editorials where I have been accused of trying to shoot Big Bird and a lot of the other things which are not true. The liberals out there never worry about the things like truth or the facts.

PROFITABLE NONPROFITS

But it is not just "Sesame Street" and Bill Moyers getting into the lucrative spinoff game.

Just recently there have been four examples of public broadcasting entities moving into some questionable territory, again with taxpayer dollars apparently backstopping public television ventures into commercial enterprise.

(1) PHILADELPHIA CON JOB

In fact, the Council of Better Business Bureaus has already requested an official Federal Communications Commission investigation into one example of unethical advertising on public TV, namely the promotion of the "Sesame Street Live" stage show.

It seems that at the end of a regular "Sesame Street" episode in the Philadelphia Area, a filmed promo popped up on the screen featuring our old friends the Cookie Monster, Grover, and Big Bird, telling kids that their stage show was coming to town, a stage show which is a commercial enterprise.

Of course, profitmaking and marketing schemes and product promotion is not new to "Sesame Street" and the Children's Television Workshop. It is the same kind of capitalism that surrounds the sales of "Sesame Street" books, lunch boxes, dolls, puppets, beach toys, watches, board games, towels, sheets and pillow cases, shampoo, baby toys, diapers, umbrellas, bicycles, tapes, videos, movies, sandboxes, swimming pools, toothpaste, chairs and tables, happy meals, pajamas, underwear, vitamins, and Band-aids, just to name a few.

Just as parents have been justifiably outraged at Saturday morning cartoon shows where it is sometimes difficult to see where the show ends and where

the advertising for cereals and toys begins, taxpayers have a right to be offended by this public broadcasting sales gimmick.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that tax dollars are being abused in this scheme, and that children's watchdog groups have complained, both the TV station in question and Sesame Street's own licensing company have refused to cooperate with authorities, refused to turn over any tapes and refused to admit anything was wrong.

(2) "LEARNINGSMITH" STORES

But there is more. We now see Boston's public TV station WGBH, one of the well-heeled, big dollar stations in the PBS empire, moving into retail sales, opening up a chain of "Learningsmith" stores to sell WGBH-related goodies, such as books, toys, art supplies, games, tote bags and videos of PBS programs.

Now, opening such a store may be a great idea, and it might even produce enough revenue to ease the taxpayers burden, but we will never know because like everything else on the profit side of nonprofit broadcasting, the books are closed.

We do not have any access and Congress apparently does not want any access. We do not have the vote to get access to those records this time. We will get the votes one of these days.

Even to the folks helping pay the rent for the WGBH store, the American taxpayer, cannot find out either.

Even to the folks helping pay the rent for the WGBH store, the American taxpayer.

And guess where WGBH has decided to set up its first store? I bet you are going to say in the inner city? You have to be kidding. In downtown Boston itself? In some noncable area? No. It's opening up in what the New York Times calls "The affluent Chestnut Hill Mall in Newton, MA." The Times also tells us that the Newton store "has been so successful that another store will open in Harvard Square."

Harvard Square and the affluent Chestnut Hill Mall? It is pretty obvious these public TV stores have been carefully targeted to go where its audience is—upscale, suburban America—that same public television that goes to help poor people, poor children; all of these things.

Unfortunately, some public broadcasting officials are a little tender about disclosure, or answering questions, or explaining income and profit, or anything else about all the tax dollars coming their way. But the taxpayers have a different view, and more than ever, they want answers, not a runaround.

According to the New York Times, details of WGBH's "Learningsmith" store's finances will not be made public. They are not going to make them public. Why should they be made public?

In other words, when it comes to profit, the public does not have a right to know, even if it is public TV. Damn the public, damn the taxpayers, damn the Congress.

Finally, there is a nationally broadcast sex education show seen on PBS a few weeks ago. I am not going to get into a debate over the contents of the show, but what has me concerned is the marketing that goes with it. The show, produced by the Children's Television Workshop, aired once, and then headed directly to store shelves on videotape. The Washington Post called it "the fastest and most high-profile trip from public television to home video in the history of the market."

If you want to see the sex education show again, hurry off to your local "Learningsmith" store and plunk down your $14.95. PBS defenders never fail to lecture us that many American cannot afford cable, another reason to keep public TV on the public welfare rolls. So far, not one has said anything about those Americans who cannot afford PBS video cassettes, who cannot afford to shop in the Chestnut Hill Mall, and cannot afford to buy Bill Moyers' latest book. What is this all about? I hear all these cries about what we are trying to do for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The marketing goes on. Look in the latest entertainment magazine, and what do you see? A big half-page ad for the sex education tape "for only $14.95, available at fine video stores." The ad includes an 800 number to find out where the nearest retailer is located. It says "retailer." Not once does the ad tell you that the taxpayers help fund, produce, and market this product, and not once do we see anything about taxpayer royalties.

There is another recent example of public broadcasting's big dollar product. It offers quite a glimpse into the taxpayer-funded windfalls I have been talking about. This time it turns into a nasty fight over the millions of dollars generated by public television exposure.

The host of the PBS popular "Wall Street Week," Louis Rukeyser, is publishing a monthly newsletter, and it is decidedly bullish. By mid-July, it is expected to gross about $10 million—a figure that has Maryland Public TV hopping mad. They produce "Wall Street Week," and it wants a piece of the action. Again, according to the Washington Post, public TV believes that Mr. Rukeyser is "cannibalizing what it took us over 20 years to create."

That is a quote from the Washington Post. Sadly, the taxpayers, who are helping to underwrite all this, are the real losers.

Unfortunately, this multi-million-dollar dispute showcases yet again the problems brought on by the troubling mix of public TV and big time, big time, big time profits.

Finally, there is the most important issue of all when we evaluate the current state of public broadcasting, which is the issue of objectivity and balance. You would think these individuals, who have prospered by the generosity of the American taxpayer, would at least cast a friendly eye now and then toward the American system, which has produced the wealth they have come to rely on. They like it. They are living pretty well. But this is rarely the case. Even the New York Times, usually quite flattering about public television, noted that when it comes to public affairs programs, PBS has a "chronic" tendency to produce documentaries that "lean to the left."

What a surprise that comes as to some of us. That is the New York Times, not Bob Dole. According to the Times critic, Walter Goodman:

> Neither the Corporation for Public Broadcasting nor the Public Broadcasting Service has ever come clean about the chronic bent to the left of their public affairs programs.

Some people like it that way. Some people like everything leaning to the left. Some like it straight up, and some like it leaning to the right.

We have watched a lot of this in the 1980's. All of the American people who are paying the bills for all this garbage, in some cases, on PBS saw one documentary after another cheering on the Communist Sandinistas and Communist guerrillas in Central America. These groups were rejected by their own people in democratic votes because they were so violent and dangerous. They had elections there, and the Communists got kicked out. These mandates in Nicaragua and El Salvador seem to make no impression on their taxpayer-supported cheering section here at home.

One recent independent survey supports my view that these documentaries lack balance. Prepared by the respected Center for Media and Public Affairs after a study of 225 programs, the study concludes that "PBS documentaries lack ideological balance, and the balance of opinion on these issues consistently favored liberal positions."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Media Monitor study be printed in the RECORD as this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Media Monitor, Mar. 2, 1992]

STUDY FINDS PBS LACKS DIVERSITY AND BALANCE

Public affairs documentaries on the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) inadequately represent women and minorities and lack ideological balance, according to a study conducted by the Center for Media and Public Affairs. The study finds support for criticism of PBS documentaries that has come from both the political left and right.

Researchers examined the topics, sources, and social and political themes that appeared on all PBS public affairs documentaries during the entire year from April 1987 through March 1988. The research team conducted a scientific content analysis of over

35,000 separate segments of 225 programs. Each segment consisted of a statement by a narrator or other source of information. Despite frequent debate over the political content of PBS programming, this is the first large-scale social scientific study of this topic. The study took four years to complete.

The findings were issued in a 160 page report, *Diversity and Balance in PBS Documentaries*, by Dr. S. Robert Lichter, Daniel Amundson, and Dr. Linda S. Lichter.

MAJOR FINDINGS

PBS documentaries lacked racial and gender diversity. Women accounted for only one out of seven statements aired (14%). Minorities accounted for one out of six statements (17%), with Hispanics especially underrepresented. These groups were used even less frequently as narrators. Minorities made up only 4% of all narrator segments and women only 6%.

PBS documentaries lacked ideological balance. The topics most frequently debated included polarizing issues involving war and peace, women and minorities, the environment, and institutional rights. The balance of opinion on these issues consistently favored liberal positions. Key issues:

War No More—Five out of six sources criticized America's participation in the arms race. Sources were evenly split over whether war could *ever* be justified.

Earth First—Three out of five sources (61%) asserted that environmental protection takes precedence over human needs, 28% argued for a balance between human needs and environmental preservation, and 11% held that human needs come first. Two out of three sources also argued that nuclear energy was unsafe.

Left Rights—Four out of five sources supported the liberal side in constitutional controversies. Majorities supported a broadly defined right to privacy (including abortion and gay rights), absolute separation of church and state, unlimited freedom of speech, and greater restrictions on police searches.

Racist America—100% of sources argued that American society discriminates against racial minorities, and 92% argued that society discriminates against women. Most sources also supported self-segregation by minorities.

According to study director Robert Lichter, "These PBS documentaries failed to meet the standards of either diversity or balance. We encountered a wide range of social and political issues but a relatively narrow range of voices speaking out on those issues."

The Center for Media and Public Affairs is a non-partisan, non-profit organization that conducts content analysis of news and entertainment media. Copies of the executive summary are available upon request.

Mr. DOLE. The liberals love it. That is why they are voting for more money. They have their own network. People are told this is all objective, facts, straight up, with balance and no tilt.

We are talking about political documentaries, which come as close to being an editorial page as an institution such as broadcasting has. Yet, in three major series in the several frontline reports on the Central Intelligence Agency put on the public airwaves during the past few years, PBS allowed the propagation of fantasies of a secret government in control of U.S. foreign policy, and of conspiracies so vast that they might make Oliver Stone blush.

One of these series, a 3-hour program, called "On Company Business," was based on the accusation of a notorious CIA defector named Philip Agee. We heard all of his lurid accusations in this documentary, but we were never told that this man was not merely a critic of our side, but an advocate of the other side. PBS made no mention of the fact that Agee himself never bothers to hide that somewhere along the line, he switched support from the American to the Communist side in the cold war.

What are we to think when we watch one of these programs? Maybe you live inside the beltway and you understand all of the politics and how the media is tilted 99 percent of the time, in any event. Maybe you do not live inside the beltway. Maybe you are lucky and live 500 miles from the beltway.

Public broadcasting started not to be an adversary, not to come off with some point of view. I turn on my PBS station, and I have to wonder, can we be as bad as public television portrays us? Do we deserve the dreary gloom and doom reports telling us what is wrong with America? Can the taxpayers not find out one time what is right about America? Or is that proposition simply not politically correct in the world of public broadcasting?

I have watched some of these, including "Listening to America" with Bill Moyers. If you ever saw propaganda or imbalance, that is it. There was a six-part series called "The American Century," which undertook a review of U.S. foreign policy since the turn of the century. It was filled with crude America-bashing and neo-Marxist cliches about what is at the root of our policies. The producers found themselves enmeshed in ironies they could not foresee. The very week a segment called "The Imperial Masquerade" was presenting the United States cold war policy as a bloody record of oppression and violence, the East German people were tearing down the wall that this country steadfastly opposed, and they embraced the democracy that it had guaranteed around the world during the past 40 years.

The only masquerade was this program's pretense to objectivity and nonpartisanship.

These are only a few examples of liberal cheerleading. In fact, the New York Times, which I have never believed to be a conservative cheerleader, had this to say, and they have been fairly blunt in a series of reviews of PBS programming when it comes to exposing blatant partisanship and left-wing propaganda.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point a sampling of the New York Times critique and comments.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following accusations of bias on the part of public broadcasting were made exclusively by New York Times critics themselves on the pages of that newspaper:

GENERAL COMMENTARY

"Documentaries That Lean Left," May 6, 1991:

"[W]hen it comes to documentaries, it is difficult to argue that [PBS's] drift is anywhere but to port side. How come?"

"Pull the Plug on PBS?" March 22, 1992:

"Neither the Corporation for Public Broadcasting nor the Public Broadcasting Service has ever come clean about the chronic bent to the left of their public affairs programs. . . ."

"A Running Debate About Public TV," May 18, 1992:

"[Despite Bill Moyer's denial,] at least in prime time, PBS documentaries on subjects like foreign policy, welfare, social issues and the environment have long had a pronounced [leftist] slant."

CRITIQUES OF INDIVIDUAL SHOWS

"Cheerleaders" (Times editorial), June 15, 1982:

"People who went to the giant disarmament demonstration in Central Park Saturday reported later that the mood was overwhelmingly genial. People who watched on [PBS affiliate] Channel 13 couldn't tell that for sure from reporting that at times was strident and loaded. . . .[An interviewer] egged on the people he was interviewing. . . . They all sounded like cheerleaders, a rally squad for the disarmament rally. . . . [Such techniques] pollute public confidence."

"'The Gay Eighties,' a Documentary," May 30, 1985:

". . . glides along on liberal, tolerant, enlightened assumptions about 'sexual preference' without pausing to examine them or the antagonism they encounter. . . . The opponents [of special rights for homosexuals, to judge by 'The Gay Eighties,' are largely Ku Kluxers and dumbbells. One anti-homosexual activist is produced, who suggests that homosexuals be quarantined. . . . The questioning [of homosexual activists] is sympathetic to the point of languor. No one is pressed; no exception is taken . . ."

"Cuba's Revolution at 25" ("Cuba: 25 Years of Revolution," "Intercom" series), July 25, 1985:

"Three cheers for the revolution! . . . There is no moral disapproval [of Cuba's more repressive features]. . . . It's not an examination of 25 years of revolution; it's an apology for Cuba."

"A PBS Documentary on Guatemala" ("Guatemala: When the Mountains Tremble"), Jan. 13, 1986 [release had been delayed by PBS because it was deemed "heavy-handed"]:

". . . a vanity film, pressing a point of view: The United States and Guatemala act in concert to murder innocent people; armed revolution is the only way to obtain justice . . . [The film] never bothers to mention that the United States suspended military aid to Guatemala in 1977. It is too busy making its case. . . . [It] ought to have tried reporting. . . . The soldiers, politicians and an archbishop speak in voices full of hypocrisy and general meanness: guerrillas and other leftists sound like gentle saints. . . . In a work like this . . . journalism doesn't matter; it's political posture that counts. . . . Hooray for free speech and many points of view, but something is out of balance."

"'Frontline' Examines Nicaragua's Contras" ("Frontline": "Who's Running This War?"), March 18, 1986:

"'Frontline' . . . knows which side of [the contra matter] it favors. . . . The context is askew. The producer, Martin Smith, has taken a political position, and then selected facts to uphold the position. Journalism is supposed to work the other way around. . . . We get a selective vision here. Facts that do not fit the political position are ignored, or else brushed off in asides. Clever film editing helps. . . . [T]he program reserves most of its scorn for Americans who support the contras.

"'Portrait of a Terrorist,'" May 19, 1986:

"'Portrait of a Terrorist' is no portrait at all. It's an apology for anyone who believes that kidnapping, bombing and murders are legitimate political weapons."

"'Mandela,' Documentary," July 1, 1986:

". . . falls victim to its own reverence [for the Mandelas] . . . The problem . . . is that "Mandela," in its zeal to indict, becomes suspect in its message. It is so determined to take a moral stance that it flouts the rules of reporting."

"'Refugee Road' on [Channel] 13, on Asians," July 24, 1986:

"'Refugee Road' misrepresents recent history. . . . The United States is the oppressor and Southeast Asians are the oppressed. . . . 'Refugee Road' sees no difference between what is spurious and what is real."

"'The Hammer and the Cross': A Series of Distortions," Aug. 17, 1986:

". . . pretends to objectivity . . . one wonders whether it is stainlessly innocent or cunningly dishonest. Either way, it is a splendid example of how television can be used to disseminate propaganda. The trick is never to allow facts to stand in the way . . . [Christian] devotion is measured in terms of commitment to leftist thought. [The show] suspends all critical faculties; its sees only what it wants to see. We get the impression the producers were political pilgrims who visited Havana and Managua not so much to make a documuntary report as to confirm a political faith. . . . serves a propaganda purpose.

'Born In Flames' Is 90 Minutes of Fizzle," Aug. 24, 1986:

"Productions like this provide an argument for the abolition of Federal financing. Liberal apologists for public television pretend the programs don't exist. 'Born in Flames' is left-wing sludge . . . has a narrow-minded piety at its core . . . Only armed lesbians can set us free . . . it moves from the conventional left wing into a campy nihilism. [A station disclaimer] seems intended to free Channel 13 from any responsibility. No one chose to show 'Born in Flames' on public television, apparently, it is something that just happened. The solemn reminder is self-serving, suggesting that no one at the station can control what we see. This is not true, 'Born in Flames' makes you long for the good old days of pledge week."

" 'Cuba: In the Shadow of Doubt' on [Channel] 13," Circa Sept.–Oct. '86:

"The . . . documentary . . . sells a myth. . . . The narration makes [Castro's revolution headquarters] sound like Lourdes. What follows is misrepresentation. . . . [makes only] small feints at objectivity. . . . [Portrayals of prisons, hospitals, etc. are] not true. . . . the documentary doesn't want us to think badly of Cuba at all. . . . At it's best, the documentary has a romantic infatuation with Cuba; at its worst, it is calculated propaganda."

"'Africans,' a Series on [Channel] 13," Oct. 9, 1986:

"It is difficult to think of any problem—civil strife, political corruption, even poaching—that [Ali A. Mazrui, the film's producer] does not lay at the door of the West . . . as scholarship, it runs on empty. . . . The series is a vehicle solely for Mr. Mazrui's feelings: West is bad; Islam, particularly fundamentalist Islam is better; indigenous African is best. Colonialism and capitalism march hand and hand in oppression, and totalitarian governments have their points. . . . Mr. Mazrui does not judge countries empirically, he judges them ideologically. . . . In 'The Africans' . . . we get one truth and one truth only. . . . When the National Endowment for the Humanities . . . demanded that its name be removed from the credits, it said 'The Africans' was 'narrow and politically tendentious.' It is, and the final episode . . . even stretches the notion of tendentiousness [and] condones racial war. . . . 'The Africans' is a pretentious fraud."

"'The Africans': An Attack on Western Values," Oct. 26, 1986:

"[Postulates that the] West is responsible for all of Africa's afflictions. The operative word here is 'all' . . . its own principle idea is that Western democratic values are worthless . . . [It is] capricious about facts. . . . [Its] big picture is founded on moralistic and political ordinates rather than the historical record. . . . [Even the] National Endowment for the Humanities, which helped to finance the series, said 'The Africans' was an 'anti-Western diatribe.' . . . What is disturbing about 'The Africans' is that, in being anti-Western, it is also anti-democratic."

"'Vacation Nicaragua,' Tourism and Politics, Oct. 6, 1987:

"'Vacation Nicaragua' . . . is gorgeously done propaganda. . . . This is a Nicaragua that receives no Soviet military aid and has no Cuban advisers. And the contras? This Nicaragua has them, but apparently they are not real Nicaraguans. They are members of a dark force, waiting to ambush the tourists while they float down a river toward the east coast of Nicaragua. . . . Someday ["Vacation Nicaragua"] should find its way into a museum as a classic in video propaganda."

"'Frontline,' on Granada," Feb. 2, 1988:

"'Frontline' does not seem to have uncovered anything new here [about the Granada invasion]. It wants mostly to criticize the [Reagan] Administration."

"Church as Threat to State" ("Thy Kingdom Come * * * Thy Will Be Done"), April 6, 1988:

"The fundamentalists will get you if you don't watch out. [This documentary] says they're trying to impose a theocracy; good citizens must be warned. * * * [It] sees a dark message: 'Nothing of the real America intrudes [in a religious theme park shown in the film].' Whose real America is that? Has [the writer-producer-director] never visited a suburban shopping mall, stayed in a Howard Johnson's or taken a vacation in Disneyland? [The theme park] has many of the elements they do, and they're just as real as can be. The film * * * has [anti-religious] tunnel vision."

"How Koop Surprised Friends and Foes," Oct. 10, 1989:

"Representative Henry A. Waxman, a California Democrat who was prominent in the original opposition to Dr. [C. Everett] Koop, [had] called him 'a frightening individual.' At the end of the program, Representative Waxman says, 'I made a mistake.' And I found myself wondering whether the public broadcasting producers, who are not known for delivering eulogies to conservatives, would have paid this deserved tribute to Dr. Koop if, though honest and committed to his beliefs, he had not proved so congenial to liberal positions."

"The Twilight of 'America's Century,'" Nov. 27, 1989:

"With the support of a few like-minded journalists and think-tankists, [Lewis H.] Lapham probes traumas like the loss of the war in Vietnam, the economic competition from Japan and West Germany, the Iranian hostage crisis, the killing of U.S. marines by terrorists in Lebanon and the Iran-contra revelations. . . . Mr. Lapham and most of his guests . . . speak mainly from the left [and see the Pentagon] as the Great Satan."

"A Confusing Decade, Its Roots and Its Legacy," Jan. 21. 1990:

"The first hour [of "Making Sense of the '60s"] offers a picture of the 1950s that is straight out of the New Left canon: . . . anti-Communist fanaticism, fear of atomic annihilation, sexual repression, weak career-driven fathers, mothers consigned to housework and the pall of Eisenhowerism over the land. No wonder the poor kids rebelled . . . [The film] takes the youth rebellion pretty much at its own assessment. . . . Black parents are presented as inspirations to their children, in contrast to the portrayal of white parents as grotesques. . . . [T]he work is up against the producers' rote preconceptions and the sound-bite technique."

"3 Women In a High-Security Prison" ("P.O.V.: Through the Wire"), June 25, 1990:

". . . dedicated less to exploration than to glorification [of three women convicted of activities connected with alleged terrorist organizations. The] documentary echoes the women's charges that the underground cells [in which they are imprisoned] were custom made for America's political prisoners and fit the definition of cruel and unusual punishment. In tell-us-how-noble-you-are interviews, the women . . . present themselves as martyrs, and the producer eagerly accepts their self-estimate. . . . The ingenuous viewer may be left with the impression that the three were not convicted for their connection with explosives or attempted prison breakouts or bank robberies or seditious conspiracy, but because they happened to be attending a rally in Central Park."

"Those With AIDS Virus Tell Their Own Stories" ("P.O.V.": "Absolutely Positive"), June 18, 1991:

"To Judge from the announcements of coming programs, the concerns of 'P.O.V.' (short for Point of View) have not shifted in response to criticisms from the right that the series is skewed to the left. The subjects include Seneca Indians in upstate New York, environmental dangers, a guerrilla leader in El Salvador and abortion. Well, maybe one of them will take a surprising point of view."

"The Grazing of Cattle vs. Welfare of the Land," Aug. 12, 1991:

"[The pictures in 'The New Range Wars'] weigh heavily against the [cattle] industry . . . How can a grown man, even on a horse, argue with an ecologically enlightened little girl, busy cleaning up a New Mexico river, who tells the camera, 'We're out here to help fish'? . . . [The cattle industry's assertions] are stampeded. . . . A touch of skepticism would be refreshing now and then, and this hour would have provided more to chew on if it had confronted the opposition arguments."

"Channel 13 To Show Film on AIDS Protest" (reportage), circa 9/19/91:

"The film, made entirely from the point of view of demonstrators from Act Up, an AIDS advocacy and protest group, features numerous denunciations of the Roman Catholic

Church and John Cardinal O'Connor. The cardinal and his defenders are rendered comic through editing and camera techniques."

[The film was dropped, initially at least, by PBS because it called it "inappropriate for distribution because of its pervasive tone of ridicule overwhelming its critique of policy."]

"Suspicions vs. Proof In Mideast Banking Case" ("Frontline; The Bank of Crooks and Criminals"), April 21, 1992:

"Like the recent 'Frontline' report on charges that supporters of Ronald Reagan delayed the release of American hostages before the 1980 elections, tonight's program suffers from the producers' evident wish to believe and to publicize more than they can prove."

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, just let me read a few of these.

I have already indicated one quote.

March 22, 1992:

Neither the Corporation for Public Broadcasting nor the Public Broadcasting Service has ever come clean about the chronic bent to the left of their public affairs programs. * * *

May 18, 1992:

[Despite Bill Moyer's denial,] at least in prime time, PBS documentaries on subjects like foreign policy, welfare, social issues and the environment have long had a pronounced [leftist] slant.

That is not me. It is the New York Times.

October 6, 1987, a little documentary called "Vacation Nicaragua," Here is what the New York Times had to say about it.

"Vacation Nicaragua" * * * is gorgeously done propaganda. * * * This is a Nicaragua that receives no Soviet military aid and has no Cuban advisers. And the contras? This Nicaragua has them, but apparently they are not real Nicaraguans. They are members of a dark force, waiting to ambush the tourists while they float down a river toward the east coast of Nicaragua. * * * Someday ["Vacation Nicaragua"] should find its way into a museum as a classic in video propaganda.

The taxpayers helped pay for this stuff. The New York Times says this about it.

Cuba's revolution, July 25, 1985. Here is what the New York Times said about it.

Three cheers for the revolution! * * * There is no moral disapproval [of Cuba's more repressive features]. * * * It's not an examination of 25 years of revolution; it's an apology for Cuba.

So do not take my word for it. And all those people writing me, who have been led on by some talk-show host and others who must be beneficiaries of some of the public radio, whatever, just try to get the facts.

Let me talk about another flagship program called "Frontline." I watch it. I like to get the other side. And generally you get the other side if you watch "Frontline." Oh, it sounds like they are serious. They even sound like some to be the truth. But in the past year, the flagship documentary series "Frontline" has presented programs insinuating President Reagan committed treason in the Iran-Contra affair; that President Bush, not Saddam Hussein, is responsible for the present suffering in Iraq; and that the Reagan-Bush team stole the Presidency in 1980 with a conspiracy involving the Ayatollah Khomeini and American hostages in Iran; it is the wacky "October surprise" advanced by a few liberals, an alleged conspiracy which the New Republic and Newsweek magazines both recently declared to be a fraudulent, fictitious, and ridiculous concoction.

Again, this is another show that is partly funded with your tax dollars. And if you are on the left, extreme left, moderates probably could not qualify. If you are on the far left and you watch this stuff, you would say: "Isn't that great? They are condemning America, telling us what is wrong with America, what is good about Castro, what is good about Cuba, what is good about the Sandinistas."

And then for a little partisanship I will give you a little bit of the menu. They insinuate all these things about Presidents they do not agree with.

So, this is a serious business.

I raise these examples of left-wing ideology and radical bias here, and I want to make it perfectly clear, not to propose that these programs, however reprehensive I personally may find them, should be censored or taken off the air. Go ahead, let them present the left, let them present that side, because I believe at least we were told back in 1967 we are going to hear all views, get all views.

All views should have access to airwaves is what freedom in public broadcasting is about. But the people in charge of the public broadcasting system have the solemn obligation to present other, conflicting opinions and contrary points of view in their documentary programming. This, I am sad to say, simply has not happened, and it probably is not going to happen until the American people demand it.

So I look around the communications world today and I see diversity, innovation, open access, and competition of ideas everywhere—everywhere, except in the houses that public broadcasting has built, places where such qualities should be most apparent. That is what this was all about to start with. That is what we were told.

Why do we not go back and do what Congress intended back in 1967? Why do we not sunset this law and let it expire in 1 year and have another hearing? Why do we not have some innovation here?

Again, all those people who make all the speeches about the rich, President Bush, and how others in the body take care of the rich, they ought to be experts, they ought to be experts if they have listened, if they look at the record, why we cannot have the facts, why we cannot know where Bill Moyers' money goes, all the money he makes, how many spinoffs, how many private profit deals does he have or anybody else for that matter?

Let us take a look at what the American people are watching and what they are not watching. They are not watching it because they are not on. They are watching a one-sided liberal, leftist, tilted program.

It might come as a surprise to some people, despite all the efforts of some, the most watched programs on PBS are not the political programs or the opera performance. What most Americans really like to watch on PBS are nature programs. Of the 25 most watched programs of all time, 13 of them—including the 5 most popular programs ever—are National Geographic specials. Five more of the most watched shows are from the "Civil War" series, two are "Grand Ole Opry" specials, and one was a "Lawrence Welk" special. None of them is a conversation with Bill Moyers, or any other liberal journalist for that matter.

The best news yet is that the National Geographic specials are not produced with taxpayer dollars. On top of that, the National Geographic programs' appearances on PBS are underwritten by Chevron. You see, National Geographic specials do not need taxpayer subsidies to build an audience, teach our children, or win the PBS seal of quality. These universally acclaimed programs, which appeal to curious minds of all ages, continue to thrive on independent commercial stations and cable television all across America.

So, let us face it. The biggest stars of public television are the sharks, the grizzly bears, the tigers, and the polar bears featured in National Geographic specials—not the MacNeils, the Lehrers, the Moyers, or the Greiders.

And I might add I like MacNeil-Lehrer. I think it is a great program.

In fact, PBS' feature—can you imagine this—is a big objective Presidential election coverage by those two great middle-of-the-roaders, Bill Moyers and William Greider.

Anybody who believes that would believe almost anything. But nobody watched them, so maybe it does not make any difference. Ninety-seven percent of the audience were watching something else. All that time Mr. Moyers was telling what is wrong with America, Mr. Greider told us of the collapse of democracy.

They are two great commentators telling us what we ought to be thinking about in the Presidential race. I am not thinking anybody this year is going to be liberal enough for them to cover. They will figure out some way to do it.

Is it not time to ask what is wrong with PBS?

But we cannot find out. And they are not going to tell us, and we are not going to make them. We keep giving

them more money, double their authorization, hope they can double the appropriation, put a few little amendments in that do not mean a great deal say, "Well, we will see you later." We give them advanced funding. They do not need it for a couple years. We give it to them early to get all the programs. They do not want to have high-paid people wait, people making $600,000, a year, or $200,000 or $300,000.

So right now it is just the American people are being shortchanged in two ways. First, when they pay their taxes and, second, when they turn the dials of their televisions and radios to PBS and NPR.

Now this is 25 years. You would think in 25 years public broadcasting might have reached maturity, and it might now be time for some adult choices. If those in control of this system insist on continuing along the path of elitism, sweetheart deals, and one-sided partisanship, then they should be prepared to see PBS privatized. And many of my conservative colleagues in the Congress have already called for that.

If PBS were a private rather than public entity, and if it stopped relying on the taxpayers' largess, then it could arrange its business affairs as it chose and take whatever politically correct positions it liked, and then let the marketplace decide. Certainly, privatization may be an option. It is not an option I am calling for.

I think public broadcasting should continue, but it ought to adopt some reforms. I do not understand why they do not want to adopt any reforms. Why do they not want to be subject to the Freedom of Information Act?

Objectivity and balance are the two pillars upon which the edifice of public broadcasting was supposed to stand. Even now, a reaffirmation of these values can provide the foundation of its future existence. But without a real commitment to objectivity and balance, and true nonprofit motivation, it is difficult to see why the American taxpayers should be asked to support it.

Mr. President, this is only the beginning. I read with interest Russell Baker's column the other day that he had some regard for me and he could not figure out why I was picking on public television. I hope Russell Baker reads what I have said because his eyes would open, too.

We have a problem. Oh, this is a worthy cause, so do not worry about it. It is double the authorization; hopefully, double the appropriation. What is another $500 million. What is $1.1 billion? When you owe $4 trillion, maybe $1.1 billion does not make any difference. As I said it could rebuild Los Angeles. That would make a difference. They are not getting PBS or anything else. They are lucky to get food.

We always have our priorities right in Congress. We take care of those who ought to be able to take care of themselves. Then we argue all week here on unemployment compensation, how we are going to help some men or women out of work, whether they ought to get 10 weeks or 12 weeks.

There is nobody here out of work, nobody in the Corporation for Public Broadcasting out of work, nobody not making big bucks. But we do not know how big the bucks are. How much? Why can we not find out? We disclose what we make. We disclose what we make in campaign funds. We disclose everything in Congress. You would think at least we would expect the same from other tax-supported institutions, whether or not they are totally Government agencies or partly Government agencies, partly funded with Government funds. Seventeen percent is enough to ask what is going on. And maybe every year they do not give us the information we ought to reduce it 1 percent—16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, zero. It would take a long time, but it has been 25 years and we have not learned anything yet.

I want to conclude by suggesting there are other people concerned about this. I have been caricatured and roasted and toasted and everything else because I had the audacity to even raise the question about public broadcasting or public radio and how it is paid for. I do not have any agenda. I am not running for anything, except reelection. There have been a lot of people out there who have been thinking about this. I have been reading all the other stuff about why we are trying to kill Big Bird and all the other phony propaganda, flat-out inaccurate stories.

Mr. President, there have been a lot of good editorials and news reports dealing with the public broadcasting issue. Some of them can even be described as courageous in that the writers are willing to challenge the status quo, willing to take the heat and go beyond the shallow characterization of the debate as simply killing Big Bird, or so-called conservatives trying to pull the plug on public broadcasting. That has never been my intention. As I said, I like it. I even contribute some to it.

As I have detailed, there is a far more serious side to this issue—millions and millions of taxpayer dollars on the line; big private profits from a so-called nonprofit network; big bureaucracies and big salaries; questionable programming; and the steady stream of documentary cheerleading for leftwing interests. That concerns me.

I am not some rightwing nut. I am not trying to make a deal. Keep them all on there. Keep all those crazy leftwing programs. But we ought to put a bunch of the crazy rightwing programs on to make it even, or at least have balance so people could take a choice. They probably would not believe, either.

So if anybody is interested in blowing away the smokescreen the special interests have built around public broadcasting, these articles make for a pretty good start.

That is why I am pleased to include in the RECORD several outstanding analyses of the public broadcasting issue, leading off with a superb piece by the much-respected Newsweek columnist Robert J. Samuelson. I do not think anybody has ever looked at Mr. Samuelson as some ideolog, some rightwing conservative. There are also articles by George Will and other respected columnists in the Washington Post. Both of these appeared in the Washington Post.

There is an article by Andrew Ferguson from the Washingtonian magazine, entitled "Not With My Money." That makes the point I tried to make. If they want to do it, do it, but not with our money, your money. And he asks the question, "With so many alternatives on the air, does public TV still deserve a handout?" A pretty good question.

In 1967, we had three networks. Now you can get I do not know how many channels on your TV station. We have the Discovery channel, all kinds of channels, business channels, sports channels, all-news channels, children's channels, Arts and Entertainment, A&E. So there are lots of opportunities.

I ask unanimous consent that all those articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

SPECIAL PLEADING FOR PUBLIC TV

You learn in college that if you're asked an exam question you can't answer, then answer the question you can answer and pretend it is the exam question. Sharon Percy Rockefeller—president of WETA, Washington's public TV station—must have done well in college. When columnist George Will proposed ending federal subsidies for public TV, Rockefeller fired off two blistering replies that managed to evade the central issue posed by Will.

It is this: How can we end federal budget deficits unless we eliminate nonessential programs like broadcast subsidies? (The answer: We can't.)

Every special pleader, like Rockefeller, wants to ignore the larger picture. In her replies, she never mentions the deficits. A+ for debating skills; F for honesty. There are principled reasons to support federal subsidies for public TV. There are also principled reasons (to which I subscribe) to oppose them. But we should be beyond this sort of delicate debate. The truth is, as Will argued, that TV subsidies are a governmental frill we can no longer afford.

It's hard to argue that America doesn't have enough TV or that it's a basic function of government to satisfy every programming taste underserved by commercial stations. It's also hard to envision that public broadcasting's best-known programs ("Ses-

ame Street," "MacNeil/Lehrer," "Wall Street Week" or "All Things Considered") would vanish without subsidies. They could—if need be—find commercial support. (Indeed, some of these programs now feature announcements of corporate sponsorship that are first cousins to commercials.) Nor would ending subsidies doom public broadcasting. Only 17 percent of its income comes from the federal government, down from 27 percent in 1980.

Naturally, Rockefeller invokes children in defense of public TV, citing (aside from "Sesame Street") programs such as "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" and "Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego?" I've got three small children, ages 2 to 7. These are good programs. But let's not delude ourselves: They haven't fundamentally improved the lot of poor children. And if these programs have educational value, they can be funded through the Department of Education. What we don't need are broad-based subsidies that underwrite more conversations with Bill Moyer.

Now, the point here is not to expose Rockefeller's considerable skills to deceive. It is to highlight the central issue; the budget deficits. Recall that the deficit in fiscal 1992 exceeds $350 billion and that the Congressional Budget Office projects deficits of at least 3 percent of the economy's output into the 21st century. That's about $180 billion in today's dollars. And these projections assume an economic recovery and a continued decline of defense spending (as a share of output), while excluding the one-time costs of the savings and loan bailout.

Almost every politician in America wants to be passionately against the deficits without being for any spending cuts or tax increases. This explains the appeal of a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget. Supporting it allows politicians to oppose the deficit while postponing any specific actions. It also explains the appeal of Ross Perot; a man who promises dramatic changes without elaborating how he will achieve them.

The trouble is that the budget deficits can't be closed without raising specific taxes or cutting specific programs. If every existing program is sacrosanct, then the cause is hopeless. Suggestions to prune such programs as TV Subsidies typically evoke this reply: Don't bother, because they're too small to matter. Specifically, this is true. Axing the $251 million operating budget of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting wouldn't visibly dent the deficit.

But the argument fails on two counts. First, many other programs resemble TV subsidies: Whatever their original justification, they no longer serve an important national need. They have constituencies and supporters, who advertise public benefits that are at best modest and at worst fictional. Amtrak, Farm subsidies, Art subsidies. Water subsidies. There's a long list. In an ideal world, we might be able to afford them. But not in today's world. There are also hordes of programs where spending could be tightened. Together, the potential savings probably amount to $15 billion to $25 billion: not enough to end the deficits, but not trivial.

And second, it will be impossible to enact meaningful tax increases (an essential part of any deficit solution) until the public perceives spending is being disciplined. Here's the crux of the deficit deadlock. Republicans propose spending cuts that Democrats reject, causing Republicans to reject tax increases. But both parties are pleased, because neither truly wants to raise taxes or cut spending. The paralysis is sustained by special pleaders like Rockefeller who have a vested interest in the status quo; that is, massive deficits without political pressures to cut the least-justified programs.

The very size of the deficit has now become an excuse for irresponsibility, because no single step is sufficient to make a major difference in the deficit. The effect is to prevent government from responding to new needs. A case in point: Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.)—husband of Sharon—last year chaired a national commission on children. The commission made some expensive proposals (for example: a tax cut for families with children) that were simultaneously praised and dismissed as unrealistic. The reason: no money. If Sen. Rockefeller wonders why, he should look across the breakfast table.

Everyone is happy to deplore "special interests" in the abstract without the discomfort of naming names or identifying programs. The attitude is live and let live: "I'll keep my favorite program, you keep yours. We can no longer tolerate this casual cynicism. People like Sharon Rockefeller enjoy unwarranted public sympathy because they defend programs deemed "worthy." In fact, she and her ilk are prime defenders of the deficits. Irresponsibility has become respectable, even chic. Until it isn't, there's no chance of making any headway.

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1992]

$1.1 BILLION FOR PUBLIC TV?

(By George F. Will)

With a spirit stronger than the reasoning behind it, Sharon Percy Rockefeller, president of WETA, Public Broadcasting in Washington, reprimands me for advocating an end to federal subsidies for public television [oped, April 28]. My offense, which her riposte moves me to re-commit, is this argument: Whatever one thinks of the case made a generation ago for public funding, the case collapses in today's utterly transformed technological and fiscal contexts.

To advance the argument, I will stipulate that public television is a net enhancement of American life. If the waving of a magic wand could sustain it, the wand should be waved. But what public television wants is another $1.1 billion for three years. So the pertinent question is not whether, as Rockefeller says, public television "improves" us. Rather, the question is whether public television—a paradigm of government's ornamental activities, pleasant but inessential—has a strong claim on some of government's scarce resources. Are its claims stronger than those of child immunization, the National Institutes of Health and a thousand competing causes?

Rockefeller says public television is part of government's promotion of "the pursuit of happiness." Actually, it exemplifies government in the distorted role of deliverer of happiness. And to whom? To an economically and intellectually advantaged constituency that could and should fend for itself to satisfy its appetite for cultural services.

When public television began, before the advent of cable and the VCR, it increased from three to four the choices available to most viewers. Today most households have scores of channels to choose from, including some (e.g., Discovery and Arts & Entertainment) that offer programming comparable to much of public television's programming.

Rockefeller responds, "More outlets do not necessarily mean more choices; an increase in quantity does not automatically result in more diversity or higher quality." Surely Rockefeller is not denying the explosion of televised diversity. Instead, her argument suggests that any demand the market satisfies must be of dubious quality. The implication is that no matter how many choices the market offers, government has a duty to add others by offering programs for which the market registers no demand. That argument guarantees that government television can forever, no matter what, be called "necessary." But it achieves this guarantee at a cost: It underscores the perverse rationale for federal subsidies.

The rationale is that no matter how much programming the market provides, government is supposed to provide more. Why? Because its programming is supposed to serve an audience so small or idiosyncratic or devoted to "quality" that market forces, even those now offering a proliferation of programming to a much-segmented market, will not satisfy it.

Rockefeller says of me, "He concludes that government should consign public broadcasting—and by extension other cultural institutions—to the forces of the marketplace." And she likens public television to "public schools, universities, libraries, hospitals, museums, symphonies and national parks." But it is Rockefeller who makes an unreasonable extension. Reasonable distinctions are necessary; let's make some.

Many cultural institutions serving small and primarily affluent audiences should indeed be weaned from dependence on tax dollars, especially federal dollars. And it is not in Rockefeller's interest to put public television on any list with hospitals, which are institutions of life and death, and schools and universities, which are essential for preparing the population for freedom and social competence. Such lists underscore the fact that public television is a social adornment, not an essential.

Which brings us to today's fiscal facts as public television seeks a 50 percent increase of its subsidy.

Beginning in 1969 (two years after creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting), the Nixon administration debated establishing a guaranteed annual income. Debate raged concerning practicalities and ethics—but not costs. Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) later published a 559-page book on the controversy, devoting just 34 lines—to costs. Back then, he says, "it was simply a given" that "money would be found" for any nice idea.

Today, although the defense budget has declined in real terms for eight years, every defender of a domestic spending program still says, "The military wastes money! Thus Bill Moyers says the military spends $200 million on marching bands, therefore Congress can vote more than six times that sum for public television.

Such crashing non sequiturs acquire a kind of crazy plausibility after a decade of fiscal vandalism. Given the $400 billion deficit, what difference does another $1 billion make? That is, no choices are necessary as long as government borrowing can push costs into the future. But the need for spending cuts is indisputable. So as it contemplates public television's subsidy, Congress should ask two simple questions: If not here, where? If not now, when?

If something as marginal as public television successfully defends its subsidy, cuts can come only at the expense of Americans less affluent, educated, articulate and skillful at lobbying than public television's aggressively moralistic constituency. And pub-

lic television will be a paradigm of government's role as servant of the comfortable and defender of the strong at the expense of the future.

[From the Washingtonian magazine, July 1990]

NOT WITH MY MONEY

(By Andrew Terguson)

"I must say I find educational television very educational. The minute somebody turns it on, I go to the library and read a good book."—Groucho Marx.

In the beginning they called it educational television: black-and-white images of a skinny fellow in wire rims slapping a pointer against a blackboard; aging couples in wrinkled suits droning in French; imperious professors lecturing on "Canada: Sleeping Giant of the North" over grainy footage of Eskimos.* * *

And so on. Dull, yes, but across these 30 or more years wonderfully innocent, too. For educational television—before the phosphorescent dawn of quick-cut editing and computer-generated graphics—embodied the old notion that education might require prolonged attention and a steady mind, that learning wasn't easy or even fun.

All that is long gone. Originally a string of cracker-box operations, public television is now a billion-dollar-a-year enterprise involving Fortune 500 corporations, the feds, hundreds of independent producers, huge production facilities, countless bureaucrats, satellites, MacNeil/Lehrer and Bill Moyers.

Washington's own WETA, which began in the home of Elizabeth Campbell, its prime mover in the 1950s, now occupies a sky-lighted, plant-festooned complex in Arlington, and it's looking for still classier facilities back in DC. With an annual budget upwards of $40 million, WETA churns out such public-TV staples as the MacNeil/Lehrer News-Hour and Washington Week in Review.

Meanwhile, the original justifications for government-supported television are fading, and the reason can be summed up in one word: cable. With the demand for arts, science, and public affairs met by such enterprises as Arts & Entertainment, the Discovery Channel, Cable News Network, C-SPAN, and the Learning Channel, isn't the $170 million that Congress routinely dishes out for public television rather, well, redundant? The question is being asked more and more often, and it strikes the public-TV establishment as a distinctly unpleasant one.

The question was anticipated years ago by the estimable Mrs. Campbell. "I feel that we'll be here as long as we're needed," she said in 1986, on WETA's 25th anniversary. "And when we're not needed, we shouldn't be here. Period."

Time's up, Mrs. Campbell.

Pulling the plug will, of course, be hard to do. By design, public television is a quasi-governmental bureaucracy, and such outfits are notoriously hard to dismember. The pattern recurs throughout the long history of government expenditure: Once enthroned, a bureaucracy shifts its purpose from fulfilling its charter to self-perpetuation.

Public television has done this with the same quest for excellence that it claims for its programming. Over the years it has camouflaged itself according to changing circumstance with a skill that would make a chameleon green (than purple, yellow, red) with envy.

Public television as we know it is a creature of the Great Society, that dizzy period when the federal government decided that no journey was too difficult for Americans to undertake so long as Washington was in the driver's seat. In this spirit, the idea of noncommercial television was seized from the community-college pedants and handed over to the forces of national uplift.

Foremost among these were America's two leading institutions of corporate do-goodery, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. The Ford Foundation supported the tiny stations dotting the country until the mid-'60s, when the tithe got burdensome, at which point the Carnegie Corporation picked up the ball.

The virtue of noblesse oblige survives in modern America, but with a catch: When the nobility embraces an uplifting idea, its traditional obligation ends after it convinces somebody else to pick up the tab, and the sucker is invariably the taxpayer. Thus, when a man named Ralph Lowell (of the Boston Lowells) urged the Carnegie Corporation to study the Future of Public Television in America, it responded in 1967 by issuing to Congress an elaborate blueprint for a service to be funded in perpetuity by a tax on television sets.

The congressmen didn't go that far because they preferred that public TV make the yearly crawl up Capitol Hill for more money. But almost every other item on the Carnegie wish list was granted.

The Carnegie report included an elegant little manifesto written by E.B. White, which has been quoted and requoted ever since. Public television, he wrote in part, "should be the visual counterpart of the literary essay, should arouse our dreams, satisfy our hunger for beauty, take us on journeys, enable us to participate in events, present great drama and music, explore the sea and the sky and the woods and the hills. It should be our Lyceum, our Chautauqua, our Minsky's and our Camelot."

Like much of what Mr. White wrote, this is charmingly cadenced and not such a great idea. Among public-TV acolytes, however, it's become a credo, the sort of thing bureaucrats would ask Mother to embroider and hang on the wall of their cubicles, if bureaucrats had mothers.

The high purpose embodied by the original Carnegie report remains central to public television's image of itself: the elitism, the we-know-what's-good-for-'em attitude, the goo-gooism, the distrust of commerce. It was the Carnegie report that recommended changing the name from educational TV to public television, and with one swift fix of the letterhead, the chalky blackboard, the droning language lessons, and the imperious professor were gone.

Like so many government institutions, public television is hopelessly rickety and inefficient. Of course, as its establishmentarians are quick to point out, public TV is not really a government institution—it derives only about half its revenue from government at all levels, about 16 percent of the total from the feds. But you couldn't tell from looking at it. If somebody attempted a diagram of how the compartments of public television fit together, it would resemble a Rube Goldberg contraption that heaves and rises and swoons and steams and rumbles and brings forth, at last, a paper clip.

Public television has learned the dodge uniquely crucial to bureaucratic survival: Become so confusing and dull in your administration that you bore any potential critic into stupefaction. Where exactly the money comes from and where it goes, who bosses whom, which Corporation Deputy Vice President of Inter-Environmental Communication Resources is responsible for what directive about which process—all is a mystery sunk in the alphabet soup of CPB and PBS and NAPTS and NAS and NCS and NPS and NNS (which did a show about the EEOC) and ESS and SIP and STP and ALS, which you confuse with ALSS at your peril.

If the confusion doesn't get you, the boredom will. I refer not to the programming—although you've got to admit that once you've seen the first half-dozen documentaries about the Leakeys and Lucy the apelady, you've seen them all—but to the ennui that sets in when one is confronted with the arcana of a sect. I myself have covered public-television board meetings and heard sentences about "developing automated index downloading to facilitate real-time distribution of interactive instructional programs," only to find my forehead drifting toward the shoulder of the reporter in front of me. And they serve free coffee.

In all this, public television is truly a child of the Great Society. But it differs from its brother and sister programs in a significant respect, one that may be its undoing. Most such programs were organized according to Voltaire's dictum that "the art of government consists in taking as much money as possible from one class of citizens to give to another." The class that was supposed to be bled was the rich, and the beneficiaries were to be the poor.

Public television reverses this.

With a limited number of frequencies available, commercial television at its inception could survive only by appealing to the masses. To make money in television, the networks would have to seek the lowest common denominator.

Public TV, on the other hand, was founded on the proposition that almost nobody would want to watch it. If there were a significant audience for the fare it offered, there would be no need for subsidies; some ingenious entrepreneur would have smelled a buck and networks would be offering opera, quality drama, nature shows, and talking heads.

The premise proved correct: Such an audience was quite small, too small for money-making. (Public television's audience share seldom rises above 4 percent.) And not only was the share of viewers small, but the viewers were choice: wealthy, well educated, and white. The rest of the country cuts part of its paycheck in order to bring this well-to-do, hard-to-please crowd its "television worth watching" (the phrase is PBS's). It's not what Voltaire had in mind.

Public broadcasters bristle at the charge that they're catering to an elite—egalitarianism is part of their credo. They brandish audience breakdowns showing that their viewers are just as prole as commercial TV's. That may be true if you factor in the broad demographic spectrum of people who plop their kids in front of the tube during the day, when Sesame Street is on. But for prime-time viewing, the audience is decidedly upscale.

Why else, after all, would those Fortune 500 companies "underwrite" public television's big-ticket shows? They're preening before consumers they want to impress. As a WETA fund-raiser told me. "They know that during prime time public television can deliver the demographic they want: affluent, highly educated, the movers and shakers, the socially conscious and well-informed."

Not Ralph Kramden, in other words. Similarly, WETA's viewer magazine lures advertisers with a promise of upscale audience. For these purposes, the station admits that its contributors have an average household

income of $94,583, an average investment portfolio of $249,693, and an average household net worth of $627,663. One out of eight is a millionaire; one out of seven keeps a wine cellar; one out of three visited Europe in the last three years.

Public television's toniness is found not only on the demand side but also on the supply side.

The paragon of public-television activism, both in the Washington area and nationwide, is Sharon Percy Rockefeller, recently elected president of WETA after a long career in the upper reaches of the public-broadcasting bureaucracy. Mrs Rockefeller is the sort of person who starts at the top and works her way sideways.

Bright and well-spoken, charming and well-read, she is as well-connected as Pepco, although her gross income is probably larger. Her father is former Senator Charles Percy; her godfather is Barry Goldwater; and her husband is Senator Jay Rockefeller, scion of the very wealthy family that embodies gallant public-mindedness. Her politics tilt leftward, and her interests are the interests of the well-to-do: art collecting, politics, and every manner of good works.

In the argot of pre-feminist suburbia, Mrs. Rockefeller is a joiner. Her board affiliations alone fill a page and a half of her résumé: four women's organizations, two non-profits, five educational, three fine arts, and three attached to the Rockefeller name. Her activity has been rewarded with eight honorary doctorates.

It's no surprise, then, that Mrs. Rockefeller and public television found each other. It was love at first sight. Never much of a TV-watcher, she was introduced to PBS through her children's affection for Sesame Street. Most mothers of a joining predisposition might offer to help out at the station, say, answering phones during pledge week: Mrs. Rockefeller got President Carter to appoint her to the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which hands out the federal subsidy.

As Richard Brookhiser, a former CPB board member, has pointed out, there's nothing unusual about this, for wealthy women have always performed good works. The difference is that they used to do so with their own money; now they do it with ours.

Mrs. Rockefeller jokes that she at last landed a full-time, paying job. Her salary is an estimated $125,000, on top of which she gets an entire television station with which to improve the populace. And her goals are as high as her salary: Her "Agenda for the '90s" refers to "establishing new standards in broadcasting," "achieving excellence, relevance, and impact," "never underestimating our viewers' intelligence," and, most comprehensively, "serving our neighbors and nation." All without spending a dime of her own money.

That sort of flattery is calibrated to appeal to the "affluent movers and shakers" who constitute Mrs. Rockefeller's viewers. But class factors alone—the wine cellars and the portfolios—don't determine public television's audience; there are lots of rich people who don't watch. The variable that intersects with class to make a dedicated public-videophile is ambition: specifically, the hunger of the middle-brow to be high-brow.

Public television is TV for people who pretend to hate TV. The middle-brow knows enough to think that Who's the Boss is stupid, and he knows that his interests should lie in art and learning; that uncomfortable inkling is the goad to his ambition. And yet, and yet * * * he can't quite bring himself to turn off the TV. He'd resent being called a couch potato—worse, a pretentious couch potato. Let's bring him up a notch and call him la pomme de terre à la couche.

What this pomme de terre wants can be found in books and museums and performances. But each of these requires some concentration and discipline. So in the Chevy Chase clapboard colonial, or high up in the $279,000 condo in Rosslyn, or in the quiet Georgetown eighteenth-century townhouse, after putting away the dinner dishes and resting his feet on the coffee table where the New Yorkers pile up like homework, below the built-in bookcase from which the 54-volume set of the Great Books, bound in imitation leather, looks down accusingly, the hungering middlebrow picks up the zapper and tunes to Channel 26, ready to watch Art of the Western World.

Of course, if he wants to be entertained, he'd do better to watch Cheers. And if he really wanted to learn about the art of the western world, he could haunt the National Gallery. But his conscience won't permit the former, and his ambition isn't strong enough for the latter more than once or twice a year.

So when the TV sizzles on, and the blue glow fills the room like stardust, the pomme gazes for an hour as a camera pans over great works of art and glides down gilded hallways and does cartwheels in great rotundas. Any extended contemplation is unlikely, owing to the thunderous music, the relentless movement of the camera, and the bland voice-over (though it's British and reassuring). The viewer's attention can wander from the TV to the office to the mortgage payment to the TV to the wine cellar. But when the hour ends la pomme is satisfied. He feels pretty good about himself. He reminds himself to write that check to WETA this year for sure.

Unfortunately for WETA, the chances of that check's getting written are dimmer than ever.

The original rationale for government-supported television depended upon a technological limitation: There were only so many frequencies to carry TV signals, and at least one of them had to be secure from the ravages of commerce, to allow what the market wouldn't bear.

Now cable has exploded the technological limits, bringing an average of 32 channels—with the possibility of many more—into more and more homes. This variety allows very small markets to be catered too—"narrowcasting," in TV jargon—as the creation of networks devoted solely to science, art, and education attests. By each of these, la pomme de terre à la couche is well served. Even better, cable demands that he himself pay for his high-brow ambition, rather than making the rest of us pay for it.

With public television on thinner ice, those whose livelihood depends on it grow more ingenious in justifying the burden it places on the federal balance sheet. They've had practice: Remember, this is a public service that's always said it's crucial to our society because almost nobody uses it. Once you've got that one, you're on your way.

Sharon Rockefeller, in defending public television against accusations of redundancy, points out that cable charges for its service, "but we're free to everyone." Of course, something that costs $170 million a year isn't free, although I do understand how a Rockefeller might be confused on the point.

What's more, like any government body, public television has an insatiable appetite for money. Bruce Christensen, president of the Public Broadcasting Service, says he would very much like to double its government subsidy. "You could quintuple my budget," Mrs. Rockefeller says brightly, "and I could spend it in a week!" No doubt.

Then there are arguments that verge on the tautological; in effect, that public television should be subsidized because it's subsidized. Its advocates point out that public television is more accessible than cable: It reaches more than 90 percent of American homes to cable's current 60 percent. In fact, Representative John Dingell of Michigan, public television's water-carrier in Congress, wants to increase its accessibility through "must carry" legislation that would require every cable service to include public TV in its range of programming.

Its advocates add that public television produces 1,500 hours of original shows a year, far more than such cable competitors as A&E and the Discovery Channel. "Our unique strength," says PBS's Jennifer Lawson, "is in the production of original programming."

Such strengths, of course, are consequences of the subsidy, not reasons for it. And isn't there something odd about the government's weighing in behind one enterprise as it competes with other, privately owned businesses in a tussle for a share of an upscale market? It's as if Dingell decided that the Treasury should subsidize The Sharper Image while leaving Abercrombie & Fitch to fend for itself

Public television knows it's in a tussle. It plans this year to increase its promotional budget as never before, unearthing every last pomme de terre through newspaper and magazine advertising and even commercials on other networks. In true bureaucratic chameleon fashion, public television has moved 180 degrees: A service that once disdained the mass of viewers now grovels for them.

Advertising is only part of the new strategy. Lawson, who was recently appointed chief programming executive at PBS, understands that the "viewing needs" of the pommes have changed. "As cable service and others emulate parts of our schedule," she says, viewers "will see a steady flow of distinctive programming that will keep our identity clear."

That will involve (to use E.B. White's formulation) less Lyceum and more Minsky's. Lawson has announced plans to develop a full range of programming for the 1990s, specializing in "wit, humor and fun": continuing drama series, magazine shows, talk shows, game shows, and sitcoms.

This might seem direct assault on what was once public TV's last line of defense; that of being "quality television," "television worth watching," "television with a difference." Brainy sitcoms? Thoughtful game shows? Some purist pommes are outraged.

But should they be? Public television, after all, is the Lyceum that casts Bill Moyers as a national intellectual and Fred Friendly as an arbiter of ethics. It launched or boosted the careers of such pop psychologists as Leo Buscaglia and John Bradshaw and Robert Fulghum. On this evidence, there appears to be some distance between what public television's advocates think it to be and what it is: a mechanism for satisfying the conceits of America's privileged.

As a test of public television's claim to quality, I spent a week watching as much of it as I could. (Kids, please don't try this at home.)

It happened to be pledge week, during which programs are interrupted every 45

minutes so that announcers can spend fifteen minutes telling you how satisfying it is to watch programs that are never interrupted by commercials. During the breaks, announcers love-bombed the audience. "You're the sort of viewer who's not afraid of bold, socially relevant, thought-provoking programming," went a typical comment. "Here at WETA we have great respect for your intelligence." (Honey, get the checkbook!) As the days wore on, the pledge drive took on the aura of a jihad: protecting virginal television from the onslaught of vulgar moneymaking.

Squeezed in among the solicitations were the programs. There was a heavy emphasis on yuppie nostalgia: the Beatles, the Grateful Dead, Joan Baez, James Taylor, and Peter, Paul and Mary. ("The phones are so busy when Peter, Paul and Mary are on public television," said the pledge lady, and I believed her.) For nostalgiasts of an older vintage, there were Julie Andrews and Nat King Cole and Gershwin and an evening of Mozart.

Public TV's nature fetish was served with hour after hour of outdoor films, most of them narrated by actors who have fallen on hard times—Richard Widmark, for example, or Peter Graves. As they intoned the script, squirrels flew from treetop to treetop, slugs slimed their way through underbrush, fleas copulated in amazing close-ups, and lions gnawed on carcasses. These shows, I noticed, seem especially popular at dinnertime. There were even nature programs explaining how nature programs are made.

But the key to "quality television," surely, is the transmission of ideas. The more of public TV's ideas I absorbed, the more hospitable I became to the idea of sitcoms and game shows. An entire Sunday was handed over to John Bradshaw, a "co-dependency theorist" who, with charts and graphs, makes the case that no matter how bad you feel, you can always blame your family.

And, of course, Bill Moyers kept popping up, interviewing academics and artists, nodding at whatever it was they might have said. His most recent triumph, repeated during pledge week, was a long series of talks with Joseph Campbell, a hitherto obscure college professor and author. For almost 50 years Campbell made a nice living squeezing his knowledge of world religions into a risk-free pantheism from which any considerations of morality and ethics were rigorously excluded. When, in the series' climax, Campbell announced that it was everyone's duty to "follow your bliss," pommes across the nation slid to the floor. That the phrase has no discernible meaning makes little difference: You can't get this on commercial TV.

Thus the flirtation with New Age claptrap has now replaced "quality" as PTV's last line of defense. It's the old uplift, wrapped in Leo Buscaglia's turtleneck. When asked at a meeting of TV critics about the justification for public television in the era of cable, Bruce Christensen said PBS would provide "a high-quality program service that, in fact, will allow people to put in context all the other things that are going on in their lives." Perhaps this is what "follow your bliss" means.

Jennifer Lawson went further: "People are looking for a lot more clarity about their lives, both in dealing with the society and dealing on a personal level." That tugging you hear is the sound of bureaucrats at the end of their tether.

If this is a need that government must meet, why not do it directly? Let's pony up for a Department of Life Clarity and Other Things Contextualization, and eliminate the middleman.

No, it's time to pull the plug. The worthy shows of public television—the British imports, the MacNeil/Lehrer News-Hour, Nova, Live From Lincoln Center, the occasional dazzling documentary series—will easily find homes on other networks.

Sharon Rockefeller can always go back to volunteer work.

And as for les pommes de terres aux couches—well, when the stardust glow of public television fades from their 27-inch sets, they can take a tip from the only Marx left to follow in the 1990s: They can read a good book.

AN ISSUE BIGGER THAN BIG BIRD

(By Laurence Jarvik)

Don't let talk about the relative merits of Big Bird of "Sesame Street" cloud the real issue surrounding public broadcasting: Should government, using your tax dollars, fund a bureaucracy that pushes a partisan agenda and generates its own private profit?

Congress is scheduled to vote tomorrow on a $1.1 billion reauthorization bill for public broadcasting. The fact is, PBS doesn't need the money.

Despite perpetual beg-a-thons, public broadcasting is a big business. Take PBS Home Video, the videocasette marketing arm of public television. It has grossed about $30 million in sales of cassettes distributed by Pacific Arts Video. Children's Television Workshop (CTW), the parent company for the "Sesame Street," has a $58 million stock and bond portfolio, which it calls an "endowment." CTW grosses about $100 million a year in royalty, licensing and subscription revenues on $1 billion worth of products affiliated with the television program.

An almost Orwellian Newspeak is being used to cover this black market: Direct-marketing promotions are "tags," sponsors are "underwriters," and on-air promotion of profitable products is called charity. To disguise what amounts to private profiteering by a public trust, public broadcasting executives engage in a pattern of stonewalling and deception—vigorously claiming to be "noncommercial" while hiding financial documents from public scrutiny.

Despite the lure of the PBS audience to sponsors, and an increase in membership from 2.6 million in 1980 to 5.2 million in 1991, the public broadcasting system has not adopted a full-blown, free-market approach to fulfill its potential. In fact, last year viewing audiences for PBS shows declined by 12 percent. The reason lies in the bureaucratic morass surrounding PBS.

Documentary filmmaker Fred Wiseman, in 1988 congressional testimony, said "there is a wide consensus on the failure of the present system," and suggested that public television be reformed along the lines of Britain's Channel Four—a private commercial channel devoted to quality programming. "Most competent professionals would not consider working in public television in its present form," Mr. Wiseman said.

Since Mr. Wiseman's testimony, public television has gone from bad to worse. The scandal-ridden Independent Television Service, allocated $24 million to produce new TV shows, has not created one minute of programming in almost four years of existence—despite spending more than $1.5 million on overhead and administrative expenses.

Meanwhile, questions have been raised in the Senate about the commitment of public broadcasters to their legal obligation to present fair and balanced reporting. The fact that the PBS prime-time schedule features election specials by Bill Moyers and William Greider, two liberal Democrats—without equal time provided for conservatives—is a violation of the spirit and the letter of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act.

Public broadcasters are on record opposing a "right of reply" to permit viewer responses to one-sided coverage. They also oppose extension of the Freedom of Information Act to public broadcasting, effectively blocking the public's right to know how tax dollars are spent.

If public broadcasting wants to shake free of congressional oversight, the industry needs to change course. Public television could be owned by its viewers. Instead of making donations, contributors could make investments, buying stocks in a company and participating to the fullest extent possible in corporate management. As a publicly held company, with its capital raised from markets instead of the American taxpayer, public broadcasting would enjoy truly insulated funding, free of congressional strings.

Is such a transformation possible? Indeed, it is. Privatization of broadcasting has worked in Italy, Spain, France and England. It is spreading to the formerly socialist states of Eastern Europe and even to the former Soviet Union.

As long as it receives federal handouts, public broadcasting should be subject to at least the same congressional scrutiny as any other government program. There's simply no other way to prevent the abuse of a public trust for private and partisan purposes.

TELLTALE DUPE AT PBS

(By L. Brent Bozell III)

The conspiracy theorists at PBS' "Frontline" have embarrassed themselves yet again. Even when they run a report acknowledging major mistakes, they manage to concoct more foolishness.

A year ago, "Frontline" suggested there was a strong possibility that the Reagan campaign delayed the release of the Iranian hostages to win election in 1980 in an "October Surprise." But thanks to independent critiques in Newsweek, the New Republic, and even the Village Voice, "Frontline" was forced to concede its errors. A new documentary, aired April 7, denounced as liars the witnesses presented as credible experts in the first show.

The PBS program admitted: "Some self-proclaimed witnesses to an arms-for-hostages deal have turned out to be not credible at all." The first and most notorious "witness" was Richard Brenneke. In its first documentary, "Frontline" had stated: "Although Brenneke's credibility remains in question, government records show that he did work with European arms dealers supplying Iran during the 1980s. According to one document, Brenneke once informed a Pentagon intelligence officer about top secret TOW missile sales to Iran three days before President Reagan authorized them." The first documentary proceeded to buttress Mr. Brenneke's claims by arguing that Bush aid Donald Gregg lied about his whereabouts.

"Frontline" off-air reporter (and co-writer) Robert Parry also defended Mr. Brenneke last year in The Washington Post: "Brenneke's 1990 trial was the government's chance to disprove the [October Surprise] allegations once and for all. But the government failed to convince even a single juror that Brenneke had lied. The tally on the five-count indictment was Brenneke, 60, the

government, zero. Despite impressing the jury, Brenneke's credibility is still assailed by [NBC producer Mark] Hosenball," Mr. Parry concluded: "Hosenball can't seem to accept government officials don't always tell the truth, while sometimes unsavory characters do."

But in the Village Voice, former ABC News producer Frank Snepp, who made the mistake of using Mr. Brenneke as a source during his tenure at ABC, showed Mr. Brenneke was lying. Credit card receipts placed Mr. Brenneke in Portland during the alleged secret meetings. On the April 7 show, "Frontline" and Mr. Parry ate their words: "Whether he lied for personal gain or for some other motive, it's a mystery why he presented his Paris story under oath to a federal judge in an unrelated case four years ago."

A second source, Ari Ben-Menashe, appeared three times in the first show, highlighted as an Israeli intelligence officer. PBS had reported that "Israeli intelligence officer Ari Ben-Menashe says he was one of half a dozen Israelis sent to Paris at Casey's request to help coordinate arms deliveries" and "Israeli intelligence officer Ari Ben-Menashe claimed that he saw intelligence reports about Casey's trip to Madrid."

After the critiques by Newsweek and the New Republic, including the information that even Mr. Ben-Menashe's wife called him a liar, PBS admitted: "His credibility with reporters collapsed because some of his assertions proved implausible, particularly his claim about George Bush."

In the first show, "Frontline" contemplated the horrible possibility that the Reagan campaign sought to delay the release of the hostages. In the second, they shifted course completely, investigating whether "Republican contacts with Iranians did exist but were intended not to delay a hostage release but to win their release as early as possible."

If "Frontline" had simply stopped at this point, this silly story would be over. But no, there just had to be more to it because the truth—"Frontline" was duped by con artists—just wouldn't do. There must have been another conspiracy going on: The CIA sent out Mr. Brenneke to lie and discredit "October Surprise" investigations!

"The allegation that Brenneke participated in Paris meetings was not at first put forward by Brenneke himself," suggested "Frontline," but by a man calling himself Mr. Razim, otherwise known as Oswald LeWinter. "He claimed that he had been hired by four American intelligence operatives to salt October Surprise allegations with enough false information to discredit the whole story."

"Frontline" went on: "LeWinter refused to say who the four people were who supposedly hired him, nor would he provide any other evidence, so his new story, too, is suspect. Is this then, a deception within a deception? If nothing else, the story of Oswald LeWinter seems to epitomize the strange nature of the riddle called the October Surprise." But it's not at all as puzzling as it would seem: PBS presented a bunch of exposed liars, and nothing they said proved anything about an October Surprise.

I have a better theory: Knowing that PBS served as a haven for leftwing anti-CIA conspiracy theorists, CIA Director William Casey decided to have some fun. He left his calendar bare, so that after his death, PBS documentary producers would embarrass themselves by spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to prove nothing. It worked.

BROADCASTING: WHAT PRICE PBS?

(By Laurence Jarvik)

Could public broadcasting survive in the marketplace without federal subsidy? U.S. Rep. Dick Armey (R-Texas) thinks so. He has introduced a bill to eliminate federal funding for public television. While it might seem hard for regular viewers of desperate pledge-week beg-a-thons to believe, there is strong evidence that Armey is right. Not only is public broadcasting "good for you," it also seems to be a good business proposition. Despite perpetual pleas of poverty, public broadcasting is already a lucrative venture on both a local and national level.

In the most recent commercial development, WGBH has announced a 10 percent investment in a chain of shops called WGBH Learningsmith. The proprietor, Marshall Smith, told the Globe in March: "The products we sell make people feel good about themselves." Among the commercial benefits he mentioned from the public-television connection were "instant credibility," "public relations" and "promotion." Smith has predicted a boom year for his shops.

WGBH already has a retailing contract with Minnesota Public Radio for the Signals mail-order catalog. With its Wireless catalog and other ventures using the public-broadcasting mailing lists and market niche, Minnesota Public Radio's trading company grossed some $77 million last year, selling such items as "She Who Must Be Obeyed" sweatshirts ($25), a sterling silver "Zen Tranquility Ball" ($29) and "Handcrafted Wooden Cats" ($15). Using revenues from this operation, the Minnesota broadcaster recently purchased a commercial radio station for $12 million and converted it to non-commercial status, earning the ire of Minnesota Association of Broadcasters head Jim Wychor, who objected to what he saw as unfair competition for advertisers.

WGBH also reports considerable direct revenues from its activities. In 1989-'90, according to the latest IRS form available, the station earned $69,343,382 from programing grants and contracts alone. It also grossed $1,751,042 from GBH Magazine, $1,345,109 from captioning and related production services, and $1,522,058 from royalties. The WGBH kitty included a stock and bond portfolio worth some $3,540,647 and land, building and investments worth an additional $19,204,773 after depreciation. The tax form also listed a collection of 29 silver spoons worth $2,550 among the station's assets.

BUSINESS BOOMING NATIONALLY

Meanwhile, business is booming on a national level. PBS Home Video, the Videocassette marketing arm of public television, has grossed some $30 million in sales of cassettes distributed by Pacific Arts Video, a private company owned by former Monkee Michael Nesmith. Children's Television Workshop, the parent company for "Sesame Street," has a $58 million stock and bond portfolio which it calls an "endowment," and grosses some $100 million a year in royalty, licensing and subscription revenues on some $1 billion worth of products affiliated with the television program. One division president at CTW earned over $640,000 a year during 1988-'89. In order to handle the formidable worldwide cash flow from its various business ventures, CTW has seven private companies, five of them operating on a for-profit basis. The company spends more than a million dollars a year on lobbying Congress.

In addition to creating multinational conglomerates like CTW, the present public-broadcasting setup has created individual multimillionaires who are adept at using the cross-promotional opportunities afforded by a bureaucratic system impenetrable to all but initiates. Although Bill Moyers, for example, will not disclose the details of his financial arrangements, he has acknowledged raising some $15 million for his private production company, Public Affairs Television, Inc. David Horowitz, head of the public-broadcasting watchdog Committee on Media Integrity, has termed the system used by Moyers and other individual "nonprofiteers" in public broadcasting "reverse money-laundering." In one case, he charged that Moyers had provided his private company with $4 million from the MacArthur Foundation through a process where the funds were cleansed of their nonprofit status through a complicated and perfectly legal series of pass-throughs.

When I wrote to Moyers to check Horowitz's claims about his finances, he answered that his company "is an independently-owned production company—like so many others in the field—and our business affairs are none of your business."

Perhaps Moyers' reluctance to bare his balance sheets is rooted in the commitment of public television to providing a "non-commercial" service. For Moyers and other public-television producers do in fact sell merchandise through 1-800 numbers featured in "book tags," with their distributors often paying a commission to the host station. A commercial sponsor, General Motors, was in large measure responsible for the production of Ken Burns' "The Civil War." A commercial distributor, Time-Life, handles the videocassette market for the series. Yet because of the official status of public broadcasting, such commercial realities must be denied, and market forces are restrained from producing maximum revenues for the system.

Instead, an almost Orwellian Newspeak has developed to cover the existence of what is in reality a black market: Direct-marketing promotions are called "tags," sponsors are called "underwriters," spot advertising dubbed "enhanced underwriting," the network is called a "service" and on-air promotion of profitable products is presented as charity. A glance at any best-seller list reveals the link between exposure on public broadcasting and book sales, for example. To disguise the reality of private profiteering from a public trust, public-broadcasting executive engage in a pattern of institutional stonewalling and even deception—piously claiming to be "noncommercial" while hiding financial documents from the prying eyes of those outside the system.

THE CHANGED TV LANDSCAPE

The reason is straightforward. The original mission of public broadcasting (as defined by the 1967 Carnegie Commission stated that the service would provide "all that is of human interest that is not at the moment appropriate or available for support by advertising and which is not arranged for formal instruction." Such language may have been appropriate for 1967, the era of a mass medium targeted to reach the lowest common denominator with the least objectionable programming. In the network era, perhaps no advertisers were interested in the "high-minded" market offered by public television's demographics.

But with the arrival of the multichannel world of cable, satellite and home video, the television landscape has changed dramatically, and so has the type of programming

advertisers are willing to support. Indeed, among the greatest beneficiaries of the demographic approach to advertising has been public television, whose "halo effect" with the affluent and educated is of great appeal to sponsors.

Despite the lure of the PBS audience to sponsors, and an increase in membership from 2.6 million in 1980 to 5.2 million in 1991, the public broadcasting system has not adopted a free-market approach that would enable it to fulfill its potential. In fact, last year viewing audiences for PBS shows declined by 12 percent. The reason lies in the bureaucratic morass surrounding the public broadcasting system. Decisions are still made in a style described by independent documentary filmmaker Fred Wiseman in 1988 congressional testimony as "a mess." Adding "there is a wide consensus on the failure of the present system," he suggested that public television be reformed along the lines of Britain's Channel Four—a private commercial channel devoted to quality programming. Wiseman noted with alarm that "most competent professionals would not consider working in public television in its present form."

Since Wiseman's testimony, public television has gone from bad to worse. The scandal-marred Independent Television Service, allocated $24 million, has not produced one minute of programming in almost four years of existence—despite spending over $1,500,000 on overhead and administrative expenses, including $100,000 on travel alone. A grant from the Markle Foundation for election coverage was withdrawn and given instead to CNN. Texaco announced it would sponsor a new performing arts series on the Bravo cable channel, and then dropped its support for "Great Performances." Ted Turner outbid PPS for David Attenborough's nature series "The Trials of Life." Summing up the dismal record of PBS, Entertainment Weekly's Ken Tucker savaged the "dreary old series and banal new offerings" in a recent article headlined "Has PBS Lost Its Edge?"

WILL 'PRIVATIZING' WORK?

The best way for public broadcasting to regain its edge is to shake free of the stranglehold exerted by those politicians in control of congressional purse strings, Democrat and Republican alike. So long as Congress pays the bills for public television, it will be tempted to interfere with what is produced and broadcast. Hodding Carter once described public broadcasting "as the perfect American screwed-up system, combining the worst of both worlds—bureaucratic Washington and opportunistic capitalism."

There is a better way. Public television could be owned by its viewers. Instead of making donations, contributors could be making investments, buying stock in a company and participating to the fullest extent possible in corporate management. As a publicly-held company with its capital raised from markets instead of the American taxpayer, public broadcasting would enjoy truly insulated funding, free of congressional strings. It couldn't be held hostage to special-interest groups every time it needed reauthorization. No outraged senators would use their privileges to embarrass highly paid producers, stars or station executives. Liberated from the strings attached to tax dollars, the viewers of public television could directly support cultural and educational programming, taking a tax deduction for business losses and sharing in the success of profitable programming.

Is such a transformation possible? Indeed, it is. Privatization of broadcasting has worked in Italy, Spain, France and England. It is spreading to the formerly socialist states of eastern Europe, even to the former Soviet Union itself. It is time to give market forces a chance to work in American public television.

[From Media Research Center]

"LISTENING TO AMERICA" OR THE DEMOCRATS?

(By Tim Graham)

The first two segments of Bill Moyers' election year series, based on a Philadelphia Inquirer report "America: What Went Wrong?" have already tilted in a predictable direction. The original Inquirer series, by reporters Donald Barlett and James Steele, ran in nine parts last fall to the delight of Democrats, who waved the newspapers from the House floor and proclaimed the report proof of their indictment of the economic policies of the Reagan years. Bill Clinton held up the paperback book of the Inquirer series during a recent speech at the Wharton School of Business to illustrate the same claim.

The bias which permeates the Inquirer series, is first evident in its focus on laid-off blue-collar workers, a bias which the Moyers' program faithfully repeats. The most urgent question for Barlett and Steele, by their own account is "What happens to the people who lost their jobs?" This is a question that is old hat for Moyers, who loaded a one-sided CBS documentary, called "People Like Us," full of Reagan budget victims back in 1982, the year before the Reagan boom took off.

"Asking a laid-off factory worker what's wrong with America is like asking a typhoon victim how he feels about nature," observed Philadelphia Magazine writer Paul Keegan in one of the rare critiques of the Inquirer approach." The unstated theme of the [Inquirer] series is that the market, left unfettered by the government, does horrible things to people."

But the problem with both the Inquirer and Moyers' series goes much deeper than the angle of entry. In between the unemployment vignettes, Moyers reprises statistics from the Inquirer that have sent many professional economists climbing the walls. For example: "During the 1980s, the combined salaries of people in the $20,000 to $50,000 income group increased 44 percent, and the combined salaries of people earning $1 million or more a year increased 2.184 percent."

How did Moyers and his sources arrive at that enormous 2.184 percent gain? By ignoring the textbook rules for compiling statistics. First, no adjustment is made for inflation. Second, by never mentioning that the number of people making more than $1 million increased from 3,000 in 1980 to 51,000 in 1990. Now, clearly if you add 48,000 millionaires to the pool, the total amount of money made by millionaires is going to rise a little. But the chart misleads people by making them think that a static number of millionaires made an enormous killing.

Third, Barlett and Steele claimed that this pool of money came only from salaries, not other forms of taxable income like interest, dividends, or capital gains. But to arrive at their pool of 51,000 millionaires, they did count all adjusted gross income, making the chart statistically shoddy.

In the first Moyers program, Barlett explained their method: "I think one of things that we do, which even a lot of economists don't do, is that we base so many of the statistics, so much of the data we used in the series on tax data not, in fact, census data." This admission defines the liberal bias of the reporters and thus of the Moyers program. The Democrat-appointed Congressional Budget Office prefers IRS tax data over Census data because they provide more stilted look at the differences between rich and poor. How? For tax purposes, the IRS currently does not index capital gains for inflation and does not count any capital loss over $3,000. Both practices inaccurately inflate the income of the richest Americans, providing statistics to fuel the politics of envy.

Bartlett went on to tell Moyers: "To our way of thinking, so much of the tax data is more accurate than the Census data because when you're filling out your tax return, you're much more likely * * * to be accurate on that." Would the average American believe that everyone strives to be accurate on their tax forms? At least when you fill out Census forms, there isn't money in it for you. One of the reasons the IRS data shows an explosion of millionaires is that the 1981 and 1986 tax reforms made it more profitable to simply pay taxes than pay accountants to avoid taxes. But neither Moyers, nor Bartlett and Steele mention inconvenient facts like the increase in total taxes and tax burden paid by the rich in the last decade.

Of course statistics, however arrived at, appear to be facts, especially when "backed up" by photographic images. TV critics, like the Boston Globe's Ed Siegal, were duly impressed: Moyers and his colleagues throw statistic after example after interview to back up claims that become nearly irrefutable by the weight of the evidence."

Sometimes Moyers didn't even rely on faulty statistics, substituting unsubstantiated assertions instead. At one point, he acknowledged that "there were a lot of new jobs created in the 1980s" but found a way to make that seem like nothing. "One of the last things President Reagan did in office was to send a letter to Congress reporting that nearly 19 million non-agricultural jobs were created during his administration, that over 90 percent of them were full-time jobs and over 85 percent of those were in occupations in which average annual salaries exceeded $20,000. Fact is, the job growth was centered in the retail and service sectors, which pay the lowest wages."

In other words, "The sky is blue. Fact is, it's green." Fact is, the White House was using official Department of Labor statistics in establishing the number of new jobs. Moyers was simply asserting an interpretation of the statistic without bothering to link it to any evidence.

We may fruitlessly wait for more balance to appear in the "Listening to America" series as the election year winds on, but like nearly every other Moyers project, there's merchandising to be done. The paperback version of America: What Went Wrong? is currently at the top of the best-seller list, despite the occasional critic like Paul Keegan, who wrote: "Their series is so fundamentally flawed, its intellectual underpinnings so weak, that it actually says little about what went wrong with America, and everything about what went wrong with Bartlett and Steele." That goes double for the Moyers series, which only take a maudlin, mostly anecdotal newspaper report and adds television's power of pathos and illusion of reality to make its case. Moyers isn't listening to America, he's talking at America, and giving them only one side of the story.

[From Media Watch, April 1991]

ADDRESS DISMISSES CONSERVATIVES, IRAQ WAR VICTORY: BILL MOYERS ROOTS FOR DEMOCRATS

PBS omnipresence Bill Moyers' address to the Democratic Issues Conference should put

to rest any idea that he is just an independent journalist. He told the March 8 gathering; "I left partisanship behind when I left the [Johnson] White House in 1967 for journalism, but my roots are all tangled with yours. Down there in Texas I was raised on mother's milk and Roosevelt speeches and over the years I still cherish the party's defining stands."

The House Democrats asked Moyers to advise them on their mistakes and how best to attract votes. "By the 1980s," declared Moyers the advocate, "when the Democrats in Congress colluded with Ronald Reagan and the Republicans to revise the tax code on behalf of the rich, it appeared that the party had lost its soul." In another slap at a conservative policy Moyers complained: "We spend four times as much on the Strategic Defense Initiative, Star Wars, than we do on the early education program Head Start, which works." Continuing in the Democratic spirit, Moyers asserted: "I know Ronald Reagan thumped his chest about rugged individuals and the self-made man. But Ronald Reagan was a movie, not a man, and I'm talking about real life."

"For ten years now the other party has embraced the notion that war is the health of the state. But in the long run, I dare say, the future belongs to the party that knows the health of the people precedes the health of the state," Moyers argued. There is "a hunger" for such a vision, otherwise, he condescendingly explained, "we would not be investing so much transcendental significance in a triumph of overwhelming technology and unchallenged power over a country no bigger than Texas and with roughly the same amount of people, ruled over by a paranoid psychopath, who proved to be just a video tiger, all growl and no guts."

[From National Review, Apr. 13, 1992]

PBS'S ENEMIES LIST

Any PBS viewer or NPR listener knows that scare tactics are a favorite angle for pledgeweek beg-a-thons. This mendicant approach has been a successful one for public broadcasters. In 1980 there were 2.6 million contributors, and the annual budget for the system was $580 million. Some ten years later, public broadcasting spends $1.2 billion annually and boasts 5.2 million contributors. And these are among the best-heeled television viewers in the United States. For example, one in three contributors to Washington's WETA has a wine cellar.

Yet despite its obvious financial success, public broadcasting successfully presents a public image of perpetual crisis. The latest development has been to use the Senate debate over the fairness, balance, and fiscal management of the system as a fund-raising tool.

Station KCRW in Santa Monica, California—among the richest public radio stations in the United States—has raised some three-quarters of a million dollars by airing round-the-clock bulletins about a "cabal" of Republicans headed by Minority Leader Bob Dole. Not since Orson Welles's broadcast of War of the Worlds has radio been used to stir up such baseless anxiety.

The basis for KCRW's alarmism is found in a memo from the president of the Association of America's Public Television Stations to all station managers, congressional liaisons, public-information directors, and development (i.e., fund-raising) directors. The memo asked public broadcasters to "get so much political clout brought to bear on the Congress" and to point out that "our support comes from all elements of society (including contributors to congressional political campaigns) * * *" It concluded ominously: "This will be a long battle."

A battle against whom? The memo included a handy "enemies list." Named were seven senators (Dole, Craig, Nickles, Wallop, Smith, Lott, and Helms), two representatives (Armey and Crane), four publications (National Review, the Washington Times, Mediawatch, and COMINT), and several organizations (the Scaife Trusts, the Bradley, Olin, and Fieldstead Foundations, the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, the Center for Media and Public Affairs, the Media Research Center, Accuracy in Media, and the Heritage Foundation). The list also included the names of marked individuals (David Horowitz, Richard Brookhiser, Robert Lichter, L. Brent Bozell, Reed Irvine, Larry Jarvik, Frank Shakespeare, and William Simon). What these all had in common, according to the memo, was that they were "conservative." The clear implication was that this was a dangerous situation. This was emphasized by references to the fact that the people and organizations are "interlocked"—as indeed are the sender and recipients of the memo.

Although designed to create the impression of an octopus-like conspiracy, the list seems to be nothing more than a grab bag of the letterheads of organizations the public broadcasters dislike and foundations which support them. But the conspiracy theory behind the enemies list reveals a disturbing attitude toward both the responsibilities of broadcasting and the obligations of PBS fully to represent the American public—which after all includes conservatives.

THE "ENEMIES LIST"

To: Station Managers, Congressional Liaisons, Public Information Directors, Development Directors.
Fr: David Brugger, APTS.
Dt: March 4, 1992.
Re: Senate HOLD on CPB's Reauthorization.

WHEN WILL IT END?

A few stations are already wondering if we are crying wolf on the need to use political capital to gain a favorable Senate vote and going to the well (our supporters) too often.

Yesterday's debate was just the beginning and assuming the bill passes the Senate today, the fight is joined.

It is our belief that this hold is just a step in an effort by very conservative organizations to cover public broadcasting by impugning motives or programming and placing us in a defensive posture, which like they feel they have successfully done to the arts endowment.

From a report in the latest "Public Broadcasting Report", the conservative organizations, their funders, their media and the principals are interlocked and include COMINT (David Horowitz, Richard Brookhiser), Scaife Trusts, the Bradley, Olin and Fieldstead Foundations, Center for Study of Popular Culture, National Forum Foundation, Center for Media and Public Affairs (Robert Richter), Media Research Center (L. Brent Bozell), Accuracy in Media (Reed Irvine), Heritage Foundation (Larry Jarvik, Frank Shakespeare, William Simon), The National Review, The Washington Times, and Mediawatch. They also fund PTV programs that provide access for their point of view.

WHAT'S THE LONG-TERM ISSUE?

The issue is federal government influence over programming. The amendments being offered by the conservatives involve reporting requirements on CPB, PES, NPR and stations for programs funded by source of funds, and for program descriptions. They will also attempt to do as much as possible to make CPB a Federal agency for a variety of purposes.

Aside from the obvious burden on stations, these measures would set up a future attempt to micromanage our business.

SO WHAT DO WE DO?

That so much political clout brought to bear on the Congress that there is no doubt that Public Broadcasting is not like the arts endowment, that our base of support is as broad as our range of programs; that our support comes from all elements of society (including contributors to congressional political campaigns); that the American people do not want a government controlled channel but do want public broadcasting services.

This will be a long battle. Even if the CPB bill passes, the conservatives will be persistent. Their friends in the House who have introduced bills to stop all funding for public broadcasting (Reps. Armey (TX) and Crane (IL)) and the Senators who had the holds on the bill (Sens. Dole (KS), Craig (ID), Nichols (OK), Wallop (WY), Smith (NH), Lott, (MS), Helms (NC)) will continue to use the misinformation being provided by the above conservative organizations to wear down our supporters.

We are not crying wolf and would not be asking you to go to your supporters if we did not think we needed to do so. There may well come a time when you will have to go more directly to your subscribers and other local supporters, especially if we are not convincing with whatever third party influentials you are now using to make your case.

Do not discourage any expression of support, even if the vote has occurred. This particular vote is the beginning, not the end. We must make an indelible impression on the Congress of the depth of our support.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, how much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed all of his time on the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will be offering the amendment as soon as the managers return to the floor. I will wait until Senator INOUYE and Senator STEVENS are on the floor.

Again I would just say that I certainly respect those who have different views. I am not quarreling with any individual, any personality except I have been around long enough to understand when one side has been flimflammed for about 25 years, somebody ought to stand up and say "Hold it. Time out." What about fair play in America? Everybody believes in fair play in America. What about fair play? That word has never been used on a Bill Moyers program or some of the other propaganda shows we have heard, whether it is Frontline or whatever it is. So fair play; fair play. We demand it here in the Senate of the United States. We think we demand it or at least ask for it in everything else we do.

When you talk about finding out what is going on in this big bureaucratic network funded by millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars, you hit a stone wall. It is none of your business,

in effect. Do not tell. Damn the taxpayer, damn the Senate, everything.

So I would suggest, I think the American people, if they understood the realities—it is not going to be understood this time around—but there will be an appropriation bill and I assume when this bill goes on to the House they will try to take everything, the little things that we do to try to provide some balance. They will try to kick all of those out and we will be right back where we were. But that will not be the end.

So it just seems to me, if we can focus on accountability and balance, we still will have what I think the original sponsors hoped they would have in 1967, back in the days of educational television.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIEBERMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased that both sides of the aisle have finally reached an agreement enabling us to proceed to a constructive debate and eventually the passage of this bill which reauthorizes the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I have spoken of my support more than once on the floor of the Senate for the outstanding cultural and educational entertainment which public broadcasting stations provide to thousands of viewers each year and I wish to do so once again today.

During the time between last March when the Senate first took up the debate on S. 1504, and today, many an editorial page—from the Washington Post to the Spokesman Review in Spokane, WA—have run contrasting opinions debating whether the Corporation for Public Broadcasting should be financed, in part, by the Federal Government. Both sides of the debate agree, for the most part, that CPB provides first-rate programming. The agreement, for many, stops here.

Proponents of reduced funding or the abolition of funding put forward two basic arguments. First, Government support represents only 17 percent of CPB's total budget and clearly, they argue, the volume of private and corporate donations could easily make up for the Government-funded portion of its budget. Second, each Member of this Chamber is cognizant of the budget deficit which looms before this Nation. It is becoming increasingly more and more difficult to explain funding priorities to our constituents. How can we, in light of the many spending priorities which we have as a nation, rationalize spending $1.1 billion over the next 4 years on television.

While these arguments are only two of the many put forward by opponents of this bill, proponents of Federal funding of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—this Senator included—believe that funding for CPB is not another example of frivolous and wasteful Government spending.

I challenge opponents of this legislation to tell the students in Yakima, WA, that innovative satellite hookups with the University of Washington providing advanced mathematics instruction and courses in foreign language are not a worthwhile investment of Federal funds. The students and their parents will argue, as will their future employers, that funding for public broadcasting is an investment which the Government needs to continue because, in the case of Yakima area schools, PBS programming extends educational opportunities, which, when put into practice further down the road, will spell jobs and economic opportunities for many Yakima area young people.

Each of us in this Chamber today is familiar with the innovative and diverse programming alternatives that public broadcasting provides. I have spoken previously about the need for balanced programming selections to be made available to viewers and I reiterate this point today. I believe that the Stevens amendment, on balance, will help to ensure a strong, equitable distribution of programming, airing both sides of the many controversial issues of our times.

Public broadcasting provides countless hours of both cultural and educational entertainment for thousands of citizens across our Nation. And, although this Senator realizes all too well that Congress should limit spending, the high rate of return on the Government's small investment in CPB makes it, quite simply, one of the few Government-funded entities which, for the most part, the Congress and the American public agree upon as money well spent.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Public Radio and Television Broadcasting Act.

While some Members of Congress and some in the news media highlight one or two programs in order to exploit what—in their view—is wrong with public television and America today, I want to take just a moment to tell my colleagues about some of the very best public television has to offer, and some of the very best that is planned for the coming months.

Shows such as "Frontline" and the "MacNeil/Lehrer News-Hour" or "All Things Considered" are shining examples of insightful and meaningful public television and radio. But public television and public radio are more than just politics and public affairs.

Many public television stations, Mr. President, such as WYES in New Orleans, LA, WLPB in Baton Rouge, LA, and WETA, the flagship station here in Washington, DC spend up to one-third, and sometimes more, of their air-time on children's programs, such as "Sesame Street" and numerous others designed to educate and enlighten children. And many more hours are spent on prime-time performance and entertainment programming of remarkable quality.

The series titled "In Performance at the White House" opened the White House and the first family to millions of Americans—to visit the Carters, the Reagans, and even the Bush's. Through this entertaining series, Americans saw the musical tastes of our presidents reflected in first-rate talent, as stars such a Vladimir Horowitz, Andres Segovia, Gene Kelly, Merle Haggard, Dizzie Gillespie, Liza Minelli, John Denver, and many others performed from the East Room at the White House.

For years WETA has brought us two major concerts performed by the National Symphony on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol and broadcast nationwide over the public broadcasting system. I am telling my colleague, Mr. President, that if we did not already have public radio and television, we'd have to invent it!

A vivid series produced last year by Ken Burns, an independent television producer, reopened America's eyes to the hurt, pains, and growth of a nation confronted by its biggest challenge since its founding, as the letters and images of the Civil War came to life on public television. That epic series won critical acclaim from many, including the Senator, and could not have been produced without the commitment by this Congress and many others to quality public television and radio programming.

Public radio has captured the imagination and loyal following of millions of listeners with "Morning Edition," "Marketplace," Fresh Air," and "Car Talk," to Name a Few Examples of its excellent array of programming.

So, Mr. President, these are just some of the many productions and performances already assembled by public television and radio. Congress should be justly proud of its role in supporting these forms of education and enrichment in the lives of the American people. But if these achievements are not enough, let me give a preview of some quality programs that are coming soon to a public TV channel near each of you.

To my friends who hail from the great expanse in this country known as the West, you can look forward to a series that explores the rugged transformation of the West—from the first Indian settlements, to initial European encounters, to turn-of-the-century glo-

rification by craftsmen and legend builders. The producers promise personal insights and storytelling, gathered from diaries of cowpunchers, missionaries, and homesteaders, combined with the spectacular beauty that comes from all the West has to offer. From the rugged Plains to the Rocky Mountains, from the Lone Star State to the Arizona desert and the California coast, from the Pacific Northwest to Alaska and Hawaii—this series, Mr. President, will tell an important story with a wide range of viewpoints.

Another interesting production being planned is the story of transportation. This series—titled appropriately "Coming and Going"—deals with one of our most basic and fundamental industries, which is largely ignored by much of our mass media. This series promises a hard look into potential solutions for our Nation's present and future infrastructure and transportation challenges.

Still another series addresses America's future role in the world economic marketplace. With Europe uniting and the cold war consigned to history, our future rests on our ability to deal with current domestic problems, and our ability to compete in a global economy. This series, "Challenge to America," will examine tough choices facing postelection America in 1993, including our Nation's capabilities in business, science, worker training, and capital formation, measured against models in Japan and Germany. The goal of the series is to analyze problems and offer positive strategies to solve them.

America's public television and radio programming has become a model, in fact a paragon, Mr. President, of the kind of public telecommunications that Americans have a right to expect as a fulfillment of their first amendment legacy. If we didn't already have it, we should have to invent it. We should continue to provide incentives for the development of quality programming, including that offered by independent producers.

Finally, I have saved the best upcoming public television programming for last. A major and exciting work is underway to write the history of jazz. And nowhere is the story told more forcefully and eloquently every day and every night than in the crown-jewel city of Louisiana, the grand city New Orleans.

The first part of the series will be titled "The Swing Years," and will recreate the flavor and excitement of the 1930's and 1940's for the millions who lived it. And for the younger generations, it will introduce them to the magic of hot southern jazz mixed with big city sophistication.

This toe-tapping series will include two more productions of three to four programs each, titled "The Early Years" and "Bebop and Beyond." They will trace jazz from its 19th century roots to its present legends and entertainers.

Mr. President, it was reported recently that one-third of students in grades 4 to 8 do not read—they watch television: on the average, 6 hours a day. If they are going to watch television, and we cannot stop them, then let's put quality programs on the air worth watching, and not leave all their choices to the lowest common denominator in the marketplace.

I happen to be a fan of jazz. I also am a fan of public television and radio. And as I have mentioned, jazz is just one of the many subjects that only the public communications mediums are willing to tackle.

The kind of television and radio I am talking about, Mr. President, is not just a pleasant addition to the quality of our lives; public radio and television are essential if we are to become, as Abraham Lincoln said so eloquently, "the better angels of our nature." If we did not already have the programming of public radio and television, we should be required to pursue its invention, Mr. President.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Senator DANIEL INOUYE. This legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, authorizes appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB], which has fostered the growth of public television and radio. Since 1967, when the Public Broadcasting Act was enacted, CPB has provided our Nation's citizens with invaluable educational, informational, and cultural programming. It has maintained a commitment to linking the need of American business to have a competitive, well-educated workforce with the ability of public telecommunications to develop and deliver high-quality, low-cost educational materials to students anywhere in the United States.

In signing the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, President Lyndon Johnson made the following comments, which clearly articulate the historical significance of public broadcasting in this country:

> While we work every day to produce new goods and to create new wealth, we want most of all to enrich man's spirit. That is the purpose of [The Public Broadcasting Act]. It will give a wider and, I think, stronger voice to educational radio and television by providing funds for broadcast facilities. It will launch a major study of television's use in the Nation's classroom and its potential use throughout the world.

Finally, and most important, it builds a new institution; the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This Corporation will assist stations and producers who aim for the best in broadcasting; good music, exciting plays, and broadcasting reports on the whole fascinating range of human activity. It will try to prove that education can also be exciting.

> So today we rededicate a part of the airwaves—which belong to all the people—and we dedicate them for the enlightenment of all the people. I believe that the time has come to stake another claim in the name of all the people, stake a claim based upon the combined resources of communications. I believe the time has come to enlist the computer and the satellite, as well as television and radio, and to enlist them in the cause of education.

Mr. President, these words are as relevant now as they were 25 years ago. CPB's mission, now as in 1967, is to facilitate the growth of the Public Broadcasting System and the development of quality programming that addresses the needs of the American public, particularly its educational needs. By authorizing appropriations to support public broadcasting, we can bring education equity to those citizens who are currently not receiving the best that our educational system has to offer.

Our country faces no greater need or challenge than improving education and upgrading our workforce. Educating and informing the public has been the ultimate objective of each of the activities undertaken by CPB since its inception. We must continue to support this effort.

CPB supports a variety of programs to fulfill its mission—general audience programs, children's programs, instructional television for grade schools and high schools, telecourses for colleges, in-service training for teachers, and outreach in local communities.

In my home State of Texas, public television plays a vita role in the educational process. In some of the poorest areas of Texas, public television has taken a front and center role in trying to enhance the quality of life for our people. In the Rio Grande Valley, reading and language skills, as measured by standardized national tests, are far below the national average. One public television station in Harlingen, TX, KMBH–TV, went to the local school board to offer its assistance in addressing this problem. Subsequently, a local partnership with local school districts in the area was developed to provide hundreds of educational and instructional programs to over 80,000 students in south Texas. The station also established a daily afterschool program to assist youngsters in improving their reading skills while they await their parent's arrival home from work.

KLRU–TV in Austin, TX, offers over 100 instructional television series to area K–12 teachers during each school year, thereby reaching over 100,000 public and private school children. The station provides educators with print and utilization training support with its subscription-based service. KLRU is also a potential site for the CPB-supported 1992–93 teacher training institute which trains teachers to use emerging teaching technologies effectively.

KERA–TV in Dallas, TX, has sponsored an outreach program to instruct child care providers on the use of "Sesame Street" to teach preschool-aged children. Furthermore, KLRN–TV in San Antonio has consistently provided a variety of innovative programs aimed at helping children improve their academic skills.

Public radio also plays an important role in providing services to local communities. Public radio stations in Texas provide educational, informational and cultural programming that commercial radio stations usually do not provide. Notably, public radio is often the main source of comprehensive local and national news for local communities.

Generally, CPB offers a variety of programming to address our Nation's educational needs. Consider the following.

Instructional programs make up 65 percent of the daily public television schedule and, with that service, 29 million students are provided access to high-quality educational materials in vital subjects such as reading, mathematics and sciences.

Over the years, CPB has helped to fund the creation of video- and audio-based college courses and the demonstration of advanced technologies for use in education such as computers, laser discs, communications networks, and interactive video which are now available to faculty and students.

To encourage teachers to make the most of available programming by linking material in textbooks to instructional programs that cover the same topics, CPB has published correlations to science textbooks for series such as "Up Close and Natural" and "Community of Living Things." CPB funds teacher's guides for all major children's series such as "3–2–1 Contact" and "Square One TV." These guides help build lesson plans and provide followup activities for teachers to use in the classroom.

CPB has also funded Edison—educational information services online—an advanced nationwide computer network that connects teachers with a number of information databases. This database network allows teachers to research educational materials, review new material, and see which of the hundreds of instructional television series currently available can be incorporated into their lesson plans.

Another CPB project is "Learning Link." Developed by WNET/New York, Learning Link provides public television program descriptions, long-range schedules, and an avenue for exchanging teaching tips.

CPB also provides funding for the Independent Television Service [ITVS], which was mandated on a bipartisan basis by Congress in 1988 to "address the needs of unserved and underserved audiences, particularly children and minorities." Since it was established, ITVS has sought to fulfill its mission by soliciting proposals from independent filmmakers, providing funding and other support necessary to develop the proposals, and ultimately making them available for free broadcast on the Nation's public television stations. No ITVS-supported programs have been aired as yet, because initial grants awards were not made until this past December. However, I expect that several programs will begin to appear on broadcast schedules in Texas and nationwide next year.

I stated in my additional views to the committee report on the Public Telecommunications Act of 1988 that: "Our Public Broadcasting System has the unique ability to provide educational and instructional programming directly to the home and to supplement the information provided to our schools and universities as well." It is imperative that we continue our commitment to public broadcasting so that all Americans today can continue to be inspired by and to learn through this powerful and important resource. The quality of life for all Americans will be vastly improved for generations to come if we devote sufficient time and resources to developing the educational process.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the important legislation before us today.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, some incorrect assumptions have been made about my position on the reauthorization legislation for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I want to set the record straight; I am not here to kill Big Bird. Like many others, I have concerns that some of the programming CPB funds has been overly political, and have asked the appropriate officials to strive for greater balance in the future. But I have no plans to terminate Federal funding.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting has an important function; it serves as the national organization, promoting the development of public radio and television broadcasting and nonbroadcast telecommunications technology in the United States. Its mandate is to provide high quality educational, informational, and cultural programming for all Americans. I am supportive of the CPB, and of this mandate. In carrying out its mandate, CPB has played an important role in the development of rural America, providing a source of information and programming that is entertaining and educational.

My concern about this legislation is not the value of the CPB. What I do question is the level of increased funding that this legislation would authorize. I have seen figures ranging from 39 percent to approximately 50 percent. Neither of these levels is acceptable. At a time when this Nation is facing a budget deficit of well over $300 billion, it is unreasonable to consider providing any program an increase of this level.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting says its request for a 39 percent increase is necessary to expand its role in developing and broadcasting educational programming. This is an admirable goal, and one I support. Indeed, for too long, Congress has gotten away with being able to fund nearly anything anybody wanted. No priorities had to be set; no hard choices made. However, if CPB chooses this to be the focus of its efforts, then it should set some priorities within its current budget to reflect that desire.

The Government is not an endless well of money. Many good ideas surface all the time, and we'd like to be able to fund all of them. However, we simply cannot afford that kind of funding philosophy today.

The typical American family has to set spending priorities, and so should the Congress. In this time of $300-plus billion budget deficits and trillions of dollars worth of national debt, we must make those tough choices.

That is why I am here to support my colleague, Mr. LOTT. His amendment would authorize $825 million for the CPB, which equals $275 million per year over the next 3 years. This amendment is being portrayed as a spending freeze. However, when you compare it with the levels of funding that were appropriated over the last 3 years, it equals an increase of 4 percent in funding. This is still a more fiscally responsible approach than the requested increase.

I hope that my colleagues share my desire to get the budget deficit under control and will support amending this legislation to provide for a more reasonable level of increase. With a budget deficit of well over $300 billion, we should not be passing legislation authorizing a 39-percent increase for any program.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the past 25 years, public broadcasting has continued to demonstrate its importance and value to the lives of Americans, and it deserves continued Federal support.

At their best, public radio and TV are unique democratic institutions that offer a vital meeting place for Americans from all walks of life. Through hundreds of public radio and television stations across the country, Americans have unparalleled access to a vital source of information, enlightenment, and enrichment.

The quality and diversity of programming available on public broadcasting stations across this country are unmatched. These programs touch the lives of over 87 million viewers each week. More than 1 million Utahns watch and listen to public television and radio each week. For many Utahns and others throughout the country in small, rural towns, public broadcasting

is their only link with the very best in music, dance, and drama. Public radio has targeted any funding increase to expand its services to rural and underserved audiences.

But public broadcasting is more than television and radio worth watching and hearing. It is a vital part of the quality of life in local communities, serving area businesses, schools, and colleges.

Public television has long been an essential educational resource to communities across America. More than 344,000 hours of instructional and educational programs are distributed by public television to homes, schools, and universities each year. In Utah, more than 250,000 schoolchildren receive instruction each week through Utah's public television stations. This year, three of Utah's public broadcasters are combining their resources to raise awareness of how parents can become more involved in their children's education.

At a time when an investment in educating our youth is imperative, public television is planning to expand its educational activities in support of a national agenda articulated by this Congress and the administration.

Public broadcasting provides a valuable service to Americans and to Utahns, who feel so strongly about its role in their communities that they help to support it. In Utah alone, more than 50,000 people support their public television and radio stations with an annual gift. Few other organizations enjoy such broad public support.

For every dollar the Federal Government gives to public broadcasting, the stations raise over 6 from non-Federal sources. Clearly, Federal funds spent on public broadcasting are a modest investment given the return Americans receive.

It is understandable that there are concerns about a few of the programs on public radio and television. Once in a while, there will be something that one of us does not like. I have been irritated by a few programs myself. However, we must keep in mind that the programs we find to be controversial represent a very small percentage of overall programming.

To deny funding on the basis of these few programs and some of our personal likes and dislikes would be a disservice to our constituents who have come to depend on public broadcasting as a healthy forum for unfettered public discourse, a marketplace of differing ideas and viewpoints, and a voice for tolerance and understanding. We cannot overlook the significant contribution that public broadcasting has made and will continue to make for this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support the pending bill and the constructive compromises that have been achieved in recent weeks, and I urge the Senate to approve this important measure.

Unfortunately, the campaign against the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has been full of distortion and disinformation. But in the weeks since the bill first came before the Senate in February, the unwarranted attacks have been effectively rebutted, and the bill can move forward with its basic programs and essential mission intact.

This is a Federal program that works, that has worked well, and that has made significant contributions to our heritage and to our understanding of our history. Enactment of this legislation will help to ensure that it continues to do so in the future.

The CPB is an exceptional enterprise, and every American with a television set knows that. WGBH in Massachusetts is an outstanding example of educational and cultural broadcasting. It is one of the Nation's finest public broadcasting stations. It is well supported by its viewers through private contributions, in addition to the public support which it receives and deserves.

Large numbers of families in communities across the country have come to rely on public broadcasting for its worthwhile educational programming, especially for the imaginative way it can help prepare children for the experience of school. A generation of children have grown up watching "Sesame Street" and "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood." The classic, "Anne of Green Gables," has enduring appeal. And other newer programs such as "Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego," an impressive adventure in geography produced jointly by WGBH and by WQED in Pittsburgh, are making clear that young viewers will watch interesting and educational programs, if they are presented well and in an entertaining way, and most of all, if they are available.

Some of the most critically acclaimed television documentaries in recent years have been presented through the CPB, including the brilliant series of the Civil War and the extraordinary history of the civil rights movement, "Eyes on the Prize." Many Americans who cannot afford to travel have been able to watch performances of the Metropolitan Opera, Lincoln Center and American Playhouse Theatre.

These and many other programs should continue to be available to as wide an audience as possible. CPB should, be commended for the diversity, the depth, and the quality of its presentations, not condemned and castigated on the basis of some false notion of ideological balance or political correctness.

In too many debates in the Senate in recent years on the creative arts, the principles of diversity, perspective and artistic freedom have been lost. Hopefully, through this debate and the constructive legislation we are about to enact, we have begun to fight back, and recoup some of the lost ground. The Senate is an unlikely and unsatisfactory censor, and we should not be pursuing that dead-end path.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991, which provides for increased funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB].

As many of my colleagues know, 25 years ago I served as a member of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television which created the original blueprint for educational television resulting in the creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Over the years, I have been tremendously pleased by the success of the CPB and by the high-quality programming that public broadcasting has offered to Americans.

I firmly believe that public broadcasting's success lies in its continuing efforts to seek new challenges, and in particular I have always been particularly impressed by CPB and public broadcasting's continuing work to create and implement innovative education projects.

Public broadcasting funds are used heavily to support formal educational efforts. For example, in my State of North Carolina alone CPB funds are being used to help more than 2,600 adults work towards a college degree by taking courses through North Carolina Public Television. In addition, the University of North Carolina Center for Public Television expects more than 5,000 young persons to participate in this summer's Reading Rainbow Club which encourages beginning readers during the summer months.

Across the country, CPB and public broadcasting have helped to provide Americans of all ages with important tools to develop their educational skills. From preschoolers who are absorbing the building blocks of learning through programs like "Sesame Street" to adults who are enhancing their education as well as human potential through literacy training, people across the United States are using public broadcasting programming to engage in lifelong learning.

Through the Public Telecommunications Act, CPB aspires to strengthen the educational focus of public broadcasting which has been so successful in the past. As a Member of the body that created CPB and as a former educator, I believe this bill wisely allocates Federal resources to assist CPB to meet today's challenge of improving education at all levels.

This legislation is designed to expand significantly the role of public broadcasting in developing and delivering new educational programs and services. For example, the bill's reauthorization levels would allow CPB to direct funding toward a variety of projects includ-

ing programs that train childcare providers in preschool education; programs that teach preschoolers learning and social skills; and programs that train teachers and educators to use educational telecommunications technologies.

Some of my colleagues believe we should cut back our spending on public broadcasting and the educational programming it provides. However, the increased funding levels included in this bill are almost entirely earmarked for specific projects to improve education. We cannot afford as a country to let education slide, and Congress must support CPB's efforts to expand public broadcasting's powerful role in teaching.

Public broadcasting allows the Federal Government to assist State and local governments in education in a very real way, and Congress must promote CPB's outstanding and cost-efficient efforts to expand public broadcasting's powerful role in teaching.

Each day, we are made more and more painfully aware of the despair of inner-city youth and the desperate needs of our young people across the country. Increasing educational opportunities through public broadcasting is a wise investment in their future and the future of our entire country.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to share my strong support for public broadcasting, and I urge by colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at full funding levels.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support this bill. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, created in 1967, already has compiled an impressive history of bringing quality radio and television programming to all Americans. Most of us are familiar with public broadcasting through such television shows as "Sesame Street," "The MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour," and "The Civil War." Public broadcasting, however, brings into our homes a whole world of diverse programming including Project Literacy, the Descriptive Video Service for the blind and satellite-transmitted distance learning programs.

Some of my colleagues have argued that public broadcasting is a luxury our Nation can ill afford. I disagree. The vast majority of funding for public broadcasting comes from private sources—only about 16 percent of total funding comes from Congress. We need to scrutinize our spending priorities as the budget deficit continues to grow. But I do not agree that the richest nation in the world cannot spend a very small portion of its resources on one program that brings us together by bringing us history, education, and culture. It's a program that works, and it deserves our support.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 1504, the Telecommunications Act of 1991. While many of the programs which appear on public television are both educational and entertaining, our current budgetary constraints do not justify spending 1.1 billion taxpayer dollars for this purpose.

The debate on this issue has been intriguing. Proponents have done a masterful public relations job, turning the issue of funding for public broadcasting into a referendum on free speech. It's not. The issue is a referendum on leadership.

I have supported free speech even when it was not popular to do so. On the 2 Live Crew issue, I said Americans have the right to listen to whatever they choose in the privacy of their own homes. Words are words. I believe in the free exchange of ideas. America needs more freedom, not less.

The debate on public broadcasting's content is important. These are taxpayer dollars. Congress has every right to question how the money is spent—for public broadcasting or for any program receiving Government funds. But I am not here to judge public broadcasting's programming. Who can dispute the educational value of such great programming as "Sesame Street" or "Wall Street Week" or the recent "Civil War" series? In fact, who's to say those programs and many others wouldn't find success in the free market on commercial outlets?

For me, however, the issue is strictly a fiscal matter. When the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] was founded in 1967, some saw a need to fill the void in education and arts entertainment not offered by network programming. The void no longer exists. One need only scan the vast number of options offered through cable television to see that Americans have more choices in programming than ever before. Public broadcasting should not be a funding priority.

Congress has lost all sense of perspective when we allow the debate over funding "Sesame Street" to overshadow the debate on revitalizing Main Street. Americans are hurting. Young families are struggling to buy their first home. Middle-class Americans are struggling as government takes more and more from their paychecks. Older Americans are struggling with the issue of paying for retirement and health care. Yet, we're willing to spend over $1 billion to fund programming that could likely succeed on its own in the free market without our help.

The issue of funding public broadcasting is a great example of why a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced Federal budget is needed. Congress lacks the courage to say "no." We all talk about the need to bring the deficit under control—about how we don't want to pass along our debt to our children and grandchildren. Yet, when it comes time to fund luxuries like public broadcasting, members will beat down the doors to cast a "yes" vote and brag about it. What hypocrisy.

If we were to eliminate funding for public broadcasting altogether, would it make a large dent in the deficit? Probably not. But we need to start somewhere step by step. We simply cannot afford the proposal to fund public broadcasting with $1.1 billion over the next 3 years—at an incredible increase of 50 percent over current levels.

I want to stress to my colleagues that if the Federal Government decided to discontinue funding for CPB, it would not mean the demise of public television. Only 17 percent of the entire CPB budget comes from taxpayers. Demographics show the vast majority of those who watch public television could well afford to help make up for the 17-percent gap if the Federal Government stops funding PCB. By contrast, less than 5 percent of the American television viewing audience watches public television. It makes little sense to allocate $1.1 billion to accommodate 5 percent of television viewers.

Mr. President, this is an issue of less spending, less government, and more freedom. Public broadcasting subsidies are no longer needed. The free market should be the guide to public broadcasting's worth, not Congress. I have made a commitment to the citizens of Florida that I will make tough decisions to control Federal spending, reduce America's $4 trillion deficit and promote free markets. This is one of those decisions.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate will vote soon on final passage of S. 1504, legislation to reauthorize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

As my colleagues well know, for the past 3 months S. 1504 has been in legislative limbo so that very important concerns that I and several Members had with respect to public broadcasting could be addressed. Those 3 months were a worthwhile investment. The result is a much improved bill that represents a responsible method of ensuring that the scarce resources of the Federal Government are accounted for and consistent with the statutory mission of the CPB.

I want to take a moment to address, specifically, the Commerce Committee's amendments to the bill with respect to disclosure, and objectivity and balance, which were adopted yesterday. These issues were at the heart of my concerns on the underlying bill and the subject of many meetings so the legislation since it was first brought to the full Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, the purpose of these amendments can be summed up in one single word: accountability. In today's

word of spiraling deficits, and the growing likelihood of a balanced budget amendment, accountability of taxpayer funds is critical. The American people should be able to know what programs and policies are the beneficiary of scarce public funds, including public broadcasting.

That is the essence of the Commerce Committee amendment with respect to disclosure. Specifically, this amendment requires the CPB to make available to the public its grantmaking guidelines, its rationale in the awarding of grants, as well as information on the programs themselves. Furthermore, the CPB is restricted from providing Government funds to any independent production entity unless it also provides the same information on the distribution of these funds.

Disclosure of the CPB's grantmaking procedures is an important step to ensure the accountability of the CPB and to maintain the public's trust and understanding of this important organization.

However, if we are to achieve real accountability within the CPB, there must be a means to evaluate the process by which programs are selected, and determine if it is consistent with the goals and purposes of public broadcasting. A number of programs aired on public television have prompted many Americans to question the programming decisions and the decisionmaking process of the CPB.

Of course, when the debate moves to program selection, we consistently hear the argument that Government should not be involved in the selection of individual programs. I agree. In fact, that is consistent with current law. However, let me remind my colleagues that current law requires the CPB to make programming available, and I quote, "with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature * * *."

The committee's amendment with respect to objectivity and balance is designed to offer a method to ensure that this statutory requirement is being met. It does so by, first, calling on the CPB Board to set up grievance procedure that will allow the American people to present comments to the CPB Board on the nature of the programming or other services that are offered. Second, it calls on the CPB to review regularly its national programming and determine if the mix of controversial shows offered during the period are consistent with the law, and take steps based on its review so that future grants will be consistent with the CPB's statutory mission.

This amendment answers the all-important question raised 3 months ago, "How does one achieve objectivity and balance in programming?" Its answer is a grievance procedure and a grant process within CPB that can be used as tools to achieve balance. This is a sound answer, Mr. President. After all, the CPB is a Government-funded entity. The goals and responsibilities described in the law must be the goals and responsibilities of the CPB, and specifically, the CPB Board.

In other words, Mr. President, it is the CPB Board's responsibility, as the direct recipient of taxpayer dollars, to maintain balance in the mix of controversial programming. This amendment makes the grant process the vehicle to meet this statutory responsibility, and it does so without getting Government into CPB's decisions on individual programs.

Mr. President, it's important to emphasize that these committee amendments do not break new ground or create new policy. These amendments are designed to reinforce the existing policy and responsibility of the CPB as required by law. It puts real meaning behind the law's objectivity and balance requirement and by doing so, brings accountability in the use of taxpayer dollars and a positive relationship between the CPB, PBS, and the American people.

Overall, S. 1504 as amended strikes a good balance: For those involved in public broadcasting, it represents a continuation of the Federal Government's commitment to support the unique, imaginative and educational programs and services seen and heard across our Nation. For the American taxpayer, this legislation represents what I hope will be the beginning of a trend toward greater oversight and greater accountability of how taxpayer dollars are spent to achieve important Government goals.

Mr. President, let there be no misunderstanding that the efforts by many of us these past months to achieve real accountability and balance in public broadcasting should not be seen as hostility to public broadcasting itself. Such an equation is a grave distortion.

My family and I have always enjoyed public broadcasting. While living in Orange County during my days as a small businessman and mayor of Anaheim, I enjoyed watching programs on KOCE, or Los Angeles-based KCET. And as a State senator in Sacramento, I was treated to fine programming on KVIE. As a viewer, I have enjoyed the high quality of programming offered by these public stations. As an elected official, I take particular interest and pride in the efforts by public broadcasters in California to provide programs that enhance the quality of a child's education, promote awareness in public affairs, and celebrate a community's cultural heritage and accomplishments. Those factors that have distinguished and characterized California—cultural diversity, technological innovation, and a commitment to a high quality of life—can be seen in the broad array of services and programs produced and aired at the local level in California.

Certainly, when all of us think of public broadcasting, we think of "Big Bird," the "Cookie Monster," "McNeil/Lehrer," "NOVA," "Masterpiece Theater," and "This Old House." All are first rate programs. But public television and radio, like politics, is local, and it is that element of programming that is not emphasized enough.

You can see this local initiative traveling through my own State of California. In San Francisco, public station KQED recently established the Center for Education and Lifelong Learning [CELL]. Included in CELL, is a school services unit that will build on KQED's already successful instructional television service. This service assists 80,000 California teachers, and reaches out to 1.7 million students in the San Francisco Bay Area. Indeed, KQED is known nationally for its tireless efforts to explore unique, innovative ways to improve the quality of education through the use of public broadcasting.

San Jose's KTEH joined with the Santa Clara County Office of Education Children's Services Department to launch a community outreach project that is designed to integrate children's television programming into the daily schedules of local child care centers and preschools. KTEH is also breaking new ground in locally produced programming. In 1991, KTEH provided over 300 hours of local programming, an increase of more than 900 percent over the previous 2 years. These programs range from the high-technology news magazine, the Silicon Valley Report, to PetPourri, a weekly, call-in pet care series.

In Rohnhert Park, KRCB has produced "En Camino," a monthly public affairs program in Spanish to inform its viewers of local issues of importance.

Los Angeles-based KCET is well-known to all who watch public television. Though KCET's locally produced programming is motivated by issues of great importance at the local level, it is not unusual to see their programming serve and make a difference for communities across the Nation. KCET coproduced the Oscar-nominated "Stand and Deliver," the documentary of the inspirational calculus teacher, Jaime Escalante. KCET provides instructional programming to elementary and secondary schools throughout the Los Angeles area, and even college-level telecourses to nontraditional students.

In Orange County, KOCE is the largest producer of college telecourses in the Nation, providing 1,575 hours of college course programming to 15,000 students.

Mr. President, I can go on and on and list the accomplishments of public broadcasting in California, but those that I have mentioned are the tip of a

very large iceberg of commitment by local public television and radio stations to their communities. Public broadcasting is community broadcasting. These stations make real the ideal that television and radio enrich, entertain, and educate its listeners and viewers. S. 1504 represents an investment in that kind of effort, and I am pleased to have played a part in the development of this legislation.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Communications Subcommittee, Senator INOUYE, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the full Commerce Committee, Senator HOLLINGS and Senator DANFORTH, for their leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. I also want to recognize the leadership of my good friends, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, and the distinguished Republican leader, especially with respect to the committee amendments to the underlying legislation. They and their staffs should be commended for their efforts to improve this important legislation.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991. The bill authorizes appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] and the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program [PTFP].

Public broadcasting serves the Nation by encouraging and assisting the development of diverse quality programming for public television and radio. The CPB plays a particularly important role for the citizens of Ohio, because it bridges Ohio's rural communities with its cities through the use of sophisticated telecommunications technology. The CPB thus opens the doors of broad-based communications to our cities, to small townships, and importantly, to the rural areas, creating an interactive intrastate communications network.

Ohio Public Broadcasting, funded through the CPB authorization, is replete with a variety of services that cover the broad interests of our communities, not the least of which is education. Today, public television is the only national instrument consistently reaching virtually all American families to provide education services for preschoolers, schoolchildren, and adult learners of all kinds.

While Ohio ranks 36th in educational expenditures, it ranks among the top 10 in instructional television effectiveness, thereby proving the effectiveness of public broadcasting for educational purposes. Working through the public television stations, 8 Ohio instructional foundations provide a wide range of services to all of Ohio's 2 million elementary and secondary students. Instructional television brings essential educational resources to our classroom.

Twenty-five years ago, Ohio created and funded an educational technology equity commission to explore the use of telecommunications technologies to extend sorely needed resources to the poorest schools in urban and rural Ohio. In January 1993, the commission will initiate a project to assess instructional methods and to train teachers. This project will be managed by Ohio's public broadcasting stations, working in conjunction with the broader educational community throughout the State. This year's CPB authorization permits Federal support for initiatives such as these.

Another positive contribution of Ohio public broadcasting is evidenced by WVIZ, a public broadcast station in Cleveland. WVIZ is a central facility for video and emerging technologies and provides services to 120 school districts and 215 private, parochial, and independent schools in northeastern Ohio. These services include on-line computer networks and databases for educators, interactive class rooms, college-credit telecourses for at-home viewers, and an everincreasing number of workshops for improving educational opportunities. Clearly, public television and radio can be used to reinforce our ability to educate. I believe, Mr. President, that through our public stations we can emphasize the resourceful relationship that education and emerging technologies share.

Public radio and television stations constitute valuable local community resources to address national concerns and local problems. WOSU in Columbus, for example, played a major role in the broadcast of an historic program in central and southern Ohio when every television station in Columbus simultaneously broadcast "Our Place, Our Problem: Drugs in the Heart of it All," a special broadcast coproduced by various stations which examined the drug crisis in the community. Public broadcasting stations address social issues head-on, and use their influence to unite communities into the solution.

Another example, WVIZ donated its facilities for a minitelethon to benefit the homeless. This successful drive raised more than 90,000 volunteer hours for various social agencies. Ohioans traditionally support public broadcasting, having provided 450,000 volunteer hours over the last 2 years which entitled stations to qualify for additional Federal funds. People volunteer for many reasons, but clearly the one passion which united these Ohioans was the strong belief that public broadcasting is a part of the solution to community problems.

Moreover, public broadcasting provides quality programming that promotes and brings together a diversity of our American culture, and provides such diversity in an affordable and accessible manner. The 3-year authorization proposed by this bill will serve the invaluable purpose of furthering the education, information, mobilization, and invigoration of our communities across the Nation. Mr. President, I fully support S. 1504 as written, not only as an authorization, but also as a continuing reinforcement of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's commitment to the enrichment of all Americans.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I am extremely proud to support S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act, and encourage my colleagues to do the same. The bill authorizes Federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting of $310 million for fiscal year 1994, $375 million for fiscal year 1995, and $425 million for fiscal year 1996. A portion of this money will likely be used by New Jersey Network [NJN] and WNET/Channel 13, two public broadcasters that provide valuable television programming to the residents of New Jersey. In addition, the bill authorizes $42 million for the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program each year for capital improvements from fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 1994.

Since 1967, Federal support for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has enabled public television and radio stations to provide their services to virtually all Americans. The CPB distributes direct grants for operations and programming to 313 public radio stations and 192 public television grantees operating 341 stations in the United States and its territories.

Through public broadcasting, Americans have been able to explore important social issues in ways that are balanced, thoughtful, and challenging. At the same time, public broadcasting has promoted creative artistic programming, bringing musical, dance, and dramatic performances to many Americans who would otherwise not be able to enjoy them.

Public broadcasting reaches 98 percent of all American homes with public television programming and over 86 percent of all homes with public radio. The news, performance, social issues, and public service programming which comes to Americans through public broadcasting stations has greatly enhanced the quality of our lives.

One program which underscores the contribution local public broadcasting stations make to their communities is WNET's "Learn To Read" program. "Learn To Read" is an at-home study course comprised of 30 programs designed to teach basic reading skills to adult nonreaders. The series emphasizes basic phonic principles, handwriting skills, and reading tips for new readers.

Another public television station serving New Jersey, New Jersey Network [NJN], maintains the State's Project Literacy hotline, providing the only clearinghouse for literacy activi-

ties throughout New Jersey. Using an 800 number, the service responds to more than 100 inquiries each week, providing information on tutoring services and enrollment.

I am especially heartened by the fact that this bill will allow the CPB to bolster the use of emerging technologies in education. One CPB service project, the satellite resources consortium, brought 1,920 hours of direct instruction in foreign languages, advanced mathematics, and the natural sciences to students and teachers in 382 high schools in 22 States during the 1989-90 school year. Such programs can make a huge difference in our ability to compete with other nations in today's global economy.

We are all aware of the importance of popular public television programs such as "Sesame Street," "Great Performances," and the "MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour." But we should also be supportive of CBP's and public broadcasters' willingness to expand their programs further to respond to the growing and increasingly diverse needs of our Nation. I applaud the work that CPB has done and encourage this body's support.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as most of you know, I am very committed to educational television and radio programming. Public broadcasting has provided an invaluable array of educational, historical, and culturally enriching productions for this country for a quarter of a century, and I am proud to be a supporter of the pending legislation.

In the early 1970's, when my wife Sharon and I lived in Buchannon, WV, we discovered the joys of public broadcasting. We had three children under age 5 and were looking for some relief, some news, and some adult voices. Sharon found "Sesame Street" for our kids, and the Watergate hearings and National Public Radio's "All Things Considered" for herself. The rest—as many of my colleagues have noted on this floor—is history.

The beauty of public broadcasting, however, is that you don't have to be a Rockefeller to enjoy it.

Public broadcasting helps tear down the barriers of privilege. It makes the riches of our heritage and culture accessible to 97 percent of all Americans, regardless of income or geography. All in all, the money we spend on public television and radio may reach more taxpayers, more directly, than virtually any other Federal expenditure.

Programs like the "MacNeil-Lehrer Newshour," "Reading Rainbow," "NOVA," and "Morning Edition," to mention a few, have become staples in millions of American households—and hopefully those numbers will grow. We now have a commercial-free broadcast system in this country that provides an essential service to all Americans, and it is something which I think has come to be recognized on a bipartisan basis as a very important part of the fabric of the American communications system.

Mr. President, we in Congress frequently lament the educational system of this country and the need to provide better education and training for young people. I believe that public broadcasting is at a critical crossroad between the gaping need for excellence in education and the tremendous capacity that the media has to enlighten and inform.

It is well known that by the time a child reaches college age, he or she will have spent more time in front of a television set than in the classroom. In fact, kids today spend more time before their television sets than before their teachers, and almost as much time watching TV as they spend with their parents. Public broadcasters provide hope that at least some of that time is spent watching quality programs and learning.

For example, WSWP, the public broadcasting station in Beckley, WV, just developed and tested an exciting new pilot program called Homework Hotline. Modeled after a show started in Rochester, NY, "Homework Hotline" was locally produced and featured a group of teachers answering questions from local students over open phone lines.

According to WSWP's operations supervisor, the response was absolutely overwhelming. "Homework Hotline" received calls from first graders wanting to learn how to count their allowance and tell time, from parents who wanted help answering their children's questions, and from viewers outside the broadcast area who picked up the show on cable. It is exactly this kind of use of our television airwaves that provides hope that some of the hours spent in front of the TV set are productive ones.

Similarly, in rural parts of West Virginia, public broadcasting supplements a severe shortage of qualified teachers in key areas like math, science, and foreign languages.

On a typical day, close to 16,000 West Virginia students watch "Writer's Realm," a creative writing series. Later that morning, "Landscape of Geometry" teaches 9,000 junior high students the basic concepts of geometry in an award winning, animated format. And before the recess bell rings, nearly 22,000 students have tuned in to "Truly American," a biography series about the lives of great Americans.

As early as 1953, the first educational television station began broadcasts to school classrooms. Now, simply by turning on a television, teachers and students across our country can access a wide range of educational programming.

These programs make learning fun and, in many rural areas, fill in the gaps of an educational system that lacks the resources available in other parts of the country.

In addition to providing programs for elementary and secondary school students, PBS reaches thousands of nontraditional learners, including adults who are enhancing their job skills, learning to read, working toward their GED high school equivalency or college degrees, or otherwise enriching their lives.

Mr. President, I've given just a few examples of the educational value of public broadcasting. My colleagues have described many more, and we still haven't begun to cover the tremendous wealth of programming offered on commercial-free television and radio.

By enacting the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, our Government made the support of public telecommunications a necessary public policy—one that has been continually reinforced by Congress since then. I want this worthwhile program to continue, and I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to renew our support for public broadcasting.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I will support the reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Although actual appropriations may eventually be somewhat less, the authorization for fiscal 1994-96 is more than $1 billion for programming and operating expenses and some $42 million per year in fiscal 1992-94 for public television facilities capital investment.

CPB has a broad mandate: Develop television and radio systems that would reach and serve all Americans, develop connection services that would link the public broadcasting stations nationwide, help support those stations, help ensure the production of high-quality programs from diverse sources, and provide training, instruction, recruiting, research, and development.

It is a mandate which CPB has, I believe, filled well. I have not agreed with all programming decisions, but I suspect that it is unlikely that any individual would. What public broadcasting has done is expand viewing options and offer an alternative to commercial programming.

When CPB was established, it was particularly important as an alternative to three major networks. Today, the broadcasting environment has changed: The choices have expanded. Yet, there are, I submit, numerous public service, cultural, and educational programs which would not be available were it not for public broadcasting.

For me, there are two questions here today. First, should we in today's climate of fiscal constraint and in an expanded broadcast environment continue to use taxpayers' dollars for public broadcast purposes. And, second, where does public broadcasting stand in an industry where rapid change in technology has become the norm.

Today, there are some 349 public television stations and 373 CPB-supported radio stations. They are stations dedicated to CPB's goals of exciting the mind and expanding the spirit. They are testimony to 25 years of success.

It is, I believe, instructive to reflect for a moment on the history of public broadcasting. Several points stand out. First, Newton Minter in 1961 clearly described what many Americans understood: that television of that time was a vast wasteland. Television could and should be more.

Second, even before the Minter description, the FCC, led by Frieda Hennock, had reserved 162 UHF and 80 VHS channels for noncommercial educational use. In other words, the FCC identified the airways as a public resource and determined it to be in the national interest to retain a certain portion of that resource for special use.

The passage of legislation creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was another milestone, this one seeking to ensure that those airways which had been reserved would be used to develop radio and television systems which would reach Americans with alternative programming.

Satellite connection of the existing stations in 1978 guaranteed the existence of a national public broadcasting network.

From recognition of a need, dedication of a resource, facilities and programming support and finally a linked system of public broadcasting brought us to the system we have today.

I believe that CPB has served us well and that it continues to serve a significant purpose, despite the proliferation of commercial services. There are many artistic and cultural programs which simply do not command the audience which commercial programming demands, yet its loss would be our loss. I count in this category symphony orchestra performances and opera. There are other programs, especially in the drama and literature fields, where there is a value in being able to follow a text or story without concern for marketing. This is particularly true when we are dealing with classics and materials for educational purposes.

Finally, public broadcasting contributes to public policy debates, especially on the local level, in a way that commercial channels simply do not. It is a local effort—local in its establishment, local in its production efforts, local in the decisions it makes on what to air.

For these reasons, I support S. 1504.

I do, however, believe that this reauthorization debate skirts a broader debate—and that is where our technology is taking us. Over the years, we have tended to view mass media services such as broadcasting and cable apart from telephony. Yet, in truth, such distinctions are giving way. Increasingly, we will see not only competition within the two broadly defined areas but competition among many elements in each. Our effort must be to promote the wise use of each and to keep always in the forefront a commitment to a common good. That commitment, I believe, must include a broad-based access to the services which can and will be available in the upcoming years.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, for the past several months legislation to reauthorize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has been awaiting full Senate consideration. My colleagues—both Republicans and Democrats—have been meeting in good faith since March to work out their differences with the bill. I commend them for their efforts, and am pleased that the bill is being brought to the floor today.

The areas of disagreement in this debate are well known, Mr. President. Opponents of the bill charge that there is a pattern of bias—some call it liberal bias—in Corporation programming decisions. They point to several CPB-supported programs—including the controversial broadcasts of "Tongues Untied" and "Stop the Church"—to illustrate their point.

I must agree that some CPB-funded programs are distasteful. And I would imagine that most members of the Senate—even those who endorse this bill strongly—would have trouble defending the artistic merits of selected Corporation-funded programming.

But I do not believe that matters of personal taste should drive public policy.

Each year the Corporation supports thousands of projects around the country, and it is unfair to select a handful of isolated programs as representative of the overall work produced at CPB. Not only is it unfair, it's wrong.

I intend to vote for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting Reauthorization legislation for the following reasons:

First, the Corporation is an independent private organization. It was established 25 years ago to provide high quality radio and television programming—programming without Government interference. And for 25 years CPB has done just that.

The Corporation's independence allows it to serve a broad constituency. Two generations of children have fallen in love with Oscar and Big Bird on the popular "Sesame Street" program. And just last year, viewers from around the Nation were gripped by the moving history of "The Civil War," the superb documentary produced by CPB.

The simple truth is that independence comes at a price. Independence means the ability to be free from the constraints of day-to-day governmental control. And if independence at CPB means that some programming decisions may be unpopular—so be it. That is the price we must be willing to pay for top-quality programming.

Second, I do not believe that Congress should be involved in decisions about what constitutes proper programming. There is a fine line between legitimate Government interest in programming and outright Government censorship.

Certainly, I do not seek out programming that depicts half-nude bodies dancing on my television screen. Nor do I enjoy watching demonstrators disrupt the celebration of Sunday Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral. But as offensive as I find some CPB supported programming, it would be even more upsetting to see creative talents harnessed by some giant Federal Government operation looking over the shoulder of every producer—making decisions about what is suitable for public consumption, and what is not.

The chilling effect that Government intrusion would have on programming decisions would be beyond calculation. Would top-rate broadcasting talent choose to work under burdensome Government constraints? Probably not. And those who did remain in Corporation broadcasting would surely be reluctant to test a policy that discourages anything but politically correct programming. In effect, self-censorship would be the result.

How can a nation that celebrates daily its first amendment right to free speech attempt to restrict unpopular views from public consumption?

In my view, expression on public radio or television is no different from protected expression in a public park. Both are maintained in part by Federal tax dollars, and both are forums for free speech. Preserving our first amendment rights is far better than the heavy price society would pay if every CPB program was subject to the scalpel of a Government censor.

And finally, I will support this reauthorization measure because the Corporation does an excellent job supporting public television in Rhode Island. Channel 36, the public TV station based in Providence, stands to gain nearly a half a million dollars per year—about 20 percent of its annual operating budget—under this bill.

Channel 36, and its able general manager, Susan Farmer, is a wonderful education resource for all Rhode Islanders. Through its broadcasting, Channel 36 offers postsecondary level courses through the Community College of Rhode Island. It also allows dropouts to get a leg up on high school equivalency tests through regular class broadcasts.

Of course, channel 36 also offers the award winning children's programs that have come to define public broadcasting, such as "3-2-1 Contact" and "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood."

I urge my colleagues to support the Corporation for Public Broadcasting reauthorization bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991, which would reauthorize funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] for the next 3 years.

For 25 years, public broadcasting has received Federal support through the CPB, a private, nonprofit organization created by the Congress in 1967. The purpose for creating this freestanding entity was to assist local broadcast stations in providing programming which focused on local needs and issues and also to fill the gaps in commercial broadcasting in many rural areas of the country.

Twenty-five years later, 86 percent of all Americans receive public radio broadcasts and 93 percent receive public television broadcasts. But the improvements fostered by CPB have not only come in broadcast infrastructure, they have come in the form of innovative, distinctive, and diverse programming with proven leadership in children's and educational programming.

Mr. President, no Member of this body is more aware than I am of the need to give utmost scrutiny to every dollar of spending we authorize. Continued inattention to the deficit is the gravest sin we commit. No program that we fund should be exempt from the mandate that significant national purposes be served in the most cost-effective manner possible.

With that mandate in mind, Mr. President, we must all take note of the fact that this legislation includes a substantial increase in authorized funding levels for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. While I support increased funding, our colleagues in the appropriations process will need to weigh every competing priority when actual spending levels for CPB are set each year during the life of this reauthorization. I am confident that CPB will continue to demonstrate its value to the Nation.

When the Corporation was established, it was directed to find, initiate, and finance the production of high-quality educational, informational, instructional, and cultural programs. For the last 25 years, programs supported by CPB have been produced by a variety of entities, including public broadcasting stations, minority-based production companies, independent producers, and educational institutions. Through their educational content, innovative qualities, and diversity, these programs have enhanced the knowledge and imagination of all Americans.

Public broadcasting is also at the leading edge of incorporating technology into education at all levels. This service is not just conventional broadcasting, but includes the infrastructure for interactive educational programming using satellites, fiber optics, cable, and computers. This federally financed infrastructure places within our Nation's reach a comprehensive telecommunications system for all the Nation's schools.

These types of improvements do not come without cost. As we debate increasing the authorization for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, it is essential to note that the Federal Government provides less than $1 out of every $6 needed to sustain public television and radio broadcasting. Private support for public broadcasting—from viewers, businesses and foundation—is also on the rise.

The quality of the U.S. public broadcasting system is internationally recognized. In my State of Minnesota, for example, CPB recently awarded American Public Radio in Minneapolis, a CPB Radio Program Fund Award for the classical renewal project, a project geared toward the renewal of classical programming on radio.

Funding from the Corporation also enables local stations such as KWCM–TV in Appleton, MN, to provide programming to serve a growing Hispanic audience through Spanish-language broadcasts of programs such as "Amigos" for children and adults who wish to learn English.

On a larger scale, Minnesota Public Radio, a network of several stations throughout the State, has used its support from CPB to make contributions benefiting the whole country. Examples of this contribution include Garrison Keilor's "A Prairie Home Companion" and the acclaimed new program "All Things Considered."

In recent years, Twin Cities Public Television has also emerged as one of a handful of production centers for nationally distributed programming, including regular segments on the "McNeil-Lehrer Newshour." Thanks to strong board and management leadership, KTCA–TV is now one of the Nation's best watched, best supported and most prolific producers of local and nationally distributed programming in the country.

Thanks to strong support from CPB, as well as State and private funding sources, people throughout the State of Minnesota are served by strong public television outlets in Fargo-Moorhead, Duluth, Austin, Appleton, and several other cities.

Mr. President, one of the most telling examples of the power of this medium was recently reported in the Washington Post. When the Metropolitan Opera's production of Richard Wagner's "Ring Cycle" was broadcast last year, it was seen by more people in that series of broadcasts than had seen it in live performances throughout the world since it was first performed in 1876, 116 years ago. Mr. President, the capacity of public broadcasting to expand the mind and enrich the spirit is a modern marvel.

A new project, the independent television service [ITVS], is also funded under the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This new organization was created with bipartisan support in 1988 and actually brought into existence less than 1 year ago. I have supported this program since its inception and am pleased that ITVS is located in St. Paul.

ITVS was created to ensure that more independent film and video producers from throughout the country would have an opportunity to make programs for public television. It was created specifically to address the many new communities which should be a part of public television's future, including children and audiences currently undeserved.

Within their first year, ITVS formed a network of 24,000 independent film makers and provided funding for a broad mix of 26 programs, ranging from drama to animation, public affairs to children's programs, and views of both urban and rural life. Because of production lag time, however, none of the ITVS project have been broadcast. Broadcast of these nationally available programs will be left entirely to the discretion of the local public broadcasting stations.

Through my staff, I have engaged in many hours of contacts with ITVS officials and I believe they are seriously committed to maintaining accountability and carrying out the full intent of their congressional mandate. I do not believe it is wise public policy to punish good faith efforts to carry out the will of Congress—particularly when there is no evidence that congressional will has been undone. Therefore, I would oppose any effort to eliminate ITVS.

Congress has created this service, funded by CPB, to bring diversity and new voices to public television. There are literally thousands of voices from throughout the country who can enrich our Nation's culture by providing insight and new perspectives about life in their own communities. In the last few weeks in particular, Mr. President, our Nation has become even more aware of the need to foster understanding among the many elements of American life. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation to allow ITVS the chance to prove itself.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment which requires the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to prepare a report on the establishment of a dedicated channel for preschool children.

Today there are more than 20 million children of preschool age in this country. Some attend preschools. Some are in day care. Some stay at home with a parent. Others spend their day with a relative or child-care provider. But, most children, regardless of their situation, have one thing in common: They watch an exorbitant amount of television.

According to a recent book by Ernest Boyer, a preschool child is likely to watch as much as 2½ hours of television a day. By the time a child enters kindergarten, he or she has probably watched nearly 4,000 hours of television.

Furthermore, a recent report by the National Assessment of Education Progress reveals that the amount of time children spend in front of a television grows each year.

I am not one who wants to encourage additional television viewing by preschool children; in fact, I would like to discourage it. I would prefer to see additional quality preschool programs and activities, including an expansion of Head Start.

But, I also believe that we must recognize the reality of many children's daily lives. And, where television is a significant aspect of children's daily lives, it should be a wholesome, supportive, and stimulating aspect. High quality television programming can contribute to and complement efforts to meet preschool developmental needs. It can also be used to provide information and training to parents, preschool caretakers, and teachers.

In my own State, Nebraska Educational Television [NETV] has an impressive record of educational programming, including its Emmy award winning series, "Reading Rainbow." I am confident that it can successfully expand into the preschool area.

At a time when our educational needs are great, at a time of growing recognition of the importance of early childhood training and education, it is important that we make use of all our resources to help our children develop to their full potential. By tapping into a resource available in most homes and schools, a ready-to-learn channel can be a potent educational tool.

This amendment seeks a report which will form the basis for moving forward on the establishment of a preschool ready-to-learn channel. I believe it is a good amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the amendment offered by Senator LOTT.

This amendment is not about objectional programming or Oscar the Grouch—it is about fiscal responsibility. It is about our $4 trillion national debt, and Congress' efforts to control Federal spending.

What does S. 1504 provide? It authorizes funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting at a level of $1.1 billion over 3 years—an increase of 50 percent over the previous 3 years. The amendment we are considering freezes the funding levels of this bill at $275 million per year, which will result in some $285 million in savings.

It has been argued that this amendment will limit the educational and community services provided by public broadcasting. Frankly, I can think of more pressing educational and community services that would benefit from a $285 million windfall. How about using the savings to increase funding for Head Start programs, or to promote the reading ability of America's young citizens?

I wonder, Mr. President, if that during this debate, anyone has suggested that our children spend less time in front of television sets, and more time immersed in books? The findings of a report prepared by the National Assessment of Educational Progress for the Department of Education shows that students are indeed spending too much time watching TV, and not enough reading.

Let me highlight a disturbing finding in this report. Of the fourth grade students interviewed, almost half said they read 10 or fewer pages in a book per day, while one-quarter said they watch TV for 6 or more hours each day. It doesn't get any better as our kids get older—nearly two-thirds of 12th graders indicated they read less than 10 pages in a book daily.

I think the Senate might do more to encourage America's youth to tune into books, turn on to reading, and for itself, to drop out of spending habits that are ringing up an enormous national debt.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, for months now we have been debating the future of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. When we first dealt with this issue earlier in the spring, I announced my support for public broadcasting. I rise today to reaffirm that support.

Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments of my colleagues and frankly, I am not convinced that cutting the budget of public broadcasting will be a net benefit. In fact, I believe that a cut to public broadcasting will be a counter to all that we say that we want to achieve in this body.

We have consistently stated that the education of our children is a paramount concern. Public television has served as a de facto teacher for many years. Through programs such as "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" and "Sesame Street" to "Nova," our children have learned everything from their ABC's to the makeup of our solar system. It would be absolutely devastating to the continuing education of our children if the availability of such shows were limited.

Public Broadcasting is especially successful at introducing and delivering culture to the four corners of our Nation. Through programs such as "Great Performances" and "Live from Lincoln Center," citizens throughout our Nation are exposed to world-class talent without ever having to leave their living room.

We all marveled last year at the "Civil War" series, one of the highest rated shows in the history of public television. It was truly a masterpiece of illustrating a critical period in our country's history. However, the magnitude of this project made it virtually prohibitive to be broadcast on the networks, and to be run on cable would have made it inaccessible to a large part of our Nation that does not have cable. Public broadcasting was the logical choice for this project. However, a cut to public broadcasting will threaten future masterpieces from ever reaching wide audiences and could prevent such important programming from being shown to the public.

As I stated several months ago, there is some programming on public broadcasting that I find objectionable. But there is so much more that I find worthwhile and educational. We cannot afford to cut short the multitude of programs that many in our Nation find informational and inspirational. Public broadcasting provides a vital part of our citizens' education that must not be eliminated. I am pleased to lend my support to the passage of this important measure.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting.

I strongly feel that any legislative action to restrict CPB's programming choices will have severe ramifications on CPB's ability to deliver high-quality educational programs, programs only shown on the public broadcasting system. If we impose such restrictions, we will begin a ripple effect that will undermine the tremendous benefits public broadcasting offers Americans.

It is not the role of the U.S. Senate to decide what the CPB should broadcast to the American people. If we impose restrictions on the CPB, we are debilitating the ability of public broadcasting to educate the American people in a unique and far-reaching manner.

The numerous high-quality programs that have been aired and heard through the CPB far outweigh the few programs that have caused controversy.

What types of programs receive funding from the CPB? In Vermont some of the most watched public programs receive CPB funds, like "Nature," "Great Performances," the "MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour," "Columbus: Age of Discovery," and "National Geographic Specials."

I am concerned about efforts that will be made to limit the ability of CPB to provide quality programming through reducing or freezing its funding levels. These efforts will only have a negative effect on the most important benefit of public broadcasting: providing a diverse range of educational programming to all areas of the country, especially rural areas like those in Vermont.

We all are aware of the need to improve our educational system, and we

cannot underestimate the vital role public broadcasting plays in this system. Besides programs like "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" and "Sesame Street," public broadcasting offers other little-known but important educational programs like "Project Education," which helps communities improve their educational abilities. Many public television series, like "Columbus: Age of Discovery," serve as important educational tools for teachers in the classroom. Reducing or freezing funding for CPB will only result in limiting CPB's ability to provide these educational benefits.

I am also concerned with efforts to eliminate or reduce funding for the Independent Television Service [ITVS]. As many in this body know, not one ITVS program has been aired, yet some people want to eliminate its funding before the American people have a chance to view any ITVS programming. More importantly, ITVS only funds these programs, it does not broadcast them. It is the decision of the local public television stations to decide what programs must be aired. It seems to me that any effort to eliminate ITVS' funding is premature given these facts.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation and continue to provide the wonderful benefits of public broadcasting.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] and urge all my colleagues to vote for the reauthorization of S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act.

For 25 years, Congress has been steadfast in its commitment to public broadcasting. This support has forged a fledgling industry into an indispensable public service that reaches coast to coast. From a disjointed group of 270 public television and radio stations in 1969, public broadcasting has become a leader in providing quality informational, cultural, and educational programming and community outreach services to over 96 percent of the American population.

CPB distributes the bulk of the Federal contribution in the form of grants to radio and television stations. In Washington State, public broadcasting serves the needs of a population of wide cultural diversity. Radio station KDNA-FM, of Granger, WA, uses its community service grants to provide programming for the Hispanic population in Washington. One program, "Buenas Noches," is a very popular talk show offering public affairs programming. The majority of the listeners are farmworkers, who benefit from the station's work with the Washington State Migrant Council, the Yakima Valley Farmworker Clinic, the Office of Farmworker Housing, and the Washington State Commission on Hispanic Affairs.

In addition to programming for Hispanics, several stations in Washington offer programming directed toward the needs and interests of native Americans. KDNA airs programming each week produced by the Yakima Nation. Radio station KPBX-FM, in Spokane, WA, recently produced five half-hour programs featuring storytelling by native American tribes.

Television station KCTS-TV, in Seattle, has developed a number of programs and services for schools. For example, KCTS developed a bilingual State history and geography video disc, entitled "Over Washington," to be made available to schools. It also produced a six-part series describing the history of our planet. The station developed ancillary teaching materials for schools, in order to expand the use of the program beyond broadcast and into the classroom.

KTPS-TV in Tacoma produced a 12-part series addressing the problem of alcoholism among native Americans, and focused on recovery and personal growth.

People in Washington also benefited from the round-the-clock Desert Storm coverage provided by National Public Radio, made possible in part by an emergency infusion of funding from CBP. NPR's nationally acclaimed coverage included town meetings, overnight newscasts, and call-in shows.

In addition, public broadcasting brings theater, opera, and drama to inner cities and rural communities to people who would otherwise be unable to experience them. More people saw the opera, "The Ring Cycle," in one broadcast on public television than had ever seen it, in total, since Wagner wrote it.

Recently public television aired the final program in the series "The Constitution—That Delicate Balance." This brilliant series on constitutional issues owed its existence to funding from the Corporation of Public Broadcasting. The program's distinguished host, Fred Friendly, concluded the final program by remarking that in the entire series there were 83 televised programs and 600 seminars. He said:

I am 76 years old. Nothing is forever. I relish the thought that in my 55 years in broadcasting journalism, 17 have also been spent in America's largest classroom—public television—with eager, thinking minds such as yours.

Thank you for inviting me into your homes and for your support of our most essential agenda: not to make up anybody's mind, but to open minds; to make the agony of decisionmaking so intense you can escape only by thinking.

Public broadcasting's contributions to cultural diversity, education, the arts, and community awareness are invaluable. Public broadcasting has been and continues to be a wise investment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to express my strong support for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] and for S. 1504, the Public Telecommunications Act. As chair of the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the CPB, I welcome this important authorization.

CPB and the public broadcasting television and radio networks play a vital role in providing educational, cultural, and public affairs programs. Especially in rural States like Iowa, public broadcasting provides a vital link to our culture and to educational resources.

I recently received a letter from an Iowan that said it all about the importance of public TV in his life. "Where else could we see an opera in George, IA?" this person asked. She also mentioned the importance of national programming such as the "Nightly Business Report" and "Wall Street Week," and Iowa Public Television's program on agriculture, "Market to Market." Their children watch shows like "Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego?" Public television and radio, more than many things that this Congress spends time and money on, has a direct, positive impact on the lives of millions of Americans with 80 percent of all Americans watching public TV at least once per month. Public radio is an important resource, especially for excellent public affairs programming and news shows like "All Things Considered" and "Morning Edition." I have received scores of letters concerning this legislation, and the response are almost unanimous in favor of public broadcasting.

Some have expressed concern about CPB-funded programs in terms of their balance, creativity, and quality. This legislation addresses those concerns, in the balance and objectivity requirements. On the whole, public broadcasting produces quality, balanced programming. That doesn't mean that public broadcasting shows are pablum, or avoid the tough issues. It means that a wide variety of opinion, from the right and the left and everything in between, are represented on public TV. Bill Moyers specials are balanced with "McLaughlin Group" and "Firing Line."

I am particularly pleased by two provisions in the current bill: The distance learning projects provision, and the language concerning people with visual- or hearing-impairment.

The distance learning projects provisions will help improve public broadcasting's impact on education in rural areas. Public broadcasting is already a vital resource to provide educational opportunities for rural students, and I anticipate that the distance learning provisions will further enhance the role of public broadcasting in rural education.

Also, as chairman of the Disability Policy Subcommittee, I am deeply concerned about expanding the responsiveness of public broadcasting to people

59-059 O—97 Vol. 138 (Pt. 10) 3

with disabilities. Once again, public broadcasting has done an excellent job in reaching out with descriptive video and captioned broadcasting. But more needs to be done. The language emphasizing that visually-impaired and hearing-impaired people are an underserved community provides important guidance to the CPB. This bill will help to reach out to the hearing- and visually-impaired communities and increase access to public broadcasting.

Public broadcasting enriches the lives of the people of my State, and our Nation. From children who learn and have fun watching "Sesame Street," to the many viewers who learned about a crucial period of our Nation's history watching Ken Burns' "Civil War" series, to important local programming such as, in my State, "Iowa Press," and to the many listeners to public radio's national and local news and public affairs programs, Iowans benefit greatly from CPB. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I support this bill, and I hope it will be passed without any amendment that would seriously undermine the funding possibilities for our public television networks and stations and their efforts to provide educational programs that are helpful to our Nation's children.

In creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] 1967, the Congress recognized the need for Federal support of the development of educational programs to use in the home, classroom, and library.

The educational roots of public broadcasting run deep—it was first called "educational television" or "ETV," and many people still use the name. It has strengthened learning from preschool through college.

The State of Mississippi's ETV Authority was chaired by my father, William Holmes Cochran, and in 1969, Mississippi was the first State in the Nation to have statewide coverage with its network of transmission towers.

Today, Mississippi ETV offers six educational networks, providing more than 65 hours of educational programming each day for students, teachers, individuals, and families. On average, Mississippi's elementary and secondary schools use 7 hours of educational programming every school day.

Additional adult-oriented instruction includes college education, teacher certification, training for daycare providers, programs like "Learn To Read," and vocational and career education.

Since 1969, preschool children in Mississippi have been exposed to the educational values of "Sesame Street" and "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood."

Nationwide, classroom television from kindergarten through high school reaches 29 million students with science, math, and reading instruction. During the school day, about 65 percent of local public television time is devoted to classroom instruction.

After school, public television programs like "Square One TV" and "Reading Rainbow" encourage youngsters to do math and to read.

College courses are available through the Annenberg/CPB Project, which began in 1981 to promote adult education. It has pioneered in interactive computer systems to improve teaching and learning.

Over 2 million students used the audio and video material in their college classes in 1991. About 250,000 students have completed project courses for college credit, and 7.5 million general interest viewers tune in to courses each week.

The Satellite Education Resources Consortium [SERC], is a coordinated effort by CPB, 23 States, and 4 communities to make quality courses in math, science, and foreign languages available in small towns and rural areas through distance learning satellite transmission.

CPB founded the initial planning and pilot semester of SERC, and it was funded by a Federal "Star Schools" grant for 2 years.

A major outreach programming effort, Project Literacy US [PLUS], has been supported by CPB to help the United States train its work force and improve its competitiveness. First Lady Barbara Bush has been an effective advocate of this effort to unite the estimated 30 million functionally illiterate adult Americans with volunteer tutors in public and private literacy organizations.

The 1990 program focused on establishing a mentor program to keep students from dropping out of school; in 1991 the program's focus was on helping families learn to read.

Another impressive program is "GED on TV," which prepares adults to take the high school general equivalency diploma exam in a nonthreatening environment.

Because of the outstanding success of this video course, the Library Services and Construction Act amendments of 1990 authorized grants to States to purchase adult education videotapes, such as this GED series, so individuals can check them out for home use.

Public broadcasting has also sought to generate better public understanding of issues before Congress. CPB funds the Public Television Outreach Alliance [PTOA], which produces programs on issues such as drug and alcohol addiction, child abuse, child care, AIDS, and the environment.

New communication technologies offer exciting opportunities to improve the quality and quantity of educational television and radio.

With the help of CPB and outside underwriters, CTW's newest and most ambitious effort since "Sesame Street" is a television-based, multimedia literacy project called "Ghostwriter."

"Ghostwriter" is designed for 7- to 10-year-olds, with a special emphasis on minority and economically disadvantaged children. It will be accessible to them in homes, after-school programs, and schools nationwide. It will enlist the support of parents, youth-serving organizations, and teachers, and will have the style that will make it appealing to today's youth. Combining education and entertainment is an approach which CTW has employed successfully from its beginnings in 1969, from "Sesame Street" and "The Electric Company" through "3-2-1 CONTACT" and "Square One TV."

With "Ghostwriter," CTW is building on an understanding of obstacles to literacy to help children read with comprehension and write with more coherence. Research indicates that at approximately age 9 or 10, too many children become discouraged from reading and writing for pleasure. They have not experienced the personal rewards of literacy. If this happens, a child's ability to learn and succeed in school is threatened.

"Ghostwriter" provides children with powerful role models for their everyday lives. It builds on children's strengths, not their deficiencies. The project's three major curriculum goals are:

First, to motivate children to enjoy and value reading and writing;

Second, to show children effective approaches to learning to read and write; and

Third, to provide children with creative opportunities to read and write as part of the program's format.

These goals are an integral part of each element of the "Ghostwriter" literacy project, starting with the weekly mystery-adventure TV series on PBS. Joining the television program to promote reading and writing skills are 20 million copies of a free "Ghostwriter" minimagazine; a newspaper column; 350,000 copies of classroom materials; and extensive outreach to children.

The program is designed to encourage partnerships with national youth-serving organizations like the YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs, 4-H, Girls Inc., and the Girl Scouts. It also includes ties to local grassroots agencies as well as concentrated efforts in five sites: Atlanta, Los Angeles, the Mississippi Delta, Appalachia, and San Antonio.

Other programs recently funded by CPB involve redesigning and repackaging traditional children's programming on public television with instructor training and teaching materials, such as:

"Extending the Neighborhood," which adapts "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood" for use in childcare centers to help children gain social skills that will assist them in school; and

"Sesame Street Preschool Education Programming" which provides specially prepared training and support

materials to help teachers and parents use "Sesame Street" to promote early development of learning skills and the curiosity of children ages 2 to 5.

Public broadcasting has a role to play in American education. It provides information and intellectual enrichment to a broad spectrum of society.

Mr. President, I support this legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as we undertake the reauthorization legislation for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, I have tried to imagine a world without public broadcasting: a world that was not enriched by the "Eyes on the Prize" series or Ken Burns' series on the Civil War; a generation of young people who were not aided by the high-quality educational programming seen on public television; a world with students who were deprived of the opportunity to earn a high school or college education because the public broadcasting system was not there to help bring the classroom to them.

I cannot imagine such a world. A future deprived of this public service would be bleak and grey. What programs would never be seen? How many lost opportunities to educate someone eager to learn?

Few Federal ventures enjoy the broad and active public support that has been the hallmark of public broadcasting. And this is as it should be, for the true mission of public broadcasting goes to the very heart of democracy. Thomas Jefferson put it very well when he said, "Democracy demands an educated citizenry." Public broadcasting is certainly a positive force toward realizing that worthy goal.

To regard public broadcasting as merely public entertainment is to vastly underestimate its effect and its purpose. Public broadcasting is one of the Nation's exemplary educational institutions, an institution that is free in nearly every home and car in America; an institution voluntarily supported and used by millions.

Its public success is equaled by its contribution. Let me be specific: Each day in Oregon, over 40,000 preschoolers watch "Sesame Street" and "Mister Roger's Neighborhood." To duplicate this coverage in a classroom would require 1,600 classrooms of 25 students each.

Each year in Oregon, we graduate 600 high school students through the GED on TV program. I am proud to say that this represents one of the larger graduating classes in my State.

Each year more Oregonians per capita enroll in college credit courses in TV than in any other State. These courses bring a college degree within the reach of students of all ages in both urban and rural communities, handicapped students and students with children at home. These courses also relieve enrollment pressure on our community college system.

And, Mr. President, public broadcasting is not just a one-way street. Oregonians love public broadcasting, and they show it through their loyal viewership: Oregon Public Broadcasting is distinguished as the most watched public broadcaster in the United States, according to the Nielson ratings.

Oregonians also show their support for public broadcasting through their substantial monetary contributions. Currently, over 96,000 Oregon residents contribute over half of the annual operating revenues of Oregon Public Broadcasting, with Oregon businesses underwriting an additional 13 percent.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to recall the origins and initial purposes of this program. In 1967, this body passed the Public Broadcasting Act. As was stated at the time, public broadcasting was to fill the gap left by the market-bound commercial broadcasting industry. Public broadcasting was to serve diverse audiences that are often underrepresented in the entertainment world, where a program's fate often hinges on ratings and advertising revenue.

The act of 1967 was the seed from which a bountiful garden has grown. Public broadcasting is a marketplace of diverse ideas and a meeting place for all Americans, regardless of income, education, geographic location, or physical handicap.

As we were painfully reminded by the recent rioting in Los Angeles, we live in a world that still simmers with intolerance, and at times our troubled melting pot boils over. Public broadcasting breeds appreciation for diversity and tolerance through understanding.

In a world that is growing so rapidly and becoming more diverse every day, there is a place and a need for quality public broadcasting programs. Public broadcasting brings a vast and diverse world right into our livingrooms, helps us keep in touch with it, understand it and hopefully more fully appreciate its richness.

This need is especially great as many communities across this Nation experience economic difficulties. In good times, education is an ornament; in bad times it is a refuge. While for some of the well-off in this land, education is an ornament within easy reach, we must ensure that it remains at least a refuge for those who would be the first to lose access to it in bad times. In this respect, public broadcasting performs a vital role.

I would like to take a moment to compliment my friend from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, for his foresight in sponsoring an amendment that is a step toward implementing a ready-to-learn public television channel for preschoolers. Such a channel will help parents and child care providers prepare preschool children for school. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment and look forward to the report which will result from it.

While television offerings have improved substantially in recent years, television without public broadcasting would be a step back toward that television wasteland that many saw prior to the advent of public broadcasting. I urge my colleagues to support reauthorization of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to speak in support of the legislation reported from the Commerce Committee and the funding level it provides for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I would like to discuss several of the significant benefits of public broadcasting which lead me to the position I am taking. First, increasing funding for public broadcasting means increasing the educational services that are available through television. That is an investment in our future. And it is time we took television seriously as an educational tool.

Public broadcasting has begun to produce programs to address adult literacy, ready-to-learn programs for preschoolers, and classroom materials for secondary schools. With increased funding, more can be done on these fronts. We all know that our communities need help with education; public broadcasting is a cost-effective way of providing that help.

Public broadcasting doesn't just produce a radio or television program, put it on the air for anyone who might happen to see it, and then go on to the next show. Public broadcasting builds in educational components such as teachers' guides, recreates some of the programs specifically for classroom use, and develops ways to involve the audience, extending the usefulness of programs to really serve the public. It is that service that needs and deserves our support.

Second, if we do not provide sufficient funding, we are not going to have quality programs that examine critical social issues. Let me give you an example.

The public station in Boston, WGBH, produced a forum on American health care entitled "Condition Critical" which many of you may have seen. WGBH brought together representatives from all facets of health care, from all over the country and Canada, and with Phil Donahue as host, devoted 2 hours of prime time television to this pressing national concern.

But that was only the most visible action taken. WGBH also prepared and distributed educational packets to the public, outlining different systems of health care, to increase understanding and aid consideration of this complex

issue. These packets went to schools and libraries, inner-city clinics, and civic organizations. And the packet included a ballot to involve citizens and ask them what system they think would best serve Americans. There was also a national telephone line viewers could call to express their opinion.

Public radio also joined in the effort with a series of reports on the national business program, "Marketplace," the week before the television broadcast. And to complement this national effort, in Boston and in cities around the country, local public television programs focused on the issue to address local concerns on the topic. And "Condition Critical" spawned local forums, panel discussions, and workshops on health care.

This is an example of public broadcasting fulfilling its mission to inform and enlighten our citizens. It didn't just produce a TV show; it reached out on a national scale to illuminate a major social issue. Such efforts are not inexpensive. Yes, public broadcasting receives some corporate and private support. But that would be nowhere nearly sufficient for efforts of this scope. Following the broadcast of "Condition Critical," WGBH and other stations around the country received hundreds of calls from viewers, and WGBH alone received a dozen calls from Members of Congress and State and local governments requesting more information or videotapes of the program.

By increasing our support for public broadcasting, we are investing in our society and in a partnership. Our support of the public broadcasting service leverages other funds—funds it and local stations work hard to raise themselves. The partnership we have created is premised on the assumption that Congress will maintain support for this service. Other contributors then do their share. That includes both corporations and individuals.

One of those individuals is a woman in Massachusetts named Ruth Anne Dingee. Ms. Dingee is in her sixties and lives alone in South Boston. She was a professional church organist and singer who loved to travel and go to museums and concerts before she was severely disabled 10 years ago. Now she is in a wheelchair, nearly a shut-in. Her neighbors take her to church on Sundays so she can still sing with the choir, but otherwise she is homebound. Ms. Dingee has a lot of time to watch television.

But she doesn't have cable and she says most of what is on commercial TV distresses her. She says that when she became disabled and her world became smaller it was public television that opened it up again. Public broadcasting took her to places she could not otherwise go, broadening her education and deepening her mind. The drama and performance programs allow her to enter theaters and concert halls. She says that when people talk with her, they never guess how little she can participate in society, because PBS allows her to be informed and involved. She doesn't have to pay someone to take her out to movies because the world comes into her home on public television. It sustains her. Ruth Anne Dingee gives money to public television. And she says she is upset with Congress for even considering reducing its support for PBS.

There are millions of Ruth Anne Dingees in this country. She is just one person among the 40 percent of our population which does not have cable. I think we owe it to her and all Americans who share with her a deep appreciation for public broadcasting, to recommit ourselves to advancing PBS and the service it provides—to help further its contributions to society rather than hold it back. I urge my colleagues to support the bill before the Senate and the funding level for public broadcasting which it contains.

In closing, I compliment the chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, Senator INOUYE, the chairman of the full committee, Senator HOLLINGS, and the very capable and dedicated committee staff for their leadership and hard work which have been key to progress on this important legislation.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I will suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GLOBAL WARMING AND POPULATION GROWTH

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the floor about the need for an urgent and concerted international effort to protect the globe's land resources—soils and forests—and to protect the wondrous and largely unknown store of biological diversity around the globe.

This morning, as the negotiations at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development get underway in Brazil, I want to address issues of the atmosphere and the related, critically important issue of rapid population growth.

In the 20 years since the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, the first major international conference on environmental affairs, the United States and other nations have made major strides in recognizing the problems of atmospheric pollution.

The Earth's atmosphere is a relatively thin, but immensely powerful component of our planet's environment. This veil shrouds the planet—filtering out and protecting us from the Sun's harmful rays, moderating and regulating global climate and renewing and cleansing the air we breathe. As we learned in elementary school, our unique atmosphere makes life on this planet possible. Our atmosphere is a wonder. Its unique composition distinguishes planet Earth from Mars, Jupiter, or Saturn. Remembering that simple truth, we must consider what we are doing to the atmosphere.

At the local level, we are putting harmful pollutants in the lower regions of the atmosphere. Looking south from my home in Boulder, CO, this fact is painfully clear. An ugly brown cloud hangs over my State's capitol, a constant reminder of what local air pollution means.

Since World War II, industrialized society has become increasingly proficient at loading the air over our cities with harmful pollutants. Particulates and sulfur dioxide are the major emissions. Seventy percent of the world's urban population lives in cities where particulates exceed the World Health Organization's guidelines.

So, too, we have seen the problems related to the release of nitrogen oxides, which react with other compounds and light to form ozone, otherwise known as smog. In our own country, 50 percent of the population lives in counties were the air does not meet the national ozone standard.

Finally, we have noted the effects of lead in the air. Enormous strides have been made in eliminating lead in this country. Elsewhere, one-third of the world's cities exceed the World Health Organization's standard for lead levels.

More broadly, the manmade emissions are impacting the air at the regional level. Acid rain, first recognized in the late 1960's, and ground-level ozone are now significant regional concerns. It has been well documented that ozone and acid rain are identifiable causes of forest and crop declines on at least two continents and have health and ecological impacts across an extensive area.

In response to these trends, the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution was developed in 1979. This agreement among the nations of Europe and North America has evolved into an effective treaty that will reduce acid rain precursors by 30 percent.

Progress has been made in reaching agreement on reductions for emissions that lead to the formation of ground-level ozone as well. In the future, it is imperative that careful attention be paid to updating these agreements to keep pace with the pollution-induced stress of ecosystems and monitor emissions trends in the developing nations, which could increase precipitously.

Local and regional air pollution have significant effects. More profound are the effects of human activity on the global atmosphere. As a species, we are fundamentally altering the composition of the atmosphere with unknown consequences for the global climate upon which we not only depend, but have based our societies on.

It is a fact that the Earth's atmosphere acts in ways similar to a greenhouse. Without a certain level of gases and water vapor in the atmosphere trapping heat near the Earth's surface, our planet would be about 60 degrees cooler than it is and the feasibility of life would be called into question.

Even without human interference, the climate record indicates that atmospheric composition of the so-called greenhouse gases has varied over geologic time. Whether these changes were the cause or effect of a changing climate is unclear. Nonetheless, there is a close correlation between the atmospheric concentration of heat-trapping gases and the global climate record.

For these reasons, the introduction of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere by man is extremely worrisome. There is no question but that our activity is changing the composition of the atmosphere. In 1988, when I first introduced comprehensive legislation to address the threat of global warming, the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide was about 350 parts per million—70 parts greater than it was before the advent of the industrial revolution. And today, 4 years later, atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide have increased to 355 parts per million.

The increased carbon content of the atmosphere is directly attributable to the tenfold increase in manmade emissions during this century. Carbon dioxide—the primary greenhouse gas resulting from fossil fuel burning, deforestation and cement production—is increasing in concentration at the rate of 0.4 percent per year. Methane—a powerful heat trapping gas that results from livestock production, the cultivation of rice, coal production, landfill decomposition, and other natural processes—is increasing at 0.7 percent annually. The story is the same with nitrous oxide and tropospheric ozone, the other greenhouse gases.

Chlorofluorocarbons—the primary agent eating away at the stratospheric ozone layer—is also a powerful heat trapping gas, and of course has been rising in concentration in the atmosphere. However, recent scientific evidence suggests that overall, the introduction of CFC's into the atmosphere has a net cooling effect, and indeed may be masking global warming that otherwise would have occurred. It is extremely important for us to keep in mind as we phase out CFC's that with reduced chlorine concentrations in the atmosphere, scientists expect a warming effect.

Based on manmade emissions, the question is no longer if the Earth will warm, but how much, how fast. During the last decade, the warmest temperatures on record have been reached eight times—a trend that does not bode well for the future.

Much has been made of the perceived scientific debate about the science of global warming. In fact, this issue has been discussed for more than 100 years, since the first postulation of global warming was written by the Swedish scientist Arrhenius.

Since the 1970's, and more intensively in the 1980's, scientific efforts have been stepped up. In a comprehensive international effort to establish the knowns and unknowns, nations joined together under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meterological Organization to undertake a major international assessment. Thus, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] was formed in late 1988.

The scientific panel of the IPCC has issued two authoritative assessments on the state of scientific understanding of global warming. The major conclusion of this assessment, peer reviewed by 380 scientists from 63 countries, is that based on current emissions we can expect a warming of 3 to 8 degrees sometime in the next century. A warming of enormous scope and unprecedented speed. To put the magnitude of such a warming in perspective, my colleagues should consider that at the height of the last ice age global temperatures were only 9 degrees cooler than they are today and ice a mile thick covered much of the northern part of our country.

In the face of these scientific understandings, the nations of the world have been working on a convention to address the issue of global climate change for more than 2 years. At the outset, we should recognize that the pace at which this issue has been confronted is remarkable. In 1988, as drought gripped much of North America, Europe, and Asia, the issue of global warming exploded in our consciousness. It is truly remarkable that diplomats have moved so far in such a short time.

Unhappily, our own United States has not been at the forefront of that effort. Indeed, we are widely regarded as being a force for inaction in the development of an international response to prevent rapid global warming.

Despite the best efforts from the community of nations, only a lowest common denominator convention could be agreed to. The pressure of the U.S. Government for less, and the desire of other nations to ensure that our President attend the Earth summit, combined to result in an agreement that was significantly weakened. The unfolding of these developments was clearly identified in a Wall Street Journal article last week.

Unhappily, the administration's strategy for a climate change convention has entailed many costs—from a biodiversity and forestry agreement to the potential for a new era of global partnership. These are major costs, major losses for our country, and history will not be kind to this administration, which reflexively responds to the politics of an old world order, while preaching the need for the new.

It is also a major underachievement for a nation the entire world is looking to for leadership. From the developing world to the industrialized community, all eyes are on the United States. We can literally make or break a treaty. If the United States sets a course, the world will follow. Unfortunately, our lead was too timid, and so was the result.

The most disconcerting aspect of our resistance to change is that we have the opportunity and the need to become more energy efficient and to develop cleaner alternatives to oil, such as our abundant reserves of natural gas.

Yesterday, the Washington Post ran an outstanding article clearly identifying the inefficiency of our country. We have a major opportunity to reduce the consumption of energy and shift investment to more productive uses. Together, this strategy will make us more competitive and allow us to market desperately needed energy efficient and clean energy technology. International competition in the market for environmentally sound technology is clearly emerging—and may define winners and losers for decades to come.

As has been documented in numerous accounts, the Germans and the Japanese are aggressively preparing to market the products of the future. They are ready for change, ready to compete. The United States, too, must engage in that competition. Economically, the need is to compete in what one businessman has called the greatest investment opportunity in history. Ecologically, the need is to provide the nations of the developing world with the technology they require to develop in a sustainable manner. Without careful attention to clean energy development, these nations—particularly China and India—will far outpace the ability of the industrialized world to the concentration of heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere.

Why should other nations stretch when we have not been willing to stretch at all?

Good questions asked in the diplomatic community, similar questions being asked in the business community. The Germans and the Japanese are well on their way toward understanding the enormous market internationally for their products in terms of cleaning up the environment, energy efficiency, and so on. The United States again lags behind particularly as this administration refuses to lead.

For all of these reasons, the nations of the world sought to establish a global partnership to tackle the challenge of global warming. That was the promise of 2 years of negotiation. Unfortunately, only the most modest of first steps has been engineered by our own country, the United States of America. The rest of the world, the developing countries, the developed countries, the island nations, all asked us for bold leadership. Our response was a paltry and halting set of steps.

Finally, Mr. President, any discussion of global climate change or global environmental crisis is incomplete without mention of the most pressing and daunting development in our history, the rapid rise of the human population.

With an estimated annual growth of one-tenth of 1 percent a year, it took until the early 19th century for human population to reach the first billion. During the Industrial Revolution, the growth rate rose to approximately 1.5 percent and human numbers reached 2 billion by 1927. Over the next 40 years, as modern health emerged and food supplies became more secure, population moved up another billion to 3. And finally, in 1970, the rate of population growth peaked at just more than 2 percent and we hit 4 billion in 1975, and 5 billion in 1988; 4 years later we are approaching 5.5 billion people. The escalation is underway. And by the end of this century, population will have eclipsed 6.3 billion.

This staggering rate of increase, 400,000 new individuals added to our numbers each and every day, is most acute in the nations that can least afford it. Population growth diminishes the efforts of the poorest nations to achieve their development goals while simultaneously influencing severely overtaxed natural resources.

Recently, the United Nations Population Fund released a report detailing the effects of this population explosion, and that report is ominous, indeed.

The report found that population growth is responsible for 79 percent of the deforestation, 72 percent of the arable land expansion, and 69 percent of the growth of livestock numbers occurring in the developing nations. Human numbers are overwhelming both our capacity to understand and respond to the increased need and impacts of a rapidly growing population.

Unfortunately, the future holds more rapid population growth. According to the best U.N. projections, the most optimistic scenario for the future would have global population stabilize at approximately 8 billion people. More likely, population will eclipse the 10 billion mark and stabilize at 11 billion. The most dire forecasts predict growth to more than 20 billion people by the middle of the 22d century.

The difference between these disparate futures—between 8, 11, or 20 billion people on the planet—could not be more clear.

Today, more than 1 billion people live in circumstances that can only be described as acute poverty. And most of the growth going on in rapid population around the world is for people who have no prospects for a job, have no prospects for education, have no prospect for the fulfillment of the human goal, the human ideal and the human potential.

It is imperative that the United States get its shoulder once again behind efforts to provide universal access to safe and effective family planning services. We have to launch major new health initiatives to provide basic maternal and child health services.

Basic needs—food, water, sanitation, and shelter—are not being met. If the peoples of this world cannot provide for one-fifth of the population in a world of finite resources, how can we possibly expect to provide for massive increases in population?

More than half a billion people have no work in the developing world. Every year during the 1990's, just to keep pace with population growth, the developing nations would have to create 30 million new jobs just to prevent unemployment from getting worse. Given the retrenchment of poverty during the 1980's—a lost decade for development—there is little hope for achieving employment, health, and food needs in the developing world. This is a timebomb waiting to explode, and we had better be prepared for it.

Simple prudence dictates that we make every effort to stabilize population at the earliest date and lowest number possible—with the goal of holding global population to less than 8 billion. This is a significant, but easily achieved goal. As set forth at the 1989 Amsterdam meeting on global population, the international community, at a cost of less than $10 billion, could provide family planning services to all individuals by the year 2000. It would be one of the wisest investments ever made.

In addition to providing universal access to safe and effective family planning services, we must launch major efforts to address the other determinants of fertility rates around the world. We can begin by working urgently to improve the status of women around the globe. We must launch major new health initiatives to provide basic maternal and child health services, reduce infant mortality and eradicate the devastation wrought by well-known, easily preventable diseases. We need to lead a worldwide educational effort—geared in particular to the needs of young females. And finally, we should join with other nations to launch a new partnership to attack poverty.

Population growth is the single most demanding challenge we face. Our ability to respond to the challenge will largely determine not just the ecological balance of the future, but also the security of an increasingly complex world in the 21st century. The objectives of global environmental protection and a new era of global cooperation and security cannot be addressed if we continue to allow the issue of population growth to be held hostage by false domestic political debates, or by ignorance and inaction.

The action plan coming out of the Earth summit will include significant recommendations for addressing population growth. Concrete goals and objectives are lacking. Incredibly, the document does not even reference family planning services. Nonetheless, we have no choice but to use the UNCED recommendations on population as a starting point for a focused and substantive discussion of population issues as nations prepare for the 1994 Conference on Population—where agreement must be reached to confront rapid population growth.

The rise in human numbers, coupled with the tremendous advances in consumption and technology that have characterized the 20th century, has occurred with such speed that we have only had limited time to understand them. But understand and deal with them we must.

In many ways, the future habitability of the planet will hinge on the actions we take in the remainder of this decade to address issues of population growth and global warming, as well as a host of other major environmental challenges. We must clearly identify the problems, their cause and solution.

Preparing for the Earth summit beginning today in Brazil, recognition and understanding of the problems has been launched. As always, this is a major step toward solution. Beyond recognition, we must develop the political will to respond. That is the challenge for Rio and beyond.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the Wall Street Journal article to which I referred, along with two pieces from the Washington Post which describe the very close relationship between energy and the environment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Rose Gutfeld)

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 27, 1992]

Earth Summitry: How Bush Achieved Global Warming Pact With Modest Goals

(By Rose Gutfeld)

WASHINGTON.—Until two weeks ago, it looked as if next week's Earth Summit in Rio de Janiero would become a widely publicized global morality play, with President Bush cast as the villain.

He was the only major world leader unwilling to sign an agreement with firm limits on the "greenhouse" gases feared to cause global warming. Mr. Bush, who as a candidate in 1988 had promised to be the "environmental president," was in danger of being tagged in Rio as No. 1 Enemy of the Earth.

But in an extraordinary coup, made final in a crowded conference room at the United Nations on a Saturday evening, Bush administration negotiators persuaded the representatives of 142 other nations to reverse course. They all agreed to sign a vaguely worded pact that sets no binding timetables for reducing emissions, makes no commitments to achieving specific levels of emissions—indeed, makes no commitments to do anything at all.

How did the White House manage to set the global-warming agenda for the coming conference on its own terms? The key, according to people familiar with the talks, was a clever bargaining ploy devised by an influential but little-known State Department official. The heart of his strategy: to use the threat that Mr. Bush would boycott the summit to wangle an agreement that wouldn't lock the U.S. into costly requirements that could threaten economic growth.

U.S. LEVERAGE

Robert Zoellick, an undersecretary of state, assumed the lead on the talks because his boss, Secretary of State James Baker, has recused himself on energy issues because of his financial holdings. Mr. Zoellick began arguing early this year that what little leverage the U.S. had came from the desire of other nations to have President Bush attend the Rio conference. If the leader of the world's only remaining superpower didn't show, they figured, the conference would be judged a failure. So as the summit drew nearer, Mr. Bush steadfastly refused to say if he would go, while allowing his advisers to carry on a quasi-public debate over whether or not he should.

Managing the issue within the administration was Clayton Yeutter, the domestic policy czar. "We felt we had a major challenge on our hands in dealing with the climate-change issue, with a substantial probability that it could provide a black eye to the president," he says. "In political terms, the conservatives of this country were frightened by the prospect of the president agreeing to a stabilization commitment * * * that could be potentially destructive to his chances of being reelected."

The politically successful outcome mainly reflects the power the U.S. can still bring to bear in world affairs, despite fears that fiscal problems and a declining share of world output weakened America's position in the post-Soviet world. "Some fear that we are in a period of protracted decline," says Sen. Tim Wirth, a Colorado Democrat who is sharply critical of the agreement. "To me, the negotiations were an affirmation of our immense power."

ELECTION YEAR EFFECT

In retrospect, even officials who argued most strenuously against Mr. Bush's going to Rio now say it was inevitable he would. "You don't want to be the only guy on the planet who didn't show up," says a Bush campaign aide, especially in an election year. Moreover, Mr. Bush clearly wanted to go. A frequent flier to international confabs, he didn't like the thought of missing one of the largest gatherings of heads of state in history. Even if the U.S couldn't reach agreement with other countries, he suggested to his advisers at one point, "maybe I should just go and explain to them why we disagree."

But by creating the impression that Mr. Bush might boycott the conference, Mr. Zoellick and his team were able to win concession beyond their fondest hopes from European nations. The U.S. is the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases, so "a treaty without the U.S. would not be very useful," says Bert Metz, an official of the Netherlands' ministry of environments.

NO COMMITMENTS

Also, trading partners weren't willing to risk jeopardizing the relationship they have with the U.S. on a range of other issues, such as monetary policy. Finally, some Bush administration officials contend that other world leaders were actually grateful for the chance to sign a weak accord; there is uncertainty in some overseas capitals about whether tough emissions curbs are advisable or achievable, despite the rhetoric of environment ministers.

What the negotiators ended up with was a mild accord under which the developed nations will agree to try to bring emissions of greenhouse gases—such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide—back to 1990 levels by the year 2000. But though they won't commit to any specific action, the treaty still will mark the first international effort to control the gases, which many scientists believe will cause significant global warming by the middle of the next century, perhaps resulting in droughts, flooding and damage to marine and other ecosystems.

The treaty will set up a procedure for monitoring scientific advances so that modifications could be undertaken. Developing nations will establish policies designed to limit their emissions, which nevertheless are expected to rise substantially; rich nations will provide financial and technical aid to the developing world, although amounts haven't been agreed upon. The accord doesn't cover chlorofluorocarbons, the gases that damage the stratospheric ozone layer; they are being phased out under a separate agreement already signed.

Many environmentalists say that even stabilizing emissions would fall short of what is likely to be needed to combat global warming. This worries American industry and White House officials. They fear that a strong climate-change accord would slow economic growth now and set up an international regime that would press the U.S. to institute far more costly and sweeping measures in the next century.

Even the mild accord will give encouragement to lawmakers and environmentalists to push for stronger international and unilateral action, especially if the scientific evidence builds. But for now the Bush administration feels it has dodged a bullet.

The story of how the U.S. views moved from being scorned to being accepted began last December, with the departure of White House Chief of Staff John Sununu, a powerful critic of any action to head off global warming. Although others in the administration continued to oppose such action as anti-growth—including Budget Director Richard Darman, chief economist Michael Boskin and counselor Boyden Gray—the Sununu departure invigorated officials such as National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft who saw climate change as a global issue that required presidential leadership. Meanwhile, environmentalists and Democratic presidential hopeful Bill Clinton began pounding the president for not committing to the summit.

GREEN LIGHTS

As the debate grew, William Reilly of the Environmental Protection Agency tried to show that curbing carbon dioxide emissions didn't have to deter economic growth. To his delight, an obscure EPA program called Green Lights, under which companies voluntarily agree to install energy-efficient lighting, was proving a bigger energy saver than anticipated. The EPA believed that this and other actions undertaken through the Clean Air Act or the national energy strategy would be enough to bring emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

But the Energy Department, using different assumptions about growth and the likely penetration of new technology, contended that emission limits would be far costlier. Eventually a compromise was brokered by Robert Grady, deputy director-designate of the White House budget office, holding that programs already in the works would bring emissions in the year 2000 to within 1.5 percent to 6 percent of 1990 levels.

The involvement of Mr. Grady and Mr. Zoellick was crucial because they are proteges of Mr. Darman, who remains opposed to the accord both men helped produce. At one point, a frustrated Mr. Darman urged insertion of language saying "nothing in this agreement shall be interpreted as requiring any country to take measures that would result in growth of less than 3.25% a year."

COMING AROUND

Pressure for a compromise built at a February negotiating session at the U.N. and then at an April meeting in Paris with major U.S. trading partners. At first, U.S. negotiators' refusal to countenance timetables or emission limits drew disdain from their European counterparts. But "they finally realized that we weren't kidding," says Robert Reinstein, a deputy assistant secretary of state. The Europeans began to indicate a willingness to talk. Jacques Delors, president of the EC Commission, suggested to President Bush that the Europeans might give up on their aim of a long-term stabilization of greenhouse gases if the U.S. was willing to bring emissions back to 1990 levels by 2000. But Mr. Zoellick and others stuck to a single message: no timetables for emission reductions.

Meanwhile, Democratic Rep. Henry Waxman of California was drawing increasing support for legislation requiring the U.S. to unilaterally stabilize carbon dioxide emissions at 1990 levels. At a White House meeting, counselor Gray expressed concern that reaching a compromise on climate change would give great impetus to the Waxman bill. The president snapped back, according to participants, "Since when is Henry Waxman running this government?"

As this month's final negotiating session approached, the State Department's Mr. Zoellick moved into diplomatic high gear, seeking out foreign leaders who were most anxious to have Mr. Bush attend and sign a treaty. Word came that Britain might be willing to talk. Just days before the U.N. session was to begin, Mr. Zoellick and Britain's secretary of state for the environment,

Michael Howard, met in Washington to cut a deal.

As other nations moved closer to the U.S. position, EPA chief Reilly and others continued to push for an agreement. "We cannot let the president go to Rio and end up standing against the entire world," Mr. Reilly argued. "We can and must get a climate deal he can support and America can honor."

LET'S DO IT

The result was the vague language that Mr. Bush found acceptable. Just before signing off on the U.S.-authored climate change agreement that has now been accepted at the United Nations, President Bush met with a small group of top policy advisers in the White House. "Well, let's go with it," he said. "I suppose I'm going to get beat up on the right and beat up on the left. So be it. Let's go with it."

To bring Europeans along, President Bush made several calls, including one to German Chancellor Helmut Kohl. And Mr. Yeutter, to allay fears in the business community, wrote to Democratic Rep. John Dingell of Michigan stating that "there is nothing in any of the language which constitutes a commitment to a specific level of emissions at any time."

The agreement was sealed at the U.N. when Jean Ripert, a Frenchman who chairs the U.N. committee that negotiated the climate-change accord, defended the vague agreement as the only one that would gain the U.S. signature—and get Mr. Bush to Rio. "The United States is not going to change its position," he said in arguing for its approval. On Saturday, May 9, the agreement was accepted with applause from the representatives of the 143 nations and others in the U.N. visitors' gallery. Recently, Rep. Waxman withdrew, for now, his legislative proposal demanding unilateral U.S. action.

But while the Europeans clearly lost on their wish for a cap on emissions into the next century, Mr. Metz, the Dutch environment official, says the U.S. also compromised. And he predicts that because of international pressure, emissions by the year 2000 will still end up at 1990 levels. Besides, he notes, "even when you have a treaty that's very clear, if countries don't want to live by it they don't."

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1992]

RUST-BELT EMISSIONS CLOUD EARTH SUMMIT

(By Michael Weisskopf)

LORAIN, OH.—Built on the banks of Lake Erie in 1919, the Edgewater power plant is still spinning out electricity from a steam boiler half as efficient as state-of-the-art generators. Power courses through antique transmission lines to the nearby Ford Motor Co. plant, which makes vans from steel forged the old-fashioned way, using three times the energy of new blast furnaces.

Welded, painted and fitted with a motor, the vans are moved down a long assembly line lit brightly as a jeweler's case and strewn with power tools hissing air. A new Ford Econoline rolls out every 60 seconds, built with about twice as much energy as a comparable Japanese vehicle.

Lorain is a long way from Rio de Janeiro. But the way its factories and products affect the global environment will be one of the paramount concerns of the industrialized nations gathering in Brazil Wednesday for the opening of the U.N. Earth Summit.

Unlike the developing nations of the Third World—which have to put economic survival ahead of ecology—the industrialized countries generally agree that they must become more energy-efficient if they are to improve the environment.

But here in the Rust Belt, amid orphan remnants of the Industrial Revolution, old energy habits die hard. Every additional dollop of energy put into the Econoline van means that much more carbon dioxide put into the atmosphere. The most prevalent of the "greenhouse gases" that threaten to turn up the planet's temperature, carbon dioxide is released when oil and natural gas are burned to generate power for factories, homes and vehicles in cities around the world.

Econoline, the nation's best-selling full-sized van, is by no means the least efficiently made U.S. product. But it is typical of the heavy energy consumption—and carbon dioxide bingeing—in U.S. manufacturing. And the way it is produced is illustrative of why many American industries fear strict measures to control global warming and tighten environmental protections.

Energy inefficiency is responsible for a host of problems, including smog, acid rain and forest damage, the ecological costs of coal mining, and oil disasters from the Exxon Valdez spill to leaking "tank farms" in Virginia. But literally above all, it contributes to the threat of global warming, the Earth Summit's hinge issue as representatives of more than 50 nations debate how to develop the planet without destroying it.

Thus the principal challenge facing industrialized nations at Rio is to decide among themselves on a strategy for better management of energy.

No nation has resisted the call more doggedly than the United States, which singlehandedly blocked a tougher treaty sought by the rest of the industrialized world to stabilize carbon dioxide emissions.

U.S. EMISSIONS OF CARBON DIOXIDE

Yet no nation contributes more to the threat. The United States, with less than 5 percent of the world's population, emitted 22 percent of the world's carbon dioxide in 1989, according to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The average American used enough energy at home, work and play to emit 5.4 metric tons (one metric ton is about 2,200 pounds), compared to 2.3 metric tons per capita in Japan, 2.9 in western Germany, 1.7 in France and 0.6 in China.

Part of the reason for that difference is a product of the coveted U.S. lifestyle: Americans generally live more comfortably in spacious homes that are much better heated, better cooled and more highly illuminated than the average in even wealthy nations.

And part is geographic: Possessing a quarter of the world's coal reserves, the United States has less need to scrimp. Cheap energy has always been a staple of industry. In addition, the vast U.S. land mass—dwarfing Japan or individual European countries—requires long-distance travel to distribute basic goods and services.

"We're blessed with a tremendous amount of natural resources, and the Japanese aren't," said Murray Weidenbaum, an economics professor at Washington University in St. Louis. "It makes sense to use the resources you have in great abundance."

But much of the disparity in national emissions of carbon dioxide is attributable to waste. According to Amory Lovins, director of the Rocky Mountain Institute in Colorado, an energy think tank, global warming will be "an artifact of the economically inefficient use of resources, especially energy."

A series of international comparisons by the federally funded Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory in California showed that efficiency was responsible for nearly half the difference in U.S. and Japanese uses of energy. When the same activity was compared for energy use, the Japanese consumed 30 percent less per unit of industrial output, 25 percent less for air conditioning and 25 percent less for auto travel.

In Europe, only Norway and Sweden exceed U.S. industrial energy use per unit of output, in large part because they concentrate in the production of energy-intensive aluminum and other basic materials. France, Germany and Britain each consumed 40 percent less energy than the United States for every unit of industrial output in 1988. Even bigger differences occur in auto fuel efficiency. Americans consume about 50 percent more gasoline for every mile traveled than Italian and Danish motorists.

THE BENEFITS OF EFFICIENCY

To understand the environmental benefits of efficiency, consider the Ford Econoline. The energy spent on each van, including the production of steel, generates 10 tons of carbon dioxide, industry experts estimated.

In Japan, producing the same vehicle with less energy would generate about 7 tons of pollution, the experts said. Modern blast furnaces run more efficiently than old coke ovens. Auto plants are equipped with super-efficient motors and laid out to minimize lighting and heat.

The 1973 oil crisis awakened Americans to the value of efficiency. And over the following 10 years, America's per capita use of fuel decreased sharply, despite a population increase of about 20 million and a 30 percent rise in gross national product. By 1987, U.S. industry cut its energy use by a third for every unit of output and U.S. vehicles used a third less gasoline per mile. Still, cars and factories lagged far behind the efficiency of Japanese and European competitors.

"The Japanese and Europeans were always more prepared to meet the world on competitive terms," said Lee Schipper, an energy economist and author of the Lawrence Berkeley studies. "As world trading nations, they can't afford to be wasteful."

No one questions the potential for reducing U.S. energy use and pollution. The Bush administration reported recently that with a few inexpensive measures, industry could offset the growth in energy consumption projected for this decade. More optimistic analyses say that halving energy use is technologically feasible and easily affordable.

But barriers to reform are rooted deeply in the nation's political system. Energy has never been taxed to reflect the full costs of its production and use, including the cleanup of environmental damage and the defense of foreign oil fields, said Eric Hirst, a corporate fellow at the Oak Ridge laboratory. Instead of taxing energy suppliers and consumers, the government passes along those costs in general taxes.

As a result, many analysts believe, energy prices have remained so low that they encourage consumption. By contrast, the high price of European gasoline—bloated by taxes to $4 a gallon in Italy—encourages conservation. Europeans buy more fuel-efficient cars and rely more heavily than Americans on public transportation.

U.S. energy suppliers not only escape taxes, but also receive federal subsidies that cover much of their costs and permit them to keep prices low. According to the Center for Renewable Resources here, a study of the fiscal 1984 budget found that there were $44 billion worth of such subsidies in the form of tax breaks, loans, loan guarantees, research grants and protection from liability. Chief

recipients were electric utilities and producers of oil and coal.

The 1986 tax law eliminated some of the breaks. But when the Alliance to Save Energy, a nonprofit research and advocacy group here, recently examined the fiscal 1989 budget, it found that energy suppliers still received tax credits of $75 million for the purchase of new equipment and took $400 million in deductions for the costs of oil and gas exploration. Industry also benefited from $5.5 billion in Energy Department research programs during the 1980s to identify new techniques for producing and cleaning up fossil fuels.

"If we're sending price signals to consumers that energy is cheaper than it really is, we'll be building buildings and plants with less efficiency than we should and we'll be using more fossil fuels than would make sense from an economic point of view," said Mary Beth Zimmerman, the alliance's program manager.

All of which may help to explain what happens in Lorain, a largely blue-collar town of 75,000 people. Located on Lake Erie, within easy reach of Appalachian coal fields, it is a natural hub for heavy industry. Today's lineup of energy-guzzling plants here—construction equipment, steel and auto—makes Lorain a miniature of Cleveland 25 miles to its east and a provincial capital of carbon dioxide.

REMNANTS OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Like so many old midwestern towns, it has never fully evolved from the culture of the Industrial Revolution.

Edgewater power plant, a fortress-like structure on the edge of downtown Lorain, began turning coal into electricity just after World War I. Used today in periods of peak demand, it is one of the least efficient U.S. facilities, federal officials say.

Officials of Ohio Edison Co., which runs Edgewater, say that the overall efficiency of their utility compensates for the relatively small output of the old Lorain plant.

But energy specialists said that keeping such plants in service, which is especially common in parts of the country where coal is plentiful, makes little sense if the goal is to economize on the use of the most polluting fuels.

Not far from Edgewater stand great mounds of iron ore mined in Minnesota for the blast furnaces of Ohio. One destination is the Cleveland Works of LTV Steel Corp., the nation's largest manufacturer of flat-rolled sheets used in everything from washing machines to Ford Econoline vans.

Steel mills devour energy and pour out carbon dioxide. But the amount can vary widely depending on the type of process selected to produce steel.

Japanese steelmakers have turned increasingly to new electric-arc furnaces that cut energy needs by two-thirds and halve carbon dioxide emissions.

For LTV, the choice was dictated by old Rust Belt logic. The new furnaces cost 10 times more to operate than blast furnaces that run on cheap coal. Although the company acquired some such new equipment in the 1980s, it stopped running it two years ago because of the expense.

"Customer demands drive our capital investment programs, and they were looking for quality and [low] cost" of steel, said Marty Suhoza, LTV's energy director. "We had to plow it into quality improvements and get whatever energy efficiency we could along the way."

With the new furnaces becoming common in Japan, steelmakers now average 17 million British thermal units (Btu) of energy per ton. In the United States, where 70 percent of steel is still made the old way, 22 million Btu are needed on the average. At LTV, last year's rate was 25 million Btu, which resulted in 3.5 million tons of carbon dioxide from the Cleveland Works alone, based on calculations from LTV's own figures.

Piled into freight cars and trucks, LTV steel is shipped to Ford's stamping plant outside of Cleveland, where it is cut into sheets, stamped and sent to Lorain for assembly into America's favorite full-sized van.

The Lorain plant, a sprawling lakeside complex, consumes more energy every year than many medium-sized cities—most of it in the form of electricity, coal burned to generate steam, and natural gas for certain processes. The assembly line is a mechanical symphony of fans, pumps, blowers and conveyor belts. The Econoline begins as a floor pan put on line by robots and encased in a frame. It is dunked in anti-corrosion baths, treated by spray guns and dried at 350 degrees.

Energy conservation measures have cut consumption by 40 percent per car since 1972. But Ford still uses twice as much energy—and thus looses twice as much carbon dioxide—as the big automakers in Japan do to produce a vehicle. General Motors Corp. is even more consumptive, exceeding Japanese energy intensity threefold, according to company statements.

To explain why American car makers emit more carbon dioxide than their Japanese rivals, it is necessary to follow the flow of power at the Ford plant. The same energy inefficiencies occur throughout much of U.S. industry, which accounts for 27 percent of the nation's total energy consumption.

Most of the electricity used at Ford's Lorain plant goes through hundreds of small motors that power fans and pumps. The standard U-frame motors long used by U.S. automakers are among the most efficient in industry. But a new, super-saver model came on the market in recent years that uses 3 percent less power to perform the same task.

According to Jim Kaman, Ford's energy conservation specialist, the new motors could cut overall energy consumption 20 percent at Lorain, significantly reducing the carbon dioxide emitted by Ohio Edison to generate power for the plant.

More and more Japanese car plants are shifting to the super-efficiency motors. But Ford has not moved beyond general discussions, Kaman said, because of a lag time before savings in electricity bills made possible by the devices would repay their initial cost. "The pie is only so big," Kaman said of the money available for capital investment. "Most funds are going now to build more competitive products to make money so we can have more to spend on efficiency."

Some efficiency, however, is cost-free. For example, Japan limits the energy spent in its auto plants by building them about 20 percent smaller than U.S. facilities.

U.S. INDUSTRY'S PAYBACK GAP

The Ford plant here covers 3.4 million square feet, including long unoccupied corridors.

Every inch is brightly lit, ventilated and temperature controlled 16 hours a day. Lighting alone accounts for 15 percent of the plant's electricity consumption.

New lighting technologies offer big savings potential in commercial and residential buildings. Compact fluorescent bulbs, for example, consume 75 percent less electricity than traditional incandescents and last 13 times longer, according to the Rocky Mountain Institute.

Four years ago, Ford began to install high-efficiency lighting at the Lorain plant. After replacing 60 percent of the bulbs, however, it balked at the prices. They were so high that the payback from lower electricity bills would have taken years.

The "payback gap" has emerged as a major obstacle to energy conservation in U.S. industry and the developed world at large. Technology breakthroughs of the past few years have led to the development of high-efficiency industrial equipment, office machines and home improvements from shower heads that cut hot water use in half to double-glazed windows that are nine times more effective in retaining heat.

Taken together, the innovations are considered so promising that some analysts predict a halving of U.S. energy use within a decade and the emergence of a new "green machine" industry to sell American energy efficiency worldwide.

If so, the nation will have to change the habits of centuries. "Energy efficiency is viewed as un-American, something for wimps," said Hirst of Oak Ridge. And yet, "We're in a global economy and are competing with other economies that are a lot smarter about managing their resources."

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONRAD). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PORTLAND TRAIL BLAZERS—FINALS

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the National Basketball Association championship begins tonight featuring the "best in the West" Portland Trail Blazers against the Chicago Bulls.

For Oregon's most outstanding team, the time for victory is now. The Trail Blazers are on their way to the championship series for the third time in their history and the second time in 3 years. They won the championship in 1977, when Jimmy Carter was President, Leonid Brezhnev was the head of the Soviet Union, and I still had dark hair.

As the excitement of the title series approaches, the city of Portland and all of Oregon is awash in the trappings of red and black. We call it Blazermania in the Northwest. At precisely 6 p.m. Pacific daylight time tonight, activity in Oregon will stop as heads turn to watch the Blazers perform their magic in Chicago Stadium.

Two years ago, the Blazers were upset by the Detroit Pistons in the

finals. I might say that I have yet to pay my bet to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN]. The bet involved a salmon from the Columbia River, but I only say that we have been undergoing some problems with the Endangered Species Act and a shortage of certain salmon fish.

This time, Mr. President, the State of Oregon and the Portland Trail Blazers will not be denied the National Basketball Association championship. "Bust a bucket," Mr. President. The Blazers are going all the way.

I yield the floor.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1991

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be taken from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE CHILD SUPPORT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2802, a bill to extend the authorization of the Commission on Interstate Child Support, introduced earlier today by Senator BRADLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2802) to extend the authorization of the Commission on Interstate Child Support and the deadline for the Commission's Report to Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a purely technical bill to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support (the Commission) from July 1, 1992, to September 30, 1992, and extend the Commission's deadline for filing its report with Congress from May 1, 1992, to August 1, 1992. The bill I introduce today makes no other changes in the law and no additional funding for the Commission is requested. It has been cleared by both the chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. BENTSEN, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. PACKWOOD.

The Commission on Interstate Child Support was authorized by the Family Support Act of 1988. Since 1990, its members have been working diligently to develop recommendations to improve child support enforcement in cases where the custodial parent and the noncustodial parent reside in different States. During its first year of existence, the Commission held hearings throughout the country on problems particular to interstate child support. During its second year, the Commission separated into committees and drafted preliminary recommendations in a number of substantive areas. The Commission also held briefing sessions on various aspects of the child support system which were often led by experts in the field.

On May 21, the Commission membership formally approved its recommendations. Its staff is currently working on a final report which incorporates the recommendations, but needs additional time to complete it on account of the fact that all Commission members want to have an opportunity to comment on and contribute to the report. This bill would allow the Commission sufficient time to complete its report to Congress and would not require any addition funds. I hope the Senate acts promptly on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the bill is deemed read three times and passed.

So, the bill (S. 2802) was deemed read for the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2802

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY OF COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE CHILD SUPPORT EXTENDED.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 126 of the Family Support Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 666 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2), by striking "May" and inserting "August", and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by striking "July 1" and inserting "September 30".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be taken out of the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1991

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent request earlier agreed to, I think the Senator from Kansas is to be recognized to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

AMENDMENT NO. 1866

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and indicate it has been cleared by the manager on each side. In fact, it is proposed by myself, Senator STEVENS, and Senator INOUYE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. INOUYE, proposes an amendment numbered 1866.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . In making available funding pursuant to authorizations under this Act, any independent production service established under section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(k)) shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, provide such funding to eligible recipients and project representing the widest possible geographic distribution, with the objective of providing funding to eligible recipients and project in each State from which qualified proposals are received over the course of such authorizations.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, while I cannot vouch for its accuracy, I received a press release today from the American Family Association. If what is alleged in the press release is true, however, I rest my case against the current so-called Public Broadcasting System.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION,
Tupelo, MS, June 3, 1992.

TUPELO, MS.—The American Family Association is urging taxpayers to watch an upcoming program on PBS. AFA says that the program is another example of how public broadcasting is using tax dollars to promote homosexuality.

On June 24, the Great Performances Series on PBS will air "The Lost Language of Cranes." The story focuses on Owen Ben-

jamin and his son Phillip as they both "come out" to proclaim their homosexuality.

In the program, Owen watches a homosexual movie in a porn theater as he tries to initiate anonymous sex with the man in the next seat. Phillip and his lover Eliot are seen in a bed scene, engaged in open-mouthed kissing in a cab and are later shown in a graphic bed scene caressing and kissing.

Eventually, Owen grows bolder, goes to a homosexual bar and is picked up by Frank who takes him home for sex, preceded by mount-to-mouth kissing. At the film's end, Philip and his new lover, Robin, are featured engaging in sex.

"The film suggests that the men are clearly to be admired and lauded for their courage in outing themselves and taking pride in their homosexual lifestyle," said Donald E. Wildmon, president of FAF. "I wonder if this is the kind of programming taxpayers would want to give $1.1 bill to support. PBS uses some of the tax funds to promote the homosexual lifestyle." He said that he had written to members of Congress urging them to watch the film. "I hope every taxpayer in America will do the same," he stated.

Texaco, which provided funding for the series for several years, recently announced that the company was ending its support for Great Performances, Texaco said "the decision was made after looking at the current and future direction of Great Performances' programming * * *" Texaco's support will end before "The Lost Language of Cranes" is shown.

"It is regrettable that taxpayers did not have the same option as Texaco," Wildmon said.

Last summer, Wildmon encouraged viewers to watch "Tongues Untied," another pro-homosexual program on PBS. More than 200 PBS affiliates refused to air "Tongues Untied."

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it ought to be beyond debate that projects funded through the independent television service, the so-called ITVS, should reflect both political and geographic balance.

The story of ITVS is nothing short of a scandal. ITVS was created in the 1988 reauthorization bill to provide funding to develop creative, independent, alternative programming—something I thought was already the purpose of the existing CPB and PBS—to develop, in other words, an alternative to the alternative.

Interestingly, at the time, the concept was denounced by no less a public broadcasting stalwart than Al Vecchione, president of MacNeil-Lehrer Productions. Mr. Vecchione called it a sweetheart employment program for those who could not otherwise get work on the merits. As events proved, he was onto something.

Incorporated in September 1989, ITVS in the first year spent $450,000; absolutely no programming resulted. Not one minute. Not one frame of film. Around $100,000 was spent on travel, and about $50,000 on consultants.

To this day, no programming has been produced. For this nonproduct, ITVS has expended $1.5 million of the taxpayer's funds on administrative costs, including travel and expenses of 42 Grant-award panelists. Pretty good work if you can find it. Maybe all it takes is a friend at the CPB.

Finally, last December, 3 years after authorization and funding, ITVS announced 25 projects chosen to receive $2.6 million in funding. A list of those projects selected suggests we might have been better off when the ITVS was doing nothing more than just paying itself.

I will leave artistic judgments to my colleagues, and just ask consent that this list of the long-awaited first round of ITVS projects be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in my view, it speaks for itself. I urge my colleagues to review it carefully. They may be pretty surprised at what the taxpayers are paying for.

The list reveals another bit of cronyism: Of the 25 grants, 15 are to filmmakers in New York City, and another 5 are to Californians. That leaves 5 for the rest of the country. I am sure there is a fair concentration of artists in those places—but they're not the only artists and potential filmmakers, Mr. President. We have got some in Kansas. I am confident that there are a good number in other States, in the Midwest, in the South, and elsewhere. In fact, this begins to make ITVS look like pretty straightforward arts pork-barreling.

We're told that ITVS provides essential cultural enrichment. Frankly, this Senator finds it hard to believe it is more essential than feeding schoolchildren, or rebuilding Los Angeles, or summer jobs for our urban youth, all causes for which we have struggled to find emergency funding. It is a luxury. With those needs, we are spending millions for this cultural playtoy.

It seems to me that the least we can do—if we're going to spend money on this boondoggle for self-appointed arts bureaucrats—is insist that it be spent fairly, across America, and give some Alaskan, or Hawaiian, or Kansan filmmaker a chance. This amendment mandates that ITVS grants be awarded on a geographically diverse basis.

In addition, I would like to clarify that in making programming funds available to ITVS, the CPB is bound by the same obligation to ensure objectivity and balance that applies to its other grantmaking and programming functions—and will likewise be held accountable.

Personally, Mr. President, I feel the last thing we need around here is another entitlement program, for an already comfortable elite. I would rather spend money on hope and employment for our urban youth than on welfare for politically correct filmmakers. But if we are going to extend this experiment, let us at least see to it that it is conducted in a way that is fair and balanced. We will be watching—the programmers, if not the programming itself.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I would just say in summary that I think this will provide some improvement. I think if I had my choice I would just knock out the ITVS, but I do not have the votes at this time.

I want to thank the manager for trying to work it out so at least we can spread out the benefits of what ITVS was certainly created for. They tell me it was supposed to be an alternative to the alternative. I noticed of the first $25,000, $15,000 went to Los Angeles and $5,000 to New York. That left $5,000 for the rest of the country.

I understand most of the artists are located in New York and California, but I have to believe there may be one in Hawaii, one in Minnesota, one in Kansas, one in Alaska. So it seemed to me we should try to work out something to address that problem.

EXHIBIT 1

ITVS GRANTS—1ST ROUND

PROJECTS SUPPORTED IN FIRST ITVS OPEN CALL

Here are the grantees, project titles, grant amounts, and ITVS's descriptions of the producers and projects:

Lynn Smith, "Sandburg's Arithmetic," $37,512—Lynn Smith is an award-winning animator whose work has been seen on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and PBS. "Sandburg's Arithmetic" is a lively animated film for children inspired by Carl Sandburg's poem "Arithmetic."

Paul Kwan, "Anatomy of a Springroll," $75,358—Paul Kwan is a multimedia artist whose interdisciplinary work has shown in theatrical venues from La MaMa to the Asian American Playwrights' Festival. In "Anatomy of a Springroll," Paul Kwan searches for the secret to his mother's spring roll recipe, using the metaphor of food to explore Southeast Asian culture.

Ana Maria Garcia and Eduardo Aguiar, "Endangered Species: The Toxic Poisoning of Communities of Color," $152,684—Ana Maria Garcia co-founded the Festival Cine San Juan in Puerto Rico and recently completed a film in AFI's Directing Workshop for Women. * * *

Three out of every five African Americans and Latinos are exposed to toxic waste. The film will examine this crisis and efforts to counteract it.

Helen Lee and Kerri Sakamoto, "Little Baka Girl," $26,795—Helen Lee's first film, "Sally's Beauty Spot," has gained an international profile and won a juror's award at the Black Maria Film Festival. Kerri Sakamoto is a fiction writer and producer of short films. In "Little Baka Girl," a Japanese-American and a recent Korean immigrant find romance, conflict and solace as they grapple with their Asian heritage.

David Collier, "For Better or for Worse," $34,140—David Collier is an independent producer who has worked on numerous documentaries for PBS, including "The Search for Excellence" and "The New American Revolution." "For Better or for Worse" is a funny, touching look at five elderly couples who have each been together 50 years or longer.

Joanna Priestly, "Aging Grace," $38,837—Joanna Priestly is an award-winning ani-

mator whose work has received top honors at over 80 film festivals. "Aging Grace" is a humorous animated film about the pains and pleasures of becoming middle-aged.

Kathe Sandler, "A Question of Color," $100,000—Kathe Sandler is completing "The Friends," an adaptation of Rosa Guy's award-winning novel, through the AFI Directing Workshop for Women. "A Question of Color" looks at "color consciousness" among African Americans and a value system based on physical features.

Veronica Soul, "Ghost Story," $65,425—Veronica Soul's films have screened internationally at festivals and galleries and have received numerous awards. "Ghost Story" is a short film about time and memory that moves between the past and present of a Chinese immigrant family.

Victor Masayesva Jr., "Imagining Indians." $297,000—Victor Masayesva Jr. is a Hopi producer whose works have received international acclaim, including a Gold Hugo (Chicago International Film Festival) and been broadcast on German and Spanish television. "Imagining Indians" will look at how Native Americans have been "imagined" in popular American media.

The Wooster Group, "White Homeland Commando," $55,669—The Wooster Group is a critically acclaimed experimental theater company whose work has been shown on public television and performed worldwide. Its members include Elizabeth LeCompte, Willem Defoe and others. "White Homeland Commando" is a takeoff on a TV cop show in which a special unit of the police force infiltrates a white supremacist organization.

Barbara Abrash and Esther Katz, "A Public Nuisance: Margaret Sanger and the Brownsville Clinic," $16,500—Barbara Abrash is an independent producer whose films have shown on American Experience on PBS and on Great Britain's Channel 4. Esther Katz is a professor at New York University. "A Public Nuisance" documents early public debates over birth control in the 1920s, and the power of media to shape those views.

Ela Troyano. "Once Upon a Time * * *" $100,000—Ela Troyano's films have shown in festivals and on public television in the U.S. and abroad. "Once Upon a Time * * *" is a dramatic film exploring relationships between young Latinos and Latinas whose culture straddles New York and the Caribbean.

Marlon T. Riggs, "Black Is * * * Black Ain't," $245,000—Marion T. Riggs produced the Emmy-winning "Ethnic Notions" and the internationally acclaimed "Tongues Untied," which both aired nationally on PBS. He recently completed "Color Adjustment," a documentary about black representation in prime-time entertainment television. "Black Is * * * Black Ain't."

Faith Hubley, "Tall Time Tales," $77,375—Three-time Academy Award-winning animator Faith Hubley is renowned world-wide for innovative work pioneered with her late husband, John Hubley. "Tall Time Tales" is a light-hearted, animated short that sheds light on the many faces of time.

Ellen Spiro, "Out Here," $78,604—Ellen Spiro is a southerner and producer of the award-winning video "DiAna's Hair Ego: AIDS Info Up Front." "Out Here" will look at southern gay and Lesbian culture through eccentric and traditional personalities, from Tennessee Williams and Bessie Smith to contemporary southerners.

Gary Soto, "The Pool Party," $65,000—Gary Soto is an award-winning Chicano writer and author of books for Latino children. "The Pool Party" is his second film * * * a light-hearted story of a Chicano boy who makes a splash at a pool party.

Sam Pollard, Peter Miller and John Valadez, "Citizen Dhoruba," $149,758—Sam Pollard has edited feature films for Spike Lee, and produced and directed PBS documentaries, including episodes of Eyes on the Prize. Peter Miller has worked on "Songs of the Civil War" (Ken Burns). "American Dream" (Barbara Kopple) and other documentaries. John Valadez has worked on several documentaries and is making his directorial debut with this film. "Citizen Dhoruba" tells the story of a former Black Panther who was falsely accused of a crime and served 19 years until new evidence secured his recent release.

Ruth Peyser, "Go to Hell!" $30,250—Ruth Peyser was born and educated in Australia. She has been an award-winning animator, graphic designer and illustrator for nearly 15 years. "Go to Hell!" is an animated short in which a woman trips and falls into a strange dream that ends up being a little too close to reality.

Tony Cokes, "Love, Labor, Language." $39,210—Tony Cokes is a videomaker and sculptor whose work has won awards and international acclaim, from the Whitney Biennial to the Berlin International Black Cinema Festival. "Love, Labor, Language" is a portrait of the artist's mother, whose experiences as a domestic, a public school maid and a food service worker inspire an imaginative inquiry * * *.

Christine Chang. "Be Good, My Children." $29,872—Christine Chang is a first-generation Korean-American and independent filmmaker who currently works in high-definition television. This drama about a Korean immigrant family centers on the conflict between a daughter who dreams of glamor and her disapproving mother.

Clay Walker. "Post No Bills." $92,155—Clay Walker is an emerging filmmaker who has worked with innovative independent filmmakers like Jean-Pierre Gorin, Raul Ruiz and others. "Post No Bills" follows the process of creating political street art by focusing on noted poster artist Robbie Conal.

Puhipau and Joan Lander, "An Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation." $94,936—Puhipau is a Native Hawaiian and independent producer whose works have shown in video and film festivals in the U.S. and abroad and on Hawaiian public, cable and commercial television. Joan Lander is an independent producer whose documentaries on Native Hawaiians are distributed worldwide. "An Act of War" portrays the 1893 American overthrow of Hawaii from a Native Hawaiian perspective.

Shu Lea Cheang. "For Whom the Air Waves." $300,000—Shu Lea Cheang is a film and video artist whose work has been exhibited as the Whitney Museum, the AFI Video Festival and other festivals and broadcast on television. "For Whom the Air Waves" is a dark comedy that brings quirky characters together in a sushi restaurant when an environmental crisis erupts. The screenplay is by Jessica Hagedorn, whose recent novel was nominated for a National Book Award.

Suzie Baer. "Warrior: The Case of Leonard Peltier." $50,000—Suzie Haer is an emerging producer who has worked on independent features, music videos and industrial videos. "Warrior" documents the case of incarcerated Native American activist Leonard Peltier.

Edin Velez. "Memory of Fire." $197,955—Edin Velez is a critically acclaimed video artist whose work has shown internationally and been broadcast on local public television stations and on Alive from Off Center. He is a past winner of the AFI Maya Deren Award. "Memory of Fire" is a stylistically rich narrative reassessing the "discovery" of the New World by Columbus.

Mr. INOUYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the amendment that was just submitted is a product of 4 hours of negotiations and consultation.

The colloquy that we will now engage in is part of that negotiation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, my understanding of the amendment No. 1863 adopted yesterday which relates to objectivity and balance is that it applies to all funds appropriated to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for national programming. In other words, it applies to any funds distributed by the CPB for national programming. Therefore, in practice, the Independent Television Service, the Public Broadcasting Service, National Public Radio and other organizations which redistribute CPB funds should strive for objectivity and balance in making their grant decisions when they elect to fund programming which is controversial in nature. Should the Board members of the CPB determine the standard has not been met, the Board is required to withhold future funds to those organizations or the CPB must itself fund additional programming to achieve the objectivity and balance, or take other appropriate action.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The objectivity and balance requirement applies to all nationally broadcast programming that is controversial in nature. It would not specifically apply to programs funded by CPB to achieve balance or arguably to a single program financed by a local station. But if the latter led to a violation of the standard, CPB would be required to fund offsetting programming, or take other appropriate action.

Mr. STEVENS. I agree with the statement of the Senators from Hawaii and Kansas.

Mr. WELLSTONE. It is my understanding that amendment No. 1866 is a directive from Congress to any independent service established under section 396(k) of the 1934 act. It should not require the renegotiation of any contracts in force as of the date of enactment.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator is correct in his interpretation of this amendment.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of S. 1504, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting reauthorization bill and to oppose the amendment proposed by my friend and colleague from Kansas, Senator DOLE, should it be offered.

Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader is well respected for his straightforward manner. Although we may often find ourselves at odds on the merits, I have long admired him for this quality. That is why I am frankly

very surprised by the amendment my friend has offered today. If the minority leader wishes to reduce program production funding for public television for its alleged sins in program objectivity and balance, his efforts should be directed toward that purpose. Indeed, the floor managers have endeavored to satisfy his every desire in this regard. Nonetheless, it would appear to this Senator that the Dole amendment goes beyond its alleged purpose and would be better served by adding funds to the Independent Television Service [ITVS], not gutting it.

The Dole amendment chills me as it should anyone who has had the privilege of serving in what many Senators label the "world's greatest deliberative body." The amendment before us today kills funding for ITVS, a small part of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] that received program funding last year for the first time, despite the fact not one Senator, nor any other person we know of, has yet to view even 1 second, less 1 minute, of any ITVS program. As I see it, the Dole amendment is akin to burning a new library to the ground before it is stocked with books.

The Dole amendment reminds me of an old courthouse quip I understand was used in the celebrated Scopes Monkey Trial of 1925 by one of Mr. Scopes' attorneys, Mr. Malone. Mr. Malone had been blocked at every turn trying to offer evidence that evolution was a credible scientific theory. In a last ditch effort, he approached the trial judge's bench and said: "Your honor may know of the occasion some time ago when a man argued a question for the plaintiff before a judge who had a very Irish wit. After he had finished the judge turned to the defendant and said, "I don't care to hear anything from the defendant, to hear both sides has a tendency to confuse the court."

As was the case on that hot and humid summer day in Dayton, TN, today we are deliberating in air-conditioned splendor in the "world's greatest deliberative body" whether to give all the information to the public. Will we make the same unfortunate mistake? Will this body pronounce that the public is ignorant or incapable of deciding what to view or what not to view? Will this body become the big brother of public television?

Mr. President, I think it is time we remind ourselves why Congress created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and authorized ITVS in the first place. In its findings contained in the original act creating CPB, Congress found "that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting from extraneous interference and control." As the Senate report emphasized: "An independent entity supported by Federal funds is required to provide programs free of political pressure."

The primary purpose of ITVS is to make television more accessible and more responsive to children, rural Americans, and minorities. In authorizing ITVS in 1988, we affirmed that the best way to achieve this goal is to give the under-served an opportunity to speak for themselves. It was a good idea then, and it is a good idea today.

Mr. President, democracies depend on having public forums on expression of ideas representing all perspectives. Television is unquestionably the most important public forum in our Nation today. Americans tune in to television for information and perspective on current events. Unfortunately, most programs serve only a narrow slice of life. Access to the airwaves is limited by money and by commercial pressure to please the majority of viewers. However, our Nation is and always has been a melting pot of many cultures, many communities, many voices, yet too many voices go unheard.

There are Americans who never see people like themselves on television, never have the opportunity to tell their stories or share their concerns. There is a tremendous richness of experience going to waste. ITVS was specifically created to fill that void and give these unheard citizens opportunities to create programs that will serve their own communities. In turn, ITVS also serves to broaden the spectrum of programming available to the entire viewing public.

Some native Americans see themselves misrepresented on television and want all others to hear their voices. One ITVS grantee who was funded by ITVS is attempting to present their views and his own on this important subject. This independent producer, Victor Masayesva, Jr., lives in Hotevilla, AZ, a Hopi community on the Third Mesa and runs a very respected television production company. ITVS was designed specifically to help him and others like him to serve underserved minorities. His ITVS grant covers a subject matter from a perspective that commercial television as we know it today cannot cover adequately. Our democracy demands that his voice and the voices of all Native Americans on this subject be aired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Masayesva, Jr., to myself be printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I am more than willing to concede that some programs aired on public television and public radio are unsatisfactory from my point of view. In fact, I have heard of shows that I probably would not like based upon reviews by my family and friends. I probably would have been shocked to see the infamous program entitled "Tongues Untied." But even if I have seen a program, my views should not influence public television any more than any other viewer in Arizona or America. In an era where the old world is experiencing a democratic renaissance, it is very troubling to me that some officials in the new world seek to build a new iron curtain across the airwaves.

Mr. President, I believe that the American public has the right to view a full range of stories and opinions. We do not need to be protected from unconventional points of view of independent television producers by Senator DOLE or Senator HELMS. The Independent Television Service was established precisely to avoid both intended and unintended suppression of ideas and it took our instructions seriously. ITVS went straight to the people they are supposed to serve; 24,000 independent producers from all over the United States were invited to submit proposals for the first year's programs. A door full of promises was opened. Now, before these programs have ever been seen, some of my distinguished colleagues are trying to slam that door of promise in their faces.

What kind of message would be sent to these rural Americans, minorities and children by such an act? Is it a message that will strengthen our Nation or is it just more politics of division in a land yearning for a message of healing?

Some critics charge that the viewers and listeners of public broadcasting are wealthy individuals who do not need PBS since they can already receive similar programming through cable television. Mr. President, those people need to read the letters I have received from viewers and listeners in Arizona. They are not only from the upper crust of society. These people are ordinary citizens who enjoy the wide variety of programs available on public broadcasting. The letters come from both the young and the old, the rich, the middle class and the poor. Everyone gains from public broadcasting. One college student from Tucson wrote that although he has a limited income and doesn't own a television, he is able to follow the news and listen to special programs on the radio. Without public radio this student and other citizens could not receive the news programs which are vital to maintaining an informed electorate. A retired couple living in rural Dewey, AZ, wrote that they doubled their contribution to their local station last year but they cannot contribute more since the economy is bad. An 85-year-old woman pledged $100 to station KUAT in Tucson, then apologized for not sending more, writing "I am so sorry I don't have more wealth." Their actions remind me of the saying, "Where your heart goes, your money goes also." People have their heart in public

broadcasting; in fact, the largest single contributor to public broadcasting is the public itself.

Mr. President, are the Members of this Senate really aware of the types of programs which the Corporation for Public Broadcasting has funded? I assure you that they are not liberal and leftwing, as some have claimed. Programs funded by CPB are known for their quality and objective perspectives. A couple from Scottsdale put it well in another letter to my office. "Given all the endless barrage of garbage and drivel offered on the majority of television stations, it is unfathomable to believe that our elected officials wish to assassinate and deprive the American people of the one televised, consistent source of educational, stimulating, and responsible programs."

The CPB has created and maintained many of public television's hallmark series and programs, including: "The Civil War," "American Playhouse" "The MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour," "Wonderwords," and "The American Experience." "The Civil War," which aired in the fall of 1991, was a critically acclaimed masterpiece of documentary work. Ken Burns, who produced the series, was praised by conservative columnist George Will, who write that "Our Iliad has found its Homer." Yet without the CPB, this series would never have been produced. The CPB, along with corporate sponsors, funded the entire production cost of the program. Mr. Burns wrote "there's no way that "The Civil War" could have been produced anywhere but on public television." It is no wonder that public broadcasting has been called "an oasis in a vast television wasteland."

Here are some more examples of programs which were funded by CPB and were seen on public televisions stations last year. In the month of September alone, various educational programs could be seen, including a program describing the effect radar had on battles in World War II, a documentary on the science of restoring old art, and a program for children which teaches geography in a fun, innovative manner. These are not controversial, leftwing programs. They are shows which educate and entertain the diverse viewers of public broadcasting. Other examples of programs planned for the future: "A Splendid Little War," which is a documentary on the Spanish-American War of 1898; a 90-minute special on the history of the Oregon Trail and its role in American history; and study of the anti-Hitler resistance within the Germany army and civilian population. Again, these programs are not propaganda for the left; they are historical accounts of past events. Mr. President, these programs belong on public broadcasting.

Public radio also benefits from CPB funding. Almost 14 million listeners nationwide have come to rely on programs such as "All Things Considered," "Morning Edition," "Crossroads," and "Marketplace." In its 6-year history, the Radio Program Fund has awarded 107 grants for a total of $22 million—approximately half of the total production costs—fostering the development of 8,000 hours of original programming for public radio. One grant went toward the renewal of classical music programming on radio. These programs provide information, insight, and culture to the people.

Funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is one of the best values for the Federal dollar that exists today. Federal support for public broadcasting results in a variety of benefits, such as high quality programming, educational services, the expansion of the public radio signal to remote areas, the development of new technologies for the hearing and visually impaired, and the promotion of new technologies to ensure that public broadcasting television and radio signals are available to as many Americans as possible.

Mr. President, our country faces no greater challenges today than improving education and job skills of our labor force. Our ability to succeed in an increasing global marketplace rests on our ability to do so. Public broadcasting programming and services already play a leading role in education in America, but their value has yet to be maximized. One way to maximize public broadcasting's contribution is by extending the impact of its programming and services through outreach activities and conversion to educational materials. For example, what made "The Civil War" such a magnificent achievement was not just its ability to rivet the Nation's attention over a five-night broadcast period. The more compelling value is in its use now as a television course by schools, colleges, and universities in dozens of States.

With the funding levels provided in this legislation, public broadcasting can use its telecommunications capabilities in cooperation with business and education to help reverse the downward trend in academic achievement and reinvigorate America's education system. In short, public broadcasting can quickly reach through geographic and institutional barriers to provide inexpensive access to educational programming in schools and at work, as well as from homes and automobiles. For this effort to be successful, Federal support for public broadcasting is crucial.

In addition, any effort to freeze, or seriously reduce funding will not allow CPB and public broadcasting to maintain current levels, for it fails to adjust for the current rate of inflation or the increased number of stations supported by the Corporation, and provides insufficient funds for the new education opportunities that I have just described, or the congressionally mandated efforts to reach underserved and unserved areas and audiences. It would also restrict already scarce resources for national programming or projects aimed at increasing opportunities for minority and independent producers.

In addition, any freeze or reduction in funds to stations would make it difficult for individual stations, particularly small stations already facing financial difficulties, to sustain their current program schedules because the cost of programming continues to rise faster than the rate of inflation and a station's ability to raise revenues.

Mr. President, in closing I urge my colleagues to reject the candy-coated poison pill amendment for the infant Independent Television Service. Diversity within a republic breeds intelligent discourse, not dangerous ideas. Danger lies only when thoughts are suppressed. One need only look to Eastern Europe to see the consequences. I urge my colleagues to vote against the proposed Dole amendment to suppress diversity—too kill ITVS—and against other proposed reduction in overall funding CPB regardless of the form of the amendment. Eastern Europe has torn its wall down—let us not erect our own.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following newspaper editorials and article concerning Federal funding of public television be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks and the letter from Mr. Masayesva: two editorials from the Arizona Daily Star newspaper; one editorial from the Green Valley Sun and News; one editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, and one article by Mr. Greg Joseph which appeared in the Arizona Republic; I further ask unanimous consent that the following remarks detailing the public television and public radio programs awarded funding in the current fiscal year also be printed in the RECORD immediately following the newspaper editorials and article previously submitted for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

IS PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
Hotevilla, AZ.

Senator DENNIS DECONCINI,
Washington, DC.

As a recipient of an ITVS television grant in its first round I express my outrage at attempts to deny funding to ITVS before any programs have been produced. The programs that have been singled out for criticism derive from communities of color and serve political expediences only.

Our program concerns the representation of Native Americans in the media, particularly feature films, which would not be supported by the mainstream which thrives on this appropriation. The voices beyond public relations notices which serve only the profit machinery would not be heard if we did not

receive ITVS funds to record and relay the voices from the Native American communities, from the foundations of Native American communities.

ITVS is fulfilling its congressional mandate to address underserved audiences and minority communities with the support of our program and to deny our communities a voice can only be seen as racist. We need your support in order to realize programming from diverse sectors of the American public, which are exciting, innovative and which promote equality of points of view. Thank you for considering the impact which television programming has on our future co-existence.

VICTOR MASAYESVA, Jr.,
Producer, "imagining indians."

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Mar. 6, 1992]

PUBLIC TV: GOVERNMENT SHOULD HELP FUEL IT, BUT LEAVE IT ALONE

The wonder about public television isn't that its programming is so provocative; it's that public TV manages to be as provocative as it occasionally is. A significant portion of its funding comes from the government, and that knowledge alone tends to encourage pablum over provocativeness.

So far, the strings attached to public TV's government money have been implied; Everyone simply knows that money could be cut, conditions could be attached, should government become displeased. Now a new effort to make strings explicit must be quashed.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, through its 25-year existence, has lived through budget cuts, presidential vetoes and threats of all sorts because people in government didn't like the content of certain programs—or the politics of certain TV personalities. While the CPB was set up to shield public stations and networks from politics, everyone in the system knows politicians are watching them in more ways than one.

The Reagan years were particularly difficult, and this year is proving no exception, thanks in part to Republican presidential contender Patrick Buchanan, who has seen public funding of the arts as a useful anti-Bush tool on the campaign trail. On Wednesday, Democratic leaders temporarily withdrew public broadcasting's funding bill from the Senate floor after conservatives upset with public TV programming threatened to tack on a number of restricting amendments.

Sen. Jesse Helms is upset about "Tongues Untied," a program about homosexual black men. Sen. John McCain criticized "Maria's Story" as a glorification of leftist guerrillas in El Salvador. Others said public TV is, in general, too liberal. They seek something called "balance in programming."

But asking public TV—which consists of a myriad of producers, stations and networks—to move in any particular political direction would only set up a system whereby decisions about artistic, scientific, intellectual and other programs would be made in accordance with the whim of whoever happened to have political power at any given time. Americans traditionally have displayed a healthy stubborn streak when it comes to such government control in their lives.

How much better, how much more intellectually honest, to support creative people in doing what they do—independently. And let the public choose whether to watch.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, May 5, 1992]

BATTLEGROUND: FUNDS FOR PBS SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITHOUT STRINGS

The conservative attack on public television reveals the attackers as elitist, out of touch and ready to stoop to coercion to get their way.

It's a sorry effort to muzzle the messenger because some in power don't like all of the message.

Funding for public television was approved by the House. In the Senate, however, it is encountering opposition from conservative senators girded for battle. Their assault on public television is fueled by the ideology of conservative think tanks. It could result in reduced funding and/or federal oversight on program content.

Opponents of public television say it has outlived its usefulness because cable networks now offer similar types of programs. This position—and the conclusion that public television should therefore be sold to the highest bidder—overlooks the vast numbers of Americans who do not subscribe to cable television. Without public television, these people would have no alternative to the slam-bam fare offered on the commercial broadcast networks.

The failure of public television's opponents to recognize this shows how removed they are from the budgetary reality of most Americans. Public television remains as essential today as an alternative to commercial television as it was when the Public Broadcasting Act created it in 1967.

The privileged few who make the assertion that cable has eliminated the need for public television did not set out to insult the average American. That was an accident born of their elite lifestyles. Their purpose in touting cable was to obfuscate the real purpose of this assault on public television. The goal is to silence ideas conservatives don't like. They damn what they see as a "liberal tilt" in public television.

But that, too, is distorting reality. They see the liberal Democrat Bill Moyers producing programs for PBS and cry foul. They choose not to focus on programs produced by such lions of conservatism as William F. Buckley Jr. and John McLaughlin.

They also fail to see that the flow of federal dollars to public television has declined over the years. Federal money now accounts for only 17 percent of the overall public television budget Corporate underwriting, foundation support and contributions from individual viewers pay the rest. Viewers send in their check because they like what they see.

By necessity, public television is responsive to the preferences of its audience. The conservative assault is a coercive attempt to make public broadcasting responsive to the political preferences of the right. It is as inappropriate as a similar demand from the left would be.

Public television should be funded without strings. It should be praised for rising above the morass, not asked to wallow in it as a condition of continued federal support.

[From the Green Valley Sun and News, Mar. 18, 1992]

PUBLIC BROADCASTING NO PLACE FOR POLITICS

Life without KUAT-TV and National Public Radio would amount to a grim existence indeed for many Green Valley area residents who depend on both for high quality, thought-provoking and substantive programming.

In the wasteland of commercial TV and the cacophony of commercial radio, public television and radio stand out as solid, informative news networks.

And both public TV and radio offer much in the way of arts, drama, comedy and other eclectic, quality programming that commercial networks generally shun.

The soft underbelly of public TV and radio is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the federally funded independent board that provides seed money for the networks.

CPB again is the target of attacks by far right-wing Republicans in the U.S. Senate who argue that the corporation sponsors two networks with decidedly "liberal slants."

Yet the president of the Association of American Public Television Stations quotes a study that shows that 79 percent of the viewers believe public television is neither liberal nor conservative.

Much the same can get said for National Public Radio, PBS's sibling in public broadcasting.

A bill to authorize about $1 billion over three years for the corporation will be on the Senate floor soon.

One amendment is in the right spirit; it would require disclosure of the salaries of the corporation's executives and performers.

Another would have Congress review the budget every year instead of every three years. That comes from the far right.

This change would bring more political pressure to bear.

Another effort would kill the corporation entirely, just as the first Reagan administration tried to do, because it didn't cotton to some PBS programming.

Consumers across a wide spectrum generally agree that PBS and NPR provide the public with fair and balanced reporting and a range of challenging, engaging and sometimes controversial documentaries unlike any offered regularly by commercial TV or radio.

As most Green Valley area residents know, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting provides only about 17 percent of the funds needed for individual stations to operate.

The rest of the money the stations, such as KUAT, must raise themselves. Without viewer approval, KUAT would go out of business, which is highly unlikely because of its solid base of support, particularly in the Green Valley area.

Though some politicians may not like it, part of the role of non-commercial TV and radio is to question authority, celebrate diversity and examine all points of view, regardless of whether they are "politically" correct enough for the liberals or pass the conservative litmus test.

Intelligent viewers can quickly spot—and reject—lapses into propaganda on both sides of the political spectrum.

The congressional lever in public broadcasting should not be turned into a club to bludgeon PBS and NPR, whose programming has made their work popular by being first-rate.

Congress would be wise to butt out of this fight because political agendas have no place in public television and radio.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 4, 1992]

POORLY AIMED SALVO AT PBS

The effort among some conservatives to eliminate public television is heavy-handed and mean-spirited. Charging that the Public Broadcasting Service is elitists and too liberal, these conservatives want to rally United States senators either to eliminate the PBS budget, or hold the $24 million increase of federal funds the House has already authorized for 1994—in effect torpedoing PBS.

Laurence Jarvik of the Heritage Foundation recently said, "What did the taxpayers get for their investment in 'Sesame Street'? A generation of kids who spray graffiti on the walls of New York City." Columnist

George Will, also siding with some mythical taxpayer who is mad as heck at Big Bird and isn't going to take it anymore, calls PBS an "upper middle-class entitlement." PBS should be dispensed with in a fashion befitting the 1980s free-market cure-alls, says Mr. Will: "Sell it."

If the multiplicity of voices and programs put together by PBS over 20 years could survive in a market where the sharp ax of profit is the main arbiter of merit, fine. But that's not likely.

We suspect it isn't the money that concerns people like Jarvik, Will, and Sen. Bob Dole. It is ideology—programming and news that often does, frankly, have a liberal worldview.

Yet conservatives do get PBS time—John McLaughlin, William F. Buckley Jr., Tony Brown, for example. Pat Buchanan made his name on PBS.

The common culture many conservatives want young people of all backgrounds to know is found on Masterpiece Theatre, which last week ran Kenneth Branagh's version of Shakespeare's "Henry V," and in science programs like Nova. The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour offers serious news in a medium pushing "infotainment."

That's a lot of value for a modest public investment. Less than 20 percent of PBS funds come from direct federal grants.

Keep PBS. The answer to contrary views in a democracy is to enrich the debate, not end it.

[From the Arizona Republic, Apr. 2, 1992]

MCCAIN, HELMS JOIN IN ELECTION-YEAR CRUSADE TO CARVE UP BIG BIRD

(By Greg Joseph)

Want to boost the economy? Want to protect the taxpayer? Want to enhance competition in the TV marketplace? Want to defend the masses from subversive, left-leaning thinking? Want to be a true American?

Kill public television!

This, in case you missed it, is an election year. Politicians on both sides of the aisle are lining up for shots at big, easy-to-hit targets that lend themselves to bombast, hyperbole and, most important, headlines.

Conservative Republicans have discovered an election-year target to end all targets; public TV, home of *Sesame Street, Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood, the MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour, Frontline, Nova, Washington Week in Review; Masterpiece Theatre, The Victory Garden, The Frugal Gourmet, The Civil War, P.O.V., Tony Brown's Journal* and—last but not least—Bill Moyers.

And what timing! The Senate is considering a three-year $1.1 billion funding package for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the umbrella agency that dispenses money to PBS and its member stations.

Conservatives have been queuing up to every controversial PBS show of recent memory like sharks in a feeding frenzy. But none has caught their fancy quite as much as *Tongues Untied*, the eloquent Marlon Riggs film about the gay-black lifestyle that Pat Buchanan used in a scurrilous gay-bashing TV ad, tying President Bush to the National Endowment for the Arts (which helped pay for the Riggs work).

A MATTER OF VIEWPOINT

In a speech last month on the Senate floor, citing examples of what he derisively called "liberal, left-wing programs," Republican John McCain of Arizona targeted Tongues Untied because of its content ("which I will not even describe") and Maria's Story, a P.O.V. documentary about an anti-government Salvadoran rebel, for its lack of balance. (Never mind that Maria's Story was never presented as anything but a show designed to give her point of view—thus the name of the series on which it was carried).

McCain, Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kan., Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., and their archconservative cronies argue that shows like these illustrate how public TV isn't fulfilling the mandate of its creation 25 years ago and, as a result, no longer deserves federal funding.

They contend that public TV lacks political balance. They insist that Children's Television Workshop, which produces Sesame Street, generates $100 million a year in the United States and $1 billion worldwide and shouldn't require public support. They argue that because of the availability of such cable outlets as the Discovery Channel and the Arts & Entertainment network, and of satellite home dishes and videocassettes, viewers don't need public TV anymore.

Talk about arguments you could drive Jesse Helms through. Has any of these lawmakers noticed that 40 percent of the national TV audience doesn't take cable? In the Phoenix TV market, half of the potential audience doesn't subscribe, either because they can't afford it or don't want it.

FILLING A NEED

That means no Cable News Network, for example. Remember when KAET-TV (Channel 8), the public-TV station in Phoenix, carried the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings and the U.S. Senate's "Keating Five" hearings? What if viewers had not had PBS or cable then?

Although not having cable means not receiving A&E or the Discovery Channel, PBS contains programming similar to both. This is its hallmark—diversity, which fulfills its mandate as a true public broadcasting system.

As for Sesame Street, CTW officials point out that when Dole suggests the show gets $14 million a year in federal funding, he's wrong. The show hasn't gotten any direct federal grants since 1982, they say. Two-thirds of the annual $17 million cost of Sesame Street is paid by CTW itself, through licensing revenue; the rest comes from public-TV stations. Snapping at Sesame Street for its licensing prowess is like knocking the Japanese for building better cars that sell.

And does anybody remember or care that Sesame Street was established to teach young, disadvantaged inner-city children their numbers, letters and social concepts? The fact that it's so well-done has attracted "haves" as well as "have nots." But what would the have-nots do if PBS went away—subscribe to cable's Nickelodeon? Sure they would.

Dole apparently wants to set up annual reviews of CPB funding, instead of having them every three years, as is presently the case. How about making it every 10 years, so politicians can't use public TV as a tool to get re-elected?

CPB PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DECONCINI. For 25 years, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB] has been supporting the creation of high quality and innovative programming for public broadcasting. Over the years, the Corporation has evolved and changed as the industry and the needs of the audiences have changed, but the commitment remains the same: to ensure the public access to programs that enlighten, educate, and inform.

TELEVISION

CPB has created and maintained many of public television's hallmark series and programs, including: "The Civil War," "Frontline," "American Playhouse," "The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour," "WonderWorks," and "The American Experience."

The fund has taken special steps to ensure that all groups of outside readers and panelists are reflective of America's cultural, ethnic, and regional diversity. All readers and panelists involved in multicultural solicitations, for example, are minority. Gender, region, ethnicity, market size, rural or metropolitan location, and race are all factors considered for readers and the makeup of panels. Typically, a panel of nine consists of five independent producers and a minimum of three minority representatives. Quite often, even for broad-based solicitations, minority panelists could be in the majority.

The following are highlights of programs that been awarded dollars during fiscal year 1992:

"Methadone: Curse or Cure"—a 60-minute documentary reviewing the history and development of drug treatment in the United States centering on the methadone program.

"G.I. Brides"—a documentary examining South Korean culture, the relationship of United States servicemen in the culture, and the effect decades of interracial marriage have had on Korean women.

"The Nacionalistas"—a 1-hour documentary on the history of Puerto Rico/United States relationship centering on the 1950's when Puerto Rican nationalists stormed the halls of the United States Congress.

"Of Land and Liberty"—a 1-hour documentary on the struggle of the Gullah people of the Sea Coast Island of South Carolina to retain cultural and economic independence in the face of a rapidly emerging resort economy.

"A Splendid Little War"—a 1-hour documentary film on the Spanish-American War of 1898.

"Postcards From the Front, the American Experience"—a one-hour documentary film on the impact of the 1910–17 battles on the United States-Mexican border, as seen through the postcards that American troops circulated across the border.

"The Oregon Trail"—a 90-minute special on the history of the Oregon Trail and its role in American history.

"Sexual Harassment"—a documentary on the many dimensions of sexual harassment in the workplace.

"Africans in America, the American Experience"—a six-part series on the history of Africans in America from the 16th century to the 1850's.

"Questions of Faith"—a seven-part series that investigates the common beliefs and ideas that lie at the heart of all the great religions.

"Listening to America With Bill Moyers"—an hour-long weekly program about national and cultural issues, hosted by Bill Moyers.

"The West"—a 10-part history of the Western frontier and its impact on the history and culture of the United States.

"The Prize"—an eight-part documentary series based on Daniel Yergin's book, "The Prize," a history of oil and its role in the history of the 20th century.

"The Bill of Rights: 200 years later"—seminars on media and society, hosted by former Columbia Broadcasting System president, Fred Friendly.

"Redlining: America's Financial Apartheid"—a 60-minute investigative documentary on the institutional practice of redlining, a system used by banks, savings and loans, insurance companies, and businesses to deny financial services to minorities.

"The Restless Conscience," 9 years in the making, assisted by the Television Program Fund, premiered theatrically in New York City this February. The New York Times praised this powerful yet sensitive study of the anti-Hitler resistance within the Wehrmacht and the German civilian populace. The producer is Hava Kohav Beller.

"The Life and Work of Audre Lorde"—a 60-minute documentary on the noted African-American poet, who is suffering from terminal cancer. The film profiles her influence on an entire generation of students and writers as well as her personal trials and victories.

"Maya Lin: A Strong Clear Vision"—a 1-hour documentary of Chinese-American designer Maya Lin, creator of the Vietnam War Memorial and the Civil Rights Memorial in Atlanta. This personality profile will capture the artist involved in the process of creating as well as provide insight into the problems of being a minority, female artist in this country.

"Ancestors in America"—a proposed multipart series on the history of Asians in America. Loni Ding of Vox Productions, Inc., will be employing a format in which family trees are used.

"American Indian Dance: Creativity and Continuity" (working title)—a 90-minute performance special depicting the genesis and cultural meaning of American Indian dance and music. Three dance suites will also be staged within a follow-up documentary designed to take the viewer behind the scenes of the creative process.

"Songs of the Homeland"—a 60-minute documentary which will explore the Mexican-American experience utilizing the culture's traditional songs.

"Carmen Miranda: Bananas Is My Business"—a 60-minute documentary on Miranda. The film is about cultural identity and reflects on the creation of a Latin American icon in Hollywood.

"A Bowl of Beings"—a 1-hour adaption of the live stage play created and performed by Cultural Class, a highly regarded group of Latino comedians. The performance, specifically adapted for "Great Performances," includes sketches, monologues, dance, and drama exploring the Chicano-Latino identity.

"Nobody's Girls: Women of the American Frontier"—a 60-minute documentary film that explores the lives and legacy of the historically neglected women of the American frontier. The film will incorporate a mixture of visual sources, including old photographs, newspaper articles, original film footage, and pre-Hollywood westerns. The film's narrative will be derived from letters, diaries, frontier literary sketches, newspaper articles, obituaries, police and census reports, personal reminiscences, manuscripts, and secondary sources.

"Golden Gate"—a 2-hour feature film for "American Playhouse." This darkly comic film is set in San Francisco's Chinatown, where an FBI agent, trailing a Chinese laundryman, falls in love with his daughter.

"A Natural History of the Senses"—a five-part series that will portray the range of the senses—smell, taste, touch, hearing, and vision. In an unprecedented marriage of arts and science, the programs will heighten scientific understanding and self-knowledge.

"Highways to Heaven: The Auto Biography of America"—a documentary series that provides a comprehensive social history of the automobile in America from its invention in the late 19th century to the present.

"The Puzzle Factory"—the first new major children's daily series since "Sesame Street." This new series will feature a group of miltlicultural "people puppets embodying the diversity of American culture and fun and foibles of being human. The series takes place in a make-believe workshop where various puzzles help solve life's little problems. The series stories will encourage children to make choices, take risks, and experiment. There will be six main characters, two animal mascots, and a variety of additional characters. Extensive educational and outreach materials will accompany the series.

"Tierra"—an adaptation of Tomas Riviera's novel portraying the life of a poor Mexican-American boy and his migrant farm worker family, as they struggle to adopt to life in American society.

"Family Stories"—a six-part cinema-verite exploration of an extended African-American family during the course of a year, focusing on racial and economic justice issues.

"Parenting Works!"—a one-half-hour series which answers questions about parenting and helps parents raise children under especially stressful circumstances.

"Dinosaur"—a four-part series that explores the newest discoveries and theories and looks back at the history of discovering dinosaurs. "Dinosaur" uses state-of-the-art animation to bring these creatures to life, providing a vision of how they looked, walked, ate, and sounded when they ruled the Earth of 140 million years ago.

"Lectronic Comics"—a pilot program in which extensive testing will be done with children and teachers relative to the appeal of a classical story in cartoon format. Use of words on screen, limited animation, and sound effects were also tested. Producers will use results of just-completed evaluations to fine tune the show format and submit to potential underwriters.

"The Choice: A Frontline Special Report"—an in-depth examination of the major candidates' backgrounds, public lives, and political performances. Each major party candidate will be profiled in these hour-long documentaries.

"The State of Democracy: A Frontline Special Report"—a multipart series based upon the research of award-winning journalist William Grieder. The series will explore and analyze the condition of democracy in America.

"MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour Election Coverage Enhancement"—a series designed to encompass candidate profiles and campaign speeches, allowing review of the candidates and their spoken messages to the public.

PUBLIC RADIO PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In the short time that the CPB Radio Program Fund has been in existence, it has revitalized radio with programming from such series as "All Things Considered, "Morning Edition," Crossroads," and "Marketplace." Almost 14 million listeners nationwide have come to rely on these programs for information and insight into the events at home and abroad that shape our world. Other CPB-funded programs such as "Fresh Air" and "Afropop Worldwide," have expanded the boundaries of radio to encompass programming that is entertaining as well as culturally progressive.

In its 6-year history, the Radio Program Fund has awarded 107 grants for a total of $22 million—approximately half of the total production costs—fostering the development of 8,000 hours of original programming for public radio.

For fiscal year 1992, the Radio Program Fund selections are based on high quality, diversity, excellence, and innovation obtained from diverse sources. CPB received 272 proposals, up from 159 from fiscal year 1991. Of the 24 projects, 15 are independently produced, produced by culturally diverse people, or are by or about racial and ethnic minorities. CPB's investments in such projects will be $2.9 million or 64 percent of available funds. CPA based its selections on the advice of an 11-member panel of outside experts:

"African Democracy, The Unnoticed Revolution"—a documentary series

that will capture the drama, humor, and innovation of the spreading democracy movement in Africa. This series will reflect the national and cultural diversity of Africa and will explore why Americans know so little about it.

"Afropop Worldwide"—a series expanded from the original Afropop series to include the cousins of African popular music from such locations in the diaspora as Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, Brazil, London, Paris, and New York.

"Baltimore Symphony Casual Concerts"—a series of occasional concerts that take risks with conductor David Zinman performing in ways that go utterly against the image of the conductor as Maestro.

"Classical Renewable Project"—a program geared toward the renewal of classical music programming on radio.

"Club Tropicana"—a series that will offer a showcase for the many forms of Latin American music now flourishing in the United States as a result of the growing immigration of Spanish and Portuguese-speaking Central and South Americans.

"Crossroads"—a weekly radio newsmagazine that focuses on multiethnic and minority cultures.

"Echoes"—a daily music program services. Echoes charts the trans-cultural experience through world music, jazz, new acoustic, and new-age music.

"Election '92 Call-Ins"—a daily 2-hour national forum that will permit voters and candidates to discuss issues with each other. This flexibility formatted program will also permit National Public Radio to focus on other international and domestic issues to accommodate breaking news during the election year.

"English-Spanish New Projects"—an exploration of whether the benefits of public radio's current $30 million investment in daily news programming can be made available to Spanish speaking audiences. Working with producers of national news programming, this project will develop and test with stations and listeners such options as newscast translations, adaptation of material from longer programs, and provision of scripts derived from English-language programs.

"Fresh Air"—a daily arts, culture, and entertainment service featuring interviews with leading writers, actors, composers, musicians, and filmmakers, as well as reviews of films, records, books, and previews of television programs.

"Hispanic Programming Satellite Network"—a public radio Spanish-language network. Programming will be available for 18 months to United States Latino-Spanish language public radio stations. Also, funding will permit the acquisition and editing of up to 300 hours of programming from Mexico's public radio system.

"Imagination Workshop"—a series of comedy programs with topical satire, original sketches, music, and the sound effects.

"Indigenous Voices"—a 1-year planning project to develop a prototype Native American cultural arts and entertainment magazine.

"Life Stories"—a series of portraits and stories of ordinary citizens from small towns, rural areas, and urban neighborhoods usually overlooked by mainstream reporting.

"The Maltese Goddess"—a comic opera for drive-time radio. It is the story of a female detective who returns to Philadelphia to close down her father's detective agency and ends up taking her father's last case.

"Marketplace"—a daily magazine of international business, finance, and the economy that relates the impact of international commerce on listeners' lives.

"The Music Makers"—thirteen 1-hour documentaries that will examine the art, the business, and the significant role that contemporary music plays in American life. Each program will include verite recordings, musical demonstrations, oral history mixed with musical illustrations, live concerts, rehearsal recordings, and rare, never-before released material.

"New Orleans '92"—a project using music from the 1992 New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival, mixed with short features on the food, customs, and culture of New Orleans. Included will be commissioned pieces from New Orleans writers and poets.

"Spirits of the Present"—a series that will be produced in conjunction with the Smithsonian Museum of American History. The series will be used as a companion piece to the 13-part documentary series, "Spirits of the Present: The Legacy From Native Americans."

"Unsung Educators—The Jeanes Teachers"—a series of historical reports on a group of African-American female teachers. In 1908, these teachers began teaching industrial education in rural communities throughout the South. They focused attention on the needs of black students in rural areas at a time when such education was virtually ignored by mainstream America.

"Wade in the Water"—a collaboration between NPR and the Smithsonian Museum of American History for a series of 1-hour programs about African-American sacred songs and worship traditions.

"World Cafe"—A daily music service designed to expand public radio's appeal to a younger and more racially diverse audience.

S. 1504 would ensure continued quality programming, sufficient support for the existing public radio system, and further progress on reaching the 14 percent of the population unserved by public radio. The funding levels in S. 1504 would enable public radio to meet its goal of reaching 95 percent of the population by the year 2000.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased it has been possible to work out an amendment addressing the independent television service which is acceptable to Senators on both sides of the aisle. But as the Senate acts to accept that amendment, I would like to place in the RECORD what I believe to be some very important considerations with respect to ITVS.

In 1967, when Congress created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Congress stated that "The expansion of and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programming depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both local and national levels." In 1967, Congress also stated that one of the purposes of the Corporation was to "facilitate the development of telecommunications in which programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities. * * *"

Since that time, Congress consistently has believed that one of the most effective ways of promoting diversity, and ensuring the maximum freedom, creativity, and innovation was to promote the production of programs by independent producers. In 1967, Congress specifically stated in the statute that the CPB "shall make grants and contracts for the production of public television and radio programs by independent producers and production entities. * * *" In 1981, this provision was amended to require that the CPB devote a substantial amount of its funding to productions by independent producers.

Finally, in 1988, Congress required that the CPB cause to be created an independent production service, separate from the CPB. As a result of the 1988 act, the Independent Television Service was formed and the CPB determined to award the ITVS $2 million per year for administrative expenses and $6 million a year for program production grants. While the ITVS was given funding to cover administrative expenses in fiscal years 1989 and 1990, it did not receive any funding for program production until June 1991. Upon receipt of those funds, the ITVS promptly requested grant proposals, and awarded grants for the production of 26 programs in November 1991.

At each of the points where Congress has considered the issue, it has determined—properly so in my judgment—that an independent production service was needed to promote diversity and innovation in programming. Congress also charged the ITVS with the responsibility of developing programming for unserved and underserved audiences such as children and minorities.

In other words, the purpose of ITVS is to serve audiences who turn on pub-

lic TV but don't often see programs which reflect their lives with authenticity or depict life from their own point of view.

Since its inception, ITVS has reached out to and embraced the thousands of individuals in each of our States who are not employed by a television station or studio, but who produce programs on their own—stemming from the passion and commitment they feel for a particular subject or issue. I believe that independent production is one of the most effective ways of ensuring a diversity of voices which will enrich public television.

The Independent Television Service took our instructions seriously. It has established a national board of distinguished media professionals, including representatives of public television—a board which is approved by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It then went straight to the people it is supposed to serve. Hundreds of individuals were asked what kind of programming would meet the needs of rural Americans, minorities, and young people. Twenty-four thousand independent producers from all over the United States were invited to submit proposals.

A door was opened—a door full of promise. I am pleased and relieved that today we have been able to overcome the urge some Members of the Senate felt to slam the door so recently opened even before the first program funded by ITVS has been completed—let alone seen.

What objections would lead to advocating such action, and thereby cause us to throw away our investment before we have seen its fruits by throwing away the money that has already been awarded to producers all over the country?

Some are claiming that since ITVS has not yet put any programs on television, we should get rid of it. The facts are that ITVS was not authorized to spend one cent on new programs until June 1991—less than 1 year ago. Television programs take at least a year or more to complete, and then several months to schedule and advertise before they reach us at home. So it is unreasonable to criticize ITVS for failing to have programs on the air. Ken Burns, the celebrated producer of "The Civil War," is working on a new project right now which won't appear on television until 1996. The criticism that ITVS should be abolished because we have not yet seen its products is far off the mark.

We have heard claims that the ITVS board has traveled around the country for meetings, and for this and other reasons has incurred substantial travel expenses. That is only appropriate: The board has gone out to meet with producers in Texas, in Louisiana, in Missouri, in Oregon, and in many other States, to encourage them to be a part of the organization, to find out how it ought to be working. In my view, such travel is necessary to fulfill the congressional mandate to serve the needs of all Americans. It makes a lot more sense to have board meetings where you can meet and talk with your national constituents than to meet in the same location every time. If you want to have an organization with a board composed of a Latino who is director of cultural affairs in San Antonio, TX; an Asian-American Foundation executive from New York; an African-American producer from Georgia; a public television leader from Illinois; the president of Public Television in Minnesota; or the head of Kentucky Educational Television, airplane travel for someone is unavoidable.

This charge is particularly ironic, in view of the fact that the same individuals who attack the ITVS also claim that public broadcasting is controlled by large stations on the west and east coasts. While I do not agree with that assertion, even if it were true, ITVS does not fit that mold. The overwhelming majority of the ITVS Board is made up of individuals from the Midwest, Northwest and South. Moreover, the ITVS focused its efforts on locating producers outside of the New York and Los Angeles production communities.

ITVS is a major new national organization, one that is entirely unprecedented. So we shouldn't be surprised that establishing it took some thinking and negotiating about how it would work. Unlike the boards of most for-profit businesses—which some in the Senate want public television to become—this board receives no compensation. Its members serve because they are personally committed to the goals of public broadcasting and independent production.

We also have heard charges that this group has spent too much in startup expenses. Media organizations have substantial startup expenses, there's no getting around it. They make investments in everything from establishing national mailing lists, dealing with a national constituency, setting up shop, and purchasing equipment. But even so, ITVS underspent its startup budget. And all of its expenses were fully approved by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Moreover, ITVS' financial records have been audited annually by both CPB and independent auditors—and they have passed in every case with flying colors.

A few Senators are criticizing ITVS for some of the first programs they've funded. In some cases the criticism focuses on the political viewpoints some claim these programs take—even though the critics have not seen a single frame from even one of these programs. They are being criticized for what's called lack of balance. How can you talk about the balance of something you haven't even seen?

ITVS' apparently clairvoyant critics are holding up 3 or 4 programs from a first group of 26, and on the basis of nothing more than their titles and a one-line description, appear to have concluded that those programs should be neither made nor seen.

ITVS' critics never mention that ITVS has funded programs about the elderly, and high quality animations for children by award winning artists. Critics ignore the fact that ITVS is creating a major dramatic series on the American family, and a series in which teenagers are asked to talk about their concerns and contribute to the programs with their own video work, and a series which mixes programs with dramatically differing political viewpoints. No, ITVS' critics are quite silent on those programs. ITVS could provide the kind of programming that its critics claim is missing from public broadcasting, if it is given a chance.

Congress asked the Independent Television Service to open the door to voices which often have been prevented from becoming part of our national debate. We asked it to put some important new programs in the basket from which public television programmers may choose.

I believe that it is in America's interest that every citizen be a stakeholder in our country's future. We need to let all Americans know that their lives are valued, that their opinions count.

One of the hallmarks of a free society is that there's no central committee of elected officials that decides whose story gets to be told. Democracy depends on citizens having access to information—on having choices. It depends on not giving in to the temptation to silence voices before we have even heard those voices.

For these reasons, I am very pleased that ITVS critics in the Senate have dropped plans to seek to abolish or maim it. I compliment the distinguished manager of the bill, Senator INOUYE, other Senators dedicated to preserving the ITVS voice, and their staffs for the exertion which has yielded this outcome.

I will be eagerly awaiting the arrival of the fresh programming ITVS soon will be bringing to public television.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time on the amendment?

Mr. DOLE. I yield back my time.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield back my time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if I have any time left, I want to thank the distinguished Republican leader and the Senator from Hawaii for their patience in the negotiations this afternoon.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, if I could have one quick moment at the very end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator?

Mr. STEVENS. I take back 5 minutes and yield it to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it has been a long 4 hours. I thank the Senator from Alaska and I certainly would like to thank the minority leader and the Senator from Hawaii.

As a Senator from Minnesota, I really do believe that the mission of ITVS is prophetic. We have to really start to hear one another in a different kind of way. I think we have to have a national conversation. We have to see each other through each others' eyes. I think it is going to be most cultural. I know we have some disagreement. But I am really pleased we could work out an agreement so ITVS could go forward. I think it is going to be a very important program. I think it will be healing and good for our country.

Mr. President, I have a whole list of initial projects that ITVS has looked at. It is a broad range of projects. I ask unanimous consent that that be printed in the RECORD, and also an article from the Minnesota Star Tribune, dated April 10, 1992.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST ITVS OPEN CALL—SUMMARY OF INITIAL PROJECTS

Lynn Smith: "Sandburg's Arithmetic."

Lynn Smith is an award-winning animator whose work has been seen on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and PBS.

"Sandburg's Arithmetic" is a lively animated film for children inspired by Carl Sandburg's poem "Arithmetic."

Paul Kwan: "Anatomy of a Springroll."

Paul Kwan is a multi-media artist whose interdisciplinary work has shown in theatrical venues from La MaMa to the Asian American Playwrights' Festival.

In "Anatomy of a Springroll" Paul Kwan searches for the secret to his mother's spring roll recipe, using the metaphor of food to explore Southeast Asian culture.

Ana Maria Garcia and Eduardo Aguiar: "Endangered Species: The Toxic Poisoning of Communities of Color."

Ana Maria Garcia is the co-founder and former director of the Festival Cine San Juan in Puerto Rico and recently completed a film in AFI's Directing Workshop for Women. Her video and film works have won international awards. Eduardo Aguiar is former series producer for the WGBH series La Plaza.

"Endangered Species" begins with a startling fact: a shockingly large number of African Americans and Latinos are exposed to toxic waste. The film will examine this public health crisis and profile efforts to counteract it.

Helen Lee and Kerri Sakamoto: "Little Baka Girl."

Helen Lee's first film, "Sally's Beauty Spot," has gained an international profile and won a Juror's award at the Black Maria Film Festival. Kerri Sakamoto is a fiction writer and producer of short films.

In "Little Baka Girl," a third-generation Japanese-American and a recent Korean immigrant find romance, conflict and solace as they grapple with their Asian heritage.

David Collier: "For Better or For Worse."

David Collier is an independent producer who has worked on numerous documentaries for PBS including "The Search for Excellence" and "The New American Revolution."

"For Better or Worse" is a funny, touching look at the nature of commitment, presenting portraits of five elderly couples who have each been together fifty years or longer.

Joanna Priestley: "Aging Grace."

Joanna Priestley is an award-winning animator whose work has received top honors at more than 80 film festivals.

"Aging Grace" is a humorous animated film about the pains and pleasures of becoming middle-aged.

Kathe Sandler: "A Question of Color."

Kathe Sandler is completing "The Friends," an adaptation of Rosa Guy's award-winning novel, through the AFI Directing Workshop for Women.

"A Question of Color" looks at "color consciousness" among African Americans and a value system based on privileged physical features.

Veronika Soul: "Ghost Story."

Veronika Soul's films have screened internationally at festivals and galleries and have received numerous awards.

"Ghost Story" is a short film about time and memory that moves between the past and present of a Chinese immigrant family and uses inventive techniques to evoke their memories and thoughts.

Victor Masayesva, Jr.: "Imagining Indians."

Victor Masayesva, Jr. is a Hopi producer whose works have received international acclaim, including a Gold Hugo (Chicago International Film Festival) and have been broadcast on German and Spanish television.

"Imagining Indians" will look at how Native Americans have been "imagined" in popular American media, and the role of popular fiction in the lives of contemporary Native Americans.

The Wooster Group: "White Homeland Commando".

The Wooster Group is a critically experimental theater company whose work has been shown on public television and performed world-wide. Its members include Elizabeth LeCompte, Willem Dafoe, and others.

"White Homeland Commando" is a takeoff on a TV cop show in which a special unit of the police force infiltrates a white supremacist organization.

Barbara Abrash and Esther Katz: "A Public Nuisance: Margaret Sanger and the Brownsville Clinic".

Barbara Abrash is an independent producer whose films have shown on "The American Experience" on PBS and Great Britain's Channel 4. Esther Katz is an assistant professor of history at New York University.

"A Public Nuisance" documents early public debates over birth control in the 1920s, and the power of media to shape those views.

Ela Troyano: "Once Upon a Time . . .".

Ela Troyano's films have shown in festivals and on public television in the U.S. and abroad.

"Once Upon a Time . . ." is a dramatic film exploring relationships between young Latinos and Latinas whose culture straddles New York and the Caribbean.

Marlon T. Riggs: "Black Is . . . Black Ain't".

Marlon T. Riggs produced the Emmy-winning "Ethnic Notions" and the internationally acclaimed "Tongues Untied", which both aired nationally on PBS. He recently completed "Color Adjustment", a documentary about black representation in prime time entertainment television.

"Black Is . . . Black Ain't" is a documentary exploring what the various meanings of "blackness" are to African Americans.

Faith Hubley: "Tall Time Tales".

Three-time Academy Award-Winning animator Faith Hubley is renowned world-wide for innovative work pioneered with her late husband, John Hubley. "Tall Time Tales" is a light-hearted, animated short that sheds light on the many faces of time.

Ellen Spiro: "Out Here".

Ellen Spiro is a Southerner and producer of the award-winning video "DiAna's Hair Ego: AIDS Info Up Front".

"Out Here" will look at Southern gay and lesbian culture through eccentric and traditional personalities, from Tennessee Williams and Bessie Smith to contemporary men and women across the South.

Gary Soto: "The Pool Party".

Gary Soto is an award-winning Chicano writer and author of books for Latino children. "The Pool Party" is his second film.

"The Pool Party" is a light-hearted story of a Chicano boy who makes a splash at a pool party.

Sam Pollard, Peter Miller and John Valadez: "Citizen Dhoruba".

Sam Pollard has edited the feature films "Jungle Fever" and "Mo' Better Blues" for Spike Lee, and produced and directed PBS documentaries, including episodes of "Eyes on the Prize". Peter Miller has worked on "Songs of the Civil War" (Jim Brown and Ken Burns), the Oscar-winning "American Dream" (Barbara Kopple) and other documentaries. John Valadez has worked on several documentaries, and is making his directorial debut with this film.

"Citizen Dhcruba" tells the story of a former Black Panther who served nineteen years in prison until new evidence secured his recent release.

Ruth Peyser: "Go to Hell".

Ruth Peyser was born and educated in Australia. She has been an award-winning animator, graphic designer and illustrator for nearly fifteen years.

"Go to Hell!" is an animated short in which a woman trips and falls into a strange dream that ends up being a little too close to reality.

Tony Cokes: "Love, Labor, Language."

Tony Cokes is a videomaker and sculptor whose work has won awards and international acclaim, from the Whitney Biennial to the Berlin International Black Cinema Festival.

"Love, Labor, Language" is a portrait of the artist's mother, whose experiences as a domestic, a public school maid, a food service worker and the mother of six children inspire an imaginative inquiry into love, work, family and money.

Christine Chang: "Be Good, My Children."

Christine Chang is a first-generation Korean-American and independent filmmaker who currently works in high-definition television.

This drama about a Korean immigrant family centers on the conflict between a daughter who dreams of glamor and her disapproving mother.

Clay Walker: "Post No Bills."

Clay Walker is an emerging filmmaker who has worked with innovative independent filmmakers Jean-Pierre Gorin and Raul Ruiz.

"Post No Bills" follows the process of creating political street art by focusing on noted poster artist Robbie Conal.

Puhipau and Joan Lander: "An Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation."

Puhipau is a Native Hawaiian and independent producer whose works have shown in

video and film festivals in the U.S. and abroad and on Hawaiian public, cable and commercial television. Joan Lander is an independent producer whose documentaries on Native Hawaiians are distributed worldwide.

"An Act of War" portrays the 1893 American overthrow of Hawaii from a Native Hawaiian perspective.

Shu Lea Cheang: "Waste Land."

Shu Lea Cheang is a film and video artist whose work has been exhibited at the Whitney Museum, the AFI Video Festival and other festivals, and broadcast on public television.

"Waste Land" is a dark comedy that brings quirky characters together in a sushi restaurant when an environmental crisis erupts. The screenplay is by Jessica Hagedorn, whose recent novel "Dogeaters" was nominated for a National Book Award.

Suzie Baer: "Warrior: The Case of Leonard Peltier."

Suzie Baer is an emerging producer who has worked on independent features, music videos and industrial videos.

"Warrior" documents the case of incarcerated Native American activist Leonard Peltier, the subject of the biggest manhunt in FBI history.

Edin Velez: "Memory of Fire."

Edin Velez is a critically acclaimed video artist whose work has shown internationally and been broadcast on local public television stations and on "Alive From Off Center." He is a past winner of the American Film Institute's Maya Deren Award for innovation in independent film and video.

"Memory of Fire" is a stylistically rich narrative reassessing the "discovery" of the New World by Columbus.

Jim Klein and Martha Olson: "Red Car Mysteries."

Jim Klein has been making independent documentaries with Julia Reichert for twenty years, and has twice been nominated for an Oscar. His work has been broadcast on PBS and includes "Seeing Red," "Union Maids" and "Letter to the Next Generation." Martha Olson is a writer and a leading Archive Researcher for nationally recognized historical films.

Not long ago, all major American cities had electrical streetcar systems that have since died. "Red Car Mysteries" documents the story of how the trolleys were abandoned for a system of urban freeways.

[From the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Apr. 10, 1992]

OPENING UP PUBLIC TV TO THE PUBLIC

(By Laura Baenen)

Paul Kwan's quest for the perfect spring roll will take public television viewers to postwar Vietnam on a symbolic journey by a native son in search of his heritage.

It's part of an effort to take public television back to its roots as well.

Rough cuts of Kwan's "Anatomy of a Spring Roll" and other U.S. independent filmmakers' works are beginning to arrive in St. Paul at a not-for-profit company created by Congress to bring more innovation and minority representation to taxpayer-funded public TV.

"We're really mandated to provide programs that increase diversity and to serve underserved audiences," said John F. Schott, executive producer of the St. Paul-based Independent Television Service (ITVS).

The television service expects to air "Anatomy of a Spring Roll" this fall. In the short film, Kwan, 37, of San Francisco, searches for the secret to his mother's spring rolls by exploring Southeast Asian culture.

"The search for the perfect spring roll became a springboard into the culture. Food is an easy way to bridge the cultural gap," said Arnold Iger, who is producing, writing and directing the film with Kwan.

It includes scenes filmed when Kwan returned to Vietnam, his first visit since he escaped the war-torn country on a fake passport nearly 20 years ago. Cinema verite and animation in the style of Chinese shadow puppets will be part of the piece, he said.

Kwan wants to convey the mood of postwar Vietnam.

"We're trying to show the human face in the country," he said. "For us, I think it's a time for healing, forgiveness."

Kwan's mother, Lac E. Minh, 72, lives in Oakland, Calif., and appears in the film. What does she think of her son's spring rolls now?

"She still complains I don't do them right," Kwan said.

ITVS will offer films such as Kwan's free, first to the Public Broadcasting Service for national broadcast, then for regional distribution. It also will buy satellite time so that all of its programming is available, free, to the nation's approximately 340 public TV stations.

ITVS, also responsible for funding, packaging, promoting and scheduling, will package some related works into short series.

"ITVS is really mandated to take risks," said Schott, who is also the organization's executive director. He formerly held the same position at "Alive From Off Center," a national PBS arts series.

ITVS was set up to develop the work of independent U.S. producers who traditionally have felt constrained by corporate sponsorship of public TV or that they didn't fit into a typical series format. Their works will include drama, documentary, animation and the arts.

"We're going to work in every genre," said Schott, on leave as a media studies professor at Carleton College in Northfield, Minn. But, he cautioned, "That doesn't mean there's a maniacal preoccupation with experimentation."

Instead, ITVS hopes to offer something for everyone.

Congress created ITVS under the Telecommunications Act of 1988. Some independent producers believed the Corporation for Public Broadcasting had become too established and wasn't serving minorities.

Since the creation of ITVS, the two groups have joined forces. The National Coalition of Independent Broadcasting Producers nominated, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting approved, a board of media professionals, including public broadcasters, educators and producers for ITVS.

ITVS' $800,000 annual budget comes from CPB's federal allocation. ITVS has 12 full-time staff members and $6 million annually to develop, produce and package independent works.

Last year, 26 independent producers won nearly $3 million in contracts from among more than 2,000 proposals. Proposals for a second round of projects are under consideration. The producers who won the first contracts work in New York, California, Ohio, Oregon, Hawaii, Arizona and Puerto Rico, but Schott hopes to see more geographic diversity.

He said he believes that independent producers are encouraged that it will happen, in part because ITVS isn't based in a traditional TV production center such as New York or California.

"I do think many have interpreted it as a fresh start," Schott said, "locating a national organization somewhere rather than where you would expect it."

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1866, the Dole amendment.

The amendment (No. 1866) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time on the bill?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me again thank my colleagues, the Senator from Hawaii, [Mr. INOUYE], and the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. STEVENS], not only for their cooperation today, but for the past several weeks, and for their good faith efforts to try to improve this, and some of us think it needs improving. I want the RECORD to reflect it was bipartisan. I thank them for it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if I have any time left, and I think I do, I want to issue one word of caution. As I said before, my State depends very heavily on this system, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. All across the land, we see efforts to test the limits of public patience with regard to funding programs by those who are at the extreme of the system.

The people who need this system are not at the extreme. They are people in their daily walks of life, in their homes. They need this system. I urge those that are managing this Corporation for Public Broadcasting to keep that in mind.

We do not need any more tests of the patience of the public in the operation of this system. We need common sense and realization that the more we go to the extreme in the use of public programs that are funded by taxpayers' dollars, the less support those programs will have in the end.

I am not suggesting censorship. I am not suggesting that we criticize here now some of the things that have been done. I must say, though, some of them I do not agree with. But what I am saying is, we are pleading for common sense in the administration of these programs so that the public can be served, the general, broad mainstream of the American public that needs this system.

I urge that other Members speak out from time to time about this concept of trying to finance with taxpayers' dollars the extremities of our civil rights. I support the exercise of those civil rights, but the taxpayers do not have to finance the exercise of civil rights at the extremities of our system.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the managers yield back their time on the bill, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Commerce Committee is discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2977, the House companion bill, and the Senate shall proceed to its immediate consideration.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2977) to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause of the bill is stricken, and the text of S. 1504, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof.

The clerk will read the bill for the third time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2977) to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] would vote "yea."

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is absent due to illness.

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced, yeas 84, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Adams	Ford	Metzenbaum
Akaka	Fowler	Mikulski
Baucus	Gore	Mitchell
Bentsen	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Boren	Harkin	Packwood
Bradley	Hatch	Pell
Breaux	Hatfield	Pressler
Bryan	Heflin	Pryor
Bumpers	Hollings	Reid
Burdick	Inouye	Riegle
Burns	Jeffords	Robb
Byrd	Johnston	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kassebaum	Roth
Cochran	Kasten	Rudman
Cohen	Kennedy	Sanford
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cranston	Kerry	Sasser
D'Amato	Kohl	Shelby
Danforth	Lautenberg	Simon
Daschle	Leahy	Simpson
DeConcini	Levin	Specter
Dixon	Lieberman	Stevens
Dodd	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Durenberger	McCain	Wellstone
Exon	McConnell	Wirth

NAYS—11

Brown	Garn	Smith
Coats	Gramm	Symms
Craig	Mack	Wallop
Dole	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Helms	Wofford
Glenn	Seymour	

So the bill (H.R. 2977), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S. 1504 will be placed back on the Senate Calendar.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his leadership, his persistence and diligence over a long period of time in bringing this important bill to passage by the Senate, following and overcoming a large number of objections and obstacles to its passage. It is a great credit to the Senator from Hawaii and I commend him for it.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I want to thank the staff of the Commerce Committee, Toni Cook, John Windhausen, Kevin Curtin, Linda Morgan, Jim Dreury, Gina Keeney and Mary McManus, for all of their work on this legislation.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, had I been able to be here for the vote, I would have voted in support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting bill. Public television has brought our Nation an extra dimension in television viewing. From children's shows like "Sesame Street" to the "MacNeil-Lehrer Newshour" to "Masterpiece Theatre," public television has brought us a range of programming that would not be available otherwise.

Frankly, I think much of the American public was surprised that public television could come under attack. But such was the case. I thought many of the points raised were without merit, and the Senate's overwhelming endorsement of the reauthorization bill shows that the extreme claims against public television fell well short of their mark.

Public television reauthorization bills are specifically structured to protect it from these political pressures. We may not all agree with each of the points raised by the documentaries that air on public television, but the alternative of a broadcast network whipped around by political winds would destroy its credibility and support. And, unfortunately, the seemingly attractive notion that public television could be replicated through the broadcast networks or cable television is without basis. The difference between the shows that predominate those media versus those on public television could not be more stark.

I commend the Senator from Hawaii for his efforts on this bill and his continuing strong support for our Nation's public television system.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

AMERICA AND THE WORLD WILL SADLY MISS AMBASSADOR PHILIP HABIB

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened by the recent passing of Philip C. Habib. Phil Habib, a career State Department official and consummate diplomat, represented the very best that the Foreign Service had to offer.

As a former Foreign Service officer, I have always had a tremendous regard for the men and women who represent our country abroad. The job, while personally rewarding, is at the same time difficult and challenging. Regrettably, our career diplomats are also in many respects underappreciated by the public at large. The American people rarely recognize the tremendous debt that we owe our Foreign Service officers for their selfless service on behalf of the Nation.

Sometimes, however, a member of the U.S. diplomatic corps rises above the rest, with accomplishments so compelling that people will sit up and take notice. Phil Habib was exactly

that sort of diplomat. His achievements on behalf of the United States—whether as Middle East Presidential Envoy, as U.S. representative to the Paris talks on the Vietnam war, as Ambassador to Korea, or as Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs—stand as testimony to his devotion and energy.

Ambassador Habib carried out his missions in a manner of professionalism and confidence that was recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike. The Nation needed Phil Habib to carry out its most difficult and sensitive diplomatic work, and when Presidents called, he was there.

Phil Habib was a troubleshooter, one who could pick his way through diplomatic minefields in the search for common ground. Throughout his life and career, Phil Habib maintained an unassuming sense of who he was and where he came from: a Lebanese-American born in Brooklyn, he was direct, efficient, and tough. In Phil Habib, these were the tools by which he achieved the mastery of his art.

I will surely miss Phil Habib. He was a friend whose judgment I respected, whose counsel I valued, and whose achievements I admired. I had the privilege of hearing him speak at a conference we both attended just a few days before his death.

The greater loss is to the Nation itself, which must sadly bear the passing of one of its most accomplished servants. I know that my colleagues would want to join me in expressing deepest sympathy, as well as heartfelt gratitude, to his family.

I would like to inform my colleagues that there will be a memorial service for Ambassador Habib on Wednesday, June 10, at the National Cathedral here in Washington, at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to address the floor, and I now ask unanimous consent that three articles on Philip Habib be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

PHILIP C. HABIB, 72, DIES; U.S. PEACE NEGOTIATOR

(By J.Y. Smith)

Philip C. Habib, 72, a career State Department official whose mastery of complex situations, skill at negotiation and seemingly inexhaustible patience led to key roles in efforts to bring peace to Vietnam, the Middle East and Central America, died of a heart attack May 25 in Puligny-Montrachet, France.

A resident of Belmont, Calif., since retiring from the State Department in 1978, he was on a private visit to the wine country of Burgundy when he was stricken.

The State Department issued a statement yesterday hailing Mr. Habib for his "profound contribution to U.S. foreign policy" and the "enduring legacy" of his work. It described him as a "man of great courage, unparalleled tenacity, high intellect and deep warmth."

From 1968 to 1971, Mr. Habib was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Paris talks that eventually ended the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and for part of that time he was acting head of the delegation. Throughout his tenure his knowledge of the situation was regarded as crucial to the U.S. side, and he conducted some of the most difficult sessions with the North Vietnamese himself.

His next post was as ambassador to South Korea, where he served from 1971 to 1974. Recalled to Washington, he was named assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs. In 1976, he was promoted to undersecretary of state for political affairs, the highest post available to a career official.

Mr. Habib received that appointment from President Gerald R. Ford, and he continued in the job under President Jimmy Carter. He laid the groundwork for the Camp David Accords—the result of the dramatic meeting at the presidential retreat at Camp David, Md., of Carter, Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat to discuss a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute.

Mr. Habib's retirement in 1978 was prompted by a heart attack—it was his second in six years—and he became a visiting professor at Stanford University and then a research fellow at the Hoover Institution.

In 1981, he was summoned by President Ronald Reagan to be his personal representative to the Middle East. The particular flash point at the time was Lebanon, torn by civil war and harried by rapacious neighbors. During two years of shuttle diplomacy Mr. Habib searched for a way to end the violence. Partly as a result of this work, Secretary of State George P. Shultz negotiated an agreement between Israel and Lebanon, but it foundered on Syrian intransigence and was never ratified. Mr. Habib, no longer welcome to the Syrians, returned to private life.

In 1986, Reagan called again. This time it was to appoint him a special envoy to the Philippines. In the same year, he was named a special presidential envoy to Central America. In 1987, he resigned when the administration ignored his advice to join an initiative that was started by other Central American governments to bring peace to Nicaragua.

Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., the son of a Lebanese grocer, Philip Charles Habib grew up a Catholic in a Jewish neighborhood. He graduated from the University of Idaho. After World War II service in the Army, he went to the University of California at Berkeley, where he earned a doctorate in economics. (His dissertation was on the economics of the lumber industry.)

By the time the degree was conferred in 1952, Mr. Habib had embarked long since on his career in diplomacy. In 1949, he was commissioned a foreign service officer. His first posts were in Ottawa and Wellington, New Zealand. He then returned to Washington. From 1958 to 1960, he was consul general in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad.

In 1962, after another period in Washington, he joined the U.S. Embassy in South Korea as political counselor. In 1965, with U.S. involvement in Vietnam deepening, he was assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, where he was chief political adviser to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. In 1967, he returned to Washington as deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs.

By that time, Mr. Habib was recognized as the State Department's leading authority on Southeast Asian affairs. He was thus a natural choice to join the talks in Paris that opened that year.

In his new memoirs, former secretary of state Henry Kissinger described Mr. Habib as being "the antithesis of the public stereotype of the elegant, excessively genteel Foreign Service officer. He was rough, blunt, direct, as far from the 'striped-pants' image as it is possible to be."

W. Averell Harriman, one of those who served as chief U.S. representative at the Paris talks during Mr. Habib's time there, once remarked that a notable strength of Mr. Habib was his ability "to understand the other man's point of view." Many colleagues remarked on Mr. Habib's capacity for hard work, and he himself was quoted as saying, "If you are working 9 to 5 and if your wife is contented, you are not doing your job."

Mr. Habib was a former president of the Foreign Service Association and a recipient of the Rockefeller Public Service Award, the President's Award for Distinguished Public Service and the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Survivors include his wife, the former Marjorie W. Slightam, whom he married in 1942, and two daughters, Phyllis and Susan.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1992]

PHILIP HABIB: BRAVE BUREAUCRAT

(By Richard Holbrooke)

When a Brooklyn kid from a Lebanese Christian family named Philip Habib joined the Foreign Service in 1949, he was entering hallowed precincts then reserved almost exclusively for members of what Joseph Alsop later called the "WASP ascendancy." Yet when he died last week at 72, Phil Habib's name had long since taken its place alongside those of men like Charles Bohlen and George Kennan as one of the preeminent career diplomats in American postwar history. The kid from Brooklyn had lived out an inspiring American success story and offered our generation a triumphant, but unfortunately rare, example of professionalism and public service.

Even when he was a tough-minded and valued adviser to secretaries of state (from Rusk to Shultz) and presidents (Johnson to Reagan), he still marveled at his own success. National service had taken Phil Habib out of Brooklyn, but you couldn't take Brooklyn out of Phil Habib. Once, on his way back from a high-level meeting, he ran into a friend on the street. "Look at these," he said, holding one foot in the air and pointing at his shoes with a combination of pride and amazement. "They cost $100. Can you believe that I could ever spend $100 for a pair of shoes?"

George Kennan, the most famous career diplomat of the century, will always be remembered for his intellectual contributions to the creation of the postwar world. Phil Habib, the Foreign Service officer of his generation, was almost the exact opposite: the operational diplomat without peer who carried out the most difficult assignments with consummate skill but at the same time spoke his mind frankly only in private. (Kennan, of course, became famous for his public statements.)

But Habib, like Kennan, was that rarest of people, a brave bureaucrat, telling the most senior members of five administrations the truth as he saw it no matter how unwelcome it might be—and still keeping their respect—indeed, affection.

In part he did this by keeping his personal dissents on policy carefully hidden from public view; even among his many friends in journalism, he was a famously "lousy source."

But plenty of people in Washington don't tell the press exactly what they think. Phil's

true value to the nation came from personal values that he brought to public service—honesty and integrity. When he told the famous Wise Men's dinner in March of 1968 that the war in Vietnam could not be won within a reasonable period of time, his words were painful for him and decisive to his distinguished audience of senior presidential advisors. They carried special weight because he had to say them in front of his immediate superiors, including Dean Rusk, who, although greatly disturbed by them, never wavered in their support of the mid-level diplomat. That critical moment in the history of the Vietnam War—also the most memorable moment for Phil in his own career—was only the beginning of two more decades of assignments of ever-greater importance in the Middle East, Central America and East Asia.

While personifying the American dream, Habib loved to complain about the decline and fall of almost everything, and this sometimes gave him an almost Archie Bunker-like quality. But Phil enjoyed his own life, and the human comedy in general, as much as anyone I have known. His zest for living kept him alive—and those who loved him in awe—for 20 years after a series of heart attacks that should have felled him. Those years, in which arduous diplomatic assignments and three-star restaurants alternated with painful and dangerous surgical procedures, were productive and satisfying.

The Foreign Service was always his greatest love, and he lived to see its leadership pass to a generation of officers whom he had played a central role in choosing. Nothing made him more proud than the arrival of "his boys" at the top. But none of them matched his unique combination of intelligence, integrity, humanity and humor—all of which he imposed on an environment that normally punished his kind of candor.

Phil's answer to this would have been characteristically simple: Let's stick, in both our foreign policy and our professional lives, to the very American values that had propelled him out of Brooklyn and onto the world stage.

(The writer, a former Foreign Service officer and assistant secretary of state, worked with Philip Habib from 1965 to 1981.)

[From the International Herald Tribune, May 27, 1992]

PHILIP HABIB

Philip Habib, the American presidential envoy, who has died at Puligny-Montrachet, aged 72, was best known for his intensive rounds of shuttle diplomacy in the Middle East during Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982.

Although he was of Lebanese descent, his professionalism was such that no-one could suspect him of dual loyalty, and in time he earned the impartial respect of many of the warring factions.

Habib had retired from a distinguished career in the State Department through illness in 1978, but his involvement in the Camp David peace process had played a significant part in the first Israeli-Arab peace treaty. His performance was so outstanding that even the Reagan administration felt it necessary to recall him.

When Israel invaded, the PLO found itself besieged in Beirut. After weeks of seemingly indiscriminate bombardment. Western opinion demanded that the shelling be halted, but the Israelis refused unless the PLO was ejected.

It tells Habib to negotiate a withdrawal of the PLO forces from the city. He accomplished this against the odds, and the Palestinians were evacuated in boats with only their side arms. Habib later returned to press for the removal of all foreign forces from the country—Israeli, Palestinian and Syrian.

He was enraged by the intransigence of Israel's Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, and frustrated by the Syrians—President Assad refused to meet him.

Despite an assassination attempt by Iranian-backed extremists in April 1983—which destroyed the American embassy in Beirut and killed 39 people—Habib secured an agreement in principle for Israel to leave later that year. He became a candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Philip Charles Habib was born at Brooklyn on February 25, 1920 and educated at the universities of Idaho and Berkeley. After wartime service with the US Army he joined the US Foreign Service in 1949. He served in Canada and New Zealand, before his appointment as consul-general in Trinidad.

Later he was a political counsellor in South Korea, and in 1966 he became chief political adviser to Henry Cabot Lodge, the American Ambassador in Saigon. Habib's dispatches contributed to President Johnson's decision to halt the partial bombing of North Vietnam; and he played a key role at the Paris peace talks.

Habib was renowned for his combination of flexibility and plain speaking. "There can be no negotiated settlement to the war unless you are prepared to withdraw all North Vietnamese troops and elements from South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia back to North Vietnam," he said.

In November 1969 Habib became the acting head of the American delegation. But the North Vietnamese resented the appointment of a nonpolitical head of the delegation; and although Habib's proposals for neutral withdrawal formed the basis of the accord, he felt that his status was obstructing its progress.

Habib requested a transfer, and was appointed Ambassador to South Korea. In 1974 he became Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, as Presidents Nixon and then Ford sought to persuade Congress to maintain support for America's allies in South-East Asia.

Although his efforts ultimately failed, Habib acquitted himself well enough to be appointed Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs, then the highest position to which a career foreign service officer could rise.

In his latter incarnation he became the Reagan administration's favorite troubleshooter. It was said of him by cynics that his appearance signalled the imminent demise of any ally. In the Philippines in March 1986, he warned Marcos that he could no longer count upon indefinite support.

In Central America Habib's efforts to gain diplomatic support for American pressure on the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua met with less success, and he soon resigned in frustration.

He married, in 1942, Marjorie Slightam; they had two daughters.

EXTEND THE MANDATE TO PROTECT THE KURDS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the next several weeks will be a crucial period in the history of the Kurdish people. In the wake of the recent watershed elections for an Iraqi Kurdish parliament, the Kurds face a difficult road ahead as they attempt to consolidate their democratic achievement. The task, however, is being compounded by the fact that the mandate for Operation Provide Comfort—the allied air protection for the Kurds north of the 36th parallel in Iraq—is set to expire at the end of the month.

Operation Provide Comfort is the salvation of the Kurds. Without international protection, the Kurds would once again find themselves at the mercy of the Saddam Hussein regime. From experience, we know all too well what that means. It means oppression and torture by Saddam Hussein's security forces. It means Kurdish women will be hauled into secret police headquarters to be raped. It means the resumption of chemical weapons attacks. It means Kurds—old or young, dissident or nonpolitical—will again disappear without a trace.

As ugly and distasteful as all this sounds, I do not exaggerate. We know this to be true because, as incredible as it seems, the Iraqis documented their persecution of the Kurds on videotape, in print, and on cassette tapes. Just last month, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee participated in an effort to transport the documentation of Iraqi atrocities, which consists literally of tons of records and other evidence, to the States for safekeeping. Just a cursory study of some of the documents, now in the custody of the Foreign Relations Committee, has revealed untold horrors wrought by the Iraqi security network against the Kurds under what is now known as the "al-anfal" campaign. A more detailed study over time ought to provide the basis for obtaining judgments against Saddam Hussein and his cronies for crimes against humanity and genocide.

We must continue the air cover for the Kurds not only to prevent them from being subjected to further savagery, but also to help them reap the benefits of their experiment with democracy. Last month, Iraq's 5 million Kurds took to the polls in exemplary fashion to elect a unified leadership. While the elections produced a split result between the two main political parties, they were an extraordinary exercise in democracy in the face of adversity and will help establish the Iraqi Kurd claim for self-government.

In April, I, along with six of my colleagues in the Senate, wrote to President Bush to urge continued protection for both the Iraqi Kurds and Shi'a. I ask unanimous consent that our letter to the President and the reply from National Security Adviser Scowcroft be included in the RECORD upon conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent to include a recent editorial from the Washington Post that addresses this same subject.

Mr. President, the expiration of the mandate of Operation Provide Comfort looms over the Kurdish people as a proverbial sword of Damoclese. The anti-

Iraq coalition has within its hands the means to ensure that Saddam Hussein's fury is not once again unleashed on the Kurds. The United States, as the preeminent player in the coalition, must take the lead in seeing that the mandate is extended.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, April 14, 1992.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to express our deep concern over the current situation in Iraq, particularly regarding the safety of the Kurds in northern Iraq and the Shi'a muslims in southern Iraq.

Recently, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held a hearing to receive testimony on mass killings in Iraq under the Saddam Hussein regime. The Committee heard graphic and convincing reports of indiscriminate killings of Iraqi Kurdish civilians, particularly during the past several years. The testimony, based on official Iraqi documents and on tests conducted by forensic specialists, confirms the Committee's own research in this area. The available evidence suggests that the total number of Iraqi Kurdish deaths and disappearances may be as high as 200,000 to 300,000, or roughly 5 percent of the Iraqi Kurdish population. This information indicates that Iraqi actions against the Kurds are tantamount to an official policy of genocide.

The Kurds have effectively established a liberated zone in most of the traditionally Kurdish areas of northern Iraq. However, it is only the threat of allied military retaliation that protects this liberated zone from renewed Iraqi attack. And, from what we know, a renewed attack threatens the Kurdish people with extermination.

We therefore strongly support an extension of allied air cover under Operation Provide Comfort, currently set to expire at the end of June. We also hope the United States will urge the government of Turkey—whose support is a critical element of Operation Provide Comfort's success—to support an extension of the mandate.

In addition, we hope that the United States will make an effort to address the situation of the Shi'a population in Iraq. While the plight of the Kurds is becoming increasingly prominent, relatively little attention has been paid to the fate of the 13,000,000 Shi'a muslims who have struggled under Saddam Hussein's rule. Last year, following the uprising in the south, many of the Shi'a combatants, their civilian supporters, and Iraqi army deserters were forced into the southeastern marshlands at the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. There they have been subject to harsh retribution from Iraqi forces, leading to numerous deaths and causing serious refugee problems. Accordingly, we would urge the United States to examine possibilities for expanding the United Nations' presence in southern Iraq and extending appropriate international protection to the Shi'a.

We appreciate your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

Claiborne Pell, Harris Wofford, James M. Jeffords, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., Albert Gore, Jr., Paul Simon, Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 26, 1992.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President and I fully share your concerns about the current situation in Iraq which you enumerated in your letter of April 14, 1992. As we have said publicly on many occasions, United States policy toward Iraq seeks to maintain international sanctions until there is a change in leadership in Baghdad and a new government prepared to live at peace both with Iraq's neighbors and with the Iraqi people. We fully support United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 which calls on Iraq to cease repression of all Iraqi citizens.

As you noted, the coalition's Provide Comfort air cover has been critical to preventing an Iraqi attack on the areas of northern Iraq under Kurdish control. We are proud of the role coalition forces have played in curtailing the suffering of the population of northern Iraq. Let me assure you that we and our allies in Operation Provide Comfort have already begun consultations on extending the mandate for the presence with the Turkish leadership.

Our concern about the suffering of the Iraqi people naturally extends to the Shi'a population of the south as well. We have been engaged in a dialogue with the United Nations about expanding the U.N. presence in that area for some time and will continue to do so.

Sincerely,

BRENT SCOWCROFT.

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1992]

THE KURDS' NEW DEMOCRACY

An important new element has been put in place to save Iraq's 4 million Kurds from a still-threatening Saddam Hussein. It consists of their first free and fair elections—internationally observed and perhaps the freest elections ever held in any Arab country—for a local leadership and assembly. By this act of organization, participation and choice, the Kurdish cause takes on a new political dimension in Iraq and new legitimacy internationally. But at the same time a basic dilemma sharpens.

The elections could take place only because the gulf war allies put up an air shield over the Kurds in northern Iraq after Saddam Hussein's terrible assault on them last year. The Americans, British and French send over some 40 flights daily to stave off Iraq's forces. The problem is that these planes are based in Turkey, which fears that self-rule agitation among Iraqi's Kurds will encourage its own Kurds, increasingly bent on secession. Turkey is bargaining hard over the terms of continued allied use of Incirlik air base. Among other things, it wants the Iraqi Kurds to shut down the Turkish Kurds' sanctuaries in northern Iraq.

Iraqi Kurds calculate their brave experiment in democracy will make it harder for the gulf war allies to abandon them; it should. But they are compelled to look to an uncertain future in which at some point they will again be face to face with Baghdad. From this grim prospect arises the issue on which Kurds split down the middle in their recent elections—whether or not to negotiate further now with Saddam Hussein. Their hopes draw them to try to solidify a fragile de facto independence. But harsh pressures bear in on them to fudge and claim no more self-government than they can expect to sustain.

A whole school in the United States demands that Washington unequivocally support the Kurds and other opposition elements—to promote democracy or at least to bleed Saddam Hussein. Would that this could be done without leaving the Kurds in even greater and lonelier peril. For the American government, encouraging the Kurds is not as useful as working with the Turks to hold the air umbrella open over northern Iraq and keeping the pressure on Saddam Hussein to live up to his United Nations obligations for disarmament and peace.

THE PLIGHT OF THE HAITIAN REFUGEES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week the administration dealt a great setback to international standards for the protection of human rights. The administration has directed the Coast Guard to pick up Haitian boat people on the high seas and forcibly return them to their country without providing the opportunity to apply for asylum. According to the U.N. protocol relating to the status of refugees, a refugee shall not be returned to territories where he or she may face persecution. The United States is a contracting member to the protocol, and has a legal and moral obligation to determine whether those picked up on the high seas may be victims of repression. The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees has strongly condemned the administration's action.

I am concerned not only that we are violating international law, but that we are also applying a double standard when it comes to the treatment of refugees. Not so long ago, the United States criticized Great Britain for forcibly repatriating Vietnamese boat people from refugee camps in Hong Kong. Unlike the Haitian refugees, Vietnamese refugees in Hong Kong were screened to determine their status and allowed to appeal their case.

Currently, the number of refugees worldwide is estimated at 17 million, with the vast majority hosted in developing countries. Guinea, which by almost any measure is one of the poorest countries in the world, received 325,000 refugees in 1990—10 times the number of Haitians received at Guantanamo Bay. Despite international humanitarian assistance, the huge influx had a disruptive effect on Guinea, yet there were no known cases of denial of entry or involuntary repatriation. The current United States policy toward Haitian refugees is an embarrassing example for the rest of the world.

The administration's policy is based on its belief that those sent back to Haiti are not in danger of political persecution. Yet, we hear from human rights groups that most returnees go into hiding immediately and that there has been a resurgence of human rights violations. We saw a vivid example of the fear of those being forcibly repatriated in last Sunday's Washington Post, as one returnee jumped off a Coast Guard cutter claiming he would prefer

to die. While I understand the administration's position that we cannot accept every individual that wishes to enter the country, the situation in Haiti is such that no Haitian should be forced to return there at this time.

The administration argues that most of the boat people are economic migrants rather than political refugees. In my view, the current refugee crisis is primarily the result of Haiti's political tumult and will be resolved only when political order is established. The United States has always been a magnet for poor Haitians seeking economic opportunity, yet only since the coup that overthrew President Aristide last September have Haitians fled in such numbers.

Of the 34,000 Haitians who have reached Guantanamo Bay since the overthrow of President Aristide, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has cleared 30 percent to seek political asylum in the United States. Even if the INS has been able to recognize every Haitian with a legitimate asylum claim, an assertion that many human rights group contest, it is logical to assume that a similar number of those being forcibly repatriated may also have legitimate claims for political asylum. As an alternative to making a claim in Guantanamo, the Embassy has begun to allow Haitians to apply for asylum in Port-au-Prince. However, by merely appearing at the Embassy, Haitians runs an even greater risk of being a target of persecution.

While I commend the administration for calling for an intensification of humanitarian assistance efforts in Haiti, I urge the administration to review its policy of forced repatriation and seek a more humanitarian and compassionate response to the plight of the Haitian boat people that complies with international law standards.

SALTY BRINE: 50 YEARS IN BROADCASTING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today I wanted to recognize a man who has contributed to Rhode Island's culture and spirit. In his 50 years of radio broadcasting, Mr. Salty Brine has distinguished himself through his popularity with, and service to, countless Rhode Islanders. In recognition of Salty's unique place in the hearts of Rhode Islanders, he was recently honored for his half-century of service to our State at a gala held at the Providence Performing Arts Center. I would also like to add that Mr. Brine is no stranger to tributes; recently, a State beach and a radio studio were named in his honor.

Salty Brine began his broadcasting career at the age of 23 when he joined the staff at WHDH studios in Boston. Shortly thereafter, he moved to WPRO studios in Providence, where he has become one of the most well-known public figures in Rhode Island through his very popular morning radio show.

Throughout the years, Salty Brine has diligently worked to maintain high standards of sincerity and kindness unique in radio broadcasting. These attributes have attracted thousands of devoted Rhode Island listeners each day.

Perhaps the greatest measure of Salty's place within the Rhode Island community can be seen in what he gives back to the public. The tragic loss of one leg as a child has led him to seek out and give hope to those who are similarly impaired. Salty also acts as a beacon of friendship to many elderly Rhode Islanders who are not able to leave their homes and who listen to Salty every morning.

Mr. Brine is a credit to the State of Rhode Island and its citizens. At the age of 73 his passion for work is unabated. Rhode Island is lucky to have the continued benefit of his services.

RICHES AND BEAUTY OF NEVADA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Nevada was first traversed by a group of hearty, courageous men. Father Escalante, Jedediah Smith, John C. Fremont, and John Wesley Powell are but a few of the pioneers who first discovered the riches and the stark beauty of Nevada.

There are modern Nevada pioneers who have come to Nevada for its beauty and riches. These modern builders are in many ways just as hearty—just as courageous as the early discoverers.

I am fortunate because I have had the opportunity to know and have as a friend, and a confidant, Jackie Gaughan. Jackie is a Nevada pioneer in the best sense of the word.

The Las Vegas Gunnery School, subsequently to be known as Nellis Air Force Base, was Jackie's first contact with the Silver State. As a college graduate with a bachelor's degree in business from Creighton University, he was a great addition to the Army Air Corps. While stationed in Las Vegas and the Tonopah Air Base, Jackie saw the potential of southern Nevada.

The Flamingo, El Cortez, Western Hotel, Union Plaza, Las Vegas Club, and the Showboat are all gaming establishments with Jackie's mark on them.

Jackie Gaughan's success has been based on a personal touch, one involving very hard work and always having time to discuss an issue, a problem, or a new venture.

Nevada charities have been part of Jackie's personality. The United Way, the Variety Club, and B'nai B'rith are all better today because of Jackie Gaughan's involvement.

Jackie was named "Man of the Year" by the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. He was Chief Barker of Variety Club Tent 39, president of the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, member of the Air Force Association, and an active participant and member of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Rebels Club. He was a recipient of Creighton University's Alumni Merit Award and president of the Las Vegas Boys Club.

Jackie Gaughan's greatest asset is his wife Bertie. She has been Jackie's partner for 50 years. Bertie and Jackie were married while he was a student at Creighton University. Just before beginning his senior year it was learned that he was going to be drafted. Jackie went to his counselor at Creighton, Father Linn, for advice. Jackie said, "Father what should I do? I have only 1 year left in school, and I think we are going to have a baby." Father Linn told him to join the Reserve, as it would take an act of Congress to call up the Reserve. Jackie followed the priest's advice and 2 weeks later, an act of Congress activated the Reserve. He was assigned to the gunnery school and then as a gunnery instructor at Tonopah. During the war, Michael and his mom spent time as guests at the El Cortez. This is fortuitous, because Jackie and Bertie later made this hotel casino famous. This is the main headquarters of the Gauhans. Bertie, the corporate secretary, works with Jackie side by side.

Michael and Jackie, Jr., their two children, are very close to their parents. They are both successful businessmen in their own rights.

Jackie Gaughan, modern-day pioneer is synonymous with the growth and vitality of the most exciting city in America, Las Vegas.

Mr. SANFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

GOVERNMENT STREAMLINING

Mr. SANFORD. President, last month, I introduced the Federal Government Streamlining Act of 1992.

I believe this is a very important piece of legislation. In fact, I believe that the American people are asking us to do precisely what this legislation is intended to do: to make the Federal Government leaner and more efficient.

This Streamlining Act should be attractive to all of us, particularly when we face a budget deficit estimated to be over $400 billion this year alone and when the American people are calling upon us to prove that we can act responsibly with their tax dollars.

Every Member of this Chamber, every Member of the House, and every candidate running for office has spoken out for the need to cut Government waste, reduce Government spending, make the Government more responsive to the needs of the people and more efficient in its operations. This legislation addresses those issues specifically.

My legislation was designed to attract bipartisan responsibility and support. When the commission is estab-

lished it will have six Democratic members and six Republican members. The members would be selected by the leaders of both parties in both Houses of Congress and by the President. Its report would have teeth. In addition to making recommendations, as so many commissions and boards have in the past, it is charged with putting before the Congress and the President specific legislation to put its recommendations into effect. To eliminate the potential for partisan and political bickering, horse trading, and possible dilution, this bill requires that we vote on the entire report in its entirety, without amendment. It will enable us to make the hard decisions that we are accused of not being able to make. Like the military base closing legislation, it will permit us to make the hard decisions that the American people want us to make.

The entire economy is undergoing a restructuring. Banks are retrenching after a record number of failures. Approximately one of every four thrift institutions has been liquidated. One percent of all businesses failed last year, a level not seen since the Great Depression. A million bankruptcies were filed last year, a record. As a consequence, companies are restructuring their operations, some involuntary through bankruptcy, many more voluntarily through internal means. Individual households being forced to or are learning to stretch their dollars. State and local governments are having to tighten their belts and try to make do with less. Very few pockets of our economy have gone untouched. All sectors of the economy are making an effort to cut the fat, become more efficient and more productive, and just get more bang for the buck.

We should do no less in Washington. There is no doubt that the taxpayers stand to gain through increased Government efficiency. Since I introduced this legislation, I have learned of several examples where it only makes sense that we examine the efficiency of delivering Government services. For example, I have learned of the following situations:

First, approximately 40 different Federal Programs are in the business of selling houses where the Government has become the owner through foreclosure or other guarantee programs.

Second, there are approximately 15 different programs attempting to deal with the drug problem in our country.

Third, the Department of Agriculture has offices in almost 3,000 different counties covering 94 percent of country while though almost all of our farms are aggregated in approximately 500 counties. In fact, the Department of Agriculture can't tell us how many offices they actually have.

Fourth, more than 20 different agencies and programs exercise responsibility over children's issues and services.

Fifth, at least four agencies share responsibility for wetlands regulation, and it is as the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, a half dozen congressional committees, and at least as many agencies, are involved in the process of determining assistance to the old Soviet Union countries.

Certainly, there are many other examples. Although every Senator and Congressman could point out an example of the Government duplicating itself, none of us intend that or like that. So instead of dealing with each new item as we learn about it on a piecemeal basis, this legislation is intended to give a bipartisan commission the broad authority to look wherever it wants, propose whatever it determines can cut Government fat, and bring it all to our attention and make it possible for us to take decisive action in the name of the taxpayers of the Nation.

I, again, Mr. President, urge the support of my colleagues of this approach to cutting our Government waste.

I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Senate Resolution 222, 93d Congress, appoints the following Senators to serve as ex officio members of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation for the purpose of participating in the National Ocean Policy Study: the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE TRADE ACT WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 244

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit a document referred to in section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1) ("the Act"), with respect to the continuation of a waiver of application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act to the People's Republic of China. The document includes my reasons for determining that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, and my determination to that effect.

Documents concerning the extension of the authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act, including a determination with respect to other countries and the reasons therefor, are transmitted separately.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 2, 1992.*

WAIVER OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TRADE ACT WITH RESPECT TO TAJIKISTAN AND TURKMENISTAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 245

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 402(c)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the "Act") (19 U.S.C. 2432(c)(2)(A)), I have determined that a waiver of the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 with respect to Tajikistan and Turkmenistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. A copy of that determination is enclosed. I have also received assurances with respect to the emigration practices of Tajikistan and Turkmenistan required by section 402(c)(2)(B) of the Act. This message constitutes the report to the Congress required by section 402(c)(2).

Pursuant to section 402(c)(2), I shall waive by Executive order the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act with respect to Tajikistan and Turkmenistan.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1992.*

WAIVER OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TRADE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 246

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the documents referred to in section 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1)) ("the Act"), with respect to a further extension of the authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. These documents continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period.

I include as part of these documents my determination that further extension of the waiver authority will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. I also include my determination that continuation of the waivers applicable to Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. The attached documents also include my reasons for recommending the extension of the waiver authority and for my determination that continuation of the waivers currently in effect for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402.

My determination with respect to the waiver applicable to the People's Republic of China and the reasons therefor is transmitted separately.

I intend to waive by Executive order application of sections 402(a) and 402(b) of the Act with respect to Tajikistan and Turkmenistan prior to July 3, 1992.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1992.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 2342. An act to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 142, 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363, and for other purposes", approved October 25, 1972 (86 Stat. 1168 et seq.); and

S. 2783. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to medical devices and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

At 6 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3489) to reauthorize the Export Administration Act of 1979, and for other purposes; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints the following as managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of sections 120 and 303 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. KYL.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of sections 201(c), 205, and 207 to 210 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 120, 123, and 502 of the House bill, and sections 121, 124, 302, 305, and 306 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GEKAS.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5132) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster assistance to meet urgent needs because of calamities such as those which occurred in Los Angeles and Chicago, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; it agrees to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. ROGERS as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3905. An act to amend the Historic Preservation Act to authorize appropriations for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4801. An act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to extend the authorization for the Historic Preservation Fund.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 156. A concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran;

H. Con. Res. 297. A concurrent resolution condemning the bombing of the Embassy of Israel in Buenos Aires;

H. Con. Res. 299. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Kurds in northern Iraq; and

H. Con. Res. 305. A concurrent resolution commending the people of Albania for their successful democratic election, urging the acceleration of market reforms in Albania, urging the President to expedite the negotiation of a commercial agreement with Albania, and urging an increase of aid to Albania.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3905. An act to amend the Historic Preservation Act to authorize appropriations for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4801. An act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to extend the authorization for the Historic Preservation Fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The following concurrent resolutions were read; and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 156. A concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. Con. Res. 297. A concurrent resolution condemning the bombing of the Embassy of Israel in Buenos Aires; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. Con. Res. 299. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Kurds in northern Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. Con. Res. 305. A concurrent resolution commending the people of Albania for their successful democratic election, urging the acceleration of market reforms in Albania, urging the President to expedite the negotiation of a commercial agreement with Albania, and urging an increase of aid to Albania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-3326. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,

Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on budget rescissions and deferrals dated May 8, 1992; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Technology, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on the Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3327. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the reenlistment eligibility of certain former reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3328. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to aid certain members of the uniformed services who are evacuated from areas outside the United States, or other places designated by the President; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3329. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on intermarket coordination for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3330. A communication from the President of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings institutions for the appointment of a conservator or receiver under the Home Owners' Loan Act for fiscal years 1993 and 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3331. A communication from the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification on the extension of the time period for issuing a final decision by 30 days in the Commission in Ex Parte No. 346; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3332. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on an amendment to the lease of the Metropolitan Washington Airports to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3333. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to reauthorize the Office of Justice Programs, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–3334. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to encourage State and local governments to further identify and remove regulatory barriers to affordable housing, to strengthen the link between Federal housing assistance and removal of regulatory barriers, to extend and amend certain laws providing Federal tax incentives for affordable housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3335. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to increase the limit on Federal matching funds available for the Medicaid program in Puerto Rico and to make improvements in the furnishing of and payment for equipment and related supplies provided to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3336. A communication from the Chairman of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Medicare and the American Health Care System; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3337. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States in the sixty day period prior to May 21, 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3338. A communication from the Director of the Information Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the USIA Office of the Inspector General from October 1, 1991, through March 31, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3339. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General from October 1, 1991, through March 31, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3340. A communication from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the first half-fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3341. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General and the semiannual report on final action for the National Endowment for the Arts from October 1, 1991, through March 31, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3342. A communication from the Public Printer of the United States, Government Printing Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General on audits and investigations covering the 6 months ending March 31, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3343. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-210 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3344. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-211 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3345. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-212 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3346. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-213 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3347. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-214 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3348. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-215 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3349. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-217 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3350. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-218 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3351. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-219 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3352. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-220 adopted by the Council on May 6, 1992; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–3353. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Labor to accept and utilize gifts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3354. A communication from the Acting Commissioner of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (National Center for Education Statistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Center for Education Statistics for calendar year 1991; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–3355. A communication from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Government Printing Office for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIDEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Chi Hsii Tsui, Jin Mie Tsui, Yin Whee Tsui, Yin Tao Tsui, and Yin Chao Tsui (Rept. No. 102–293).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 2801. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to improve the effectiveness of administrative review of employment discrimination claims made by Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

S. 2802. A bill to extend the authorization of the Commission on Interstate Child Support and the deadline for the Commission's Report to Congress; considered and passed.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2803. A bill to mitigate the adverse effects on defense workers and defense contractors of reductions in defense spending; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. KASTEN):

S. 2804. A bill to establish a program to provide technical assistance to employers and labor unions, in order to assist in preparing the workplace to employ women in apprenticeable occupations and other nontraditional occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN:

S. 2805. A bill to strengthen United States laws to enforce economic embargoes against foreign countries pursuant to a declaration of national emergency or United Nations Security Council measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2806. A bill to establish a program to ensure nondiscriminatory compliance with environmental, health, and safety laws and to ensure equal protection of the public health; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 2807. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to require additional information with respect to the report on trade agreements and national trade policy agenda; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 2801. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to improve the effectiveness of administrative review of employment discrimination claims made by Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE FAIRNESS ACT OF 1992

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which is designed to fix problems in the Equal Employment Opportunity complaint system. I ask unanimous consent that Senators STEVENS, MIKULSKI—Senator MIKULSKI is on the floor—SIMON, AKAKA, and MCCAIN be added as original cosponsors to this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, last May 16 and again on October 23, the Committee on Governmental Affairs, which I chair, held hearings on the EEO complaint system. We heard compelling testimony from several witnesses who gave first hand accounts of the flaws in the system.

We heard from Donald Rochon, a former FBI agent, who gave an eloquent account of the 4½ years he spent trying to get the system to respond to his request for relief from the racist situation confronting him in the FBI. To say the system failed him would be a gross understatement. In fact, the person who was charged with deciding his fate was also named in his complaint. So, he was in effect asking the very people for relief who were implicated in the complaint. The FBI in investigating itself, held itself blameless. That is the outcome of most of the cases in the Federal agencies.

Virginia Delgado ran into much the same problem. She was an EEO counselor in the Department of the Navy, and the system again failed when she tried to seek some sort of redress from the environment that she considered to be hostile and sexist. Five years after she filed the suit—5 years, Mr. President—the U.S. District Court agreed with her that she was dealt with unfairly. However, in retaliation for her complaint, she was fired. The supervisor, who was found to have illegally created a hostile environment, was later promoted and became one of the Navy's top experts in sexual harassment.

Other witnesses were equally as informative to the committee and, not surprisingly their case histories were very similar in tone and context. I could go on and on with different examples we had and some of the testimony we had, but I will not do that this morning in the interest of time.

I believe this legislation will move us toward a system that will be fair and responsive to the individual employee, instead of favoring the agency.

The Federal Employee Fairness Act will provide the statutory base for revising procedures that govern the process of EEO claims, a process which has not been revised since 1972.

First, this legislation would take agencies out of the business of judging themselves. It would transfer the authority for determining the merits of EEO claims from the agencies against which the claims have been filed to the EEOC, an independent agency with expertise in investigating and evaluating employment discrimination claims. Recently, Federal agencies were 72 times more likely to adopt findings of "no discrimination" than of "discrimination" as reached by EEOC administrative judges in cases tried before them. Obviously, every case is not a perfect case, but 72 times more likely? This bill would end this inequity.

Mr. President, the staff of the Governmental Affairs Committee has received many items of mail detailing case after case of agencies conducting their own investigations with predictable results.

Second, this legislation would eliminate duplication in the processing of EEO claims. The bill would eliminate the duplication that currently occurs when more than 120 different agencies each investigate claims and attempt to keep their EEO staff trained in the latest legal developments by transferring to the EEOC the authority for ensuring that claims are properly investigated and adjudicated. The agencies would still retain critical responsibilities for counseling complainants, attempting to resolve the claims and gathering relevant records. But, the bill would greatly increase the accountability for managing the processing of EEO claims by placing principal responsibility in one agency, not all over the lot, not spread all over Government, not in the many agencies that now deal with it.

In fact, in a report issued by the GAO entitled Agencies Estimated Costs for Counseling and Processing Discrimination Complaints, we may actually save money by consolidating the complaint process in a single agency.

Further, Mr. President, the bill would impose strict time limitations on the complainants, the Federal agencies against which claims have been filed, and the EEOC which would adjudicate the claims. This action will greatly reduce the inhumane delays currently confronting the parties to Federal sector EEO claims. In fiscal year 1990, the most recent year for which figures are available, the average time to fully adjudicate EEO claims in the Federal sector was 338 days, rather than the recommended 180 days. Listen to some of these other figures. Some agencies process the claims much more slowly, such as the Department of Justice, of all places, which averaged 841 days. And they are supposed to have these things done in 180 days to deal fairly with people. That is well over 2 years; and the Department of State which averaged 1,134 days, or over 3 years to adjudicate complaints. That is intolerable.

Under existing law, the complainant must file his or her EEO claim within 30 days. Often, this stringent time limit does not allow the Federal employee to determine if a claim should be filed. The Federal Employee Fairness Act which we introduced today would extend the time within which EEO claims can be filed from 30 days, at present, to 180 days, which is currently available in the private sector, affording Federal employees time to think before they must act.

The bill would provide Federal employees who eventually prevail in the system with interest on their awards of back pay to compensate for delay, just as employees in the private sector have recovered for years.

Another feature of the bill is that it ensures that hearings will be based on a complete and fair record. The bill would provide the parties with the

right to conduct limited discovery of each other's position and authorize the administrative judges to ensure that the record is complete. Hearings would be based largely on a record compiled by the parties, with assistance from the judges where a party needs assistance and not, as is the current practice, on a record largely prepared from investigations that the agencies conduct themselves.

The legislation further provides these same procedural improvements to victims of age discrimination. The bill would amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act to adopt the same procedural improvements that would be made to title VII. In addition, the bill would allow employees to file within the same 2-year period that is available to employees in the private sector. And finally, it simplifies and streamlines the processing of mixed cases where civil service and employment discrimination claims are mixed together. Rather than the current system that requires Federal employees with mixed cases to pursue a multiyear labyrinth, the bill would permit Federal employees to choose from several, greatly simplified procedures for processing their claims.

Because of the concerns raised by the managers and supervisors of some Federal agencies, my bill will include due process protection for those who are in fact found by an administrative judge to be a discriminating official.

Mr. President, there is not a lot we can do for those Federal employees who have suffered under the past system, but maybe we can do something about future complaints and make this process better where the basic issue is one of fairness. And that is it. Many people have suffered under the past system but we can do something about these future complaints.

If ever a bureaucratic system cried out for change, this one does.

It is appropriate for me in my capacity as chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee to thank the many Government employees who have shared their experiences with us. They showed considerable guts in just coming forward to tell us about their particular position and situation.

According to the Comptroller General, Charles Bowsher of the GAO, the Federal Government needs to invest in its human resources. We can ill afford to lower the quality and morale of our Federal work force through the tactics of discrimination and delay that have been all too prevalent in this particular situation. My Federal Employee Fairness Act will help to right existing wrongs in the EEO complaint process.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise with my colleague, Senator JOHN GLENN, to introduce this very important piece of legislation, the Federal Employee Fairness Act of 1992.

I would like to congratulate the Senator from Illinois on his leadership on dealing with the issue of sexual harassment within Federal employment and also dealing with the issue of sexual harassment in the U.S. military, as well as in the U.S. military service academies.

On the issue of sexual harassment, Senator GLENN has shown that he certainly has the right stuff to deal with this most pressing issue.

Mr. President, it is critical that we correct the complaint system at the EEOC and to do it now. There is a revolt going on within the United States of America on the issue of sexual harassment, and we see that the United States of America and its people do not want the status quo of the way victims of sexual harassment have been treated in the past. They want it to be treated seriously and they want it to be treated in a timely way.

If you talk to the victims of sexual harassment the way I have, they will often tell you they were victimized by both the event in which they have been abused and then subsequently they have been abused by the very system that they turn to for help. The system is neither timely on it and certainly is not complaint friendly.

This bill is an important step in the right direction. It will give agency heads the right to impose sanctions against persons who have engaged in sexual harassment, whether they be managers, supervisors, or coworkers.

Mr. President, as we enter into this debate once again—I know that I do not like the term "sexual harassment" because I do not believe that it gives the full impact of what it means to a person who must endure this type of abuse. And make no mistake about it, it is abuse. It is as abusive as a physical blow. Sexual harassment is really a form of sexual battery. It is a form of sexual humiliation. It is a form of degradation. For those people who endure this type of abuse, this legislation is crucial.

Mr. President, I serve on the U.S. Naval Academy Board of Visitors. I was charged with the responsibility of being on a board of inquiry where allegations of sexual harassment took place at the Naval Academy.

I worked very hard to say that sexual harassment would not be tolerated by officers and now it's time we said the same to the rest of the Federal Government.

I worked to clear up the mess with the U.S. Naval Academy, and now I want to join with Senator GLENN to clear up this mess in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, during the Clarence Thomas hearings, we heard a lot of talk across this United States of America on the issue of sexual humiliation. Now it is time to take that talk and put it into action because the time has passed and the American people certainly have not forgotten.

The Clarence Thomas-Anita Hill hearings have left an indelible mark on the psyche of the American people. And why? Because at that time, we saw a woman who was treated in a way that sends a wrong and dangerous message to all women—that for those women who are subjected to sexual humiliation and want to fight back or think about taking the stand for herself, the message was this: Do not accuse anybody no matter what he does or you are going to become accused.

The message is this: Our courage in coming forward will be met with suspicion and scorn and with unproven and unsupported charges against the very victims themselves, about us being opportunists or even mentally unbalanced.

Mr. President, the United States of America went through a very important lesson on sexual harassment. If we do not pass this legislation, the Senate will once again flunk the course. Victims who have the courage to stand up and say, no, this is not right, should not be treated as if they themselves were the villains. This is where the process has failed. If you have talked to the victims of abuse the way I have, they will tell you as I said, they are often doubly victimized: First, they are victimized by that event, and then by the system.

This legislation will help change all of that. This bill will address systematic problems and the EEOC complaint system itself. It will establish timetables for agencies to respond to complaints. No longer will they be able to put it under the rug or hope the complainant will go away, and at the same time, even place the complainant at risk because very often when you follow a complaint you stay in the same situation with the same boss of which you are being accused. It is like being locked in a back alley with someone who is about to mug you and say wait until your trial comes up.

We cannot tolerate this. And we will allow employees more time to file their complaints because we know when you are a victim of sexual battery you need time to deal with your own feelings, to gather the courage to undergo this ordeal of the complaint itself. It gives the agency head the right to impose sanctions against those who harass or discriminate against their employees.

Mr. President, during the Thomas-Hill hearings, my phones were flooded by phone calls from women who suffered similar experiences, and underwent great trauma.

Mr. President, I have also been approached personally by men who tell me what it is like to hear of the sorrow of the women they love who have been victimized by harassment.

I heard husbands talk to me about what their wives endured at work. I have fathers share with me swelling up with anger as they talked about how

they tried to give their daughters the best education so they could compete in a world only to be battered through sexual innuendo and harassment at the workplace.

What did those men tell me? They told me how powerless they felt to defend the woman they loved against the very system she would have had to turn to in order to be protected. Often they said to their wives or to their daughters, "Don't go ahead with it; it's just not worth what will happen to you."

Mr. President, they turned to me and said, "Senator MIKULSKI, anything you can do to change the law, to empower the victim, to give them an opportunity to present their complaint, to make sure they are not treated as the victim, go for it because we need your help."

Mr. President, if I can help it, with this legislation, I will see that the process is changed so that people feel that the system works for them and not against them. I feel very strongly about this, and I want to conclude by saying that we have an opportunity to send a message to victims everywhere and to those who work in Federal service that on the issue of sexual harassment, the United States of America wants to ensure that the silence on sexual harassment is broken and that this legislation will begin to correct the wrongs of the very system itself.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague, Senator GLENN, in support of the Federal Employee Fairness Act of 1992, a bill to address the shortcomings in our present equal employment opportunity complaint process.

As you are well aware, sexual discrimination came to the forefront this past summer during the confirmation hearing of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. Americans came to recognize that sexual and racial discrimination continue to pervade the workplace, while millions of women and minorities struggle to overcome discrimination on the job.

Thousands of these individuals are Federal employees, men and women who work for their country—a country that claims to ensure freedom and liberty for all, a country that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, age and gender. However, we have found that Federal agencies have broken this promise with its employees. Far too many women and minorities labor under a "glass ceiling," an invisible barrier beyond which they will never rise.

How can we expect the private sector to successfully end discrimination when we in Government seem to fail. This is a problem which affects us all, and one which the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, addressed during hearings on discrimination in the Federal workplace.

The current complaint system employed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC] is "neither effective nor efficient," according to the General Accounting Office, which has recommended improvements to EEOC guidelines. The current process possesses an inherent conflict of interest when the accused agency is allowed to investigate its own claims. In addition, agency staff assigned to provide EEOC services are often inadequately trained and often perform EEOC responsibilities on a part-time basis. The commitment by the agencies to ensure equal employment opportunities is simply inadequate. This is readily apparent when you consider the time it takes for agencies to process a complaint. For instance, in 1990, the Department of State had 112 pending complaints which, on average, took 1,134 days to process. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission had eight complaints, which took, on average, over 2 years to process.

During the hearings, the committee heard the personal experiences from former and current Federal employees. These victims found the same inaction, frustration, and retaliation experienced by thousands of other Federal employees who file discrimination complaints each year. The legislation introduced by Chairman GLENN seeks to correct this injustice. It is a comprehensive approach toward fair and equal justice.

The bill introduced today would establish a timetable for agencies to respond to employees' complaints. As I stated before, many employees who file discrimination complaints must often wait several years before even receiving an initial decision from the agency. The bill also increases the statute of limitations for filing a complaint to 180 days. This will allow the individual to assess all available options before proceeding with a discrimination complaint. Under the current system, a person is given 30 days in which to submit a complaint. Often, this does not adequately allow an individual to completely assess the situation before making a complaint.

The bill makes a crucial change to the current process by prohibiting reprisals against an employee who files a complaint. Currently, complaints of retaliation equal, or even exceed, the amount of original discrimination complaints. And all too often many of the accused individuals face little or no penalty for their illegal actions. The bill gives heads of agencies the right to impose sanctions against an individual who is found to have engaged in discriminatory practices.

Most importantly, the proposal will eliminate the conflict of interest in the current process. Under the proposal, all investigative authority will be given to the EEOC. It also provides administrative law judges the authority to ensure that a complete unbiased case record for review is presented.

Mr. President, the Federal Employee Fairness Act of 1992 is the foundation upon which we will build a strong EEOC system where all our Federal employees are assured that they will be judged on merit alone. It must be a home in which racial, age and gender discrimination will not be tolerated. Only when our Federal family is secure in this knowledge, and every effort is made to provide a supportive environment in which we work, can we then help our counterparts in the private sector.

Let me thank the chairman for his leadership in this area, and ask my colleagues to join us in support of the Federal Employee Fairness Act of 1992.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2803. A bill to mitigate the adverse effects on defense workers and defense contractors of reductions in defense spending; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

DEFENSE WORKERS ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT ACT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which addresses sweeping world changes and the impact those changes will have on the men and women of this country who have served in the defense of America.

Those loyal and committed citizens now face possible unemployment as we reduce defense spending.

Congressman JIM BACCHUS of Florida, who is joining me in this effort, is introducing identical legislation in the House of Representatives.

Our legislation provides a blueprint for action. What are we trying to achieve with this legislation?

We want to replace the defense jobs we will lose—every one of them.

We want to go further and actually expand the overall number of good-paying jobs for American workers.

We want to improve our global competitiveness by sparking innovation and creativity in the workplace.

These are our objectives. These are goals which we can achieve. But to do so we must act now, we must act intelligently and creatively to spend the dollars we save as we reduce defense spending.

Delay will cost us important competitive opportunities and result in a painful transition for our defense workers.

Mr. President, according to a February 1992 report by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment [OTA], the United States can expect to lose an estimated 2.5 million defense-related jobs from 1991 to 2001, an average of 250,000 a year.

The decline could be uneven, according to OTA, with steep drops in short time periods, making adjustment even more difficult.

Measured in constant dollars, U.S. defense spending in 1990 was at an ex-

tremely high level by historical standards—nearly as high as at the peak of the Vietnam war, the OTA reports.

Mr. President, we could be in for a very painful period unless we start planning now. This is not a problem that is going to disappear.

But it need not become an overwhelming crisis. In fact, we can create opportunities with defense savings that could both improve our competitiveness and increase the supply of good, well-paying jobs over the long-term.

A number of States—California, Texas, Virginia, New York, Connecticut and my State of Florida—have already been hard hit by defense cutbacks. Florida, for example, is the fourth largest State in defense-related employment. According to the Florida Department of Commerce, our State could lose 12,000 jobs annually in each of the next 5 years.

Pratt & Whitney, which employs 6,400 people developing military jet engines and space products in northern Palm Beach County, has already eliminated 1,000 jobs during the past 12 months.

Other States face just as serious or even more critical adjustment problems.

The bill I am introducing today is an action plan to create jobs and strengthen our economic competitiveness.

First, our legislation establishes an economic reinvestment council that will supervise reinvestment initiatives. The council will be our guarantee that the Federal Government responds quickly to the transition needs of each and every State affected by defense spending reductions.

We back this commitment up with resources. We would authorize the Council with more than $2 billion to help States promote economic development, job growth, education and retraining, technology transfer and technology infrastructure.

Where will this money come from? It will come from the over $4 billion in defense dollars we anticipate saving as we reduce military spending.

Second, we direct the President to develop and carry out a program to assist advanced technology projects to improve the Nation's technology infrastructure.

Mr. President, it was interesting that one of the initial impetuses for the space program was to provide alternative uses for the technology that had been developed in World War II and later in the Korean war and which was potentially going to be a wasting national resource. We took that opportunity in the 1960's and converted it to one of America's greatest technological achievements.

We have similar opportunities in the 1990's in areas such as high-speed rail transportation, in areas of environmental protection, in medical technology, to take the advances that we have made, advances upon which we have spent billions of dollars, and assist in transition of those to civilian application.

Third, we establish an Office of Training Oversight and Administration in the Department of Defense to oversee retraining activities for eligible employees.

Mr. President, one area that I hope will be explored is the issue of how to facilitate the transition of highly-trained military personnel into the civilian field. As an example: Although today many States and school districts are suffering budgetary constraints that are causing restrictions, even layoffs, of professional educators, we know that America is going to require an expanded pool of technically competent and proficient teachers. One area in which that pool could be fed would be from those persons who have already had experience in the military, who have had extensive educational and training backgrounds, to now come to the service of our schools.

In the State of Florida we started several years ago with the Pensacola Naval Air Station and the University of West Florida in a program of assisting personnel, prior to their separation from the Navy, to prepare themselves to become classroom teachers. That is one example of many opportunities which I hope the Office of Training Oversight and Administration in the Department of Defense would direct its attention to.

Fourth, we authorize the Department of Commerce to enter into cooperative agreements with United States businesses interested in demonstrating commercial potential of cutting edge technology.

Fifth, we require the Department of Defense to reexamine its product specifications to ease dual military-civilian product use.

Mr. President, I recently spent a day working at a defense plant in Daytona Beach, FL which produces simulators. These simulators are used primarily for the Air Force and Army, particularly in aviation applications. I asked to what degree these simulators could also be used for civilian, for nonmilitary, training purposes. The answer was, "very limited." The reason: Because the highly specific specifications which the military requires makes it difficult for a firm to produce on the same assembly line in an efficient method for both the military and the civilian markets.

Certainly there are areas in which military specifications must be significantly different than civilian. But I believe the Department of Defense should be required to demonstrate that those differences in specifications meet legitimate military necessity, because we are paying a high price in terms of frustrating our ability to make a transition from totally military to a mix of military and civilian products in many of our industrial plants.

Mr. President, these are all examples of the initiatives that we hope to launch with this legislation. I urge my colleagues to carefully study these proposals. I know that we all have our own ideas as to how to manage this important transition. I believe this package captures many of the thoughts that we have shared over the past several months.

Mr. President, I want to congratulate Senator PRYOR on the leadership that he has displayed as chairman of the Senate Defense/Economic Conversion Task Force. He and his staff have done a superb job of organizing the efforts of the Senate to address this problem.

I also want to congratulate my friend and colleague, Congressman JIM BACCHUS, for the creativity and commitment that he continues to focus on this problem.

Mr. President, I send to the desk legislation to establish the Defense Workers Economic Reinvestment Act and ask for its appropriate referral.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The legislation will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislation which I have submitted, as well as a section-by-section summary, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2803

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Workers Economic Reinvestment Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT COUNCIL

Sec. 101. Establishment.
Sec. 102. Duties and functions of the Council.
Sec. 103. Annual economic reinvestment progress report.
Sec. 104. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE GOALS IMPROVEMENT AND CONSORTIA CREATION

Sec. 201. Purpose.
Sec. 202. Importance of advanced technology projects.
Sec. 203. Selection of advanced technology projects.
Sec. 204. Creation of technology consortia.
Sec. 205. Examination of procurement specifications.

TITLE III—RELIEVING LABOR SHORTAGES IN SELECTED CIVILIAN APPLICATIONS

Sec. 301. Training Oversight and Administration Office.
Sec. 302. Retraining and other transition assistance programs.

Sec. 303. Eligible employees.
TITLE IV—COMMERCIALIZATION OPPORTUNITIES
Sec. 401. Promotion of commercialization opportunities.
Sec. 402. Leveraged small seed capital projects.
Sec. 403. Commercialization loans.
Sec. 404. Promotion of industrial parks.
Sec. 405. Defense commercialization award.
TITLE V—FAST RESPONSE STATE TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETITIVENESS GRANTS
Sec. 501. Purpose.
Sec. 502. Funding formula.
Sec. 503. State eligibility.
Sec. 504. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "qualified defense contractor" means a private business producing goods or services for the Department of Defense that, during the three years immediately preceding the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) obtained at least 30 percent of its gross income from defense contracts or subcontracts; or

(B) had at least 30 percent of its workforce actively engaged in work directly related to defense contracts or subcontracts.

(2) The terms "Economic Reinvestment Council" and "Council" mean the Economic Reinvestment Council established under section 101(a).

(3) The term "advanced technology project" means a project funded under title II for the research, development, and application of critical technologies.

(4) The term "critical technologies" means technologies—

(A) identified as critical technologies pursuant to section 603(d) of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683(d)); or

(B) eligible for assistance under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n); or

(C) identified as critical technologies in the annual defense critical technologies plan prepared by the Secretary of Defense under section 2508 of title 10, United States Code.

(5) The terms "Office of Training Oversight and Administration" and "Office" mean the Office of Training Oversight and Administration established under section 301.

TITLE I—ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT COUNCIL

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Economic Reinvestment Council.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be comprised of 25 members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of Defense.

(2) Seven other employees of the Federal Government (at Under Secretary level or higher) appointed by the President.

(3) Eight representatives of qualified defense contractors appointed by the President.

(4) Nine representatives of private industry and academia appointed by the President from a list of individuals submitted jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority leader of the Senate.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Council shall be elected by the members of the Council for a two-year term.

(d) FIRST APPOINTMENT.—The members of the Council shall be first appointed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) TERM.—The members of the Council shall be appointed for terms of two years. Of the members first appointed, one-half of each group of members referred to in subsection (b) may be reappointed for an additional two-year term. A member may not serve on the Council for more than four years.

(f) VACANCY.—Any vacancy in the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) COMPENSATION.—A member of the Council shall receive per diem compensation and travel expenses for each day of service on official business as a member of the Council.

SEC. 102. DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall—

(A) administer the National Technology Infrastructure Goals Improvement and Consortia Creation program established under title II and the Fast Response State Technological Competitiveness Grants program established under title V; and

(B) have the authority to examine and approve or disapprove all other project and program selections made under this Act and funding decisions under this Act that exceed $500,000.

(2) TIME FOR REVIEW.—To the extent practicable, the Council shall complete its review of funding requests within 60 days after receiving the request. The Council shall also provide an expedited review process for time-critical decisions.

(b) ADVICE ON ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT PROGRAMS.—The Council shall advise the Secretary of Defense and the heads of other Federal agencies on the progress and success of the economic reinvestment programs established under this Act and under the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 in alleviating the adverse economic and social effects of reductions in defense spending. The Office of Economic Adjustment of the Department of Defense shall provide the Council with such information as the Council may request. The Council shall consult on a regular basis with Governors of States involved in reinvestment activities.

(c) ANNUAL STUDY OF POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT OF THE BUDGET PROPOSAL OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Upon receiving notification of the annual budget proposal of the Secretary of Defense, the Council shall commence a preliminary study of the potential adverse economic effects the proposal may have on qualified defense contractors and communities.

(d) STAFF.—To assist the Council in carrying out its duties, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) detail, on a reimbursable basis, personnel of the Department of Defense to serve as a staff for the Council; and

(2) satisfy the Council's requirements for office space, meeting facilities, and office equipment.

SEC. 103. ANNUAL ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT PROGRESS REPORT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Council shall prepare and distribute an economic reinvestment progress report on an annual basis that shall include the following:

(1) A discussion and analysis of currently available Federal programs that promote economic reinvestment and help to minimize the dislocation of workers, communities, and qualified defense contractors caused by reductions in defense spending.

(2) Any recommendations by the Council to improve these programs.

(3) A description of the status of loans and grants made under this Act.

(4) Any proposals by the Council for new initiatives to further minimize the dislocation of workers, communities, and qualified defense contractors caused by reductions in defense spending.

(b) SUBMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Council shall submit the annual report required under subsection (a) to the President and the Congress not later than March 31 of each year. The Council shall also distribute copies of the report to State Governors, the heads of Federal departments and agencies, and any other person who requests a copy.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Council $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out this title.

TITLE II—NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE GOALS IMPROVEMENT AND CONSORTIA CREATION

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to support advanced technology projects that improve the technology infrastructure of the United States, allow the United States to compete successfully globally, and maintain and improve the standard of living and quality of life in the United States.

SEC. 202. IMPORTANCE OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.

To exploit the potential of critical technologies that would benefit our national infrastructure and create export opportunities, the President shall develop and carry out a program to assist advanced technology projects. Investments in advanced technology projects to improve the technology infrastructure of the United States are in the national interest and include (but not be limited to) projects in the following areas:

(1) Space exploration, including the development of a national launch system and improved earth observing satellites.

(2) Transportation, including projects to improve the safety and efficiency of highways and the air traffic system and to develop magnetic levitation.

(3) Environmental restoration, including hazardous waste disposal and the cleanup of military installations.

(4) Telecommunications including direct broadcast and teleconferencing technologies and assisting public education and technology transfer.

(5) Energy efficiency, including alternatives to the combustion engine, and space solar power generation and earth distribution.

(6) Health care, including improved diagnostic technologies.

(7) Education, including interactive multimedia simulation technologies for teacher and student training.

(8) Ocean technology.

SEC. 203. SELECTION OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS.

(a) PROPOSAL GUIDELINES AND SOLICITATION.—The Economic Reinvestment Council shall solicit, review, prioritize and select advanced technology projects to benefit the national technology infrastructure from among the proposals it receives. The Council shall prepare and disseminate guidelines for qualifying project proposals. Among the guidelines shall be emphasis on the following project objectives:

(1) Improving the national technology infrastructure.

(2) Benefiting the public interest.

(3) Improving national technological competitiveness.

(4) Enhancing export opportunities.

(5) Exploiting critical technologies as project components.

(b) PROJECT PROPOSALS.—

(1) INITIAL SUBMISSION.—During the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, proposals for advanced technology projects shall be submitted to the Council by the heads of the following Federal departments and agencies:

(A) The Department of Commerce.

(B) The Department of Defense.

(C) The Department of Energy.

(D) The Department of the Interior.

(E) The Department of Transportation.

(F) The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(G) The Department of Health and Human Services.

(H) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(I) The Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS BY OTHER PERSONS.—Federal departments and agencies not specified in paragraph (1) may also submit proposals for advanced technology projects. The Council shall also provide for the submission of such proposals to the Council by private and public organizations, including State Governors.

(3) SUBSEQUENT PROPOSALS.—Additional project proposals may be submitted at any time after the end of the period specified in paragraph (1).

(4) CONTENT OF PROPOSALS.—Project proposals shall indicate the manner and extent to which the project would use the skill and resource base of qualified defense contractors as well as any appropriate surplus equipment and facilities of the Department of Defense. The selection of the first three proposals shall be made by the Council within 90 days after the end of the period specified in paragraph (1).

(c) ASSISTANCE TO SELECTED PROJECTS.—Once an advanced technology project is selected, the Council shall review project plans and schedules, provide funds to the project through the Department of Defense from amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (e), and oversee implementation of the project.

(d) PARTNERSHIPS.—Joint ventures with combinations of industry, academic and State and Federal Government partners shall be encouraged. Primary research and development for the project will be performed by a consortium created under section 204, with oversight by the Council. Partnerships with Federal laboratories would be through regular contracts and cooperative research and development agreements.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to fund advanced technology projects, including the technology consortia for those projects, $419,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1996.

SEC. 204. CREATION OF TECHNOLOGY CONSORTIA.

(a) CREATION REQUIRED FOR EACH PROJECT.—The Council shall coordinate and oversee creation of one consortium matched to each advanced technology project. The consortium created for a project shall focus on basic research and applied research for that project. At least 50 percent of the funding for a consortium shall be from non-Federal sources. Federal funding for a consortium created under this subsection may not exceed $5,000,000 annually and shall terminate after four years. Small businesses should be included and receive a minimum of 20 percent of the consortium research funding.

(b) OTHER CONSORTIA UNRELATED TO PROJECTS.—The Council shall solicit and evaluate other promising proposals for critical technology consortia and select at least three proposals annually. Federal funding for a consortium created under this subsection may not exceed $5,000,000 annually or more than 50 percent of the funds expended by the consortium and shall terminate after four years. Activities conducted by a consortium shall include a significant defense component, such as development of a dual-use technology or a critical technology highly relevant to defense readiness. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1996.

SEC. 205. EXAMINATION OF PROCUREMENT SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) EXAMINATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall reexamine existing procurement contracts to determine whether overly restrictive specifications on systems, supplies, and services that are also available commercially have been made. For those contracts exceeding $100,000 where Department of Defense specifications preclude the purchase of commercial sector products, the Secretary shall justify the necessity for developing a different specification and the unsuitability of commercial specifications. Within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress detailing procurement contracts of this type and the reasons for their unique specifications.

(b) AMENDMENT REGARDING DEFENSE CONTRACT SOLICITATION.—Section 2305(a)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (i);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (ii); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) encourage the use of commercially available systems, supplies, and services.".

TITLE III—RELIEVING LABOR SHORTAGES IN SELECTED CIVILIAN APPLICATIONS

SEC. 301. TRAINING OVERSIGHT AND ADMINISTRATION OFFICE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an Office of Training Oversight and Administration to coordinate and oversee retraining, placement, and other transition assistance activities for eligible employees described in section 303. The Office shall be under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel) and shall be consolidated with existing transition assistance programs that are currently the responsibility of the Assistant Secretary.

(b) INFORMATION ON RETRAINING AND PLACEMENT.—The Office shall disseminate information to all qualified defense contractors and eligible Department of Defense employees concerning the availability, scope, and rules governing the retraining and other transition assistance programs established by section 302. The Office should ensure that each qualified defense contractor informs all employees of the contractor regarding these programs. The Office shall facilitate placement by acting as a repository for employment opportunity information and publicizing the availability of qualified employees.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO COUNCIL.—The Office shall maintain statistics to analyze the effectiveness of the retraining and placement programs in order to assist the Economic Reinvestment Council and provide any other information that the Council may request for their approval.

SEC. 302. RETRAINING AND OTHER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) SKILLS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—The Office, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, may enter into agreements for the provision to eligible employees described in section 303 of retraining assistance in skills identified by the Office as being, or projected to be, in short supply in the area in which the retraining program operates. Retraining programs may be developed and taught pursuant to the agreement by any Federal agency, State and local governments, institutions of higher learning (especially associate-degree granting colleges), educational consultants, or qualified defense contractors. The Office shall have principal responsibility for transition assistance to such eligible employees and should consult with the Secretary of Labor to avoid duplication with services provided by the Department of Labor.

(b) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS.—The Office may award eligible employees one-year and two-year scholarships to educational institutions. The awards shall be based on a competitive selection process, except that the Office may give a priority—

(1) for scholarships in certain critical occupations, as determined by the Office; and

(2) to eligible employees who seek vocational training offered by associate-degree granting colleges.

(c) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal contribution to a training program conducted under subsection (a) may not exceed 50 percent of the costs of the program.

(d) ALLOWED EXPENSES.—Funds provided under this section for retraining programs may be used to pay employee certification, apprenticeship, or professional registration costs incurred by an eligible employee receiving retraining to enter a new profession. The Secretary may also share any other subsistence costs associated with employee transition as long as the Federal funding share does not exceed 50 percent of such costs. Extended income support requirements can be reduced by the employer through early retraining prior to employee termination.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1995—

(1) $100,000,000 to carry out subsection (a); and

(2) $50,000,000 to carry out subsection (b).

SEC. 303. ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—The following persons shall be eligible for assistance under section 302:

(1) A full-time employee of a qualified defense contractor for at least three years who—

(A) is directly involved with a Department of Defense funded project which is canceled or experiences a reduction in Federal funds equal to at least 25 percent of the Federal funds received for the project the previous year; and

(B) as a result of the cancellation or reduction, is terminated or identified by the employer as likely to be terminated within one year.

(2) a civilian employee of the Department of Defense eligible for transition assistance under current regulations.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—A qualified defense contractor shall make a good faith effort to

identify as early as possible employees who meet the eligibility requirements of subsection (a), advise them on retraining options, and allow them to participate in retraining and other transition assistance programs.

(c) CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY TERMINATED EMPLOYEES.—An employee of a qualified defense contractor who was terminated during the one-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be eligible for assistance if the Office determines that the employee—

(1) was a full-time employee of a qualified defense contractor for at least three years;

(2) was directly involved with a Department of Defense funded project; and

(3) was terminated as a result of the cancellation or a funding reduction of that project.

TITLE IV—COMMERCIALIZATION OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 401. PROMOTION OF COMMERCIALIZATION OPPORTUNITIES.

(a) PROMOTION PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Commerce shall establish a program to assist United States businesses in creating and applying the generic technology and research results necessary to commercialize significant new scientific discoveries and technologies.

(b) MODEL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall model the program selection board after the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n). The Secretary may contract out administration of the financial aspects of the program as described in sections 402 and 403.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO COUNCIL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall inform the Economic Reinvestment Council of the status of funded projects and information on new selections for the Council's approval as required by section 102(a).

SEC. 402. LEVERAGED SMALL SEED CAPITAL PROJECTS.

(a) COMMERCIALIZATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary of Commerce may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with United States businesses for commercialization projects to demonstrate the feasibility of a particular technology or process up to the prototype stage. Federal funds may not exceed 33 percent of the costs of the project. A single project may not receive more than $1,000,000 in funds under this section. The Government shall receive equity in the project equal to its share of the investment acting as a limited partner. Any profits distributed to the United States from the investment shall be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1996 $50,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 403. COMMERCIALIZATION LOANS.

(a) LOANS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Commerce may make loans to United States businesses in an amount not to exceed $3,000,000 for any one commercialization project. No more than three loans may be made to any single company or joint venture. The loans shall be made under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require, including the payment of fair market interest, except that repayment of any loan is due within seven years. A loan may be made to assist production if the Secretary determines that a reasonable case can be made that no other mechanism exists for production. The loan recipient shall be required to match the amount of the loan with an equal amount of non-Federal funds specifically guaranteed for use in the project.

(b) LOAN CRITERIA.—The potential for the development of a product that has military applications and nonmilitary commercial applications or dual-use shall be a funding criterion, although not an absolute requirement. Other criteria should include risk balanced against utility to consumers and the United States.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for fiscal year 1993 $300,000,000 to carry out this section. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be available until expended.

SEC. 404. PROMOTION OF INDUSTRIAL PARKS.

(a) PROMOTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall encourage the creation of industrial parks or technology incubator centers, including prototyping facilities, to transfer and spinoff technology from qualified defense contractors, including those operating national laboratories, to small businesses.

(b) USES OF PATENT ROYALTIES.—The Secretary of Defense may use up to 50 percent of the royalties from the licensing of relevant Department of Defense and Department of Energy owned patents to assist local technology transfer activities conducted in close proximity to qualified defense contractor facilities and up to 25 percent of such royalties to assist technology transfer activities that are unrelated to the proximity of a qualified defense contractor facility.

SEC. 405. DEFENSE COMMERCIALIZATION AWARD.

(a) AWARD.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall create and administer an awards program to foster and encourage innovation and redirection efforts by qualified defense contractors in the area of commercialization. Criteria for selection of award recipients shall include job creation, leverage of Federal funding, and product quality.

(b) MODEL.—The Secretary shall model the awards program after the Malcolm Baldridge Quality Awards provided under section 17 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a).

TITLE V—FAST RESPONSE STATE TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETITIVENESS GRANTS

SEC. 501. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide Federal assistance directly to States for defense reinvestment programs. The funds shall be used to improve existing programs and to create new initiatives. Qualifying projects should stress economic development, quality job growth, education and retraining, technology transfer, technology infrastructure, and enhanced competitiveness. Technical and financial assistance should be made available in a diversified set of programs stressing innovation, flexibility and responsiveness to immediate and projected needs associated with Department of Defense spending reductions. Funds under this title shall be directed by States to those industries, workers, and communities who have been adversely affected by the overall reduction of defense spending in the State. States may use funds under this title in conjunction with other Federal or State assistance for programs within the public and private sectors, involving industry, communities, and academic institutions.

SEC. 502. FUNDING FORMULA.

(a) ALLOCATION.—From the amounts appropriated under section 504, the Secretary of Defense, based on the recommendations of the Economic Reinvestment Council, shall allocate such amounts for distribution consistent with the formula specified in subsection (b) for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1995.

(b) FORMULA.—From the amount allocated for a fiscal year under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense, based on the recommendations of the Economic Reinvestment Council, shall annually distribute fast response State technological competitiveness grants to States whose reinvestment programs meet the requirements of section 503 as follows:

(1) 50 percent of the total allocation for that year to be distributed among the States pro rata based on the ratio of the population of the State to the total population of all States, as determined by the latest available Federal census; and

(2) 50 percent of the total allocation for that year to be distributed among the States pro rata based on the ratio of the cumulative dollar amount of Department of Defense purchases in the State for fiscal year 1991 (including research and development, procurement, operations and maintenance, and construction) to the total dollar amount of such Department of Defense purchases in all the States as determined by the Department of Defense using its most recent official data collected after fiscal year 1990.

SEC. 503. STATE ELIGIBILITY.

(a) APPLICATION GUIDELINES.—The Economic Reinvestment Council shall develop and disseminate guidelines on State eligibility for fast response State technological competitiveness grants consistent with section 501. The guidelines shall require the following:

(1) The State shall agree to contribute to the defense reinvestment program of the State an amount equal to at least 10 percent of the amount of the technological competitiveness grant made to the State.

(2) Any program using funds provided under a technological competitiveness grant that is assisting a defense contractor shall require the contractor to provide at least a $1 funding match for every $2 expended in grant funds to assist the contractor.

(3) In addition to the matching contribution required by paragraph (1), the State shall guarantee to maintain its aggregate expenditures from all other sources for programs which provide technical and financial assistance to defense contractors at or above the average level of such expenditures in the two fiscal years preceding the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) STATE RESPONSIBILITY.—Prior to receiving a fast response State technological competitiveness grant, the Governor of the State shall provide to the Council information about the defense reinvestment program conducted by the State. The State shall appoint a single agency or entity within the State to be the recipient of the Federal funding and to administer and oversee the State's reinvestment program. Each State must annually report on the progress of its defense reinvestment programs back to the Council and supply any analysis data that the Council may require for program evaluation.

(c) WITHHOLDING OF GRANT FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall withhold a fast response State technological competitiveness grant from any State if the Council concludes that the State's defense reinvestment program or the progress of such program is unsatisfactory relative to the published guidelines. In such a case, the Council shall provide to the State the reasons for its dis-

qualification and provide a 90-day appeal period during which the State shall be allowed to submit a revised proposal for review by the Council.

SEC. 504. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense for the fiscal years 1993 through 1995 $1,000,000,000 for fast response State technological competitiveness grants under this title.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE DEFENSE WORKERS ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT ACT

GOALS

The goals of this Act are to:

Mitigate the adverse effects on defense contractors and defense workers of reductions in defense spending.

Convert some defense workers to non-defense industry employment.

Transform segments of the defense industry to robust new commercial technology industries.

Develop technology infrastructure projects that benefit the nation.

Total Authorization: 3.8 billion over four years.

TITLE I—ECONOMIC REINVESTMENT COUNCIL

Sec. 101. Establishment

Designates and staffs and Economic Reinvestment Council, including DOD, defense contractor and private industry representatives.

Sec. 102. Duties and Functions of the Council

Objective evaluation, oversight and spending authority over defense reinvestment programs. Implementation and administration of the National Technology Infrastructure Goals Improvement and Consortia Creation program and the Fast Response State Technological Competitiveness Grants program.

Sec. 103. Annual Economic Reinvestment Progress Report

Annual analysis for Congress on the progress of federal reinvestment programs.

Sec. 104. Authorization of Appropriations.

Authorizes $2 million per year to operate the Council.

TITLE II—NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE GOALS IMPROVEMENT AND CONSORTIA CREATION

Sec. 201. Purpose

Fund advanced technology projects that improve the technology infrastructure of the nation.

Sec. 202. Importance of Advanced Technology Projects

Exploits the potential of new technologies to benefit the national infrastructure—creates domestic employment, export opportunities and improves the nation's global leadership in development of critical technologies and their integration into complex systems. Examples of appropriate projects using new technology include space exploration and exploitation, efficient and safe transportation, environmental restoration, improved telecommunications, better health care and interactive tools for education.

Sec. 203. Selection of Advanced Technology Projects

The Council solicits, reviews, prioritizes, selects and coordinates the projects. The Council will disseminate guidelines for appropriate projects that include improving the national technology infrastructure; benefiting the public interest; improving national technological competitiveness; enhancing export opportunities and exploiting critical technologies. Proposals can be made by Federal departments and agencies, states, and private and public organizations. The guidelines encourage joint ventures with combinations of industry, academic and state and federal partners. First three projects to be funded within 9 months. Authorizes $419 million annually for FY93–FY96.

Sec. 204. Creation of Technology Consortia

(a) Research for each project to be performed by a consortium dedicated to the project. Consortia are jointly funded by industry and state partners with the federal government. A project consortium acts to facilitate communications and manage research among the joint venture partners to ensure a successful project.

(b) Also solicits proposal and selects three new consortia annually for research and development of critical technologies relevant to defense applications. Funding of these new consortia must be matched by industry. Authorizes $50 million annually for FY93–96.

Sec. 205. Examination of Procurement Specifications

Requires the Secretary of Defense to examine procurement contracts exceeding $100,000 whose specifications preclude the purchase of commercial sector products and to report to Congress within one year with justification for the restrictions.

TITLE III—RELIEVING LABOR SHORTAGES IN SELECTED CIVILIAN APPLICATIONS

Sec. 301. Training Oversight and Administration Office

Secretary of Defense to establish an Office of Training Oversight and Administration to oversee retraining and placement activities for displaced defense contractor employees.

Sec. 302. Retraining Programs

Develop and coordinate retraining programs in cooperation with the Department of Labor, state and local governments, academic institutions, educational consultants and defense contractors. Retraining makes the best match between displaced employee skills and available or projected employment opportunities in a specific region. Also establishes one and two-year scholarship programs to assist displaced employees in more intense vocational training or to develop specific skill for critical technologies. Federal share of costs limited to 50% of total expenses, which may include retraining, certification, apprenticeship and subsistence costs. Authorizes $100 million annually for the retraining and $50 million annually for the scholarship programs, for FY93–95.

TITLE IV—COMMERCIALIZATION OPPORTUNITIES

Sec. 401. Promotion of Commercialization Opportunities

Secretary of Commerce to establish and oversee two programs to assist in technology transfer and commercialization, modeled after the NIST Advanced Technology program.

Sec. 402. Leveraged Small Seed Capital Projects

Secretary of Commerce to provide grants in exchange for equity of up to $1 million per project, to not exceed 33 percent of the project cost. Projects will demonstrate feasibility of commercialization of a technology or process up tot he prototype stage. Authorizes $50 million annually for FY93–96.

Sec. 403. Commercialization Loans

Secretary of Commerce to provide loans of up to $3 million per project for commercialization of significant new research and technologies, biased toward dual-use products. Seven-year loans may be used for production and must be matched by industry. Authorizes $300 million to establish a loan fund in FY93.

Sec. 404. Promotion of Industrial parks

Encourages creation of industrial parks and technology incubator centers to facilitate technology transfer for federal entities to private industry. Allows use of up to 50% of DOD and DOE patent licensing royalties to fund technology transfer activities.

Sec. 405. Defense Commercialization Award

Establishes an awards program, operated by the Department of Defense in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, to encourage and recognize successful commercialization efforts by defense contractors.

TITLE V—FAST RESPONSE STATE TECHNOLOGICAL COMPETITIVENESS GRANTS

Sec. 501. Purpose

To encourage states to expand existing state-operated defense reinvestment programs and to create innovative new programs. Since states programs may be more flexible and responsive to local needs, federal funds with minimal matching requirements are allocated to states based on a "fair share" type formula.

Sec. 502. Funding Formula

Each state, once eligibility is established, is entitled to an annual federal grant based on its population and the amount of defense procurement spending in the state.

Sec. 503. State Eligibility

The Council must ensure a state qualifies for funds. This qualification consists of a state proposal which details its programs focused on defense reinvestment and economic competitiveness, and their results.

Sec. 504. Authorization of Appropriations

Authorizes $1 billion over three years.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself and Mr. KASTEN):

S. 2804. A bill to establish a program to provide technical assistance to employers and labor unions, in order to assist in preparing the workplace to employ women in apprenticeable occupations and other nontraditional occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

WOMEN IN APPRENTICESHIP OCCUPATIONS AND NONTRADITIONAL OCCUPATIONS ACT

• Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, between now and the year 2000, over two-thirds of the people entering the labor force will be women. Unfortunately, a disproportionate number of women continue to be segregated into a cluster of low paying jobs in the service sector. Sixty percent of all minimum wage earners are women, although women comprise only 45 percent of the American labor force. According to the National Commission on Working Women, "the number of women who head households has more than doubled in the past 27 years. In 1987, one of every four mothers in the labor force was maintaining her own family. In 1986, the poverty line for a family of four was $11,203. A single mother of three working full time at

minimum wage earned $6,968. After a year's work, this mother was living $4,235 below the poverty line."

I rise today to introduce the Women in Apprenticeship Occupations and Nontraditional Employment Act, and request that a copy of the bill be placed in the RECORD following my remarks. This bill is part of the Economic Equity Act of 1992; a package of bills designed to improve the economic well-being of American women. The legislation is a companion to H.R. 3475 which was introduced in the House by Representative CONNIE MORELLA.

There is little debate that a stonemason makes more money than a store clerk, an electrician is better paid than a waitress, or a heavy machine operator is better able to support a family than a hairdresser. Last year, Congress passed the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act, which amended the Job Training Partnership Act. Signed into law in 1991, this legislation expanded women's opportunities to receive training for nontraditional jobs. The reason for congressional support for the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act was the knowledge that employment in traditionally male jobs can provide women with greater wages, benefits, and opportunities for advancement.

However, training alone will not be sufficient to stimulate and maintain increased employment for women in nontraditional occupations. The Women in Apprenticeship Occupations and Nontraditional Occupations Act will provide the necessary support to help women enter and sustain employment in apprenticeships and other nontraditional occupations. The bill establishes a proactive role for the Department of Labor in efforts to place and retain women in nontraditional jobs through the provision of technical assistance to employers and unions. The purpose of this technical assistance will be to help employers and unions integrate women into trade apprenticeships and nontraditional jobs in the workplace. Authorized for $1 million, this bill requires the Department of Labor to conduct a variety of technical assistance activities such as training seminars, facilitating support groups and networks for women in nontraditional jobs, as well as developing outreach and orientation sessions to recruit women into apprenticeships and nontraditional employment.

The increasing number of single mothers and the disproportionately low wages for jobs held by women are contributing factors in the high child poverty rates in America. While the poverty rate for adults has dropped precipitously, the child poverty rate remains high—twice as high as the adult rate. According to a 1991 report from the Children's Defense Fund, one in five American children, and one in four preschoolers, is poor. If we hope to raise children out of poverty, efforts must be made to increase the earning power of their parents. The Women in Apprenticeship Occupations and Nontraditional Occupations Act is one small effort which could help many women and their families win their struggle for economic self-sufficiency.

The expanded opportunities for training in apprenticeship and nontraditional employment will be of limited use if barriers in the workplace prevent women from entering and retaining employment in these professions. I would like to urge my colleagues to join with me in working for the passage of this legislation.•

By Mr. LIEBERMAN:

S. 2805. A bill to strengthen U.S. laws to enforce embargoes against foreign countries pursuant to a declaration of national emergency or U.N. Security Council measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1992

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, on April 9 I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 285 which expressed support for the United Nations resolutions calling on Libya to hand over the suspects in the bombing of Pan Am 103. My resolution also called for stiffer sanctions in the event that Libya did not cooperate. Cosponsors included Senators KERRY and BROWN, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Terrorism, and Senators D'AMATO and LAUTENBERG, who served on the Presidential commission which investigated the bombing. It has been more than a month since the last United Nations resolution was passed and Libya still has not complied with its terms. I believe, therefore, that we should take additional steps to drive home to Qadhafi that he will be increasingly isolated if he does not cooperate.

One important measure would be to make sure that the United Nations embargo against Libya is airtight. The U.S. Government and others are working hard to detect any sanctions violations and to take actions against violators. However, it is not an easy task. As often is the case with international sanctions, there are individuals and companies that are tempted to violate sanctions for financial gain. We should make, therefore, every effort to deter potential sanctions breakers. To that end, I am introducing legislation today that would increase the penalties for violating the sanctions. It is the International Sanctions Enforcement Act of 1992.

By way of background, on March 31, the Security Council imposed mandatory sanctions on Libya unless it complies with United Nations Security Council Resolution 731, approved unanimously on January 21. These sanctions:

Forbid air service to or from Libya except for specially approved humanitarian flights.

Prohibit the sale of aircraft, spare parts, and related services, and prevent the operation of all Libyan Arab Airlines offices;

Impose an arms embargo and prohibit any foreign military advisers from working in Libya;

Reduce the number and level of staff at Libyan diplomatic missions.

The sanctions will remain in effect until the Security Council determines that Libya has complied fully with the requests made by the United Nation Security Council in Resolution 731 of January 21. This required Libya to:

Surrender the two Libyans indicted for bombing Pan Am flight 103 for trial in the United States or the United Kingdom, and accept responsibility for their actions;

Disclose all relevant information about the crime;

Pay appropriate compensation;

Cease all terrorist actions and support of terrorist groups, which it must prove by concrete actions.

The key elements of this bill would provide stiffer penalties for those who violate the U.N. sanctions. It is intended to deter companies and individuals from doing business with Libya in violation of the sanctions and United States laws.

Section 2 of the bill would ban U.S. purchases of goods and services from foreign companies that violate U.N. sanctions. It is virtually identical to the CBW nonproliferation provisions of State Department authorization bill for fiscal year 1992–93 enacted last year and the nuclear nonproliferation bill passed by the Senate this year.

This section would also ban U.S. companies from making purchases from sanction violators. The intent is to make potential violators think twice. If they want to do business as usual with Libya, they cannot do business with the United States.

A related provision, section 7, would increase by tenfold, to $100,000, the civil penalties for Americans who violate the existing U.S. trade sanctions under IEAPA, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act. Stiff criminal penalties already exist but the increase in civil penalties would be useful.

Another provision is aimed at Americans who continue to work in Libya despite United States laws that prohibit this. Section 4 would increase civil penalties for the illegal use of United Sates passports to travel to Libya from $2,000 to $50,000. This is the figure proposed in the administrations's draft consular reform bill. There are an estimated 500 to 1,000 Americans working in Libya and it is unconscionable that they should help support a regime that bears responsibility for killing so many Americans.

Two other provisions are designed to add to the existing sanctions against Libya.

One would authorize banning air service to the United States of airlines controlled by any country violating sanctions—section 5. It is similar to legislation first used in the 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 and also in the CBW sanctions of the State Department Authorization Act for 1992–93.

Another provision intended to strengthen economic sanctions against Libya would also ban the shipment of certain technical publications to Libya—section 6. This is intended to curtail how-to-do-it manuals and other technical data that might help Libya's economy; it would, of course, have no effect on the free exchange of political ideas.

And, finally, the bill includes a provision that would help protect foreign individuals who provide information that either prevented terrorist attacks or assisted in apprehending and prosecuting terrorists. Section 3 would facilitate relocating in the U.S. participants in the State Department's counterterrorism rewards program.

In the course of preparations for a hearing I conducted earlier this year for the Governmental Affairs Committee, we learned that during the gulf war, there were difficulties using existing immigration or other legislation to quickly bring in from harms way overseas and relocate in the United States, people who helped prevent terrorist attacks against U.S. targets. This amendment is intended to help persons who are not part of any organized terrorist or other crime group or otherwise do not fall under the witness protection program.

I also want to add that I consulted with administration officials at the State Department and Treasury Department when drafting this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe that it is extremely important that the U.S. Congress do what it can to support the United Nations sanctions, particularly since this is the first time that the U.N. has resorted to sanctions against terrorists. If enacted into law, this bill will demonstrate to other terrorists and their state sponsors that they will continue to be treated as international outcasts. Penalizing those companies and individuals that continue to flaunt the will of the international community will drive home that point. We must isolate terrorists in order to defeat them.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2806. A bill to establish a program to ensure nondiscriminatory compliance with environmental, health, and safety laws and to ensure equal protection of the public health; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ACT OF 1992

• Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as world leaders gather in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, this week for the opening of the Earth Summit to reach new international agreements on protecting the global environment, we face disturbing inequities in the way severe pollution problems are distributed here at home. In disproportionate amounts, toxic wastes and toxic emissions from industrial processes contaminate the neighborhoods of minority communities, depressing land values and posing serious threats to the health of those in our society least empowered financially and politically to do anything about it. Here in the United States, we know that if you're poor and if you're an African-American or Hispanic-American or a member of another minority, you're more likely to be threatened by toxic pollution—much more likely—but less likely to know about it or be able to respond. People facing these threats need help protecting their families and their homes. They need information, confidence in the system of regulations designed to protect them, and a better ability to be heard when they have concerns.

That is why, Mr. President, on the eve of my departure to Rio, where I plan to participate in the activities surrounding the Earth Summit as the chairman of the Senate delegation, I am introducing legislation to help those people who face the greatest risk of exposure to toxic substances and pollution right here at home. This bill, the Environmental Justice Act of 1992, calls for a comprehensive survey of every county in the country in an attempt to rank the 100 counties most severely contaminated by toxic chemical releases. The bill would support community groups in those areas with technical assistance grants, provide for comprehensive health surveys in those vicinities, require mandatory inspections of area facilities, and provide for a moratorium on new pollution sources in such communities.

Mr. President, human suffering and environmental devastation travel together. While all of us suffer, the poorest people carry the heaviest burden. The Earth Summit is about sharing that burden and ensuring that all of our children in this and the generations to follow live in a clean, safe world. That's the goal behind this legislation as well.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by the distinguished Congressman from Atlanta, JOHN LEWIS, who will be introducing the companion legislation on the House side. And I am particularly grateful in this effort for the work of Rev. Ben Chavis, executive director of the Committee for Racial Justice of the United Church of Christ. In 1987, this committee produced a seminal study entitled "Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States: A National Report on the Racial and Soci-Economic Characteristics of Communities with Hazardous Waste Sites," that in large part forms the basis for this initiative.

I commend the study to the attention of my colleagues. Among its many significant findings, the study determined that the distribution of commercial hazardous waste facilities fit a troubling pattern: There are twice as many minorities in communities where a commercial hazardous waste facility is located and, where two or more facilities exist, the proportion of minorities is more than triple. In addition, the study found that race is the single best predictor of where commercial hazardous waste facilities are located—even when other characteristics, such as household income and average home value, are considered.

The Environmental Justice Act of 1992 is the starting point for easing the burden disadvantaged communities bear in living with the toxic byproducts of the lifestyles to which we have all grown accustomed. For too long, minority communities in America have suffered from neglect and abuse, and have slowly been transformed into the dumping grounds for America's excesses and the cancer alleys of American industry. We must set about restoring the equal protection under the laws for all the people of our country. I hope my colleagues will join Congressman LEWIS and me in this endeavor.•

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 2807. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to require additional information with respect to the report on trade agreements and national trade policy agenda; to the Committee on Finance.

TRADE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1992

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself and Senators RIEGLE and ROCKEFELLER to introduce the Trade Act Amendments of 1992.

This bill seeks to improve the coordination of our international trade policies with our domestic economic and technology policies in two ways. First, the bill would focus the attention of our trade policies on those technologies and industries which are critical to the long-term economic vitality and security of the United States. Second, it would require that our trade policies be judged against their effects on the international competitiveness of those technologies and industries.

THE CHALLENGE

The United States is facing a rising economic challenge from foreign competitors, especially Japan and the European Community. The U.S. economy is increasingly being integrated, like it or not, into a global economy. These trends, and the on going process of defense conversion, make it especially

important that our international trade policies are harmonized with and support our domestic economic technology policies.

However, U.S. trade policy has not focused on those technologies and industries which are critical to the long-term economic vitality and security of the United States. In our efforts to open foreign markets to American goods, we have given insufficient priority to American high-technology and value-added products. There has also been insufficient attention paid to the negative effects of our trade policies on the competitive positions of those technologies and industries, especially in the new, post cold war world. Some of these policies have restricted exports of many of our most competitive products, effectively robbing our own companies of their comparative advantage, constraining their market share, and limiting their revenue for future investment. In summary, our trade policy has too often been ad hoc, reacting primarily to dying industries with political access rather than based on rational priorities or a strategic view of the economic future of the country.

The essential question is whether the United States formulates its trade plans and policies with a clear goal in mind: increasing the international competitiveness of those technologies and industries which determine whether this country has a secure economic future and a rising standard of living.

THE TRADE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1992

Mr. President, this bill would be another step toward formulation and coordination of strategic trade policies to serve the long-term economic interests of this country, not short-term political interests.

The bill would require the President, as part of the annual report on the trade agreements program and the national trade agenda, to report on the operation of U.S. trade policies with respect to the international competitive positions of, first, national critical technologies—as determined by the National Critical Technologies Panel; second, U.S. industries developing and utilizing those critical technologies, and any other U.S. industry considered vital to the national economy. It would require that the President detail the trade actions taken by the United States and foreign governments, and the effects of those actions on the identified technologies and industries. Finally, it would require that the President explicitly state U.S. trade strategies and plans and explain how they would increase the international competitiveness of the identified technologies and industries.

CONCLUSION

The new realities of the post-cold-war world make economic matters directly and inextricably bound to matters of national security and international influence. This bill is one piece of a larger framework of bills I and others have introduced to focus this country's policies and efforts on technologies and industries which are of long-term importance to the economic vitality and security of this country. It is also intended to encourage policy formulation with those goals in mind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Trade Act Amendments of 1992 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2807

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trade Act Amendments of 1992".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Advanced and emerging technologies and industries are significant contributors to the economic strength of the United States, creating jobs, improving productivity, raising standards of living, and increasing international economic competitiveness.

(2) International trade policies (particularly as such policies relate to unfair foreign imports, closed foreign markets, and international agreements) directly affect the health of advanced and emerging technologies and industries in the United States.

(3) The continued vitality of important technologies and industries, requires the United States to formulate international trade policies with full understanding of the potential effects such policies have on key technologies and industries.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to encourage the integration of United States international trade policies with the competitive position of industries and technologies which are vital to the continued economic health of the United States.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) COMPETITIVE POSITION OF UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES.—Section 163(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2213(a)(1)) is amended by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a semicolon and "and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) the operation of United States trade policies with respect to the international competitive positions of—

"(i) the technologies identified by the National Critical Technologies Panel pursuant to section 601 of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976,

"(ii) United States industries developing and using the technologies described in clause (i), and

"(iii) any other United States industry considered vital to the national economy.".

(b) SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON TRADE ACTIONS AND STRATEGIES.—Section 163(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The President shall include in the report the following information with respect to the technologies and industries described in paragraph (1)(C):

"(A) Trade actions taken by the United States and foreign governments, including negotiations, discussions, agreements, duties, quotas, and legal action, which affect such United States industries and technologies.

"(B) Whether the actions described in subparagraph (A) have postitively or negatively affected such United States industries and technologies.

"(c) The United States trade strategies and actions which are planned, and how such strategies and actions increase the international competitiveness of such United States industries and technologies.

"(D) The trade strategies and actions of other nations which affect the international competitives of such United States industries and technologies.".●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 752

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the allocation of research and experimental expenditures permanent.

S. 2018

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 2018, a bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide that a single Federal Agency shall be responsible for making technical determinations with respect to wetland or converted wetland on agricultural lands.

S. 2064

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] were added as cosponsors of S. 2064, a bill to impose a one-year moratorium on the performance of nuclear weapons tests by the United States unless the Soviet Union conducts a nuclear weapons test during that period.

S. 2197

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2197, a bill to promote a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba through the application of appropriate pressures on the Cuban Government and support for the Cuban people.

S. 2244

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to require the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict.

S. 2296

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] were added as cosponsors of S. 2296, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 to make it unlawful for any stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer to transfer or market nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 2362

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 2362, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the reduced medicare payment provision for new physicians.

S. 2560

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2560, a bill to reclassify the cost of international peacekeeping activities from international affairs to national defense.

S. 2622

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2622, a bill to establish an Office of Cambodian Genocide Investigation, to support efforts to bring to justice national Khmer Rouge leaders who committed crimes against humanity in Cambodia, and to exclude the national leadership of the Khmer Rouge from the United States.

S. 2624

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] were added as cosponsors of S. 2624, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Interagency Council on the Homeless, the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2682

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2682, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the beginning of the protection of Civil War battlefields, and for other purposes.

S. 2711

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] were added as cosponsors of S. 2711, a bill to ensure the fair treatment of members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces who are adversely affected by certain reductions in the size of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action with respect to certain alleged violations of the requirements of title IV of the Social Security Act.

S. 2752

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2752, a bill to establish a REFORM Commission to review the field structure of the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

S. 2763

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] were added as cosponsors of S. 2763, a bill to establish the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program for intensive training in the Japanese language, government, politics, and economy.

S. 2794

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2794, a bill to relieve the regulatory burden on depository institutions, particularly on small depository institutions, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 247

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 247, a joint resolution designating June 11, 1992, as "National Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 257

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 257, a joint resolution to designate the month of June 1992, as "National Scleroderma Awareness."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 273

At the request of Mr. SEYMOUR, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 273, a joint resolution to designate the week commencing June 21, 1992, as "National Sheriffs' Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 274

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 274, a joint resolution to designate April 9, 1992, as "Child Care Worthy Wage Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 281

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 281, a joint resolution designating the week of September 14 through September 20, 1992, as "National Small Independent Telephone Company Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 288

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 288, a joint resolution designating the week beginning July 26, 1992, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 291

At the request of Mr. GARN, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 291, a joint resolution to designate June 10, 1992, through June 16, 1992, as "International Student Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 303

At the request of Mr. PELL, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from

Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 303, a joint resolution to designate October 1992 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 306

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 306, a joint resolution designating October 1992 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 307

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 307, a joint resolution designating the month of July 1992 as "National Muscular Dystrophy Awareness Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 113

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 113, a concurrent resolution concerning the 25th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

SENATE RESOLUTION 300

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 300, a resolution relating to suspension of assistance and cooperative programs with the former Yugoslavia.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

LOTT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1865

Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. DOLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. COATS and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1504) a bill to authorize appropriations for public broadcasting, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 6, strike lines 12 through 15 and insert:

"(3) by inserting ", $275,000,000 for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996.'"

DOLE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1866

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. INOUYE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1504, supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . In making available funding pursuant to authorizations under this Act, any independent production service established under section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(k)) shall, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, provide such funding to eligible recipients and project representing the widest possible geographic distribution, with the objective of providing funding to eligible recipients and projects in each State from which qualified proposals are received over the course of such authorizations.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, June 25, 1992, beginning at 2 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills currently pending before the subcommittee. The bills are:

S. 1879, to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest, and for other purposes;

S. 1990, to authorize the transfer of certain facilities and lands in the Wenatchee National Forest, WA;

S. 2392, to establish a right-of-way corridor for electric power transmission lines in the Sunrise Mountain in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 2397, to expand the boundaries of the Yucca House National Monument in Colorado, to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries, and for other purposes;

S. 2606, to further clarify authorities and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in issuing ski area permits on National Forest System lands; and

S. 2749, to grant a right of use and occupancy of a certain tract of land in Yosemite National Park to George R. Lange and Lucille F. Lange, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, anyone wishing to submit written testimony to be included in the hearing record is welcome to do so. Those wishing to submit written testimony should send two copies to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information regarding the hearing, please contact Erica Rosenberg of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224–7933.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 3, 1992, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on the effectiveness of enterprise zones as a spur to investment in economically distressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on civil defense programs and policy, in review of S. 2629, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, at 10 a.m., in SR–332, to hold a hearing on U.S. Department of Agriculture's computer operations.

For further information please contact Andy Finkel of the Agriculture Committee staff at X4–5207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to request unanimous consent to hold a hearing to consider health legislation and to conduct oversight of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The hearing will be held on June 3, 1992, at 10 a.m. in room 418 of the Russell Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, at 2:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the Department of Defense's 1994–99 Defense planning guidance and its illustrative scenarios and to consider the nomination of I. Lewis Libby to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, 1992, at 2 p.m. to hold a closed hearing on intelligence matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 3, at 10 a.m. to hold ambassadorial nominations hearing.

NOMINEES

(1) Mr. Richard Goodwin Capen, Jr., of Florida, to be Ambassador to Spain.

To be introduced by: The Honorable Dante Fascell (D–FL) and the Honorable Connie Mack (R–FL).

(2) Mr. Peter Barry Teeley, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Canada.

To be introduced by: The Honorable Ted Stevens (R–AK).

(3) Mr. Donald Herman Alexander, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

To be introduced by: The Honorable Christopher Bond (R–MO).

(4) Mr. Adrian A. Basora, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

(5) Mr. William Henry Gerald FitzGerald, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to Ireland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY AND ROYCE VINSON, OWENSBORO, KY

• Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes today to recognize Dorothy and Royce Vinson of my hometown of Owensboro.

In May of 1962, Dorothy and Royce opened the Royce Restaurant on West Second Street. The Royce is a family-style restaurant with good home cooking, and for 30 years now, it has served generations of Owensboroans.

In a business that often sees owners come and go, the Royce has been a pleasant exception. It is the oldest one-owner restaurant in Owensboro, and its longevity is no accident: The Royce is a success because of the hard work, dedication and good nature of the Vinsons. They work 16-hour days, they know most—if not all—of their customers by name, and they pay attention to what their customers want. They and their restaurant have deservedly become local fixtures.

The Vinsons have a knack for making everyone feel at home. Students from Kentucky Wesleyan College stop in to eat, study, and mingle. Folks drop by to catch up on the day's news. Music from an old-time jukebox adds to the atmosphere and makes the restaurant an enjoyable place to visit.

Mr. President, Dorothy and Royce Vinson have demonstrated that they have what it takes to be successful, and I am pleased to have had this opportunity to pay tribute to these fine folks as their business enters its fourth decade of operation.•

DRUNK DRIVING

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on May 14, 1988 a light truck hit a bus in Carrollton, KY, killing 24 students and 3 adults. What amplifies the scope of this terrible tragedy is that the driver of the truck was under the influence of alcohol when the crash occurred. This was no accident. It was an alcohol-related crash that was preventable. This nightmare shocked our State and plunged an entire community into grief. The horrible fact of the matter is that every 10 hours the same number of people are killed by drunk drivers.

On May 19, of this year, Molly Evenstad of Virginia, sent my staff a very informative article from the April edition of Aide magazine which explains the toll drunk drivers have on Americans each and every day of the year. At this time I would like to thank Ms. Evenstad for her commitment to the cause of preventing drunk driving and insert the article in the RECORD: "What if 100 Jumbo Jets Crashed, and No One Survived?"

The article follows:

WHAT IF 100 JUMBO JETS CRASHED, AND NO ONE SURVIVED?

Sauced. Blotto. Polluted. Tanked. Squiffed. No matter what you call it, it means drunk. And behind the steering wheel, drunk can mean deadly.

In 1990, drunk driving killed more than 22,000 people in the United States. That's a death toll equivalent to the crash of 100 jumbo jets, with no survivors. Alcohol-related crashes injured an additional 355,000 people. A recent telephone survey conducted by the Gallup Organization found 42 percent of respondents personally knew someone who was killed or injured by a drunk driver. Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) reports half of all traffic fatalities involve alcohol.

With statistics like those, if your life hasn't been affected by a drunk driving accident, you can count yourself lucky. If your life has been changed—well, these excerpts from letters written by Aide Magazine readers tell the story.

At approximately 1:30 a.m. on September 15, 1990, Allen was on his way home and either fell asleep or passed out at the wheel. Less than a mile from home, his car drifted to the left side of the road, and it looks as though he woke up and turned the wheel hard right. This caused the vehicle to roll over. He was ejected from the car, and I pray his death was immediate. His blood alcohol level was 0.25, which is two-and-one-half times the (Virginia) legal limit of 0.10.

Anger twisted around my grief when I found that three bars where Allen had been drinking failed to check his identification. (Allen was 19; in Virginia, the drinking age is 21.) These establishments advertise as "family-oriented" restaurants. Allen was wrong to drink and drive, but these establishments had a moral and legal obligation to be responsible beverage servers. The establish-

ments did not get their licenses revoked or suspended. They were fined $2,000 apiece, which is a mere slap on the wrist. Allen paid with his life, and we, his parents and family, are left to suffer.—William H. Pierce II, Manassas, Virginia.

It was Christmas Eve 1959. The police report stated, "The occupant never had a chance." While waiting for a red light, his vehicle was hit from behind by a drunk driver. The force of the impact instantly broke his neck, partially ejected him from the car and dragged him over 100 feet. The drunk driver was not injured, nor was he insured. The deceased was 32 years old and often said, "I'm too young to need life insurance." He left behind a wife and four boys, ages 3 to 10 years old. I haven't had a Dad since. Yes, I was only 5 years old, and my life had changed forever.—Christopher M. Kelleher, Ft. Belvoir, Virginia.

I can remember sitting in the back seat of the car as my mother drove me home from school on days when I stayed late. She was an alcoholic and would invariably not be completely sober when she picked me up. She would be driving very slowly yet weave all over the road and make some very poor judgment driving moves. I remember thinking that I, too young, and with no driver's education training, could manage a straighter and safer course.

Our family never discussed the drinking problem, and being as young as I was, I really felt I had nowhere to go with the information that my mother was driving under the influence. When I think back on those days, I'm thankful she never had an accident or hurt anyone with her DUI driving. It could so easily have been a different story, and I would have felt partly responsible as I was too scared to tell anyone about those long rides home (three miles).—Name withheld, Chicago, Illinois.

When a car hits a telephone pole at 70 miles per hour, the pole will snap in half. When six people in a car hit a telephone pole at 70 miles per hour, two people will die, one will become disabled, two will be medically discharged from Naval service, and one will spend 30 days in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. When six people drink and one of them is the driver, all six lives will change. When one of the passengers peels the crushed roof off his best friend's body, he wonders why the driver consumed alcohol and got behind the steering wheel.—David R. Putnam, Jacksonville, Florida.

My 18-year-old brother, John Robert Ruiz, the baby of the family, was killed by a three-time-convicted drunk driver. This person, driving at an estimated speed of 110 miles per hour, lost control of his car, causing it to flip over on its top and burst into flames. This car then hit my brother's car head-on. Amazingly, out of the four persons in the two cars, no one else was seriously injured. My brother was killed on impact. I cannot begin to describe how hard it was, being 21 years old at the time, to plan my little brother's closed-casket funeral.—Norma J. Murray, Tampa, Florida.

I'll never forget the acidic pain of watching my friend, my soul mate, being dragged out of the crushed car. His head had smashed the windshield. I walked to the car and I wanted to touch him, to bring him back to life. I would have dreams in which I healed his torn face and then he would smile at me. The void in my soul will never go away.

It really makes no difference whether he was a victim or whether he brought this upon himself. Life is precarious as it is. There is no need no inject stupidity into the formula. I can never bring back the young, beautiful life that was lost for good. It still hurts.—John Doberty, South Bend, Indiana.

Hal and his wife, Helen, were enjoying retired life to the fullest. Traveling was a big part of their lives. He even managed to return once to Italy where, 45 years earlier, he had been shot down on a bombing run in his B-17. Evading enemy troops, he encountered American sympathizers who aided and fed him. Piecing together his route, he eventually found and again met some of the civilians who had, so many years before, helped this young aviator to survive and reach Allied lines four months later.

Maybe he was planning another trip when all future dreams were dashed. The automobile, without braking, slammed into the rear wheel of the bike Hal was riding. Hal was thrown over the hood of the car into a telephone pole. He was then catapulted 50 feet down the pavement, where he lay without movement or heartbeat. Today, he is paralyzed and severely brain damaged. He requires 24-hour care in a nursing home, a man much too young in years and spirit to be in a nursing home. All of the family is a victim of this tragedy. Christmas is no longer celebrated. Special times of the year only remind us of our profound loss. We take life one day at a time, coping with ongoing medical crises, crippling financial obligations and a future devoid of the love and devotion that so epitomized this once-giant of a man.—Madeline Linneweb, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Since I had plenty of beer in the back seat, I was my own mobile party ready for anything. Some curves in the road appeared just before midnight. I fastened my seat belt, floored the accelerator. Soon my speed exceeded my car's ability to hug the road. I slipped through the first turn, the tires screaming for traction. I was too dazed to react; my foot remained glued to the floor. After recovering, I felt challenged; my heart was pounding and my passenger was speechless. Gaining speed for turn two, the engine was soaring, the tires were screaming! Against my wishes, I jumped the curb. On my left was a street sign, on my right a tree. Could I squeeze between them without suffering a scratch? Probably not—so I chose to flatten the sign. I missed. The tree fought for survival, and won. Barely able, my poor car limped away. I stepped out to pull the metal away from the tires. Ooops! Police on patrol . . . "Has there been an accident? Are you and your passenger okay? Can I see your license? Where was the accident? What did you hit? Have you been drinking? You have the right to remain silent!" Almost five years of trying to forget, trying to leave it behind. Insurance companies want more money, and employers want someone else. Family members still look at me differently—as if this is my life story, as if I cannot be controlled. I'm not like that at all!—Jeffory J. Stumpf, Ponca City, Oklahoma.

At 7:00 a.m. on Thanksgiving morning, when most Americans are preparing the stuffing for their turkey, our son's eyes were removed and the corneas donated. A 17-year-old boy, who was drinking, using marijuana and speeding at about 75 miles per hour, broadsided our son, John, who was making a left turn.

Driving under the influence was not an accident, but rather involved two clear choices: to drink and to drive. The driver received only three months in juvenile hall, yet caused many innocent people unbearable sorrow and burdens. Our son spent 19 years becoming a unique creature in nature. It took years of effort and love to make such an individual, and this negligent act has removed him from life forever.—John and Maureen Rood, Mission Viejo, California.

My husband and I will never forget the morning we woke our only child, Brenda, to tell her the news following a crash the night before. A drunk driver had killed Chad Kernan, a friend of Brenda's in school. Chad was one of three students in Brenda's high school who were killed by intoxicated drivers in six months in two separate crashes. At Chad's crowded funeral, Tracy Johnson, a friend of Brenda's, said, "We have to stick together; we can't let anything like this happen again." But seven months later Brenda's and Tracy's lives were ripped away from us by a drunk driver. A drunk driver who decided to imbibe enough alcohol to cause his blood level to soar two-and-a-half times past the legal limit. A drunk driver who decided to drive the wrong way down a divided highway and crash head-on into our daughter's new car. A drunk driver who had four prior DUI arrests. A drunk driver who ignored court orders for Antabuse and alcohol counseling.

The pain only began on that evening our daughter was murdered. My mother died three weeks later from the stress of losing her granddaughter to a four-time offender. Brenda and Tracy both died strapped in their safety belts at the scene of the crash; their killer lived. He lived only to get released from the hospital still in possession of a legal driver's license. He lived to go home to his family for Thanksgiving and Christmas. He lived to hold his baby in the courtroom in an effort to portray a good father image to the jurors. We were not allowed to bring Brenda's and Tracy's pictures into the courtroom.

The injustices continue for my husband and me. Every morning we have to get up and function without our only daughter. Our birthday and Christmas presents to her are bouquets of flowers. We donate money to her memorial scholarship fund instead of exchanging Christmas gifts.—Joseph and Molly Evenstad, Falls Church, Virginia.

Driving home, having had two drinks, I approached a highly dangerous intersection in East Tampa. Unfortunately, the light control was malfunctioning. The light was green as we approached, but was green the opposite way, also. The driver of the pickup truck in front of me was disoriented by the whole situation and stopped. Then, as the driver backed away from the green light, I tried to avoid collision by turning to my left. We collided anyway, my front to his back under a green light. The investigating officer did not consider the light being green, did not consider the truck was backing up at a green light. His investigation wholly centered on whether I had been drinking. The only important fact was who had been drinking; none of the facts concerning the light function or the truck backing up while the light was green were taken into consideration. This story is a perfect testimonial that you may not be at fault in an accident, but if you have had a drink, you will be the one at fault.—Anonymous, Tampa, Florida.

The drunk driver who killed my Granddaddy Harris survived with no physical injuries. I'm sure, though, that the driver of that car lived with a tormented soul. In my own heart I feel a gaping hole where my grandfather should have been. When I look at the precious few photographs we have of him, I wonder about all the ways he could have enriched my life.—Valerie C. Beckner, Richmond, Virginia.●

REJECT MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR CHINA

• Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, yesterday, only 2 days before the anniversary of the massacre of prodemocracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square, President Bush chose to renew most-favored-nation trade status for China. That is the worst possible way to commemorate the deaths of those courageous students. And the worst message the President could send to China's leaders is to renew most-favored-nation status unconditionally at this time.

The list of reasons to reject most-favored-nation trade status for China continues to grow. The Chinese Government routinely engages in abusive trade practices, and irresponsibly exports nuclear and other weapons technologies to unreliable countries in the Middle East and elsewhere. It systematically represses proponents of democracy, free speech, and human rights through torture, intimidation, and executions.

Nothing has happened since the Congress last debated this subject to strengthen the arguments of those who wish to see an unconditional renewal of China's most-favored-nation status. In fact, the opposite has occurred. The collapse of the Soviet Union rendered the "China card," the notion that we need to support China as a balance to the Soviet Union, obsolete. Our economy has worsened and unemployment increased, showing more clearly the effects of unfair trade relations on America's workers.

New evidence of Chinese weapons proliferation has surfaced. And the Chinese Government has not let up on its relentless human rights violations both within China itself and in Tibet.

China does not deserve an unconditional renewal of most-favored-nation status. I hope that this time enough of my colleagues will reject the President's arguments and support attaching stringent conditions to China's most-favored-nation trade status. That will send the appropriate message to China's leaders: that America does care about human rights, that it does care about its workers and will protect them from unfair trade practices. It will certainly be a more fitting memorial to the victims of the Tiananmen Square massacre than the one President Bush bestowed on them today.•

COMMENDING JONATHAN DOWNING, CHEYENNE, WY

• Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize Jonathan Downing from Cheyenne, WY. Jonathan, a student at Cheyenne East High School, took first place in the Wyoming Coal Committee's scholarship competition with his essay entitled "Wyoming Coal—Helping Wyoming's Environment and Economy." This young man competed with other students from across the State of Wyoming. Jonathan's was chosen from among the top 18 essays, which were judged by a State senator and three State representatives.

This particular scholarship program is intended to encourage Wyoming's young people to understand how the coal industry has contributed to the State's economy and environment. As Jonathan notes, Wyoming coal is low in sulfur content, creating strong demand by electric utilities around the country. Wyoming coal has so little sulfur that its use allows utilities to comply with the Clean Air Act emission standards.

As Jonathan said with much insight, "it is of concern to the citizens of our State that we protect the land while being able to derive a living from it." It strikes me that such a balance between the proper use of resources and care for the land should be common sense for all of us.

Jonathan plans to attend the University of Wyoming in Laramie this fall to pursue a degree in English communication. If his essay is any indication, it may well be his calling.

I am sure all of my colleagues recognize the importance of these scholastic events. The Wyoming Coal Information Committee's scholarship encourages bright people like Jonathan to wrestle with this intellectual topic and articulate their views. I hope my colleagues join me in congratulating Jonathan Downing in his achievement. I thank the Wyoming Coal Committee for affording Wyoming youth this opportunity.

The essay follows:

WYOMING COAL—HELPING WYOMING'S ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY

He was only nine years old when his father died but he can still remember his Dad coming home at the end of the shift with the tell-tale rings of coal dust around his eyes, carrying his miner's hat tucked under his arm. It was hard work being a hewer[1] on the underground coal face of a Welsh coal pit in the 1940's. The working hours were long and conditions far from pleasant in what was then the deepest coal pit in Europe. Many men died from the "black lung". There wasn't a man in the pit who wanted this life for his son. His father had a dream of a better future for his son. He wanted him to receive an education so that he would know a better way of life. This miner was my Welsh grandfather. His dream became reality when his son received a good education, yet he hadn't lived long enough to know that. He would never know how my father emigrated from the great Welsh mining area to the great State of Wyoming, the largest coal producing state in the land. Yet the coal mines of Wyoming provide sharp contrast from their Welsh counterparts.

Wyoming coal . . . what does one think of when one hears "Wyoming coal"? I think of the "larger than life", open-pit mines with thick black seams of coal that I have seen when travelling through Campbell and Sweetwater Counties. Then I think of the schools that have been built with revenue and royalties from the coal industry. I also think of the green rolling prairies of Wyoming. Green rolling prairies? When people think of Wyoming they don't usually think of green rolling prairies! They think of the brownish-tan landscapes, mixed with the pleasant odor of sagebrush in the air and maybe a few antelope grazing with a rancher's cattle, but "green rolling prairies"? Well no, not until after reclamation!

The impact of Wyoming coal on the state's environment and economy cannot be overestimated. With the passage of the new Clean Air Act in 1990, the coal industry in Wyoming will take a much greater role in our economy and environment. First, let's discuss the environment.

For many years coal has had a great influence on Wyoming's environment. As an energy source Wyoming coal is one of the better environment-friendly coals because of its low sulfur content. Eastern coal contains 5 to 9 percent sulfur whereas Wyoming coal contains only 0.5 to 1.5 percent sulfur. In a time when power plants and factories must comply with stronger emission standards set by the Clean Air Act, the demand for Wyoming coal is becoming much greater than it has ever been. Ninety-eight percent of Wyoming's coal is used for electrical generation with most of the coal being exported to twenty-nine states across the nation.

It is of concern to the citizens of our state that we protect the land while being able to derive a living from it. This is true whether we are discussing farming, ranching, building, highway construction or the coal industry. Environmentalists accuse the coal industry of engaging in poor stewardship practices in Wyoming, but a simple trip through some of our "coal counties" proves otherwise. Environmentally sound, modern mining and reclamation techniques have been used in Wyoming which, along with our stringent air, land and water quality laws, ensure that land which has been affected by surface mining will be reclaimed to a condition which is better than the land's pre-mining condition. *Minerals Today* (February 1992) tells us that "less than one percent of the nation's land has been affected by mining, and of that, forty percent has already been reclaimed.

As the number one coal producer in the nation, Wyoming's coal mines produced 184,005,701 tons of coal in 1990. Wyoming coal is more competitive with that of other states due to the fact that it is less expensive to produce. It is environmentally desirable, and we have an estimated one trillion tons of coal lying beneath our feet!

Wyoming coal produces $200 million in payroll and over $400 million in taxes and royalties each year. In 1989 through severance tax revenues and royalty distributions Wyoming coal contributed $27.6 million to public schools, $33.8 million to the highway funds and a combined total of $3.9 million to capital construction projects for cities, towns and school districts.

Currently the population of the State of Wyoming is the lowest in the nation. Most states with low populations have to impose a state income tax to produce enough revenue to adequately fund schools, highways and construction projects. Wyoming's tremendous mineral revenues have enabled citizens to keep more of their hard earned incomes. Further, the coal industry has provided many Wyoming families with their means of support through high paying jobs.

[1] A hewer used a hand held pickax to break the coal from the coal seam. He would often work 10 hour shifts underground. It was one of the most physically challenging jobs in the mine.

Children in Wyoming are able to enjoy schools which are consistently rated among the best in the nation. Adults in practically every part of the State have access to higher education through seven fine community colleges. The State has an excellent University. Revenue from the coal industry has contributed greatly to enabling these educational institutions to receive adequate funding, build attractive campuses, attract good teachers and professors, and to offer strong academic and extra curricular programs. While providing an excellent education for their students, salaries from the employees of our schools circulate in the economies of even the smallest communities.

The people of Wyoming and the many travellers visiting or passing through our state have the benefit of well maintained highways. Our highways not only provide a pleasant trip while travelling but provide construction jobs for Wyoming citizens which in turn strengthen the local economies. This is possible, to a major degree, because of the $33.8 million dollars received by the State of Wyoming from the coal industry and used for highway projects.

The coal industry of Wyoming has certainly played a major part in providing us with a clean and beautiful environment in which to live and a secure economy on which we can depend.

I often wish that my grandfather could have been alive today to see how much safer, cleaner and environmentally sound coal mining is in Wyoming now compared to that of the Welsh mines of the 1940's. Had he had the opportunity to witness coal mining in Wyoming, I'm sure he would have been proud to have a son join him in the coal mines . . . maybe even a grandson!•

AGNEA ANTONIADES AND HER WORK TO CELEBRATE CULTURAL DIVERSITY

• Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would like today to commend the tireless work of Agnea Antoniades of St. Paul, MN. Through her efforts, the great State of Minnesota has designated the first Sunday of June as Ethnic American Day. With the designation, our State recognizes and celebrates the rich cultural diversity of our society. As Americans continue to struggle for equality and justice for all, we must not lose sight of the diverse heritage of our Nation. From the original indigenous Americans to those who arrived as immigrants; from those who arrived under the bondage of slavery to those fleeing persecution in their homelands, all Americans have benefited from the contributions made by our diverse and rich cultural history.

I commend Ms. Antoniades on her tireless work to promote awareness of our cultural diversity, and along with her and the people of Minnesota, I will be celebrating Ethnic American Day this Sunday.•

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN TAIWAN

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have expressed the desire that the United States should reward democratic reform in the Republic of China on Taiwan by ending the de facto ban on high-level contracts between our two Governments.

The world has experienced enormous changes in recent years. Nations all over the globe now trying the recipe for economic progress that is free markets and democracy. The United States has rightfully recognized the recent efforts many nations have made to liberalize both their markets and their political systems. We should not ignore Taiwan in this recognition.

In this context, it is appropriate to acknowledge an important recent event in Taiwan's political development. That event—on May 20—was the second anniversary in office of President Lee Teng-hui and Vice President Li Yuan-zu.

Taiwan's continuing democratic reforms underscore its importance in the world and also emphasize its continuing significance to our own economy. Taiwan is not only one of our largest trading partners, but it holds the world's largest foreign exchange reserves.

Resuming high-level contacts with Taiwan therefore serves two purposes. First, it will continue sending the important signal that the United States is rewarding democratic reform. But it also will facilitate our bilateral economic relationship by enabling greater understanding and cooperation in addressing many important trade issues, including those dealing with intellectual property rights.

Mr. President, the time for upgrading relations with Taiwan is now.•

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

• Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report serves as the scorekeeping report for the purposes of section 605(b) and section 311 of the Budget Act.

This report shows that current level spending is below the budget resolution by $1.7 billion in budget authority and above by $3.6 billion in outlays. Current level is $2.9 billion above the revenue floor in 1992 and $0.7 billion below the revenue floor over the 5 years, 1992–96. Since my last report the Congress has cleared for the President's signature H.R. 4900, a bill rescinding certain funding in fiscal year 1992. This action changes the current level for budget authority and outlays.

The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is $351.9 billion, $0.7 billion above the maximum deficit amount for 1992 of $351.2 billion.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 1, 1992.

Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1992 and is current through May 21, 1992. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated May 19, 1992, the Congress has cleared for the President's signature H.R. 4990, a bill rescinding certain funding in fiscal year 1992. This action changes the current level for budget authority and outlays.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 102D CONG., 2D SESS. AS OF MAY 21, 1992

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level	Current level +/− resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,270.7	1,269.0	−1.7
Outlays	1,201.7	1,205.3	+3.6
Revenues.			
1992	850.5	853.4	+2.9
1992–96	4,836.2	4,835.5	−.7
Maximum deficit amount	351.2	351.9	+.7
Debt subject to limit	3,982.2	3,832.4	−149.8
Off-budget:			
Social Security outlays:			
1992	246.8	246.8	
1992–96	1,331.5	1,331.5	
Social Security revenues:			
1992	318.8	318.8	
1992–96	1,830.3	1,830.3	

[1] Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 102D CONG., 2D SESS., SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 21, 1992

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			853,364
Permanents and other spending legislation	807,567	727,184	
Appropriation legislation	686,331	703,643	
Mandatory adjustments[1]	(1,041)	1,105	
Offsetting receipts	(232,542)	(232,542)	
Total previously enacted[2]	1,260,314	1,199,389	853,364
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Emergency unemployment compensation extension (Public Law 102–244)	2,706	2,706	
American Technology Preeminence Act (Public Law 102–245)			(3)
Technical Correction to the Food Stamp Act (Public Law 102–265)	(3)	(3)	
Further continuing appropriations, 1992 (Public Law 102–266)[4]	14,178	5,724	

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 102D CONG., 2D SESS., SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 21, 1992—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Extend certain expiring veterans' programs (Public Law 102-291)	(4)	(4)	
Total enacted this session	16,881(4)	8,427(4)	(3)
PENDING SIGNATURE			
1992 Rescissions (H.R. 4990)	(8,154)	(2,499)	
Total current level	1,269,041	1,205,318	853,364
Total budget resolution[5]	1,270,713	1,201,701	859,501
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution		3,617	2,863
Under budget resolution	1,672		

[1] Adjustments required to conform with current law estimates for entitlements and other mandatory programs in the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 121).

[2] Excludes the continuing resolution enacted last session (Public Law 102-145) that expired Mar. 31, 1992.

[3] Less than $500,000.

[4] In accordance with section 251(a)(2)(D)(i) of the Budget Enforcement Act, the amount shown for Public Law 102-266 does not include $107,000,000 in budget authority and $28,000,000 in outlays in emergency funding for SBA disaster loans.

[5] Includes revision under section 9 of the concurrent resolution on the budget (see p. S4055 of "Congressional Record" dated Mar. 20, 1992).

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.•

THE SUCCESS OF CHICAGO'S TEACHERS' ACADEMY FOR MATH AND SCIENCE

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Nation's Governors have called for American students to be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement by the year 2000. We have a long way to go, and only 8 short years, to reach that goal.

I rise today to applaud a Chicago program and its founder who have taken up that challenge. Dr. Leon M. Lederman is a Nobel Prize-winning physicist at the University of Chicago. He is well-known for his work in the laboratory, but less well-known is his work to strengthen America's elementary and secondary schools. His program will have a direct effect on the teaching and learning of math and science. But just as important, it will serve as a catalyst to help reform America's educational system.

When Dr. Lederman joined the University of Chicago a few years ago, he was drawn to the movement to reform Chicago's public schools. As many know, Chicago has implemented a bold reform plan which seeks to empower parents, teachers, principals, community members, the business and nonprofit sectors to raise academic achievement and spur real change in Chicago's public schools. Dr. Lederman wanted to help. In conjunction with others concerned about school reform, Dr. Lederman settled on an ambitious goal and a daring intervention strategy. The goal: To reform the educational process through improving students' math and science achievement. The strategy: To retrain the 17,000 teachers who teach those subjects, so that teachers, student, and their families are all engaged in learning. The Teachers' Academy for Math and Science was thus born on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology in September 1990.

The Teachers' Academy is a private, nonprofit organization which provides teachers intensive retraining, followed up by supplemental enrichment programs. Its technique is to involve the teacher, child, and parent as participants in the learning process. The academy is in its second year and has shown great promise, and has attracted some notable talent and support. However, much remains to be done so it can reach the thousands of teachers, and, in turn, the millions of students, it must in order to fulfill its goals.

I have visited the academy and have seen it work. I have seen that it can serve as a national model for teacher retraining. To that end, I will shortly introduce legislation that would provide the academy a secure funding source and ensure that its methods become available to schools throughout the Nation.

It has never been more important to influence the cycle that traps so many students in failure and despair. The Teachers' Academy can help by speeding our students on the way to becoming first in math and science achievement. Its methods should also stimulate a change in the classroom, and help raise our students' interest in school and academic achievement. As Dr. Lederman's remarks indicate, he is showing us a way to real change.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of Dr. Lederman's speech to the American Philosophical Society's symposium on the underclass of April 24, 1992, be inserted into the RECORD.

The speech follows:

TO CHANGE A CITY

(By Leon M. Lederman)

An adage I read in a business brochure calls for the courage to change the things that can be changed, the serenity to accept those that cannot be, and the wisdom to know the difference. I am chronologically advantaged enough to recall a Presidential candidate in the 1930's tell us: "one third of a nation is ill-housed, ill-clothed and ill-fed." Of course this was Franklin Roosevelt and he was talking about the underclass of 1930. So many things have happened since then. As a nation, we have grown immensely more affluent by any measure you may choose, we have had long periods of intense concern about the poor, the underclass, minorities * * * we have legislated equality, ruled against segregation, we have "Brown vs. Board of Education," we have an extensive welfare system, Head Start programs, at least some Head Start, and other public, private initiatives too numerous to know. But the 1930's assessment is still with us and although only a fool would say we have not made any progress, there seems to be an invariant—one third of a nation (still!) * * *.

This would seem to call for wisdom and serenity to conform to the adage but it is not always wisdom that shapes what one does * * * it wasn't wisdom that got me into the campaign I will tell you about. Frankly I'm not sure I know what it was. Perhaps it is arrogance, the arrogance of the scientist who has had some success in management or perhaps it's just unreasoned anger. I find myself being very angry these days but I'll try to control this and tell you what I know. It has to do with education. It has to do with public schools in large cities.

First I must tell you about my city—Chicago. With 410,000 students, it's the third largest school system in the nation. There are somewhat over 20,000 teachers and some 17,000 of them must teach some kind of math and science, largely in primary school. Like so many large cities, the school population is 88% minority, 12% Asian and white. So much for Brown vs. the Board of Education. Over 67% of the children come from families below the poverty level. The drop out rate is officially listed by the Board of Education as 45% but the more reliable estimate is that between 60 and 70% of the children never graduate from high school. For individual schools in the worst districts, the numbers can be in the high 80 percent. Chicago students do very poorly on national tests. Over half the high schools placed in the lowest one percentile of ACT scores.

Again, like all other cities in America, the streets and even the school corridors are unsafe—violence, drugs, gangs are part of the territory. Many school buildings are over 100 years old, they are over-crowded with gyms and corridors impressed into use as classrooms. Jonathan Kozol documents this so much more eloquently in his book, "Savage Inequalities." One interesting piece of data bearing on the resilience of the underclass fraction is the increase in births to single women compared to the total of live births.[1] In 1950, this was 2.9%, in 1990 it is 28%. What has this to do with education? Well one of the President's goals is that by the year 2000, all children will be ready for school. What does this mean? It means:

(1) supplemental nutrition problems for pregnant women and young children

(2) it means immunization

(3) it means prenatal care

(4) it means special attention to the babies born to poor women and

(5) it means encouraging, not discouraging family planning and sex education. Children that are part of these statistics have a high probability of being problem children in school: hyperactivity, low attention span, impaired hearing and vision, asthma and a variety of learning problems resulting from malnutrition and brain damage in utero—these children are not ready and very little is being done to change the numbers * * * "by the year 2000."

Our teachers tell us that one or two in a class can be handled without shortchanging the rest but more tends to lead to paralysis. Ernest Boyer's 1991 study indicates that 35 percent of the children in this nation are not ready for school when they enter kindergarten. With this as background, let's look again at Chicago, "* * * the worst school system in the nation," according to William Bennett, former Secretary of Education.

Something interesting happened in Chicago in 1988—a movement lead by outraged parents, eagerly assisted by university people, the private sector and many other elements of the city sharing the view of the public schools as a tragic and no longer tolerable disaster, combined to pass the most radical school reform law in the nation.

[1] I am indebted to Mr. Irvin Harris for information on the pre-school problem.

Today, at least in principle, Chicago has almost 600 new "corporations", the CEO (principal) is installed by a Board of Directors (local school councils—elected by citizens who live around the school) and he or she must run a successful operation or be dismissed. It is far too early to comment on this reform except for the obvious benefit of stirring up of interest by the parents and citizens in the process—in running for LSC, in voting and being, even in a limited way, enfranchised by the reform of the educational system.

I was drawn to the excited discussions of how to make school reform work after moving to The University of Chicago in 1989. Out of these discussions there arose an idea for how a group of interested parents, teachers, scientists and businessmen could intervene to make a difference. And so was created the Teachers' Academy for Math and Science which, miraculously opened on the campus of IIT in mid-Chicago in September of 1990.

This private, not-for-profit entity was formally created by a Council of Presidents (all the Universities in Chicago) and has, on its board, teachers, principals, scientists from universities, from two national labs near Chicago, private sector leaders, executives of some of Chicago's leading corporations, museum directors, the Chicago Teachers' Union, Urban League and the Hispanic equivalent, UNO, and representatives of the Mayor and Governor.

The intervention we had designed was a massive retraining of the teachers—those 17,000 teachers who must teach math and science and who, for the most part, were never trained to do so.

This is a very large and very complex program. With good will all around, one has still to tread on cross-cultural, political and ethnic egg shells. Yet, its the only program I know that has the scale to address the President's further goal of "being No. 1 by the year 2000." There are many reasons why the teachers in the Chicago Public Schools are inadequately trained and this raises a host of other problems * * *. Let me simply quote: "in the broad sweep of educational history, teacher education does not emerge as a potent force—the conditions one needs for vigorous, coherent and self renewing programs of teacher preparation are not in place." Even if they were, it would be at least a decade before this would show up with significant force to have an effect. When this happens, the Teachers' Academy, as now designed, will not be needed. But let me jump ahead here to assure you that our experience with the teachers has been very positive. We find that they care, they want to be better teachers, they hate to be required to teach things that they do not understand; there is a love of children there. In our view the ultimate tragedy is to have children arrive at school, having overcome whatever obstacles their lives provide, from their bed to the schoolroom, ready to learn only to discover in their child-wise way, that the teacher is merely and unhappily using time.

Our conviction is that the teacher is the key to a positive, zestful school experience and to deploying the newest techniques for teaching math and science: hands-on, activity based, children working together, talking and doing, the teacher not the authoritative giver of all wisdom but as mentor and guide. These new techniques act as a catalyst, engage the child and the teacher, and are designed to involve the parent or the grandparent. We didn't invent this: interventions of this kind were going on all over the country—one school here, two schools there, ten, twenty, fifty teachers. There were many programs going on in and around Chicago. The best ones had magical effects: Teachers were re-enthused, children entranced by the learn-play activity were no longer sitting passively at their places, praying that they not be called upon. Now they work together in groups—wrong answers are just as welcome as correct ones—the objective is thinking skills. Here, through math and science, there is a key to true reform of the entire educational process.

Our plan was to "do" the while city. Exploiting school reform, we would contract with the principal and the LSC. We quickly realized that the scale of our mission required in-service training that is, taking the teacher out of the classroom so we'd have to supply our own replacement teacher.

We hastily concocted a sixteen week intensive training program, realizing it would evolve in time. We supplemented this with afternoon, week-end and summer programs of follow-up enrichment, technology workshops, museum programs, every possible form of outreach. To get through 17,000 teachers, we planned to do 100 the first year, 1000 the second year and 2500 from then on until year eight when we could taper back to preservice teachers and follow-up programs.

Well, reality? We indeed managed 109 teachers the first year with about 1500 teachers attending our outreach programs. We are now in our second year. We are changing things and we'll be lucky if we get through 600 teachers. We have had over 3000 teachers attend our workshops and ancillary programs. We intend to have a full-time staff person in all the schools we cover for one year as one component of what amounts to a permanent follow-up program. However, we are frustrated by the difficulties of recruiting capable staff and even more by the inexplicable difficult of securing funding.

Too many details. Let me summarize the status and my conclusions.

The good news: it works! Or to state it more carefully, it seems to show promise of working. In addition to built-in pretest and post-test measures, we record comments from teachers, principals and parents as well as our own in-school staff specialists. We measure hours of science and math taught in our schools and in the schools not yet involved and we have begun to compare truancy rates. In spite of a reasonable number of mistakes, the palpable enthusiasm of teachers who should be "burn-outs" and principals is evident. We are concentrating on K-4 now, next year we'll extent it to K-8.

If early school education can influence the cycle that traps so many minorities—the cycle of failure and drop-out, of poverty and crime, of teen age pregnancy and new candidates for the entrapment, then we have, I believe, shown a way to genuine change.

The bad news: it's an expensive program although the other things the City needs are even more expensive. When in full swing, the Chicago effort will need $30M a year * * * under present circumstances, the balk can only come from the Federal Government. We were enthusiastically supported by DOE Secretary James Watkins and succeeded in getting start-up funds from the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation. An early grant from David Hamburg's Carnegie Corporation was enormously helpful. Last year we raised $4M from the Feds, $2M from the State and about $2M from private sector contributions. This year the State (like so many other states) looks hopeless, the city even more so. Floods are also not helpful. Our expectations for Federal support have been scaled back from $15M to $6M or $7M. Support from foundations and businesses continues to be strong but it takes a huge effort to raise one or two million dollars if you are not Harvard or Stanford.

From the beginning we have received the following criticisms of our program: What good is it to fix teachers when the family support is lacking or when learning impairment is already so advanced that a great kindergarten teacher is too late * * * or when the buildings are so old and crumbling or when * * *? My response has always been that the critic is indeed correct but that if we waited for a total solution, nothing would ever start, so we'll continue with the teachers and encourage the critic to get busy on these other things. It seems absolutely clear to me that our society had better get serious about all these issues and we must do it soon.

I have thought deeply about how we do things in this country. Suppose that what we are doing makes sense. There are 25 cities like Chicago that could do similar things. We are not marketing the specific programs adopted although we are trying to document all of our efforts and mistakes. What is unique is the marshalling of all the intellectual resources of a community to a purpose. The commitment of University President(s), CEO's of major corporations, scientists, professional educators should be enough to sway a funding agency. However, conventional reviews by the professional bureaucrats is still the rule. To extend the kind of thing we are doing to 25 cities and perhaps to intervene in an equal number of poor rural areas would require something under $1 billion. In Washington, they look at you as if you are really not with it—one billion dollars! But is this really too much to invest in the underclass—to provide a lifeline, an escape ladder out of ignorance and poverty?

Yes there is indeed a fiscal crisis yet the Republican President proposed and the Democratic Congress approved a military budget for 1993 which will allocate something like $140 billion dollars to defend Europe against an attack from the East! Is there any wonder at the irritation of the voters or the apparent frustration of legislators who are quitting or my own and, hopefully your personal anger?

My mood alternates—I oscillate from gratitude at getting any help at all (even $6 million is a huge sum of money) all the way to discouragement with the sheer weight of bureaucracy that one must penetrate in order to get anything done. This applies to the Federal Government, to the State, the City, the School System, even the University. The teacher enhancement initiative is very often greeted with great praise: "visionary," "bold," "practical" are some of the accolades. Yet, in spite of leaders at the highest level who do grasp the issues, it is also clear that they live under constraints and one still has to prevail way down in the bureaucracies where decisions are made and checks are written. All over town one finds highly skilled professionals in the best sense of the word but also in the worst sense of the word. The rhetoric is echoed: "we must break the mold, we must have radical reform," but the real understanding of these words, the real sense of urgency, the awesome implications of an existing teachers corps in which, for example, only 35,000 out of 1 million elementary school teachers (3.5%!) are specifically trained for math and science teaching, these are rarely appreciated—no, there is no priority for the underclass, it creates a most discouraging block to action.

POSTSCRIPT: A CITIES INITIATIVE

There are many successful interventions; we read and hear about wonderful people who, by the force of their energy and creativity, will turn around an entire school or two. The pre-school initiatives are another case in point. But how do we begin a national deployment of what works? How do we pull together the crucial ingredients? Let me, at substantial risk, propose something really new. Suppose we define a Special Administrator for Cities, charged with the task of bringing the educational achievements of our larger inner cities up to the standards we want our nation to have. This must include teacher retraining, some equipment, e.g. computers, a large extension of Head Start and the other early intervention programs which are needed to make children ready for school. This Special Administrator must be educationally expert, nationally known, "street smart" and city-wise. Suppose this Special Administrator, appointed by the President with the concurrence of key Congressional committee chairs, is given a budget appropriation which allows the Administrator to encourage the formation of consortia of the kind I have described for Chicago. Cities would organize these not-for-profit groupings to apply for Federal funds. The matching could be 50% Federal, 50% State, City and private sector contributions. The grants might be for a period of five years whereupon the Federal contribution begins to be reduced as local sources increase. Total appropriations for this Cities Initiative might grow to something like $5B/year some of which may be reallocated from other agencies.

The Administrator could report to a Commission on the Cities which might include the Secretaries of Education, HHS, Energy, the NSF, NIH and NASA Directors as well as the President's Science Advisor and Domestic Council chair. The size of staff of the Administrator should be legally restricted since we want to keep this new (bypass) artery as free-flowing as possible. A proposal by a City should merely be authenticated e.g. the President personally asks and receives a pledge of deep commitment from the President of the local University, the CEO of the Corporation, the Chairperson of the City School Board, the Mayor and Governor, etc. No site visits or peer review or Washington second guessing is needed. Once a year, the Administrator would ask the relevant agencies to form a visiting committee to gauge and document progress, to insure fiscal integrity and to improve intercity sharing of experience and data. One could start with three cities and gradually work up to the twenty-five or so cities that contain a large fraction of what we have been calling the underclass. Let's find the courage to change things.●

IN HONOR OF KENTUCKY'S BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is a privilege to rise today in honor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky's bicentennial celebration. While June 1, marked the anniversary of Kentucky's recognition as the 15th member of the United States, this date also represents a significant historic milestone for America as a whole.

In our Nation's earliest days, a profound belief in freedom and a fervent desire to foster the benefits of opportunity brought men and women from their homelands to the North American Colonies. In time, these same values caused the imaginations and talents of explorers and entrepreneurs to turn to the lands west of the Appalachian Mountains. When the first farmer's plow turned the richness of Kentucky's soil, it revealed not only the aspirations of one family, but established the means by which millions would seek the American dream.

Kentucky's heritage reflects the desire of every American to improve one's welfare through the development of one's talents and resources. While the accomplishments of Kentucky's great leaders and innovators are found throughout the annals of history, our true heros are the men and women whose names fill the record books of every county courthouse. These individuals chose to manifest their dreams by traveling into the wilds of unknown territories. Whether they ventured out into the uncertainties of nature or society, they invested all of their physical and mental energies in achieving the goals they held most dear.

The spirit of these pioneers is exemplified by the characters depicted in the 1992 Kentucky Chautauqua sponsored by the Kentucky Humanities Council. The Kentucky Chautauqua will enable the citizens of the Commonwealth to share in the lives of predecessors who display the resiliency, pride, and faith that brought Kentucky to its 200th anniversary. Mr. President, so that my colleagues may better appreciate the 1992 Kentucky Chautauqua, I ask that an article by the Louisville Courier-Journal appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

Throughout this year, communities across the State will gather to celebrate Kentucky's birthday, each taking the opportunity to share its unique traditions and talents with its neighbors. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I invite our fellow States to share in the wealth of Kentucky's heritage by joining us in celebration of the Commonwealth's bicentennial.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville (KY) Courier-Journal, May 3, 1992]

IN CHARACTER FOR KENTUCKY—BICENTENNIAL IS REVIVING SOME LEADING FIGURES IN STATE'S HISTORY

(By Andrew Adler)

Kentucky's 200 years of statehood have produced no shortage of spectacular personalities, be they governors, abolitionists, entertainers or madams. Some are celebrated by history; others are relegated to its dustiest corners. All, however, had significant impact on the commonwealth.

The Kentucky Humanities Council is determined that they won't be forgotten. As part of the state's bicentennial observances, the society matched 10 actors with an equal number of characters, set them up with period costumes and booked them for performances in each of the State's 120 counties.

It's all part of Kentucky Chautauqua, named after a tradition of touring religious/educational shows founded in Chautauqua Lake, N.Y., during the late 19th century. The current process began about a year ago, when the society mailed out 6,000 brochures inviting suggestions on appropriate characters.

Prospective presenters "either had to have some drama experience or be a scholar," project director Kathleen Pool explained.

About 120 people responded. Thirty were asked to audition, and 10 were selected. Six of them will give their opening presentations May 15 and 16 at Louisville's J.B. Speed Art Museum.

Reticent, they are not.

"I have the reputation, I suppose, of being pretty loud, pretty lively in class," said Carol Crowe-Carraco, a history professor at Western Kentucky University in Bowling Green. She's portraying Mary Carson Breckinridge, who founded the Frontier Nursing Service in 1925 and who trained generations of American and British midwives.

An acknowledged expert on Breckinridge's life and career, Crowe-Carraco has spent a decade researching her work. "I think I admire her because she recognized how effective the use of nurse-midwives could be, before the medical profession became cognizant of the idea," she said.

Crowe-Carraco and her nine Chautauqua associates were allowed to hire consultants in drama, costuming and—if necessary—scholarly background. Everything is being paid for by a $124,000 grant—$50,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities, $50,000 from the Kentucky Bicentennial Commission and $24,000 from the Humanities Council.

The one-person productions last about 45 minutes. Under terms of the program, any county could reserve two free presentations from any character. Actors receive $300 per show and are guaranteed at least 24 performances.

Presenters vary widely in their experience. Jimmy Lowe, who is taking on the state's late Poet Laureat Jesse Stuart, teaches English in Barren County, Ky., and has written a children's biography of the author.

George J. McGee, Jr., who portrays Baptist minister and bourbon distiller Elijah Craig, is director of theater in the communications arts department of Georgetown (Ky.) College.

David S. DeWitt, who plays post-Revolutionary War land grabber Joseph Galloway, is a Centre College drama graduate who has acted as an extra in film and television.

Laura Lee Duncan O'Connell, who plays Moonlight Schools adult-education founder Cora Wilson Stewart, joins husband Michael Duncan O'Connell in her presentation. (He portrays several related characters.) Both are performing artists-in-residence at Morehead State University.

And then there's Dick "Richard" Albin, "a banjo player, storyteller and, for want of a better word, a comedian" who portrays vauderville artist Emmit Davenport. "My father used to do vaudeville," Albin explained, "and all this got me to thinking that Emmit Davenport would be a good character. This has been in the works for almost two years."

Albin, a native of Tulsa, Okla., grew up in Arkansas and lived for a time in the Red River Gorge area. He taught theater at the old Kentucky Southern College in Louisville. Portraying Davenport is a means of "paying homage to some roots," he said.

"The story is not a performance of Emmit onstage," said Albin, who now lives in Nashville. Instead, "I'm backstage getting ready for a performance," and later "I reminisce

with the audience. It's almost a stream-of-consciousness format. Then when I say, 'I hear my cue to go onstage,' I take an old microphone and do a routine."

Steve Wise, an alumnus of Actors Theatre of Louisville, has spent much of his time since 1986 playing abolitionist Cassius Marcellus Clay. Wise's Chautauqua effort is adapted from his existing show, "The Lion of White Hall," which he has performed more than 500 times across the state.

"I have gone back through and rethought the whole thing," he said. "I'm trying to be as truthful to history as possible, though that is difficult with Clay," who was embroiled in numerous violent incidents both before and after retiring to Madison County, Ky.

"People find him fascinating everywhere; he was just a really colorful character," said Wise, quipping that most audiences respond to the saga's "sex and violence." Still, "the deeper I got into research, (the more) I realized that it was quite an important story that had to be told. Clay thought that he did more than anyone else, including Lincoln, to free the slaves. I think it's great fun for me to explode the myths of history."

Striving for human rights also distinguished the life of Elisha W. Green. Born into slavery, he gained fame in 1883 for refusing to give up his train set to a white man. "He was just a minister who stood for human dignity," said George T. Vaughn, an assistant professor of English at Maysville (KY.) Community College, who portrays Green.

Vaughn calls Green "one of those unsung heroes, and I think everyone should know about him. He was just as effective as our modern heroes and heroines."

Though Vaughn's previous stage experience was limited to "one line in one play as an undergraduate" at Tougaloo (Miss.) College he isn't worried. "I've sung since I was knee-high to a duck," he said.

Vaughn, who uses a script written by John Klee, a history professor at the Maysville college, says simply that he seeks "to relay (a) message, especially to a lot of young people, who can look only as far back as Martin Luther King. But there were a lot of great blacks before him that set him on his journey, but were overlooked."

Green's credo: "Nobody has to give up any thing if they stand fast," Vaughn, said.

It is something of a leap from Elisha Green to Belle Brezing, the illustrious Lexington madam, whose tombstone read, "Blessed Be the Pure in Heart."

"Until she was closed down in 1917" said Nancy Sherburne of the character she portrays, "she ran what was probably the most elegant parlor house—brothel if you will of the South. Not much is known about her clientele because that was one of her claims to fame: She was very discreet. We do know that she was born in Lexington, and about her childhood, which was pretty rough. Her mama slept around; her father beat her she was seduced at the age of 12 and had a baby at 16."

Pretty pungent stuff, so much so that a few counties have said "No, thanks" to her charms. In other quarters, however, Brezing is quite sought after.

"She's very popular with women's clubs," Pool reported. "We want something that's historically accurate, and she's part of history. You can't change that."

"I have grown very fond of her," said Sherburne, an artist-in-residence for the Kentucky Arts Council. "She was a lady in a very unladylike profession."

Sherburne's script was prepared by her husband, historical novelist James Sherburne. "It's done in very good taste," she said, and "is pretty theatrical—a play as opposed to a lecture."

Vic Hellard Jr., director of the Legislative Research Commission in Frankfort, isn't worried about his impending travels as Gov. Edwin Porch Morrow. Most of his trips "will be on weekends with maybe 2 or 2½ days of vacation time."

Meanwhile he's doing his best to maintain his professional equillibrium. He's rehearsing in private, for instance, and sparing his office colleagues. "I've tried not to bore them too much," he said. "They are around politicians every day."

The Speed museum performances scheduled for May 15 are Elijah Craig, 1 p.m.; Cora Wilson Stewart, 2:15 p.m.; Cassius Marcellus Clay, 3:30 p.m. The May 16 schedule is Belle Brezing, 1 p.m. Mary Breckinridge, 2:15 p.m.; and Jesse Stuart, 3:30 p.m.

Admission is free on a first-come basis.●

JUNTA PATRIOTICA CUBANA

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask that a letter from the Junta Patriotica Cubana relating to current situation in Cuba be printed in the RECORD and encourage Members and their staffs to read the document.

Certainly, I believe a Communist Cuba's days are numbered. Freedom and democracy will ultimately prevail, and it should be the United States' goal to ensure those fighting for freedom in Cuba receive the necessary support to bring about those changes.

The letter follows:

JUNTA PATRIOTICA CUBANA,
Washington, May 18, 1992.

Honorable Chairman of the Twenty-Second Ordinary Period of Sessions of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (O.A.S.):

Honorable Ministers of Foreign Relations:

Honorable Ambassadors and Representatives of the American States:

Dintinguished Representatives of the Americas:

The Americas, as a whole, geographically and historically, have a right to participate in the restructuring of the new world order, based upon freedom, democracy, market economy, unrestricted respect for human rights and security.

The Inter-American System, the most prestigious and oldest regional organism in the world, has made a great contribution to the consolidation of the Judeo-Christian values and principles upon which our civilization is based. That is why, when this General Assembly gathers, the world sets its attention on our tasks and the Americas become, once again, the continent of hope.

We, born in the Cuban State that is a part of the Inter-American System and of the OAS, in compliance with reciprocal historical obligations, as well as exercising a right, have come to reiterate to you, once more and perhaps for the last time, what the Cuban State, as a member of the Inter-American System and of the OAS, respectfully demands of you, in your capacities as representatives of the peoples of the Americas, tired about the lack of interest that many of the governments have shown regarding the drama endured by the noble and suffering Cuban people during these long and cruel 33 years of communist regime. That is why we see ourselves forced to reiterate our complaints.

This General Assembly of the OAS gathers precisely on the year of the 500th anniversary of the encounter between Europe and the Americas (1492–1992), and vis-a-vis the collapse of the totalitarian system implemented by the Marxist-Leninist Socialism, which crisis must reach, in its full scope, the last Stalinist-Marxist-Leninist redoubt in Cuba, and on the 102nd anniversary of the Inter-American System.

Precisely now a new horizon is opening for humanity with the total failure of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and with the Inter-American System scoring the greatest victory in its long history. It was here, in the Americas, in 1962 at Punta del Este, Uruguay, where the most transcendental political statement by the Americas in this century was made: "The Marxist-Leninist doctrine is incompatible with the Inter-American System." History has proven us right: Not only is the Marxist-Leninist doctrine incompatible with the inter-American system, but it is also incompatible with the human dignity in all latitudes of the planet. That is why it has failed and shall be swept from the face of the Earth, after having been proven that it only was a "tragic Utopia."

Now it can be perceived with greater clarity why the communist regime of Cuba was automatically separated from the Inter-American System, while the Cuban State remains a member of the System and of the OAS. Today, that government is much more incompatible than when its incompatibility was declared.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE POLITICAL, ECONOMICAL, IDEOLOGICAL, MORAL AND SPIRITUAL INTEGRATION

Nobody can deny that the Cuban State is a member of the Inter-American System and of the OAS, as well as of this General Assembly, as stated in their agreements and the ample recognition by your previous deliberations. Being this so, that State must have some form of representation, thus "We are the voice of those who have no voice."

Some have tried to "integrate" the Cuban Socialist-Marxist-Leninist regime to the Inter-American System and to the OAS, and they have committed a serious historical mistake, a political, moral and ideological myopia that has affected the Americas very dearly. They have not been able to achieve it thus far, nor shall they be able to attain it in the future.

Even the least knowledgeable are aware that, in order for two or more things to get integrated, certain requirements in the physical, ideological, political, economical and moral realms must be accomplished; some factors must coincide. In the case of the present government of Cuba, none of these requisites are present, and no factors are coinciding.

The Prime Minister of Spain, Hon. Felipe Gonzalez, upon answering a question from journalists in his recent visit to Washington, about whether the government of Cuba could be integrated into the OAS, responded: "Antagonist systems cannot be politically integrated, and such different economic regimes cannot be integrated either."

It is totally impossible to integrate, "to make compatible" a Stalinist-Marxist-Leninist system with democratic regimes. That cannot be conceived, even as a hypothesis. There is no possibility whatsoever for any coincidence.

It is not possible, either, "to make compatible" a totalitarian economic system, in which there is total control of the economy by the State, bringing about a total destruction of economic freedom, of private initia-

tive, with market-oriented regimes that have economic freedom and liberty for private initiatives.

Furthermore, this General Assembly of the OAS has neither jurisdiction nor competence to give admission to a government such as the present Cuban regime, that was automatically separated from the Inter-American System and from all of its organisms, especially the OAS, by the Reciprocal Assistance Treaty, better known as the Treaty of Rio, whose protocol, in accordance with American International Law, is a part of the Inter-American System. That is why any agreement that would be intended for enactment in order to amend, change or delete that incompatibility, would have to be enacted through the Treaty of Rio, and since this General Assembly has been convened under the OAS Charter, it lacks the authority to grant admission to the Communist regime of Cuba.

On the other hand, which country in the Americas, which of the present governments of the Americas would be willing to have the burden of historical responsibility, not only to facilitate entry to the Communist regime into the OAS, but what is even more serious: to make the Marxist-Leninist doctrine compatible with the inter-American system. That would be, not only a serious mistake but something worse than that: "A STUPIDITY," as Talleyrand told Napoleon upon commenting about a known crime: "Sire, that is more than a crime, it is stupidity."

How could we make the Marxist-Leninist system compatible with the Santiago resolution about democracy, enacted unanimously, and which not only was and is constant with the OAS Charter and with the Inter-American System, created to promote, defend and assist development and to maintain representative democracy in this continent as the irreplaceable political system, but which also set its general parameters, i.e.: Self-determination of the people to elect its rulers freely; unrestricted respect for human rights and guarantees for their own security and that of neighboring countries and of the hemisphere (the latter implies the elimination of arms races). We were in Santiago de Chile when such transcendental agreements were adopted, and we had the high privilege of participating in their adoption, from our position of ex-officio representatives of the Cuban State, a member of that Assembly.

The Resolution adopted regarding the "coup d'etat" in Haiti, which overthrew the democratically elected President, Jean Bertrand Aristide, who albeit not being the prototype of democratic president that we would want for our nations, does represent the constitutional and democratic legitimacy in Haiti. That is why the OAS Resolution refers to the Santiago Resolution, respect for human rights and guarantees for security in a state of law.

Venezuela was about to fall into the category of a "coup d'etat" such as Haiti, and the support of the OAS for the democratically elected government was prompt, in reiterating the formidable democratic proclamation about the Santiago de Chile Resolution.

Peru would not be far behind in producing a "sui-generis" coup d'etat: The democratically-elected president assumes extraordinary powers outside of the constitution, violates the constitutional rhythm and dismisses Congress and the Judiciary Power, plus suspending constitutional guarantees for a period of time.

Again, the OAS convenes in an extraordinary session and again adopts similar measures as those for Haiti, taking into account the differences between both coups d'etat and the political features of each country, but the important thing is that in the Peruvian case the same arguments are repeated, which we have already learned in the Americas to apply to any coup d'etat or to any dictatorship, be it leftist or rightist.

The Santiago de Chile Resolution about democracy is a landmark in the struggle of the Americas on behalf of the principles and values of our Judeo-Christian civilization, and in the enforcement and exercise of all democratic rights of our peoples, as well as the enforcement of a state of law and unrestricted respect for Human rights.

After having set these principles and having embraced these ideals by the founders of the Americas, it is not even possible to imagine that a troglodyte regime, that declares itself to be "Marxist-Leninist or Death," that has violated human rights in a dual dimension: institutional violation and human violation, where a state of law does not exist, and where the democratic system cannot exist, because the latter is incompatible with the totalitarian dictatorship, could be admitted into the Inter-American System and the OAS.

Jose Marti, the Apostle of Cuban Independence, said: "To see a crime in silence is the same as to commit it." Now, when some political and "revolutionary" leaders in the Americas are tearing their garments upon hearing about any human rights violation by rightist governments, we would like to see who, by "subsequent alliance," would be willing to legitimize a convicted and self-avowed Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist regime, or who would dare to "wash it in the Jordan River of the Inter-American System," in trying to reintegrate said regime into the System and the OAS.

Over 42,000 Cubans have been executed by firing squads on the death wall, while over 300,000 Cubans, male and female, have been through the Communist dungeons as political prisoners. There has existed, and there still exists, a "plantado" political group of prisoners, made up by men and women who do not accept the so-called Communist "rehabilitation."

A million and a half Cubans in exile, scattered upon the whole geography of the Americas and the world, constitute in themselves, without need for any further investigation, a painful reality of a nation of the Americas that awaits her brethren from the Continent of Hope, to give them solidarity in their fight. Our Apostle, Jose Marti, in his struggle on the last century for the freedom of Cuba, said: "I am not asking cooperation from the countries of the Americas, for fear that they may deny it and dishonor themselves." How right Marti was!

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has prepared seven special reports, several annual reports and it has now resolved to prepare the eighth report, because the subjective and objective circumstances that facilitate the violations against human rights are still present.

Said Commission, in view of the continuous pattern of violations of human rights, has stated in condemning the communist Cuban regime:

"The exposition performed along this section evidences the extremes reached by the government of Cuba in its repression of any manner of dissent. For that purpose, the government utilizes all resources derived from legislation enacted in order to subjugate the rights of the individual to the demands of the State which, in these cases, are those of a small group in power. This feature is the one that led the Commission to qualify the present political Cuban system as a totalitarian one, in the Seventh Report about the Status of human rights in Cuba, and to indicate that the state of law does not exist in that country."

In this paragraph of the report it must be underlined that the Commission charges the Stalinist satellite regime of Cuba with the following:

A. Institutional violation of human rights.

B. Having a totalitarian regime.

C. Being a tyranny.

D. That there does not exist a State of law in Cuba. (We have denounced and proven that, where a state of law does not exist, human rights are not respected).

E. That the rule of law does not exist in Cuba.

Not only are these violations maintained, but they also extend into an even wider area of opponents and dissidents, greater than in the past, against whom all kinds of violations are exerted, from the assaults by mobs in the so-called "repudiation acts" to physical aggressions by members of the secret police and militia. It is an inhuman and degrading system.

Institutional violation of human rights is inherent to the Marxist-Leninst system, without which violations it could not survive. We could mention many articles of the so-called Socialist Constitution of 1976, of the Penal Code and of all of the legislation in force, which they call the "Socialist Legality." In the latter, albeit it may seem paradoxical, human rights are "legally violated"; it would suffice to mention Article 61 of the Socialist Constitution in order to better understand the substance of the institutional violation that we have documented and which is known as the "Benedi Doctrine."

"Article 61. None of the freedoms recognized for citizens can be exerted against the dispositions in the Constitution and the laws, nor against the existence and purposes of the Socialist State, nor against the decision of the Cuban people to build Socialism and Communism. The violation of this principle is punishable."

After 33 long years, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, convened at Geneva last March, resolved to appoint a Special Counsel to investigate the violations of human rights in Cuba. In that 53-member Commission, to add insult to injury, one of the members is the very Communist regime of Cuba. Condemnation is not done there only for violating human rights, because if the violating country has the necessary number of votes, as it has been happening with nations that one way or another were in the Soviet Union's orbit, they were not condemned although they might have been the greatest violators of human rights; but those other violators outside of the Soviet orbit not only had a Special Counsel appointed against them, but they were later condemned. We have nothing to object against condemning those countries which violate human rights, whatever they may be, but we object to the procedure. Justice never reached the violators, because the procedure impeded final condemnation. That is awful, to say the least. However, in the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the OAS, what has always mattered has been the justice of the cause, whatever the regime may have been, whether rightist or leftist. That is the way justice is done. We believe that this has been a triumph of justice over procedure, what has happened at Geneva, in

this opportunity with the Cuban case, although we must underline that the totalitarian Cuban regime has already announced that it will not comply with the agreements of the UN's Commission on Human Rights, that it will not allow it to visit Cuba in order to carry out its task. Should that happen, we ask of those countries that are members of this Assembly, and which are also members of that Commission, to request that the totalitarian regime be expelled from the UN's Commission on Human Rights, because its presence there constitutes an affront.

To add insult to injury, there is the fact that has astonished many, since while the UN's Commission on Human Rights appoints a Special Counsel against the Communist regime of Cuba in order to investigate violations of human rights, it also elects a member of the Castroite regime on a vote of 38 against 15 to be a member of the most important Commission on Minorities, after preferring the Communist regime of Cuba, a violator of human rights, over the candidate from Costa Rica, who has clean and impeccable credentials of capability and respect for human rights.

THE PRESENT CUBAN REGIME, A SATELLITE OF THE SOVIET UNION

We wish to underline, for all pertinent effects, that the present Cuban Communist regime has been a satellite of Soviet Imperialism in the Americas, and in order to prove that we are going to transcribe what the Cuban communists wrote into the preamble to the so-called Socialist Constitution, enacted on February 24, 1976.

They deleted the name of God from the 1940 Constitution upon taking over the government. That Constitution was the most advanced and perhaps the most progressive in the world, and in the Constitution that they enacted in 1976 they maintained the deletion of the name of God. And not only that, but also anything that had to do with the transcendental sense of life, the vertical dimension. The preamble of the Socialist Constitution presently in force in Cuba reads: "Supported by: . . . the fraternal friendship, the assistance and cooperation of the Soviet Union. . ."

What would you think of any country in Latin America that would write such a thing into its Constitution, regarding the United States? Nobody has ever imagined such an ominous subjugation, because all nations in this hemisphere are free, independent and sovereign, and they have juridical and political equality, and they have a vote and no right to a veto in the OAS.

That preamble of the Socialist Constitution of Cuba is in force, although the Soviet Union may have disappeared. Now they will have to change the name and write Russia instead.

Consenting with that subjugation, in obedience to Soviet Imperialism and to serve the interests of the communist area and especially those of the Soviet Union, the totalitarian Cuban regime risked the annihilation of the Cuban people in an atomic extermination. That is not our assertion, it is documented on recent official statements from the totalitarian regime, whereby they said that they had taken atomic projectiles into Cuba in 1962, not to protect the regime, but to serve the Socialist camp and the Soviet Union. It was thus stated in Havana, in a recent meeting held there to commemorate the "missile crisis," and it also appears on an official document issued by the present government of Cuba, on official letterhead, distributed at the United Nations in New York.

In order to keep Cuba as a Soviet base, with a base for nuclear submarines at Cienfuegos, as well as an electronic surveillance base at Villa Lourdes, close to Havana, and the whole of Cuba at the service of the Soviet Imperialism, the totalitarian regime has not signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco on Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. If the present government of Cuba does not make nuclear weapons, nor it had the intention of allowing the Soviet Union to locate atomic weapons in Cuba again, as a guarantee and signal of good faith for the nations of the Americas, it should have signed that Treaty. But it did not before, nor has it done it now. It continues to maintain the option and the menace.

Furthermore, we want to remind you, Honorable Chairman and Representatives of the Americas, that in the recent meeting held in Havana to deal with the Missile Crisis, attended by representatives of the former Soviet Union, who were participants in said crisis, there were also representatives from the United States and from Cuba. It was there proven, once more, the presence of nuclear missiles with an intermediate range and with long range; but what alarmed everybody, there and outside, was what the Soviet general in charge of the missiles in Cuba at that time, said in the presence of then-Secretary of Defense of the United States, Robert McNamara: The Soviet general said that they had in Cuba at that time, also short-range missiles (30 miles) and added something unheard of: That he had the authority from the Soviet Union to launch those missiles against the United States, in case of an invasion from the latter, without any need to consult with Moscow. McNamara was astonished, and with surprise on his face he said: "A) We did not know that you had short-range nuclear misiles" and, "B) did you believe that, if you launched those nuclear missiles against our forces, we would not have retaliated?." "We would have reacted with the same arms against Cuba and the Soviet Union." Do you image, Honorable Representatives of the Americas, how close we were to witness the disappearance of Cuba in a nuclear holocaust, and how close the world was to a nuclear war? And, is that totalitarian Communist regime of Cuba the one that some have wanted to bring to the OAS? What for? That would be rewarding infamy. But the free nations of the Americas shall never commit that infamy, and should any one do it by mistake or ignorance, it would be condemned by History.

GEOPOLITICS AND GEOSTRATEGY IN CUBA

Cuban communists, with Castro, took Cuba out of its Geopolitics and incorporated it into the Soviet Geostrategy. That is an uncontested fact. In the Cold War, Cuba was a pawn handled from Moscow with the cooperation of all the communists in the Americas and the world, with crypto-communists, socialists and a sizable part of leftist intellectuals (later repented belatedly), with the North American "progressive liberals," in order to make believe that the Cuban affair was an autochthonous revolution, "as green as the palm trees." The deceit was in full, and Castro himself recognized it when he states that "if he had said during his guerrialla fight years that he was a communist, he would never have attained power." "Upon admission from a party, no proof is necessary," it was previously said. That communist movement that seized power in Cuba had no precedents in the Americas, since none of those attempted had it success. Later on, the Sandino-communism emulated the feat. In El Salvador, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Chile, Colombia, Bolivia, Uruguay and Peru, they have kept trying up to now, with great injuries to all of those people.

The Socialist-Marxist movement is very far from having been finished in Latin America, albeit it may have disguised itself under various names and programs; at the core, it is the same movement already defeated in Europe and on the way to oblivion because of the failure of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. But the Communist Geostrategy is still in force, at several levels, in our Continent. To overlook this would be a historical error with serious consequences.

THE EMBARGO, NOT AGAINST THE CUBAN STATE, BUT AGAINST THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT OF CUBA, A TOTALITARIAN AND MARXIST-LENINIST REGIME

Now, when the Organization of American States has imposed an embargo against the revolting military in Haiti, it is timely that we will recall what has happened to the embargo imposed against Cuba, which has two stages differentiated in time, but with the same objective:

Embargo of the OAS against Cuba

The leader of democracy in the Americas, Don Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, denounced before the Consultation Meeting of Foreign Relations Ministers convened in accordance with the Treaty of Rio, that the Castro regime had intervened in the internal affair of Venezuela and had attacked his country. The Consultation Meeting of Foreign Relations Ministers of the Americas condemned the Castro Communist regime for its intervention in the internal affairs of Venezuela, violating its sovereignty and attacking its people.

In Resolution No. 1 of the Ninth Consultation meeting, among other agreements, the following were adopted:

Article 3, item b): "That the Governments of the American States shall interrupt all of their exchanges, be they commerical, direct or indirect, with Cuba, except foods, medicines and medical equipment, that can be sent to Cuba for humanitarian reasons, and c) that the Governments of the American States shall interrupt all maritime transportation between their countries and Cuba, with the exception of necessary transportation for reasons of humanitarian shipments."

In Article 5, the possibility of the use of legitimate defense is left open, individually or collectively, "which may include the use of armed force . . ."

As we can clearly see on Item 5 of the above mentioned Resolution No. 1, the sphere of action for the institution of legitimate defense, individually or collectively, was already open for those actions "which show the features of intervention or aggression," concretely applied to the present Government of Cuba.

The trade embargo has a continental dimension in that Resolution No. 1.

THE UNITED STATES EMBARGO AGAINST THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

This embargo was established in 1961 by then-President John F. Kennedy, after the Cuban Government, with premeditation and in accordance with the Geostrategic Plans of the Soviet Union, had already resolved to provoke and attack the United States, in order to force it to impose the embargo. The measure taken by the Cuban communist regime was the confiscation (theft) of all properties of U.S. citizens and companies, thus violating the right to property enshrined in the American Declaration of the Rights and

Duties of Man, and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

And the Cuban communist regime not only confiscated all U.S. properties, but also every individual and enterprise properties of Cuban and foreign nationals. All properties went to State's hands, the totalitarian State's hands, and they still remain under the control of that totalitarian regime that has led, through the suppression of individual freedoms and individual initiative, to the total ruin of the country.

REGRESSIVE TRANSCULTURATION

We have denounced and proven that a regressive transculturation has taken place in Cuba. The values and principles upon which civilized coexistence rests in this Hemisphere have been destroyed, and other, falsely called values, which run counter to the traditions, culture and history of the free nations of this Hemisphere and those of Cuba, have been imposed in opposition to Judeo-Christian civilization.

THEOCENTRISM VERSUS ANTHROPOCENTRISM

The Inter American system is a Theocentrical one, and its values and principles include the belief in God, the dignity of the human person, his/her freedom, justice and peace, and the idea that the resources existing in the Amiercas are at the service of the common good, for the benefit of human beings. The Inter American System proclaims the absolute respect for human rights, fellowship and brotherhood among all, repudiates class warfare and proclaims love as opposed to hate; for all of the above, Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the Inter American System, since the former proclaims hate against the gospel of love, the class warfare, the totalitarian state, militant atheism, the destruction of the sense of transcendence and of the human person, his/her dignity and rights; it is essentially anthropocentric.

A MYTH WHOSE FALSEHOOD HAS BEEN PROVEN: COMMUNIST EDUCATION IN CUBA

It has been proven that communist propaganda about the progress of education in Cuba, propagated by the crypto-communists and their accomplices, is a total falsehood, and not by exiled Cubans, but by international organizations, such as the United Nations and others.

When Castro seized power in Cuba, there was only a 20% rate of illiteracy, only surpassed in Latin America by Argentina and Uruguay, which had a 15% level. At the World level, according to an analysis from the University of Chicago, Cuba was in the 35th place among 156 countries in the world.

The UNESCO recognized in 1940 that all Cuban teachers, in the elementary and secondary levels, had degrees from the Teachers' Colleges for Education or from the University.

When Castro seized power, there functioned in Cuba 30,000 elementary classrooms, staffed by some 34,000 teachers who served 1,300,000 students in public schools, with half of the present population. In private schools, that were over 1,000, regulated by law, over 200,000 children were taught, according to data provided by Professor Dr. Levi Marrero.

What there has been in Cuba after communism seized power cannot be called education properly, but Marxist-Leninist indoctrination. Children of both genders have been forcibly subjected to a materialistic and atheistic indoctrination, without the vertical dimension towards God, in a regressive transculturation, with false values and principles that have no support in the reality of the present world. Besides, it is another falsehood that such an indoctrination has been free, since the cost has been deducted from the meager salaries that workers are paid.

THE MYTH OF "THE PARADISE OF THE PROLETARIAT" HAS ALSO BEEN DEBUNKED

The Cuban labor movement, formerly grouped under the Cuban Confederation of Workers (Spanish acronym CTC), was the most advanced one, not only in Latin America, but in all of the Hemisphere and a great part of the world, including the developed world. Minimum salary, eight working hours, wages paid in a currency with a real purchasing value, maternity rights for working women, freedom to change jobs, collective labor agreements, right to strike, compensation for unwarranted dismissal, freedom to unionize, protection against discrimination in employment were some of its achievements. All of those rights, social vindications that led Cuban workers to the highest level of labor development, have disappeared under communism. Nowadays, the Cuban worker is a serf, with no right to change jobs, no right to strike, no right to free unionization, no right to private initiative and evident violations of his/her human rights, both at the institutional level and at the human level. All of that is the negation of what has been falsely proclaimed by communist propaganda, and that has undoubtedly been proven in the former Soviet Union, the Eastern European nations and now in Cuba.

THE MYTH OF HEALTH HAS ALSO BEEN DEBUNKED

High-ranking officials, physicians, male and female nurses who have recently left Cuba have been the ones who have documented the abysmal failure of medicine in Cuba. Cuban officials have been forced to get out of the island in order to seek health care in Europe, the United States and other countries in Latin America. Furthermore, Dr. Enrique Huertas, President of the World Medical College and of the Cuban Medical College in Exile, has demonstrated that medicine in Cuba is far behind the advances made in the Western World. The communist regime itself has recently stated that it lacks the medicines that are plentiful at the present time in all countries of Latin America. We do not want to be too extensive in citing statistics that any of you will be able to easily obtain in your own countries.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED IN CUBA

The Socialist Constitution itself suppresses institutional freedom of thought and freedom of the press. The latter is controlled by the totalitarian state. In 112 countries analyzed during the period when communism seized power in Cuba, it was in the 33rd place with 101 daily newspapers per 1,000 inhabitants. Only Uruguay (154 per 1,000), Argentina (154 per 1,000) and Panama (111 per 1,000) surpassed Cuba in Latin America. Mexico was 48th in that classification, with 48 daily newspapers per 1,000. In Havana, at that time, there were four first-rate dailies in the morning and three in the afternoon, an amount higher than in any of our Latin American countries. Nowadays, there is only one newspaper in Havana, "Gramma," with "news" controlled by the totalitarian state.

THERE IS NO FREEDOM OF RELIGION IN CUBA

Religious freedom and educational freedom are institutionally denied in the Socialist Constitution of Cuba.

That Constitution and the laws in force in Cuba clearly state that the totalitarian state is atheistic and materialistic, and that education shall be given in accordance with dialectical and historical materialism. Children are raised there, as well as youngsters, without God, without a transcendental sense of life, and humanities have been deleted from the teachings.

At the beginning of the communist regime, not only was the name of God deleted from the Constitution, but that deletion was repeated in the last of the Constitutions in force.

On the freighter "Covadonga" 168 Catholic members of the clergy were expelled from Cuba, among them a Bishop, and sent to Spain. They were originally Spaniards and Cubans. Religious teaching has been forbidden at all levels, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and other religious organizations. Many members of the clergy have endured imprisonment, insults, tortures and beatings. Several members of the so-called Jehovah Witnesses have been executed before firing squads. Executions by firing squads continue in Cuba because of political and religious matters. The last three executions were widely publicized and many others remain hidden behind the "sugar cane curtain."

There were 12,500 Jews in Cuba when communism seized power in 1959. There are presently few over 500. Why has such a large number of Jews fled from Cuba? The answer is obvious: because there does not exist a climate of freedom, because one way or another all freedoms have been threatened, persecuted, limited or outright suppressed for religious organizations, since the materialistic and atheistic state of communism is militant, anti-religious, does not believe in transcendence, does not believe in God.

THE "BALSEROS" (RAFT PEOPLE) DIE IN THE STRAITS OF FLORIDA

The suffering of the Cuban people is unspeakable. In order to have a painful and terrible idea about the martydrom of the Cuban people, besides events at the communist dungeons, where male and female Cuban political prisoners endure a "cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment," as the Inter American Commission on Human Rights has verified and declared, we must underline what is happening with the so-called "balseros" (raft people), male and female Cubans of all ages who risk their lives every day in small rafts, that they construct themselves, with automobile tires and inner-tubes. Last year, 2,800 of these people arrived in Florida United States and reliable sources affirm that out of every three who leave only one arrives alive. And however exaggerated the figure may seem to you, it is very close to reality, since male and female Cubans presently resolve to risk dying in the waters of the Straits of Florida rather than living under communist slavery.

LEGITIMACY OF COLLECTIVE ACTION

Treaties in force in the Americas, signed and ratified by your own States and by the Cuban State, when Cuban was free, authorize collective action. Furthermore, we can prove that independence and freedom were achieved by almost all peoples of the Americas through the collective intervention, of patriots and nations of the Americas, in the internal affairs of other States. Simon Bolivar, the Liberator, Sucre, Paez, San Martin, O'Higgins, are examples of that. Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, just to mention a few, could never have attained their independence at that time, had the other American States and their leaders not intervened on their behalf, as the United States of North America intervened to assist in the inde-

pendence of Mexico—which was decisive in Maximilian's defeat—as Spain, France and Cuba intervened in a decisive manner to help attain independence for the Thirteen Colonies that became the United States.

As long as the Castroite totalitarian dictorship continues to exist, it cannot be said that there is no communism in the Americas.

The Cold War has not ended in the Americas while Cuba continues to be a bastion of communism, with its slogan of "Marxism-Leninism or Death." Castro has said and repeated it: that he was a Marxist-Leninist since he was a student, and that he would be such until the day of his death.

THE COMMUNISTS' STRATEGY IN LATIN AMERICA

The communists' strategy in Latin America has two well-defined objectives to undermine and destroy, i.e.:

A. Democracy

B. Economic and social development

The democratic neo-liberal regimes that are springing up in the Americas to replace those others influenced or sympathizing with the Marxist-Socialist trends, and the populist, corporativists or military, are a positive advancement in the annals of the political development of the Americas, and a threat to the pro-Soviet organizations or groups. That is why the former Soviet Union was fomenting, and the communists in the Americas continue to promote, guerrilla, terrorist and subversive movements, in order to impede the strengthening of democracy in the Americas.

In a recent study about terrorism, performed by the U.S. Department of State, it is specified that three-fourths of terrorist assaults against that country, its citizens and their properties have taken place in Latin America, and that Castro and Cuba are the heaven for Latin American guerrillas.

Communists and their satellites and allies in Latin America apply subversive and terrorist techniques against the economic and social development in the Hemisphere, in trying to hamper or paralyze them. Thus, a human and economic decapitalization is brought about, which implies a massive exodus of "brains" (so urgently needed in Latin America) as well as the flight of national capital and the absence of foreign investment. That is the way to the paralysis or immobilization of social and economical development that is noticed presently in many countries in Latin America, plagued by that communist intervention that tries to impose its system of state control and to behead economic, individual and enterprise freedom. While that situation will continue to exist, there cannot be a favorable environment to keep the indispensable "brains" for development, nor national and foreign investments. That is the challenge that Latin America faces nowadays. We should not blame others for our own mistakes. Either we create the political and economic infrastructure for the economic and social development, or Latin America shall continue to go down to infrahuman levels of poverty and inability to fend for itself. Fortunately, the decade of 1990 signals towards an overcoming of those values, but communists and their allies, in an irresponsible manner, are still trying to bring Castro to the OAS, which would only go to serve Marxism-Leninism and Marxism Socialism.

A MONUMENT TO A NUCLEAR MISSILE

As another mockery from satellite Castro to the Americas, he has built a monument to a nuclear missile from the Soviet Union at Playa del Chivo, East of Havana. This was one of the nuclear missiles shipped to Cuba by the Soviets in 1962. It is 80 feet high, and is similar to those introduced in Cuba by the Soviets. The monument, built with concrete and marble, is very high and, although it does not have the nuclear warhead, it is a challenge and a mockery for all of the Americas, and is a proclamation that he is counting on the Soviet backing from those who have replaced it.

We ask whether this is one of the 40 missiles that remained in Cuba after the "Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding," because that would be one more violation of that "understanding" or, on the contrary, it was shipped later to Cuba by the Soviets, which would also be another violation and mockery to the leaders of the Americas, who are trying to bring satellite Castro into the OAS, including his monument to the nuclear missile.

THE "KENNEDY-KHRUSHCHEV UNDERSTANDING"

After 30 years of the unfortunate "understanding," the letters that were secret have been published, containing the agreements made between then-President Kennedy and then-Secretary General of the Soviet Communist Party, Khrushchev, to put an end to the so-called nuclear missile crisis in Cuba.

Three negative consequences derived from that "understanding": (A) The promise on Kennedy's part not to invade Cuba and not to allow other countries in the Hemisphere to invade it, despite the fact that the Treaty of Rio was in force, which authorized the use of armed force in case of aggression in its various forms, among them subversive aggression; (B) the prohibition for Cuban patriots in exile to be able to invade Cuba and fight with full freedom to attain the overthrowing of the totalitarian communist regime, and (C) the Soviet Union obliged itself, in the "understanding," not to ship atomic or offensive weapons to Cuba. However, in violation of that "understanding" the Soviets built a base for nuclear submarines in Cienfuegos, and brought down weapons that can be deemed as offensive, as submarines and airplanes capable of loading atomic weapons. In the long range, under the cover of the nefarious "understanding," the Soviets were able to place a Soviet base in Cuba, which has not yet been dismantled, and 27,000 Soviet troops still remain in Cuba, as another affront to the Americas.

In both cases, the direct and indirect results of that "understanding" have facilitated the permanence of the communist regime in Cuba for 33 years. Since that "understanding" was made between the President of the United States and the Soviet leader, on behalf and representing the Soviet Union, and the latter has disappeared, it must be deemed as finished, de facto and de jure, null and void and said "understanding" without any effect whatsoever.

We request the solidarity and cooperation of this OAS assembly, and that of each of its Member States, in order to attain the dismantling of the Soviet base and the eradication of communism.

THE GRAVE DANGER FROM NUCLEAR REACTORS BEING CONSTRUCTED IN CUBA

It is not a secret for anybody that two nuclear reactors are being built at the Jaragua plant, Cienfuegos. Those nuclear reactors are being constructed with Soviet technology and without the indispensable safeguards to insure that a nuclear disaster would not occur.

Russia has just closed two nuclear reactors that were being built at Krasnoyarsk, 1,600 miles from Moscow, in Siberia, because plutonium was being produced there, a substance that is used for the production of atomic bombs, and although the reactors located in Cuba would take a little more time, in the medium or long range of time they could also produce plutonium with the same purpose. Experts in atomic energy have stated that the reactors being built in Cuba do not meet the indispensable requisites as to guarantee that a nuclear explosion would not occur there, not only because of their faulty equipment, but also due to the place where they are being built and the lack of duly trained technical staff.

An explosion in any of these atomic reactors being built in Cuba not only would endanger the lives of millions of Cubans in the Island, but its effects would also reach Key West, Tampa, Miami, Louisiana, Texas, the Southern part of the United States and Mexico, besides Cuba's neighboring countries.

The risk is too great to overlook the pertinent measures that could prevent a Cuban Chernobyl, that would entail far more tragic consequences than those which took place in the Soviet Union. That is why we request of this OAS General Assembly its help in attaining a solution for such a serious problem, which solution could only be the closure of those two nuclear reactors in Cuba, in the same manner that the other two were closed down in Russia.

THE TWENTY-SECOND OAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Several issues have been included in the agenda of this Twenty-Second Ordinary Period of Sessions of the General Assembly, the treatment of which exclude, de facto and de jure, any possibility of an opening towards the totalitarian Marxist-Leninist regime of Cuba, such as:

A. A reflection about the Inter-American System.

B. A program of Action for the Strengthening of the OAS.

C. A Report about Cooperation for the Security of the Hemisphere and the Limitation of the Proliferation of War Instruments and Massive Destruction Weapons.

D. A Proposal to stimulate the conservation and strengthening of democratic systems.

E. Compliance with the resolution entitled "Human Rights and Democracy—Electoral Observation."

F. Progress achieved in the compliance with the resolution entitled "Unity for the Promotion of Democracy."

G. Report about the implementation of the resolution entitled "Support for the Initiative for the Americas."

We oppose any kind of dialogue, negotiations, coexistence, or covenant with the totalitarian Marxist-Leninist regime of Cuba and/or with communism. We emphasize, in accordance with the values and principles of the Inter-American System and of the Organization of American States, that communism is not negotiable in this hemisphere.

In Cuba today there is popular resistance against the government's violence and terror. That unstable balance is about to break towards freedom. We count on you for this final stage and for the reconstruction of Cuba.

Honorable Mr. Chairman, Honorable Ministers of Foreign Relations, Honorable Ambassadors and Representatives of the Americas: We respectfully ask of you to deem as submitted our petitions and denouncements; that the totalitarian Marxist-Leninist regime be denied admission to the Inter-American System and to the OAS; that our rights as a Member State continue to be recognized (since what is excluded is the present govern-

ment of Cuba, not the Cuban State), and that we be afforded the moral and legal support to which we are entitled in full, while we exercise our belligerency rights and continue to struggle towards the second independence of Cuba, for the expulsion of the totalitarian tyranny, the eradication of communism, the dismantling of the remainder of the Soviet base; the offensive weapons (airplanes, ships, etc.) taken there by the former Soviet Union; the exit of spies and military personnel disguised as technicians, businesspersons or diplomatic personnel, and for the purpose that this year, scheduled in the historical calendar of the Americas as the 102nd, Anniversary of the establishment of the Inter American System and the Encounter Between Europe and the Americas, shall also be, on the calendar of the Continent of Hope, the Year of the Liberation of Cuba.

We remain, with our utmost consideration and respect, yours sincerely,

Dr. Manuel Antonio de Varona, Chairman, Cuban Patriotic Board, Former Prime Minister of Cuba, Former President of the Cuban Senate.•

NATIONAL WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS MONTH

• Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, on the occasion of National Telecommunications Month, I would like to share with my colleagues one rather dramatic example of how wireless systems are changing the face of telecommunications.

It is hard to believe that cellular telephone technology is only 8½ years old. And already it has attracted more than 8 million subscribers.

The focus of cellular work by the Federal Communications Commission has been the licensing of 2 competing systems in each of 734 markets. The agency rejected the idea of licensing a single, national network operator.

The bottom line of this history is that, until recently, subscribing to cellular service provided limited benefits, or extra hassle, if you traveled outside your home city. Today, that's changing. The industry is busy fielding what it calls seamless roaming.

Cellular companies first worked to make it as easy to place a call when traveling as it was back home. Then, they began working to make sure a telephone call is not interrupted if you cross the boundary between two markets. And now, the most remarkable roaming innovation of all is under way. The cellular industry has begun knitting its systems together for automatic call delivery. In other words, a phone call placed to your cellular number back home will be able to automatically find you—anywhere in the United States—without you or the caller doing anything extra to make it happen.

Now, not everyone wants to have a phone call find them at any and all times. That is why the industry is also offering voice mail and call forwarding.

Mr. President, we can all understand the freedom and flexibility that's afforded by having instant access to communication in your car—or in your pocket. Seamless roaming is one more step in the wireless revolution, and another reason why American telecommunications is still preeminent in the world.•

IMPOUNDED V–22 FUNDS

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, the Comptroller General has just transmitted to Congress his finding that the Department of Defense has impounded V–22 funds authorized and appropriated last year. This conclusion, no surprise to supporters of the V–22, has been long awaited. By law, this report by the General Accounting Office [GAO] serves as a rescission, and starts the 45-day clock for the release of funds.

Can anyone in the administration still be unaware of the incredibly corrosive effect the Pentagon's bureaucratic machinations have had on relations between Congress and the administration?

It is my hope that Congress can reject this de facto rescission at the earliest possible date. I can think of at least one readily available vehicle, and intend to appeal to my chairman and ranking member to include a V–22 provision in that pending piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask that the Comptroller General's letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks as if read in its entirety.

The letter follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1992.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

This letter reports an impoundment of Department of Defense (Department) budget authority that should have been but was not reported to the Congress by the President under the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Act). Section 1015(a) of the Act, 2 U.S.C. §686(a), requires the Comptroller General to report to the Congress whenever he finds that any officer or employee of the United States is to establish a reserve or has ordered, permitted, or approved of such a reserve of budget authority, and the President has failed to transmit a special impoundment message with respect to such reserve. This report is submitted in accordance with section 1015(a) and has the same effect as if it were a special message transmitted by the President.

BACKGROUND

The impoundment in question occurs in the fiscal year 1992 account "Research Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy", Pub. L. 102–172, §8090, 105 Stat. 1193 (1991), and involves $790,000,000 appropriated only for the V–22 program.[1] We have previously reported on impoundments involving the V–22 program. See GAO/OGC–90–4, B–237297.3, Mar. 6, 1990 (unauthorized policy deferral of $200 million); GAO/OGC–91–8, B–241514, May 7, 1991 (unauthorized policy deferral of $165 million).[2]

CURRENT STATUS OF V–22 BUDGET AUTHORITY

In the fiscal year 1992 authorization and appropriations process, the Congress transferred the $165,000,000 reported as a deferral in our 1991 report (GAO/OGC–91–8) to the fiscal year 1992/1993 Navy RDT&E account to be merged with $625 million in new RDT&E budget authority. *See* Pub. L. 102–190 §211, 105 Stat. 1315 (1991); Pub. L. 102–172, §8090, 105 Stat. 1193 (1991). The Appropriations Act directs that these funds be obligated for a Phase II V–22 Full Scale Development Program to provide new production representative aircraft which will have the objective of demonstrating the full operational requirements of the Joint Services Operational Requirement (JSOR) not later than December 31, 1996. *Id.* The Act also requires the Secretary to provide to the Congress within 60 days of enactment of the appropriation Act a total funding plan and schedule to complete the Phase II V–22 full scale Engineering Manufacturing Development. *Id.*

By letter of January 26, 1992, the Department's Comptroller advised the Congress that substantial redesign was necessary in order to meet the JSOR. The Comptroller added that the total estimated cost of the Congressionally mandated manufacture and test of the V–22 would be in excess of $2.5 billion and that no additional source of funding had been identified. The Comptroller added that he did not believe it would be possible to satisfy the Congressionally mandated 1996 deadline even if Congress appropriated additional funding. Finally, he stated that the Department would not be able to spend the $790 million before it expired, and therefore proposed that Congress extend the availability of the funds.

By letter of April 2, 1992, Secretary Cheney provided additional information to supplement the views of the Comptroller. He noted that the Navy had presented alternative plans, none of which would satisfy the statutory mandates in Pub. L. 102–172 because the legislation was too restrictive in terms of funding, schedule, and tooling. The Secretary reiterated the Department's position that the V–22 required substantial redesign and testing. He further explained that one alternative, to revert the V–22 program to a technology demonstration project, could not be done since it would not comport with the statutory mandates expressed in P.L. 102–172. At the end of his letter, the Secretary stated:

"We do not, however, intend to execute this program, because it is not affordable within the overall constraints we face on defense resources. . . . We continue to work to find a solution which meets our amphibious medium lift needs affordably".

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is currently withholding from obligation $790 million of V–22 funds. In response to our request for the Department's legal justification for the withholding, the Department's Acting General Counsel explained that the V–22 aircrafts require major redesign. Accordingly, the Department maintains that "it is not factually or technically possible for the Department to comply with the provisions of section 8090." In so concluding, the Acting General Counsel reads section 8090 as imposing two separate requirements: (1) the

[1] The $790 million consists of $625 million in fiscal year 1992 budget authority earmarked by §8090 out of the Navy RDT&E account and $165 million transferred from the fiscal year 1991 "Aircraft Procurement, Navy" account. Pub. L. 101–511, 104 Stat. 1864 (1990).

[2] GAO/OGC–91–8 contains a detailed history of other impoundment actions taken with regard to the V–22 program.

FY 1992 funds must be obligated for new production aircraft having the objective of demonstrating the full operational requirements of the JSOR and (2) the "aircraft must have the objective of demonstrating those requirements not later than December 31, 1996." The acting General Counsel maintains that since it is impossible to satisfy the two requirements of section 8090, the Department may not obligate these funds and thus there is no impoundment within the meaning of the Impoundment Control Act.

Finally, the Acting General Counsel explains that the Secretary of Defense's statement in his letter to the Speaker of the House that "[W]e do not, however, intend to execute this program. . . ." was not intended to have, nor should it be construed as having, Impoundment Control Act implications. Instead the Acting General Counsel cautions that the Secretary's remark reflects no more than the Department's consistent opposition to what it views as an affordable program.

ANALYSIS

The issue before us is whether the failure by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to release for obligation the $790 million of V–22 funds constitutes an impoundment reportable under the Impoundment Control Act. In this regard, our opinions distinguish between programmatic delays in obligation that are outside the reach of the Impoundment Control Act, and withholdings of budget authority that constitute impoundments under the Act's provisions. We have observed that programmatic delays typically occur when an agency is taking necessary steps to implement a program, but because of factors external to the program funds temporarily go obligated. GAO/OGC-91-8 (May 7, 1991). This assumes, of course, that the agency is making reasonable efforts to obligate.

In our opinion, the failure to release the V–22 funds cannot be viewed as programmatic under the circumstances described by the Department. It is true that the V–22 continues to experience developmental difficulties. However, when the Congress appropriated new budget authority for the V–22 in Public Law 102–172, it was well aware of these difficulties and expected the Secretary to embark on a program to correct identified deficiencies and produce production representative aircraft. H.R. Rep. No. 328, 102nd Cong., 1st Sess. 152 (1991). It is also true that the Senate Committee on Armed Services (like the Department) has expressed concern regarding the affordability of the V–22. Sen. Rep. No. 113, 102nd Cong., 1st Sess. 115 (1991). Nevertheless, in the end, both the authorization and the appropriation legislation direct, in very specific terms, the Department to continue developing the V–22.

According to the Department, section 8090 of the fiscal year 1992 Department of Defense Appropriations Act is too restrictive in terms of funding, tooling and scheduling, thereby making it "factually and technically" impossible to execute the program and obligate the funds in compliance with section 8090. We disagree.

We recognize that it may not be possible to demonstrate the full operational requirements of the JSOR within the 1996 timeframe established by the Congress, and that Congress may, if it deems it appropriate, extend the timeframe. Unlike the Department, however, we view the 1996 date as a goal rather than a firm deadline. Given the prior difficulties Congress has experienced in the Department's execution of the program, we think Congress placed the December 31, 1996 date in the statute to spur the Department to early implementation, not to condition the use of the funds for program purposes. We do not accept the view that the Department's ability to meet that date is a condition precedent to the availability of the funds for obligation. The Department's lack of confidence in its ability to fully satisfy the statutory objectives does not free it from the obligation to use its best efforts to obligate funds in faithful execution of this legislatively mandated program.

Finally, we do not agree with the Acting General Counsel's assertion that the Secretary's statement is devoid of any Impoundment Control Act implications. We view the Secretary's statement as a clear indication on his part not to execute this program. We also cannot ignore the Department's past attempts to retard the V–22 program through unauthorized withholdings. All these actions taken together reflect an intent to reserve funds that should have been, but were not, proposed for rescission.

As noted above, under the Impoundment Control Act, whenever the Comptroller General finds that the head of any department or agency of the United States, or any officer or employee of the United States has established a reserve of budget authority for which the President is required to but has not transmitted a special message with respect to such a reserve, he is required to report it to the Congress. 2 U.S.C. §686(a).

In the instant case, the Department has advised that the funds are being withheld from obligation because the statutory mandates make it impossible to obligate the funds. Thus, the Department argues that as long as the statutory provisions exist, the funds are not available for obligation. The consequence of the Department's position is that the funds are not and will not be available for obligation until the restrictive statutory conditions are changed. Alternatively, if the restrictive statutory conditions are not changed, the Department's position leads to the conclusion that the funds will be withheld until they expire. Based on the Secretary's statements, the Department's legal justification, and our prior experience with this program, we view the Department's action as attempting to effect a rescission in fact of V–22 budget authority that should have been reported as a proposed rescission.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, we are apprising the Congress of the unreported withholding of budget authority. Since, in our opinion, the Department presently does not intend to make the $790 million in budget authority for the V–22 available for obligation prior to its expiration, we consider the funds as being reserved from obligation without a special message transmitted as required by section 1012(a) of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, 2 U.S.C. §683(a).

We note that this impoundment report has the effect, by operation of law, of permitting the withholding to continue for 45 legislative days unless the Congress earlier disapproves the proposal. For purposes of this report and based on the current Congressional calendar, the 45-day period during which the funds may be withheld expires on August 3, 1992.

MILTON J. SOCOLAR,
Comptroller General of the United States.●

DICTATORSHIP IN ZAIRE CONTINUES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on several occasions I have drawn the attention of my colleagues to the tragic situation in Zaire, where the 27-year-old regime of Mobutu Sese Seko continues despite popular opposition and growing economic chaos. We in the Senate need to continue to state our concern for the Zairian people and our support for the process of creating a representative and accountable government which has been undertaken by Zaire's sovereign national conference.

Recently I sponsored a forum on United States policy toward Zaire, along with the African office of the National Council of Churches. I would like to insert into the RECORD the conclusions of that session. There are three specific recommendations for United States policy, endorsed by over 30 church-based and other nongovernmental organizations knowledgeable about the situation in Zaire. In addition, I include the analysis of the current state of United States-Zaire relations given by Ms. Anne Griffin, legislative director of TransAfrica, an organization which has long been respected for its activism on South Africa. I would also point out that participants in the forum have prepared a detailed list of mass executions for which Mobutu's security forces are responsible. These abuses, by a regime which has received over $1 billion of U.S. taxpayers' money over the years, are unconscionable, and again I call on our administration to indicate clearly that the United States will no longer support these abuses.

The material follows:

RECOMMENDED POLICY FRAMEWORK

PREMISES

1. Mobutu's continued hold on power, not the prospect of his departure, is the greatest threat to stability in Zaire and in the region today. The regime has lost effective control over the country, and Mobutu survives primarily because of the loyalty of two elite military units. The continued deterioration of the administrative machinery and of law and order threatens disintegration as in Liberia and Somalia. To prevent further chaos and civil war, Mobutu should step down from power and leave the country.

2. However useful Mobutu may have been as a loyal friend and ally of the U.S. in the past, his continuation in power serves neither U.S. interests nor the interests of stability and democracy in Zaire. A credible transition depends above all on restoring a legitimate framework for government. U.S. policy should support the democratic process as embodied in the sovereign National Conference. There is no justification for efforts to make the U.S. the political arbiter of the post-Mobutu order.

3. Recovery from economic disaster depends on resolving the political crisis. The identification of U.S. interests with Mobutu's survival is not credible, even in pragmatic economic terms. The longer the impasse continues, the more difficult it will become to rebuild the production and transportation infrastructures necessary for extracting and marketing Zaire's raw materials. With proper organization and management, Zaire is a country that not only can feed itself but one that can also become the breadbasket of Africa as a whole. Policy planning for recovery is necessary, but no

policy can have significant impact without a credible government and an administration to implement it.

4. As of April 1992, Zairian opposition groups have identified the following steps as necessary for the preparation of the democratic institutions of the Third Republic:

(a) Mobutu's resignation;

(b) the successful completion of the sovereign National Conference, to determine the main guidelines for institution-building and for public policy;

(c) the choice of a transitional government to administer the country and manage the transition to multi-party democracy;

(d) the setting up of a constitutional commission to draw up a new constitution;

(e) the approval, by referendum, of the new constitution;

(f) local, regional, and national elections to the new representative institutions of the Third Republic.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

1. The U.S. Government should use all the diplomatic leverage at its disposal to pressure Mobutu to retire from office and leave Zaire.

Measures to be taken include, but are not limited, to the following: warning that failure to leave now might complicate or even diminish his chances of obtaining asylum in a friendly country later; the freezing of his bank accounts abroad, given that they contain assets stolen from U.S. assistance; embargo of economic contacts with Zaire, with the exception of support for the National Conference and humanitarian aid protected from confiscation by Mobutu's forces.

2. The U.S. Government should respect the right of the sovereign National Conference to decide all the pertinent questions placed before it independently of any foreign pressure or manipulation.

Given the past history of U.S. intervention in the political life of Zaire, and escalating popular resentment of the U.S. role in prolonging Mobutu's rule, this implies exceptional efforts to avoid both the reality and the appearance of U.S. manipulation or favoritism in the transition to a new democratic order.

3. The U.S. Government should offer to assist the process of transition with bilateral financial support and diplomatic support for active multilateral involvement as requested by the National Conference.

The U.S. role is critical not only in terms of bilateral aid, but in terms of leadership among Western powers, in the United Nations and in other international organizations, where U.S. attention or indifference significantly affects priorities. Areas for which support is likely to be needed urgently include the following: humanitarian aid channeled through non-governmental organizations or through transitional government institutions once established; international support for demobilization of troops and building up of professional nonpartisan security forces; reconstruction of essential infrastructure as a prerequisite both for economic recovery and for communications during the electoral process; international support for the organization of elections and election monitoring; immediate debt relief once a transitional government is established.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS ENDORSEMENT LIST
(PARTIAL LIST)

Africa Christian Mission.
Africa Office of the National Council of Churches.
Africare.
American Baptist Churches, International Ministries.
American Committee on Africa.
Association of Concerned Africa Scholars, Dr. Jean Sindab, Co-Chair.
Baptist International Missions.
Bread for the World.
Center of Concern, John Prendergast.
Christian Missionary Alliance.
Disciples of Christ/UCC, Rev. Dan Hoffman.
Evangelical Covenant Church.
Global Exchange, Joan Heckscher.
Grace Ministries International.
International Association for Zaire.
International Labor Rights Education and Research Fund.
Literacy and Evangelism International, Robert F. Rice, Director.
Lobby of American Witnesses.
Mennonite Central Committee.
Missionaries of Africa, Richard Archambault.
National Rainbow Coalition, Jack Odell, International Affairs.
Navigators, Zaire Section.
Presbyterian Church (USA), Global Mission and Social Justice and Peacemaking Unit, Elenora Ivory, Washington, Office.
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Reverend Archie Lemone.
Sante' Rurale au Zaire (Sanru/USA).
Society of African Missionaries, Steve Price, Office of Justice and Peace.
Rainbow Lobby.
Transafrica.
United Church of Christ, Andrea Young, Office of Church in Society, Board of World Mission, Reverend Benjamin Chavis, Commission for Racial Justice.
United Methodist Church, World Division, General Board of Global Ministries.
Washington Office on Africa.
Women's International League of Peace and Freedom, Aida Bound, Legislative Director.
World Relief.
World Relief International, Dick and Judy Anderson.
Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A.

UNITED STATES-ZAIRE RELATIONS: A FOREIGN POLICY DILEMMA

(By Anne Griffin)

My appreciation to the National Council of Churches for inviting TransAfrica to this very important briefing on Zaire's political crisis. I would like to make several brief comments on the context in which U.S. foreign policy toward Zaire has been made before we proceed with the rest of the program.

For the last thirty years, American foreign policy toward Zaire and its infamous president Mobutu Sese Seku has been unconscionable. The bad news is that the U.S. government in large part, created Mobutu. And because of the decades of American financial and diplomatic support that has been heaped upon his regime, the United States is in part responsible for the resulting chaos and destruction. The good news, of course, is that with the demise of the Cold War—the justification for that behavior has eroded. The world is now on a more rational tilt, we hear. America's so-called strategic interests are no longer a priority in the region and therefore the "see-no-evil" policies of the past will most assuredly cease.

While it would appear that anti-Communist ideologies are relics of the past, it is also quite evident that the State Department has been sluggish to steer its policies from the original dead end course that was designed in the Cold War era.

For over 25 years, Mobutu has ruled his country and has been criticized by the world for his keptocracy and brutal human rights abuses. Mobutu has squandered the fortunes that were bestowed on him and his country by Western patrons. In all, the United States has given more than $1 billion in foreign aid to Zaire. The World Bank has approved $1.5 billion in loans and credits. The money proved to be a poor investment. Now, Zaire, potentially one of Africa's richest nations is facing financial ruin, an economic abyss rarely seen before. Inflation is estimated at 30,000% and climbing, banks, schools, and hospitals are dysfunctional. Everything has ground to a disturbing halt. The people struggle for basic substance, many families eating on alternate days because there is not enough money to buy food.

This meager lifestyle presents a stark contrast from Mobutu's daily existence. Mobutu, said to be one of the richest men in the world, operates from an opulent yacht, while the citizens of his country struggle to survive.

Because the United States has been one of Mobutu's prominent patrons, it is time for us, in this new era, to be his loudest critic. As the democratization movement spreads throughout Kenya, Malawi, Benin, Togo, the Congo, Ghana, South Africa and elsewhere across the African continent, the United States must be there to support the very principles that we proclaim to be the foundations of our country. Friends and foes alike must face scrutiny. The U.S. government can no longer "shield its eyes" from Mobutu's atrocities in order to protect a long ill-fated friendship. U.S. policymakers must escape from the ideological trap that was once proscribed by a misguided anti-Communist fervor.

Africa's democratization efforts are as important as the ongoing struggles in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. If we ignore Africa now, it will mean a cruel double standard for the African continent that will point to an unfair and hypocritical foreign policy that can only be labeled as unresponsive, contradictory and racist.

There is, however, a glimmer of hope, and maybe there was a hint of this in the State Department's recently more aggressive criticism of Jonas Savimbi, another of the United States, ill-chosen Cold War allies. The State Department has cut all but humanitarian assistance destined for Zaire and Assistant Secretary of State Cohen has spoken publicly about the fact that Mobutu is leading his country into ruin. It is no longer in dispute that Mobutu confuses his country's state funds with his personal finances. It is acknowledged that Mobutu has commanded his security forces to brutally attack anti-government critics. It is well-known that Mobutu has attempted to disrupt the proceedings of the national conference—a process that could well lead to his ouster. Yet the State Department stops short of calling for Mobutu's unequivocal resignation.

Because the U.S. helped to create the monstrous Mobutu regime, it has a responsibility to be just as active in its destruction. We can not now stand behind the scenes and conduct foreign policy in hushed whispers.

Africa is changing and as President Soglo of Benin recently said, "the winds of change are blowing through the coconut trees of Africa." My message to you today is an expression of hope that those same gusts of wind will reach the dusty briefing books of American foreign policymakers. We must do more for the people of Zaire.●

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 4; and that the time for consideration of the conference report be limited to 3 hours equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY and HATCH, or their designees, and at the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the conference report, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9 a.m., Thursday, June 4; that following the prayer, the Journal of Proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; with the following Senators recognized for the time limits specified: the first hour of morning business under the control of the majority leader or his designee; followed by 45 minutes under the control of Senator SIMPSON or his designee; and then Senator REID for up to 10 minutes; and the remaining time until 12:30 p.m. under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., recessed until Thursday, June 4, 1992, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1992:

THE JUDICIARY

LEONARD E. DAVIS, OF TEXAS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS VICE A NEW POSITION CREATED BY PUBLIC LAW 101-650, APPROVED DECEMBER 1, 1990.

J. DOUGLAS DRUSHAL, OF OHIO, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO VICE JOHN M. MANOS, RETIRED.

C. CHRISTOPHER HAGY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA VICE MARVIN SHOOB, RETIRED.

LOUIS J. LEONATTI, OF MISSOURI, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI VICE CLYDE S. CAHILL, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN FRANK BOOKOUT, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

KENNETH R. MANCUSO, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE U.S. MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND FOR THE TERM OF 4 YEARS VICE DONALD W. WYATT, RESIGNED.