So while I favor using the CBO numbers, I do not favor putting into law and holding the President hostage in terms of a shutdown of Government if he does not agree to that, because if I were President of the United States I would not agree to it.

It does not have much to do with the question of the budget. It has a lot to do with the question of separation of powers. We are going to be visiting, as the Senator from Nebraska said, these issues every year, whatever the results of this compromise that I hope will emerge in negotiating a final reconciliation bill.

We will have to have a compromise. These are going to be estimates. We are going to make mistakes. The Medicare-Medicaid savings—I applaud the Republicans for taking on these entitlements; I think it is long overdue. I think those of us on the Democratic side need to muster up some courage to begin to take on the entitlements also. But I believe we are going to have to go back and have a lot of corrections made to the changes that are being made because all of these are estimates.

We do not know how much is going to be saved. That is one of the reasons I feel that going forward with a front-end tax cut is a mistake now because we are going to have to have some money to patch up the mistakes as we go along and we find out people are really being hurt in an unjustified way.

So I hope out of all of this, we will reach some compromise very soon that will have the President basically agree to the 7-year target and goal but not have Congress impose by law the CBO numbers. There are lots of ways to be able to do that, and I hope we will find a way before too many more hours go by.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I did want to comment on that one point.

Mr. REID. I appreciate my friend's statement. In addition to the two Senators from Nebraska, the Senator from Georgia has a record of many, many years of being frugal and always trying to do something about a balanced budget and entitlements. He and the senior Senator from New Mexico have worked together on this for many years, and when we hear of the Senator from Georgia speaking out about the problems with the present reconciliation bill, it says volumes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 7½ minutes. The Senator's request is to speak for a total of how long?

Mr. REID. I would like to speak for 10 minutes starting now, since my friends have used part of my time.

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

GROWING USE OF VIOLENCE TO SHOW DISAGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, like most everyone here who serves in the U.S. Senate, I have a home in my home State, Nevada, and a home here. I announce that because my wife, recently one night, presented to me something she received in the mail from our home here in Washington, and I want to refer to it.

In March 1993, I was the first Member of this body to come to the floor and renounce the senseless killing of Dr. David Gunn as he left his job at a health clinic in Pensacola, FL. I came to the floor again in 1994 and offered a sense-of-the-Senate resolution condemning the specific tactic of soliciting signatures on petitions that express support and justify the use of murderous violence against those who oppose the pro-life position.

I am prompted again today to come to the floor and address this issue after finding in our mailbox this despicable piece of literature. This flier is simply abdicating violence. It abdicates clearly an invasion of a person's privacy, who happens to be a physician who I do not know and do not want to know, as well as the man's family.

It is well known that I advocate a pro-life position, and during my years in the House and Senate have voted accordingly. Because of my affiliation with this position, I also feel it is my responsibility to stand up and condemn tactics such as this flier, which are used by fringe elements of the pro-life movement.

This is a piece of trash. The people who put this in my mailbox violated Federal law. They have no right to put this in my mailbox.

''Guilty of crimes against humanity.'' I am reading from the document—''The National Socialist Party in Germany made gassing gypsies, Poles and other non-Aryans legal.''

They go on to insinuate this man, whose name, work, and home address are on this document—with phone numbers for both is a Nazi. They direct me to call this doctor and his spouse, asking them to ''end this slaughter, because they say he has no conscience.''

They say, ''In reality it is murder.'' This man, whose name I am not going to disclose, ''should be tried for crimes against humanity.''

They quote various pieces of scripture from the Old Testament. They go on to say, ''He so lacks conscience that slave owners would have used him to apprehend runaways.''

''He is the equivalent of a slave trader.''

''Don't allow your children to play with his.''

''We will haunt him.'' I am skipping around on this document.

''In the meantime, organize to have his lease canceled,'' and it goes on and on.

Mr. President, this is wrong. This is wrong.

Two months ago, I came to the floor to express my outrage over the bombing of the family car of a Nevada forest ranger. This car was located 3 feet away from his family who was in their living room. I am concerned about the growing use of violence as a means of showing disagreement with the Government and with other individuals. It is this extremist mentality that is at the foot of devastating acts, such as the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin and, I believe, the Oklahoma bombing and, of course, the shooting of Dr. Gunn.

Extremists advocate violence as an alternative to meaningful debate and meaningful discussions. Individuals who carry out such violence or endorse it believe they are above the law.

As I have stated earlier, I am personally pro-life, but Roe v. Wade is the current law in our country, and I, as a citizen of this country, respect the law of the land. In fact, I personally disagree with the judgment rendered by a court, however, I believe in following the law.

This does not mean that those who disagree with the Supreme Court's decision cannot work within the legislative process to change the law. The debate over abortion elicits some of the strongest emotions that people feel.

However passionate and vigorous debates can be, they should be healthy and they should be speeches, comment, and discourse that are civil in nature, not statements like ''crimes against humanity,'' ''gassing gypsies,'' ''don't play with their children.''

Mr. President, when you arrive at a passionate, vigorous debate, I believe this represents what our democracy is all about, which is a participatory and functioning democracy at work. We have a responsibility to decry the violence and the advocacy of violence as a legitimate means to solve our differences. We cannot acquiesce to the violence through our silence, and I am not going to. It is incumbent upon this body, this Congress, this country to make it unmistakably clear that such tactics are shameful and are to be denounced.

Without quick condemnation of such tactics, as this flier in my mailbox, violence will continue.

I shed tears at the assassination of President Kennedy, at the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin, especially when his granddaughter cried pain of love for her grandfather. We cannot stand by and allow this to happen.

I hope we will all speak out against it and that the people who are spewing forth this filth will stop doing it, because it does not help the cause.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. I yield back my time.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 10 minutes.

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

DAYTIME TALK SHOWS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, last month, I joined my colleagues, Senator LIEBERMAN and former Secretary William Bennett, who was the former Secretary of Education, at a news conference in which they were shining a spotlight on what I believe is the problem that for too long has been ignored by television executives, corporate advertisers, the news media, as well as the American people. The problem is the content of some of our television programming and the corrosive effect this programming is having on our culture. Nowhere is this cultural erosion or ''cultural rot,'' in the words of Secretary Bennett, more evident than in the content of many of today's daytime talk shows.

The news media are finally beginning to report on these issues, even though many Americans have been voicing their concern for a long time. I know that I have been speaking out on these matters for a number of years, as have a number of my colleagues, and as have Americans from all walks of life and all parts of the country. The media has not been listening until recently, but they are listening now, and I think that is having a real effect.

I would not be speaking out today, or in the past, if I believed television was not important. It is very important.

According to the World Almanac for 1995, Americans watch approximately 16½ hours of television per week; teenagers watch about 12 hours per week. I think the number is higher than that, but that is what this says. Our children watch approximately 13 hours per week. For adults, this amounts to two full 8-hour working days of television viewing per week. For children and teenagers, this amounts to 2 extra days of ''television school.'' For children, this is far more time than they devote to homework. The second most widely circulated magazine in America is TV Guide, a magazine about television. Billions and billions of dollars are spent on television advertising. We all know that market forces would not pour that kind of money into television if it did not have a powerful impact on the people watching it. All of these statistics point to the fact that television has a powerful and profound affect on all of our lives.

Given the tremendous impact of television on American culture, the content of our television programming is important. To illustrate this point, I refer my colleagues to the June 1992 edition of the Journal of the American Medical Association, which reported on a study that concluded there was a direct relationship between the level of violence on television and the growth of violent crime in our society. The study—headed up by Dr. Brandon Centerwall, a Seattle, WA, psychiatrist—concludes: ''The epidemiological evidence indicates that if, hypothetically, television technology had never been developed, there would today be 10,000 fewer homicides each year in the United States, 70,000 fewer rapes, and 700,000 fewer injurious assaults.''

Neither I, nor Senator LIEBERMAN, nor former Secretary Bennett is talking about turning back our technological clock by 50 years. There are many good programs on television. There is much education on television in a positive sense. However, violent television programming is not a necessary part of television technology, and the logical conclusion from Dr. Centerwall's study, and numerous other such studies along this line, is that a reduction in the level of violence in television programming will, over the long term, lead to a reduction in violence in our society.

Nowhere is the content of television more depraved and more sensational, nowhere does television unapologetically appeal to people's most prurient interests and worst instincts than on daytime talk shows. These are shows that do not even pretend to excuse themselves under a disclaimer that they present fantasy or fiction. They pump up their ratings by portraying their contents as ''real life.'' As a consequence, they demean and exploit real people. By implication, they tell their audiences that men, women, and children who have serious problems in life are an object of freak-show fascination. I doubt that many of the producers or sponsors of these shows will tell you that they are proud of what they do. If you asked them why they do it, in private, and if they were honest, I imagine they would confess they do it purely for money.

During the Lieberman-Bennett press conference last month, which I joined, some clips from these shows were shown to illustrate our point that much of this programming has gone far beyond the pale, and that we as citizens, as leaders, and as consumers should let television executives know and should let companies who advertise know that we believe it is unacceptable for those shows to continue to cultivate the seeds of cultural and moral decline in our Nation.

In subsequent responses to these comments we made at the news conference, and in an effort to defend this medium, some defenders of daytime talk shows suggested that we were out of line by speaking out against the content of these shows. They even raised the question of the first amendment. Some suggested that daytime talk shows were the victims of broad generalizations, perhaps suggesting that we found a few sensationalized, anomalous episodes and were holding those up as the standard daytime talk show fare.

To follow up on this issue, one member of my staff voluntarily conducted an unscientific survey of the topics of daytime talk shows. Every hour or so, he would scan the television on his desk and see what the day's topics were for the daytime talk shows. The results added to the concern that I already had.

The first day, one show was called, ''Stop Pretending To Be a Girl'' and featured young boys whose parents were upset that their sons dressed and acted like a girl. Another show offered a show entitled ''Boys Who Only Have Sex With Virgins.'' Yet another show featured a girl dumping her boyfriend on national television and asking her new ''significant other,'' another girl, to commit to her.

Mr. President, I thought that surely the next day's shows would pale in comparison to these. I was wrong. Subsequent days' reviews of these shows found titles such as ''One-night Stand Reunions.'' Another show was entitled ''I'm Ready To Have Sex With You Now.'' And another show was called, ''I Cheat and I'm Proud of It.'' One show featured a woman who chose to tell her fiance on national television that she cheated on him with her sister's boyfriend and that she lied to him about a miscarriage which was actually an abortion. Another show reunited pornographic stars, strippers, and transvestites with their past lovers. Perhaps the most appropriately titled show of all was the one entitled ''You Look Like a Freak.''

Quoting again from Dr. Centerwall, babies ''are born with an instinctive capacity and desire to imitate adult human behavior.'' Continuing the quote, ''It is a most useful instinct, for the developing child must learn and master a vast repertoire of behavior in short order.'' The problem is that children do not possess an instinct for gauging a priori whether a behavior ought to be imitated.

Therein, Mr. President, lies the problem. We should not hesitate to speak out against things we feel are harmful to our children and to our society. The people that produce television and radio and newspapers have a first amendment right; no doubt about that. We all hold it sacred. But we also have a constitutional guarantee of free speech as citizens. We do not have to be Senators to have that right. Citizens have that right in America. While our guarantee under the first amendment allows programs such as these to exist, it also allows them to be criticized. Further, it allows us to encourage the corporations and businesses whose advertising dollars make these broadcasts possible to rethink their sponsorship. That is what I have been doing for at least the last 5 years. If they do not rethink their sponsorship of these programs, the first amendment and our marketplace allows us, as consumers, to no longer support the products of the corporations that fund programs