

Mr. GLENN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SNOWE).

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam 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. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

#### CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President and Members of the Senate, I was concerned this morning to see in the Washington Post a story that was critical, essentially, of companies that might be interested in purchasing, acquiring, or partnering with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other public broadcasting entities. In fact, the story highlighted or used as a headline, referring to these companies as "vultures moving in," and quoting one public broadcasting executive as referring to them in that way.

I think it is most unfortunate that fine, honest, telecommunications companies or other companies who might be interested in purchasing or running or managing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other public broadcasting entities or contributing the same amount of money the Federal Government now contributes in exchange for certain program and commercial rights with conditions of children's programming and conditions of rural radio and rural TV, to refer to them as "vultures" indicates the mentality of the insider group at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the so-called public broadcasting family.

This family consists of inside-the-beltway crowd at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service, National Public Radio, the Association of Public Television

Stations, et cetera. It includes groups and certain foundations that surround the Corporation for Public Broadcasting such as the Children's Television Workshop. It includes some of the stations that get the lion's share of the funds such as WNET, which gets at least 20 times as much Federal money as my huge geographic State gets. This group is very defensive to any change.

Madam President, I am chairman of the committee that has oversight over the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and related agencies. We are supposed to think of some new ideas. There has been a telecommunications revolution since 1967. I think it was good that public radio and TV were created. It is now up and running.

There are several other privately funded areas that are producing the same kind of programming at a great profit, including Nickelodeon in children's television, including the Learning Channel, including the History Channel, and so forth. Granted these are on cable. Some say that they do not reach everybody.

We are also in an age when we have the computer Internet and many other exciting telecommunications and information technologies which did not exist in 1967.

We have VCR's, we have a number of additional new telecommunications and information technologies that will be coming if my Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995 is enacted. We will have an explosion of new telecommunications and information technologies. It is time that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other public broadcasting entities in this country be reformed and reinvented.

So I put these suggestions forward in the most sincere of fashions, but every time I make a suggestion, somebody in the public broadcasting family comes back with a very critical comment, discrediting it without any discussion of the facts.

The facts are that the American taxpayer is now providing a free public platform for many performers who make great profits, and I have nothing against profits, but the taxpayer is left out.

So I want the quality programming. It could be sold with conditions. Telecommunications in this country is privately owned, but they have conditions for universal service and certain rules on telephones and telecommunications devices. Railroads in this country are sometimes sold with public conditions, such as the Conrail sale a few years ago. Airlines have public conditions under which they operate.

We have reached a time when the Corporation for Public Broadcasting must rethink its role, it must rethink its relationship to some of the other telecommunications technologies. It can profit from them. It can get along without a Federal subsidy, and it would be operated much better if it were privatized.

I have spoken to several privatization experts in the last week. I find the only people opposed to this are those inside the beltway, the people in that public broadcasting family who get salaries of between \$200,000 and \$600,000 a year, in some cases, whose salaries exceed the Members of this body. But these people cloak themselves in the public robe, saying that they are public servants. Well, if they want to be public servants then they should be paid like public servants, I suppose, in the opinion of some, if they do not want to be private.

They want to have their cake and eat it, too. They now have advertising on public radio and television. They get all sorts of grants. They have private-sector salaries, but yet they want the taxpayers' money.

So I say decide what you are or who you are, but get caught up with the telecommunications revolution, in any event. And the fact that several telecommunications companies are interested in buying, acquiring, or partnering with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other public broadcasting entities indicates a synergistic relationship in this day and age. How wonderful it would be if public broadcasting would synergistically interact with the other new telecommunications, with computer Internet, with VCR's, cable TV, and with lots of other technologies. For example, Nickelodeon, which produces so much good children's programming that it is being sold in France.

#### PRIVATIZING PUBLIC BROADCASTING

If one message is clear from November's elections, it is that Americans want deep cuts in Federal spending, without gimmicks or special pleading. As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I expect to propose cuts of tens of billions of dollars from current levels of spending—and to privatize wherever possible. The Clinton administration as well is calling increasingly for spending cuts and for privatizing government agencies and subsidized enterprises.

A prime candidate for privatizing is the America's public broadcasting system. I want to wean public broadcasting from the \$300 million annual subsidy it gets from Federal taxpayers. I am convinced that the service public broadcasting is intended to provide could be better offered without costly Federal spending on posh Washington headquarters and legions of high-salaried bureaucratic personnel.

As the Senate is well aware, we in America continue to face a severe fiscal crisis. With an annual budget deficit projected at \$175 billion and a national debt of over \$4.6 trillion—with a "T"—we simply cannot afford to pay for all the good and worthy sounding projects which vie for American's tax dollars.