accomplished each year during Alabama Business Connections, and wish the Alabama Minority Supplier Development Council all the best for a successful event this summer. They are to be commended for their outstanding work toward the cause of furthering business opportunities for minority suppliers.

REINVENTING PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, another thoughtful voice has joined the debate in favor of re-inventing public broadcasting. Jack Kemp has written an article, published in today's Wall Street Journal, making the case that public broadcasting can be re-invented and become self-funding. This would be a win-win proposition for taxpayers, for television and radio audiences, and for the public broadcasting industry.

Secretary Kemp's analysis is timely, because through the rescission bill Congress has an opportunity to begin an orderly and reasonable phasing out of Federal subsidies for public broadcasting. I support the approach of the House of Representatives, to begin phasing out the subsidies in a significant measure, now.

Secretary Kemp just this week has been named chairman of the new National Commission on Economic Growth and Tax Reform. This is by appointment of Majority Leader DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH. Secretary Kemp is superbly qualified for this position. I offer Secretary Kemp my hearty congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Secretary Kemp's article, entitled ''Privatizing PBS Doesn't Mean Killing Big Bird,'' from today's Wall Street Journal.

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

The Wall Street Journal , April 5, 1995

PRIVATIZING PBS DOESN'T MEAN KILLING BIG BIRD

(By Jack F. Kemp)

Politics doesn't have to be a zero-sum game, even when it comes to budget cutting—and especially when it comes to as contentious an issue as cutting the public television budget. I believe it's possible to find a compromise where both sides of this debate emerge winners and happy.

First, let's look at the impasse we seem to have reached in Congress. On the one hand, we have a new generation of Republicans who are absolutely serious when they talk about limiting the size, scope and power of the federal government. For these ''neo-Federalists,'' it isn't enough that a program have some positive benefits or a committed political constituency (almost all programs do); there must be a compelling reason why the federal government, as opposed to state and local governments, or the private sector, is involved. As they have said, no domestic program, except Social Security, will be exempt from scrutiny.

Energizing the neo-federalists is a budget deficit that they have claimed they could get under control, when no one else could—and to a great extent, they realize that their political legitimacy rides on making good on their promise. The almost $300 million yearly subsidy to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) will add up to almost a billion dollars over the next three years. That's not chicken feed, even for Big Bird.

On the other hand, there are large numbers of people inside and outside Congress who value public broadcasting. Leaving aside for a moment questions of political bias, they have for many years found on the PBS stations quality programming that is hard to find elsewhere. those with young children especially value what I would call the ''trust factor,'' the fact that one can leave one's children watching PBS without having to constantly monitor the TV for fear that they will be exposed to the kind of mind-numbing violence so common on the other stations. For adults, the ''MacNeil-Lehrer Newshour'' provides a similar respite from ''sound-bite'' news programs.

What is the solution? It lies, as it so often does, in a growing, technologically expanding private sector—in a future that is bigger than the present, where one person doesn't have to lose for another to gain. Where both sides can be winners.

The following is a brief sketch of how the CPB can be privatized in such a way that it emerges stronger, healthier and in a better position to continue the kinds of quality programs that many admire it for.

It must first be stressed that ''privatization'' does not mean ''extinction.'' Far from it. Look at Britain's experience: British Airways, British Telecom and British Petroleum are good examples. In our own country, Conrail has benefited from privatization. Privatization is the new rage in our nation's cities and towns because local governments have found that services are often delivered better when they are transferred back to the private sector.

The fact is, as many on the side of public broadcasting concede, the CPB, like most government-funded agencies, has its share of waste and redundancy. An analysis by the Twentieth Century Fund found that 75% of its budget went to overhead (including inflated executive salaries). The most expensive, and least necessary, expenses are the number of stations that carry its programming. ABC, the largest network, has 221 stations. NBC has 213. CBS and Fox have 208 and 201 stations, with sometimes as many as four or five signals serving essentially the same market.

As part of any privatization scheme, CPB should be asked to choose a core group of, say, 160 stations that would cover the entire country. All other stations would have the opportunity to ''merge'' into the core station that served their market. PBS could shift the licenses of the ''non-core'' stations to commercial usage and auction them off to the highest bidder. The proceeds would go to a National Programming Endowment that would be administered by PBS and used to make the network self-sustaining.

Pro-PBSers should realize that spectrum auctions are no small potatoes. Even with the current technology, PBS could garner some $2 billion from auctioning off its redundant stations. But the technology is changing, making each one of these station's signals potentially many times more valuable. Meanwhile, the market is getting more competitive as the newly created networks of United Paramount and Warner Bros. scramble to pick up affiliates—and that pushes value up, too.

A conservatively estimated endowment of $2 billion would eliminate PBS's need for federal subsidies. CPB—which currently administers government subsidies to PBS—would no longer need to exist, eliminating an expensive layer of bureaucracy. Certainly, PBS's cushy executive salaries would have to be trimmed to be more in line with the private sector, but each core station would receive increased membership contributions (from the redundant ''non-core'' stations that have been eliminated), as well as corporate and foundation grants. Meanwhile, PBS would, by dint of necessity, become entrepreneurial by developing and owning shows that it would sell around the world, as well as merchandising rights to its children's productions (an area of funding that officials admit they have not taken proper advantage of).

Will there be resistance to this plan? Yes, by those who distrust the private sector, no matter what. And by those politicians who like having a PBS station in their district that is required to carry local school board or city council meetings, giving incumbents a free platform. But for those who honestly want to cut the budget deficit, and for those who care about the future of PBS, this is a plan that makes everyone a winner.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the incredible Federal debt which long ago soared into the stratosphere is in about the same category as the weather—everybody talks about it but almost nobody had undertaken the responsibility of trying to do anything about it until immediately following the elections last November.

When the 104th Congress convened in January, the U.S. House of Representatives approved a balanced budget amendment. In the Senate all but one of the 54 Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment but only 13 Democrats supported it. Thus, the balanced budget amendment failed by just one vote—there will be another vote later this year or next year.

As of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, April 5, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly $4,878,158,190,719.92.

REED LARSON'S 40 YEARS: TIRELESS DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a little over 40 years ago—January 28, 1955—the Nation's pre-eminent defender of workers' freedom was founded in the basement of Washington's Mayflower Hotel.

It was named the National Right to Work Committee, and it was organized by a small group of railroad workers and small businessmen. The Right to Work Committee has grown into a proud home for freedom-loving Americans who believe that while workers may have the right to unionize, no American worker should ever be compelled to join, or even support, a labor union.

Mr. President, upon the founding of the committee, its first president, Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr., of New Jersey, declared, ''[We] will not shrink because of attacks which may be made against us. We intend to do everything