

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the Omnibus Property Rights Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for a hearing on emerging infections, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Aging will hold a hearing on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 10 a.m., in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The hearing will discuss quality of care in nursing homes.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during a session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 18, 1995, at 11 a.m., in Senate Hart room 216, on the Ruby Ridge incident.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ABDICATING ON THE CASE FOR ENDOWMENTS

• Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to invite the attention of the Senate to an article in the October 2 edition of the Washington Times entitled "Abdicating on the Case for the Endowments." The author is Leonard Garment, a Washington lawyer who has followed the issue of Federal funding of the arts and humanities since he worked as White House counsel to President Richard Nixon.

"That soft gurgling you hear," writes Mr. Garment, "is the sound of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities being slowly strangled to death."

In the article, Mr. Garment lists the abuses of the public trust that, in his words, "denigrate the values of millions of taxpaying Americans." The notorious Andres Serrano project. The panels that judge projects by ideological litmus tests and fund the politically correct. The wheelbarrows full of money dumped into frivolous whimsies.

He concludes that the solution is not to throw the baby out with the bathwater—to risk weakening America's cultural treasures because of these abuses. Rather, he advocates a clean break with the past. He would disassemble and rebuild them from the ground up.

"Such reforms," he writes "are not only possible but already on the congressional table—in the form of a bill, jointly introduced by Senators Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and Robert Bennett of Utah, that addresses every one of these issues."

I am gratified that a man of Mr. Garment's stature and experience supports our bill. I recommend this excellent article to my colleagues, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 2, 1995]
ABDICATING ON THE CASE FOR THE
ENDOWMENTS

(By Leonard Garment)

That soft gurgling you hear is the sound of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities being slowly strangled to death. The House of Representatives has voted to fund the endowments at drastically reduced levels and take them out entirely in two years. The Senate, while not imposing a similar deadline, has also slashed the endowments' money.

Yet most fans of the endowments are walking around with "What, me worry?" smiles on their faces. Since they survived, they think their arguments worked and that they can just keep making these arguments again and again until their opponents' fervor cools. Then it will be business as usual.

I fear the endowment enthusiast overestimate the stamina of their friends and underestimate the resentment of their adversaries, in Congress and out. The editorial stalwarts at The Washington Post, for example seem to have quietly tiptoed out of the current debate, leaving it to Jonathan Yardley, The Post's senior book reviewer and distinguished social commentator—a man with cast-iron convictions, by the way—to call for an end to the Endowments (Aug. 28, Sept. 10, Sept. 25). During this barrage, the Post gave "Taking Exception" time to a wearily hackneyed defense of the humanities endowment by one of its senior officials (Sept. 19). Jane Alexander, chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, the lead horse of the cultural troika, appears to have taken a sabbatical powder from public advocacy, apparently content to let matters rock along without risking a misstep that might upset the congressional stay of execution.

The national endowments are making a miserable mistake in thus defaulting on the attacks against them, letting the once-splendid arts and humanities enterprise fade slowly into history with little more than befuddled whimpers of support. This is a pity, since every legitimate objection made by those who want to pull the plug on the endowments can be answered. What has been missing, as usual, is the creative intelligence and the legislative will necessary to do so.

After 30 years of reasonably close observation of the spasms of congressional support and hostility toward the endowments, it seems to me that the current mixture of indifference and resentment, reflecting the powerful conservative political tide, involves five major categories of complaint. First, it is said that the endowments have supported artistic and humanities projects that denigrate the values of millions of taxpaying Americans. Robert Mapplethorpe, Andres Serrano, Annie Sprinkle and Her Magnificent Speculum, blah, blah, blah. All true. However these unpleasant projects came to be funded, the relevant fact is that they should not have been. But the chance of such mistakes in the future can be reduced to near-zero if the endowments are prohibited from awarding grants, subgrants or fellowships to individuals. These personal subventions have been the main instruments of the corrosive damage inflicted on the endowments.

Next, the endowments are called mutual back-scratching societies that use their hundreds of so-called "peer panels" to support highly personal and ideological judgements about art and scholarship. True again. But this need not be if we eliminate the large array of narrow and manipulable peer panels and create a small number of cross-disciplinary advisory groups, less vulnerable to parochialism and conflict of interest, to advise the endowment leadership on the distribution of endowment resources. The arts and humanities are too important to be left to artists and humanities—who are intensely concerned, and understandably so, with self-expression, not with safeguarding cultural institutions from political harm. Individual grants and fellowships are a fine idea but quintessentially the business of private foundations and corporate or individual donors. And I refuse to believe that an artist or scholar who has something important to say will pack up his palette or PC if he or she is not paid in advance. Just try making the argument for the necessity of individual grants to the hordes of young writers, painters and musicians who work without complaint at part-time jobs to support their particular muses.

Third, critics contend that the endowments are used by federal arts bureaucracies as instruments for their own private agendas. Also true. To the extent that the law permits, we should clear out these long-timers—who think they, not the taxpayers, own the endowments. We should make the rest accountable to a council subject to Senate confirmation as well. The council should be composed of mature persons required by law to be genuinely "learned in the arts and humanities." Even allowing for the occasional political hack who will slide through, such a council would be very difficult for bureaucracies to roll.

Front and center for years now, the big complaint is that the endowments try to be all things to all constituencies rather than acting out of their own sense of national cultural mission. For this grievance Congress has a remedy at hand. It can establish by law that the endowments will support only American cultural institutions whose weakening or destruction would mean the loss of irreplaceable treasures. These institutions—there are not that many—would be selected by the national council and would be the nation's indisputable best: The great museums, symphony orchestras, jazz ensembles, art schools, performing arts centers, ballet, operas and theater companies. In short, they would be the emblems of the honor that America gives to its major cultural institutions and of the importance it ascribes to them as instruments of aesthetic education. Congress also can (and should) stipulate that

a substantial part of the federal arts and humanities budgets will be distributed, by formula, to states and local governments for the support of local equivalents of the national treasures, mandating substantial community outreach as a condition of the award of public support. This money would also be subject to a categorical ban on individual grants.

Finally, the endowments are said to be overloaded with administrative costs and redundancies in areas, such as film production, already supported by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Public Broadcasting System. A final "true." To solve this problem, the two endowments (and the Institute for Museum Services) should be consolidated into a single endowment under unified leadership, with a presiding chairman and three deputies for the arts, humanities and museum services components. This merger would save millions of dollars, and each of the constituent organizations would benefit immensely from the enhanced cross-disciplinary scrutiny. The humanities section of the new endowment could be constructively pared by at least a third of its present budget with that money redistributed to meet large and urgent arts and museum services needs. (Thumb through the annual NEH catalogue of humanities grants; if you can explain 10 percent of these mystifying projects, you should be the next dean of Harvard College.)

Such reforms are not only possible but already on the congressional table—in the form of a bill, jointly introduced by Sens. Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas and Robert Bennett of Utah, that addresses every one of these issues. It would be a shame if partisans of the endowments ignored this bill and thus missed the opportunity to anticipate and block the future proposals that will otherwise lead inevitably to the evisceration of the endowments. It may be too late in the budget cycle to consider structural reforms" right now; but reauthorization or deauthorization time will soon roll around and a deep breath and a careful look at the history and future structure of the endowments will be in order.

The national endowments are powerful symbols of an American commitment to the support and dissemination of the arts and humanities at a time when a horrifying junk culture pervades our public spaces. Even aside from this concern, abandoning the endowments would be a shabby act, utterly unworthy of a great nation. Their massive 30-year contribution to American culture dwarfs their mistakes. They furnish unequaled cognitive tools for early education for the children of what will be the largest and most complex multi-cultural nation in the world.

Ways and means can be debated; what I believe unarguable is that the endowments should not be destroyed—slowly, swiftly or at all—simply because aggressive cultural predators and self-indulgent members of the federal bureaucracy have occasionally corrupted the work of the agencies over the past three decades. And if these persons and organizations now hope to stave off reform, believing responsible defenders of the endowments will simply go away, those of us who care for the arts and humanities and understand their importance should not let them get away with it.●

THE BAD DEBT BOX SCORE

Mr. HELMS. While we are waiting, Mr. President, let me mention that since February 1992, I have each day the Senate has been in session reported to the Senate the exact total of the

Federal debt as of the day before the close of business, or in the case of Mondays the previous Friday. I call it the bad news about the Federal debt, and today's news about the Federal debt is pretty bad.

Before we have "another go," as the British put it, with our little pop quiz that I so often have, I hope Senators will remember one question, one answer, about this \$5 trillion debt that the Congress of the United States has run up for future generations to pay off. That one question on my pop quiz is: How many millions of dollars would it take to add up to \$1 trillion?

While anybody within earshot is thinking about that, I would suggest that we bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress, where I work—here and the House of Representatives on the other side—that ran up this Federal debt that now exceeds \$4.9 trillion. We are going to hit \$5 trillion before this year is out. And these young people who are serving as pages, their generation and generations following them, will be struggling to pay off the debt. Every day that we fail to balance the Federal budget runs the debt up further.

All right, what about the total Federal debt as of the close of business yesterday, October 17? The total Federal debt down to the penny stood at \$4,968,953,453,657.73. Now, this figure is not far from \$5 trillion.

Another depressing figure discloses that on a per capita basis, assuming that every man, woman, and child would accept and pay off somehow his or her share of the debt—and we know that only about half of the people, men, women, and children, will in fact pay any taxes at all, but if everybody had a share and paid it off, it would amount to \$18,862.23 per man, woman, and child.

Now, then, remember the question that I asked in my little pop quiz? How many million in \$1 trillion? There are 1 million million in \$1 trillion. That gives you some idea of the enormity of the debt and the enormity of the irresponsibility of the Congress during the past generation or more.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, awaiting wrap-up information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. For the final time this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

BILL READ FOR THE FIRST TIME— H.R. 1715

Mr. HELMS. Now, Mr. President, I will inquire of the Chair if H.R. 1715 has arrived from the House of Representatives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has. It will be read for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1715) respecting the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am going to object to my own request since there is no Democrat on the floor. I am going to do their job for them in this instance.

I now ask for its second reading. And I object to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HELMS. So the bill will remain at the desk and be read a second time following the next adjournment of the Senate; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HELMS. All right.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HELMS. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 10 a.m., tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1995, and that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 10:30 a.m., with Senators to speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the exception of two Senators: Senator KASSEBAUM 10 minutes and Senator DORGAN 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m., tomorrow, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 927, the Cuba Libertad bill, and that at that time Senator DODD be recognized to offer his two amendments that remain in order under a previous unanimous-consent agreement.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

PROGRAM

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, it is the hope of the leadership that the Senate may complete action on H.R. 927 by 12 noon, or thereabouts, tomorrow; therefore, votes can be expected to occur prior to 12 noon tomorrow.

So I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on or in relation to the Simon amendment numbered 2934, Thursday, October 19, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, following 20 minutes of debate to be equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Following the disposition of H.R. 927, it is the hope of the leader that the