

with people in the private sector making large salaries. I do have a problem with private sector salaries being paid to those who cloak themselves in public service, especially when my State gets so little of the Federal money. While CPB and PBS salaries do generally follow congressional caps, the highest salaries in the system are routed through stations, producers, and performers.

For instance, as Senator DOLE pointed out in 1992, WNET of New York reported paying Executive Director Lester Crystal \$309,375 in compensation plus a package of \$92,000 plus in benefits; George Page a director gets \$184,000 plus \$55,000 in benefits; Robert Lipsyte a host gets \$184,000 plus \$54,000 in benefits. KCET of Los Angeles had a salary package of over \$250,000 per year in 1992. According to the Wall Street Journal, the president of Pittsburgh's WQED resigned in disgrace in 1993 when it was revealed he was receiving a second salary of \$300,000 from a station contractor. Other stations still permit other sources of income. Station perks often include cars, travel, service on other boards etc.

Children's Television Workshop, the producer of Sesame Street, reported a top salary plus benefits package totaling some \$625,000 in 1992.

The biggest unknown is payments to PBS stars—since stations contract with private companies to pay the talent. As a result, we do not currently know what MacNeil, Lehrer, Ken Burns, Bill Moyers, or the Frugal Gourmet make. It has been reported that Norm Abrams, the carpenter on "This Old House", makes over \$250,000 a year.

CPB's campaign on children's television is even more alarmist. At a public relations event this month in Washington, CPB trotted out the president of the local PBS station from New Orleans, who gave his dire prediction of what would happen at his station without Federal taxpayers' funds.

"Early morning broadcasts of Barney and Lamb Chop's Play-Along would go away," the station president said emotionally. "It would be a huge step backward for America."

That's what I call a "close the Washington Monument" strategy: Threaten to shut down the most popular and visible attraction when threatened with a marginal loss of tax dollars. And for public broadcasting, the end of Federal subsidies would be but a marginal loss. To reiterate a point made earlier, only 14 percent of public broadcasting's revenues comes from Federal taxpayers. The other 86 percent comes from private contributions, corporate underwriting and State government grants.

Any decently managed organization should be able to sustain a loss of one source accounting for 14 percent of revenues—especially when its horizons are wide open for revenues from other sources.

High quality children's programming is available now through free market media that did not even exist when CPB was chartered and its taxpayer spending began to grow. The Learning Channel, the Discovery Channel, the Disney Channel are but a few. Another, Nickelodeon, has fared so well both critically and commercially that it has sold programming to television in France—an exceedingly hard market for U.S. cultural offerings to penetrate.

Profit and commercialization are treated as obscenities by sanctimonious public broadcasting executives. These prim people remind me of the "sportin' house" piano player who swore he had no idea what was going on upstairs.

As I mentioned before, profit certainly isn't a dirty word to the creators and licensees of such successful shows as Barney and Sesame Street. While hundreds of millions of dollars were being made, thanks to the contracts negotiated by CPB's pious managers, CPB failed to reap a penny in return.

Restructured and truly privatized, CPB could be a clearinghouse for quality programming from our highly creative competitive marketplace. And it would have the right incentives to prevent squandering opportunities and resources.

The American people are right on target in making it a priority to halt taxpayer spending for the CPB bureaucracy, to privatize the public broadcasting industry and bring it up to date with today's markets and technologies. This is one of my top goals as the new chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

OSHA RULES GOVERNING LOGGING OPERATIONS

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, Washington bureaucrats are at it again. On February 9, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, otherwise known as OSHA, will impose rules governing logging operations out in the woods. Now, logging can be hazardous and there are certain rules that do make sense and should be enforced to ensure that folks are not subjected to unnecessary risks. But people who work in the woods are not dummies. They know they do dangerous work, and they know which rules make sense and which ones do not.

Unfortunately, the OSHA folks back here in Washington, DC, got carried away with their rulemaking because they issued a host of logging regulations that, I must tell you, simply defy common sense and they hurt the people who are trying to make a living rather

than helping them. You can tell whoever wrote them works at a desk, probably in Washington, DC, and not with a chain saw.

For example, these new regulations require loggers to wear foot protection that prevents penetration by chain saws. That means steel-toed kevlar boots. While requiring loggers to wear these boots sounds like a good, sensible rule, the fact is, it is not. As Montana loggers will tell you, steel-toed boots are impractical when it comes to steep terrain—and I can tell you, we have a lot of that—and in cold weather. We have some of that, too. Since they reduce comfort and significantly reduce flexibility, they make it easier to slip and to fall, not a good thing when you are carrying a chain saw. Uncomfortable and inflexible boots might make the job more dangerous, not less dangerous. We have to, I think, let the logger make that call.

Furthermore, chain-saw resistant work boots would have to be made out of exotic material like kevlar. These boots are not readily available from manufacturers. It seems impractical to me then to ask loggers to take a vacation while their new up-to-standard boots are on back order.

Another provision requires loggers to wear both eyeglasses and face protection. Eye protection does make common sense. It is a regulation that loggers have strictly followed for many years. The additional requirement of face shields, however, will only cut down on loggers' peripheral vision; here, again, a regulation that creates more of a hazard than it alleviates.

A third provision requires health care providers to review and approve logger first aid kits on a yearly basis; a doctor's appointment for a first aid kit. OSHA has to be kidding. I would think that OSHA could perhaps list the required contents for an aid kit and just leave it at that.

These, Madam President, are but three examples that demonstrate just how bad these regulations are going. They are tough and violators are subjected to stiff penalties. They also make no sense and will needlessly put hardworking men and women out of business come February 9 when they go into effect.

Sometimes it seems to me the Feds have it in for people who work in the woods, or just like to go camping. For example, last year, I persuaded the Forest Service to withdraw a set of regulations that told folks what they could and could not do in the woods. These were the rules that outlawed people from carrying firearms, picking up rocks, or shouting out loud in our national forests.

The Forest Service finally came to their senses and withdrew those regulations, and I hope that the Department of Labor will do the same here. I have asked the Secretary of Labor to suspend implementation of these regulations for 180 days.

Madam President, during this time, OSHA should go back to the drawing board and talk to the people with actual logging experience. These folks can help OSHA create rules that are specifically tailored to the region, compatible to the nature of the work and help, rather than hinder, the logger.

I urge my colleagues to support my call for a halt to the implementation of these regulations as they are currently written.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I applaud the Senator from Montana, and I hope that OSHA will pay attention to his letter. I own a small tree farm in Vermont. In fact, I live on it. We harvest mixed types of trees, mostly hard wood, some soft woods, doing probably 25 to 35 acres a year. The man who does the harvesting was named a couple years in a row as the best forester in Vermont.

He did not get that way by taking unnecessary risks. He has a very good logging business, hires a number of people, logs primarily in the winter-time when the ground is frozen, and moves things out.

Frankly, I would trust him to make some of these judgments, some of the things the Senator is describing. They make no sense in our State, either.

I remember one day walking down the road last winter. It was between 30 and 35 degrees below zero. He was standing with his truck. He really loved it because the roads were frozen and he could move. And he had the roads to himself. But I can see him trying to walk with the type of boots the Senator is talking about. I can see him just breathing into any kind of face mask the Senator is talking about, where it is 30 to 35 degrees below zero. You are going to have nothing but sheer ice on the inside of that face mask. I wonder what kind of safety factor that is going to be.

So, Madam President, I would ask the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, one who has paid more attention to these issues than just about anybody I know in this body, if he would share with me the response to his letter because I think he raises a valid point.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I very much would like to and will share the response I get.

I am curious whether they are going to apply windshield wipers on the face shield.

Mr. LEAHY. Defrosters.

Mr. BAUCUS. Defrosters. I wonder whether, if they are battery powered, the logger will have to carry a battery pack for the windshield wiper on the face mask or the defroster on the face mask because, as the Senator said, and as you know, Madam President, in your State of Maine—our States are northern States—snow falls in the win-

ter. It gets a little cold when we are out in the woods. They could easily fog up. So I am not sure whether the OSHA people are thinking only about dead of summer logging or whether they are also thinking about logging operations the time of the year when it sometimes gets a little cooler.

But I thank the Senator for his observations and I will give him a copy of the letter I get.

HOLDING THE COURSE TOWARD MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we all know that making peace has never been easy. It is hard to forget the pain of having lost loved ones. It is hard to abandon the image of an enemy as fundamentally evil and begin to recognize that same enemy as a fellow human being. It is hard all of a sudden to forget the vocabulary of hatred and re-creation and start using words like "goodwill" and "trust" and "cooperation."

It is even harder to lead others to do these things. The risks are enormous. The enemy leader may doublecross you, or his followers may try to do that. You may be branded as weak and gullible. In fact, extremists on each side may try to undermine the process. And then, if you are the peacemaker, extremists on your side may prevent you from keeping your promises or, worse yet, attack you. The chances are great that you will end up being blamed for any bloodshed rather than being praised for the bloodshed you prevented.

Madam President, I wish to take a moment today to recognize one who, despite all the risks, embarked on the road to peace and who, despite all the efforts to derail him, remains on it. I am speaking of the Prime Minister of Israel, Yitzhak Rabin.

Sunday, Israel was shaken by yet another bomb attack: 19 Israelis were killed and dozens injured. And once more, understandably, families are grieving. Once more, they are wondering what peace with the Palestinians means. And once more, the voices of those who oppose peace are raised high, many calling for Prime Minister Rabin's resignation.

I hope he does not resign. Israel needs him. The Palestinians need him. We Americans need him. In fact, we all need leaders who are willing to take risks for peace wherever that might be in the world.

We grieve, obviously, for the most recent victims of terrorism. A victim of terrorism is a victim of terrorism no matter who initiated it. How tragic that even now, a year after President Clinton brought Prime Minister Rabin and Chairman Arafat to the White House to shake hands, there are still people who cannot put the pain of past losses behind them, people who still fail to see that continuation of confrontation only brings more pain, people who are still not ready to work to-

gether for a better future for their children.

Madam President, as we here in America grieve, I hope we do not lose our bearings. I hope we keep sharply focused on what is the goal, which is peace in the Middle East.

Madam President, I say this because over the past several months, we have seen some interesting activity here on Capitol Hill. I know in my case, and in others, we have had a group of Israelis coming to our offices informing us what American national interests are. Not Israeli interests they would like us to support—in fact, no reference to Israel or the interests of the Israeli Government. They say they are doing us the service of helping us figure out what American interests are.

Frankly, Madam President, I think that is what I was elected for; that is what I am paid for. And I will try to make that determination without someone from another country coming in and telling me what our interests are. I am referring here to those Israelis who are waging a campaign to have Congress in advance forbid American participation in any eventual peace monitoring force in the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria. Why are they doing this? Is there a peace agreement between Israel and Syria? No. Has the Israeli Government asked us to commit ourselves to participate? No. In fact, on the contrary, Madam President, Prime Minister Rabin and Israeli Ambassador to the United States Itamar Rabinovich have made clear that their Government is very anxious to have United States participation in a Golan Heights peace-monitoring force, assuming that at some point possibly one is created, just as the United States has participated and continues to participate effectively in the Sinai force monitoring the peace between Israel and Egypt, something that we have done for years, since the time of the Camp David Accords.

So, why, Madam President, would anyone want the U.S. Government to forbid American participation in a venture even before we know what the venture is? There will be time enough to make that determination once and if there is a peace agreement and we are asked to help. In fact, I ask why would Israelis be working in Washington to persuade the United States Government to act against the wishes of their own Government?

I assume they are here to oppose their own Government, and they would like Americans to help bring down their Government. I am opposed to that. And I am opposed to those who come here who really want to stop the peace process.

Madam President, I do not envy Prime Minister Rabin having to negotiate with Syrian President Assad. He is not a person to whom I take very kindly, President Assad, the same President Assad who has been responsible for terrorist attacks against the Israeli people for decades. This is the