

that the problem goes much deeper than individual and collective resolve. Rather, it is the institutional structure of Government that encourages short-term responses to problems instead of a focus on the greater good and the future.

There is no doubt about what our responsibilities as national leaders are. There is also no question as to what the American people want and deserve. There is a question as to whether the Congress will respond affirmatively by accepting this challenge. We have the momentum and the opportunity to finally stop mortgaging the future and saddling our children with unconscionable debts.

I look forward to the debate in the coming days. I hope we will find the strength and determination to do what we know must be done in order to restore our economic health.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I have spoken critically of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the whole system of public broadcasting with which it is associated on this floor on some occasions, but I would like to compliment CPB for something its board did last week.

The board decided to begin to require that the CPB will receive a percentage of income from sales exceeding \$25,000 of toys, books, clothing, and other products related to shows funded by the CPB. I hope that this will begin immediately to substitute for taxpayers' payments to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Mr. President, I have been one who has advocated reinventing or possibly privatizing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. That means the corporation here in Washington, DC. Each State has its State public broadcasting system and a lot of them do a great deal of good in terms of education, and in terms of providing unique programming.

Indeed, it is my opinion that public broadcasting in South Dakota would be better off under a privatized or a reinvented system of public broadcasting.

I also want to commend the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in that the executives, I understand, are starting some meetings with at least one regional Bell operating company. I hope they meet with several cable companies and others to see how they can interact with the information super-

highway and perhaps provide other income and enrich programming in public broadcasting in the United States.

Last Friday, I had a fascinating conversation with Glen Jones, of Jones Intercable of Colorado. He is privately providing educational materials and educational programming across the United States and around the world. He wants to expand upon this and finds it is a very marketable and useful thing to do for public service, as well as in terms of promoting his own company.

In addition, there are many privately run cable channels elsewhere which are making a great contribution in terms of quality educational programming. Nickelodeon is making a great contribution to children's programming and is even marketing children's programming in France. The Learning Channel, the History Channel, Arts and Entertainment, the Disney Channel, and many more, are providing good programming with which our public TV friends could interact and could achieve a great deal of income in some cases.

Earlier, I observed on this floor that we could privatize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and other entities in public broadcasting; that if a private company would take a percentage of the program rights that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service or National Public Radio just give away, it would more than replenish the \$300 million a year that the Congress gives the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. That has been verified by many corporate leaders who have told me they would like to buy public broadcasting entities or they would like to participate in partnerships for public broadcasting. These private sector leaders assured me they would accept conditions requiring preservation of a certain amount of rural service or small city service or children's programming.

I have compared the situation to a local telephone company which is a private company but which has public service requirements such as universal telephone service.

So, Mr. President, I think it is very appropriate that we should be working on reinventing and privatizing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and public broadcasting in general. The Vice President, after all, asks that Government be reinvented and that we try to privatize certain agencies.

But I would strongly disagree with those who say we are trying to kill Barney or we are trying to kill children's programming. That is just not true. Or that we are trying to kill individual States' public broadcast programs. That is simply not true. What we are trying to do is to be inventive.

We are facing a budgetary crisis of profound proportions. Let's face it: the Corporation for Public Broadcasting most likely at least will receive a cut. We are in a situation where I think they would be grateful for ideas on how they could make more money. One of

those is getting a percentage of the program revenues. Presently we have a lot of people making a lot of money from public broadcasting while the taxpayers don't share the wealth.

Also, Mr. President, the corporation has to look at its distribution of funds. I do not think my State of South Dakota gets a very good deal, very frankly. Much is made of \$1.7 million in Federal funds that is sent to South Dakota. But the State legislature, individual contributors, and corporate grants provide an overwhelming majority of the funding.

If we take a look at where some of the money goes, one station in New York gets about \$20 million from Federal taxpayers. That is not the State of New York, that is one station. That station has executives earning between \$200,000 and \$400,000 a year.

We have the so-called Children's Television Workshop, which has, as Senator DOLE has pointed out on this floor, paid salaries of between \$400,000 and \$600,000 a year. Those are taxpayers funds.

"Well," they say, "we take that money out of what is contributed." But it all comes out of the same pot.

Now, I am not against people getting rich. I am not against people in the private sector getting high salaries, but these folks wrap themselves in the cloak of public service. They wrap themselves in the clothes of one serving the public and then collect taxpayers' money. Meanwhile, our States that are told, "You are so lucky to get \$1.7 million, you are so lucky, you should be so grateful."

If you really look into it, most of the money is going to a small public broadcasting clique—an east coast and inside-the-beltway gang.

I think the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting acted correctly the other day when it voted to start getting a percentage of profits from the programs and related products. They should have done it long ago. I do not think they would have done it if it were not for the pressure from people such as myself on the Senate floor and elsewhere. The taxpayers should get some relief. I am going to make sure they do.

There was a 1981-to-1984 study about privatizing public broadcasting and getting revenue from more commercial advertising. Make no mistake about it, there are ads today on public radio and television. Granted, they are called by the code word, "underwriting," but they are ads just the same. This study found that the viewers were not offended by having ads at the beginning and end of programming or even more extensive ads. This is one source of revenue.

There are the programming rights. That is another source of revenue. There is the chance to interact with the information highway. That is still another potential source of revenue. So, I think the public broadcasting executives should be creative in going

out and finding new sources of revenue and new sources of opportunity and, also, new sources of material.

I have been troubled by the fact that I think taxpayers' money is being used to lobby for more taxpayers' money. There is a nationwide grassroots program to contact your Congressman to be sure to continue full funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This is being done, in part, with Federal money, in my opinion. If you ask, they say, these are our affiliates doing this and they are doing it with money that is contributed in these beg-a-thons, money being contributed privately. But the contributors are not told that. They are told this is listener-supported radio and TV. They are not told part of their money will be used to lobby for Federal money. They should be told, "This is a taxpayer-supported channel. We get some private contributions but much of it is taxpayer supported, both State and Federal." There should be honesty in these beg-a-thons.

But, also, let us be very careful about this business of lobbying for more Federal money with Federal money. Here we have a very sophisticated group concentrated in Boston, New York, and Washington, DC, that is doing so. They are not saying, "Senator PRESSLER wants to keep public radio and TV at the State level." They are saying, "Anybody who wants to change anything is trying to kill public radio and TV."

I submit that public broadcasting will be stronger when it is reinvented and privatized. I submit that the entire public broadcasting system has become bureaucratic, inefficient, and wasteful. Taxpayers around the country would be amazed at how much money is being wasted.

The 20th Century Fund did a study in which they found that 75 cents of every \$1 in public TV is spent on overhead. That has not been rebutted. So those who serve on the oversight committees—and I chair the Commerce Committee, which has a duty to conduct oversight over the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—it is our job to dig into things, to make suggestions, maybe to take some heat. But it is not the job of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the other public broadcasting entities to put false information out across the country. They are wrong when they say that people who are required to make budget cuts and suggest ways to reinvent the system are trying to kill local public broadcasting. That is not the case.

There was local public broadcasting before the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its glut of Federal funding ever came along. In fact, some people feel we would have a stronger set of local public stations had the national Corporation for Public Broadcasting never been created in 1967.

We should think about that. Here we have a very intelligent, sophisticated, lobbying campaign that has people scared that their public broadcasting

channels will be shut off if this group here in Washington, DC, does not get their Federal money. That is not true. That is not true at all. In fact, my State may well be better off in a reinvented or privatized system of public broadcasting. That is true of most States.

Again, I congratulate the CPB board for doing what they should have done long ago, getting a percentage of the program and product profits. That will provide them with a good deal of revenue. It might provide more revenue than they have ever gotten from the Federal Government, and that would not bother me a bit. I hope they continue to make such steps.

I hope public broadcasting executives have many meetings with the companies that are on the information superhighway, ranging from local telephone companies to cable companies to long distance companies to computer companies, to see what interrelation there can be.

Finally, I would like to know what is public broadcasting's own plan to reinvent itself? So far it seems only to be to get more Federal money, to stay just as things are, not to make any changes, and of course to be the self-appointed arbiters of American culture. But I am asking them to roll up their sleeves, get out, listen to a few people, and not expect increases in Federal funding because it will not be coming.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak at this point.

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

##### *To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of July 18, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. On December 22, 1994, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan gov-

ernment in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on July 18, 1994. The amendment (59 Fed. Reg. 51106, October 7, 1994) identified Arab Hellenic Bank (AHB), an Athens-based financial institution, 4 other entities, and 10 individuals as Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs) of Libya. (In addition to the recent SDN action against AHB, the Greek central bank has recently announced that AHB's banking license has been revoked.) Included among the individuals are three Italian shareholders in Oilinvest (Netherlands) B.V., who increased their positions in the Libyan government-controlled firm shortly before United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 883 directed a freeze on certain Libyan assets owned or controlled by the Government or public authorities of Libya.

Pursuant to section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, FAC has determined that these entities and individuals designated as SDNs are owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the Government of Libya, or are agencies, instrumentalities, or entities of that government. By virtue of this determination, all property and interests in property of these entities or persons that are in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. Further, U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in transactions with these individuals or entities unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. The designations were made in consultation with the Department of State and announced by FAC in notices issued on June 17 and July 22 and 25, 1994. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 136 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (73) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent Government of Libya interest. The largest category of denials (41) was for banking transactions in which FAC found a Government of Libya interest. Three licenses were issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya.

In addition, FAC issued eight determinations with respect to applications from attorneys to receive fees and reimbursement of expenses for provision of legal services to the Government of Libya in connection with wrongful