

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

# PROFESSIONAL GOLF ASSOCIATION TOUR AND POSSIBLE FTC COMPLAINT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that the Federal Trade Commission is considering filing a complaint challenging the PGA Tour's conflicting event and media rights rules as unfair competition.

I question whether the public interest would be served by eliminating the foundation for the success of the tour, which has worked well for a very long time and enjoys the support of players, fans, and sponsors. I understand that the PGA tour has generated more charitable contributions from its events than all other sports combined. I am concerned that forcing the tour to alter its rules may put these charitable activities at risk.

Mr. President, I have today sent a letter to Federal Trade Commissioner Starek outlining my concerns. I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 15, 1995.

Hon. ROSCOE B. STAREK, III,

Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR COMMISSIONER STAREK: I understand your staff in the Bureau of Competition, after a four and one-half year investigation of PGA TOUR, has recently recommended to the Commission that a complaint be issued challenging the PGA TOUR's conflicting event and media rights rules as unfair methods of competition.

I am familiar with the PGA TOUR's operations and its record of growth, integrity and contributions to charity. PGA TOUR has been able to generate more charitable contributions from its events than all other professional sports combined. More than \$30 million in charitable donations were generated through PGA TOUR events in 1994 alone. I am concerned that forcing the PGA TOUR to alter its rules may put these charitable activities at risk.

Through years of experience, the players have learned that the way to accomplish their objectives was to develop rules which include the players' commitment to support their own events. Only through this commitment, as expressed in the conflicting event and media rules, will the sponsors and broadcasters who provide the financial support for PGA TOUR events risk investment in PGA TOUR tournaments. It is because of the sponsors' and broadcasters' financial support that the players, through PGA TOUR, are able to produce a ten-month season of weekly tournaments with significant prize money for not only the world's top money winners, but also young aspiring players and players past their prime. Thus, it appears to be clear that both the purpose and effect of the rules in question are to increase output and competition, not to limit competition unfairly.

As you know, our antitrust laws do not prohibit reasonable limitations among members of a league or organization of competitors where the limitations are required to increase output and competition. It is my understanding that the PGA TOUR was inves-

tigated by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in the late 1970's and no action was taken to challenge or change either these rules or other conduct of the PGA TOUR.

I appreciate your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE,  
Republican Leader.

## A DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, one of the vital crusades in American history was the women's suffrage movement—a giant step that, in extending voting power to American women, vitalized our entire democracy as few changes in our political system have.

A complement to the extension of voting rights to women was the founding, seventy-five years ago, of the League of Women Voters of the United States, a non-partisan organization of more than 1,100 chapters and in excess of 150,000 members and supporters nationwide. In my own State, West Virginians can be particularly proud that the current National President of the League of Women Voters of the United States is Mrs. Becky Cain, St. Albans, West Virginia. She is a woman who has served with great distinction during her two-year term.

As I suggested, today marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the League—its "Diamond" Anniversary, as it were. Certainly, throughout those seventy-five years, the League of Women Voters has more than proved and repudiated its value to our democratic way of life in its unflagging efforts to educate voters, to encourage the exercise of our precious franchise, to elevate political debate, and to urge improved quality among the men and women who seek public office.

Mr. President, as we witness the birth pangs of democratic practice around the world—as we observe nations and groups of people within nations struggling to learn and to revere democratic institutions, and to respect honest differences of opinion within their electorates—we can be thankful that America has come so far in little more than two centuries in balancing and preserving those instruments of political and electoral life that have provided us with a long heritage of the peaceful transfer of political power and mutual respect among people with differing political values. In no small part, we owe to the League of Women Voters a large measure of our gratitude for enshrining that tradition of civility in our national electoral life. I believe that for that legacy of peaceful change and spirited debate in lieu of armed conflict, we stand indebted to efforts of groups such as the League of Women Voters—groups devoted to the peaceful and serious practice of democracy.

Mr. President, I salute the League of Women Voters, and I know that I speak for all of our colleagues on the League's anniversary in expressing my appreciation to the League for its

record of the enhancement and celebration of our Constitutional rights, privileges, and ordinances.

## TRIBUTE TO THE HON. CAL ANDERSON

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a former colleague, a great legislator and a courageous and loyal friend, Washington State Senator Cal Anderson.

I worked with Cal Anderson when I served in the Washington State Senate. He is known throughout my home State as an outstanding legislator. His reputation is one of hard work, of holding true to his beliefs but compromising for the greater good, and of reaching conclusions that work for everyone. Cal is a true believer, as I am, in good government.

I was honored to work with him on open record policies in my home State. I was astounded by his ability to be inclusive, to bring everyone into the debate. Cal made sure that our bill was not just legislation that was good to look at but legislation that was good for people.

Cal is a Vietnam veteran. He earned two Bronze Stars and four Army Commendation medals for meritorious service in that conflict. He is courageous, Mr. President, and he is honest. He has touched so many lives across this country—his very presence in our State legislature shows young people that no matter who they are or where they come from, everybody has a great deal to offer their communities and our country. His very presence tells us that America will be great when we let everybody participate and be an equal voice in our national dialog.

Cal Anderson is one of the highest ranking openly gay elected officials in this country. He continues to break down stereotypes and ignorance. And, he is a champion and a role model for all people. Nobody in the State legislature thought of Cal as the "gay legislator"; we thought of him as an extraordinary man who just happened to be gay.

And, this week, Mr. President, with his characteristic honesty and integrity, Cal Anderson told us he has AIDS. He has been diagnosed with non-Hodgkins lymphoma and is undergoing chemotherapy. I called him today, and was not surprised to find him in his senate office in Olympia. He has a lot of work to do, and is determined to get it done.

Mr. President, Cal Anderson's honesty should inspire all of us who shape public policy to take this epidemic seriously. In my own State, more than 5,500 men, women, and children have been diagnosed with AIDS. More than 1,100 cases have been reported over the previous year. Cases are growing in rural areas, and cases are growing among women.

A few weeks ago, we learned the sad news that AIDS is now the leading cause of death of Americans between

the ages of 25 and 44. I fear that everyone in America will soon know someone who is infected with HIV. My friends and neighbors in Washington do now: his name is Senator Cal Anderson.

Mr. President, let me conclude by thanking Cal for everything he does for my home State, and by wishing him and his partner, Eric, only the best with his therapy and in the future.

#### MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support raising the minimum wage. It helps working Americans improve their standard of living. It moves in the direction of self-sufficiency and away from welfare. It gives help to those who practice self-help.

First, raising the minimum wage will certainly help increase working Americans' standard of living. In this country, a full-time job should not mean full-time poverty. The typical American family is living on less than it did 15 years ago. The current minimum wage of \$4.25 an hour for a full-time year-round worker equals only \$8,500 per year. This minimum wage is not a living wage.

Second, increasing the minimum wage helps people move toward self-sufficiency and away from welfare. I know that raising the minimum wage 90 cents is not enough to lift a family above the poverty level. But, if a 90 cent increase to \$5.15 an hour is the best we can get right now, then we will take it.

Finally, raising the minimum wage will help those who practice self-help. Two-thirds of minimum wage workers are adults over the age of 21. They are reliable, dedicated employees who want a chance to move up in society, or just to get back on their feet.

They believe, as we all do, in the satisfaction that comes from hard work. They do not apologize for not making a lot of money and they are not looking for public hand-outs, but they certainly deserve a decent wage for honest work.

Mr. President, the minimum wage is worth less than it used to be. Because of inflation, the value of the minimum wage has fallen by nearly 50 cents since 1991, and is now 27 percent lower than it was in 1979.

I know in the coming weeks we will see many statistics, graphs, and figures from supporters and opponents of raising the minimum wage. But in this debate, I do not want my colleagues to lose sight of the fact that these statistics represent people, real people who go to work every day so they can pay their bills, and have a decent place to live.

These are real people, who live in Baltimore, Annapolis, Hagerstown, and other American cities who must choose between clothing or food for their kids, between medical care or heat.

A low minimum wage contributes to the notion of "working poor". By raising the minimum wage, we give people a chance to help themselves, to do bet-

ter for themselves and their families, and to achieve the American dream.

That is why I support this legislation to help make work pay.

#### THE NATIONAL SECURITY REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate is concerned about the national security of our country. I know each of my colleagues give serious thought and consideration to the details of how best to provide for our national defense and the strength and well-being of our Armed Forces.

And for that reason call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article by the Secretaries of State and Defense, entitled "Foreign Policy, Hamstrung," which appeared in the February 13 edition of the New York Times. Secretary Warren Christopher and Secretary William Perry have joined together to present what I believe is a most cogent and informative analysis of the National Security Revitalization Act, legislation which the other body is considering today and tomorrow.

Secretaries Christopher and Perry point out that this act which is part of the so-called Contract With America that the Republican leadership of the House is rushing to pass, is in its current form, a deeply flawed piece of legislation. It is their considered opinion that the measure would undermine any President's ability to safeguard our national security and to effectively exercise his or her constitutional role of commanding our Armed Forces.

I believe we should give serious consideration to the concerned views expressed by these two able Cabinet officers, who are directly responsible for overseeing the day-to-day work of guiding our Nation's foreign and defense policies.

They believe that the act's first major flaw is that it would return the United States to a crash-schedule deployment of a costly national missile defense system designed to protect against a nonexistent credible threat to our national security. They correctly point out that such an unwarranted and expensive system would not only divert billions of scarce defense dollars from other more urgent defense needs, such as the readiness and well-being of the men and women of our Armed Forces, but that the unnecessary expenditure of funds on continental defense against a nonexistent ballistic missile threat would also be detrimental to the ongoing development of an effective theater defense system.

It is indeed ironic that while some on the other side of the aisle, both here and in the House, loudly proclaim the need for increased spending on a multibillion-dollar star wars program to defend against a theoretical intercontinental ballistic missile attack, they are, at the same time, unwilling to support the necessary funding for the Nunn-Lugar program to reduce the threat of nuclear attack by working

cooperatively with Russia to dismantle the missiles and nuclear warheads which were once aimed at our cities.

Secretaries Christopher and Perry also point out that the proposed act unilaterally designates certain Eastern European states for NATO membership without consideration of the concerns and desires of other NATO members, or the readiness of the designated states to assume the military and political obligations inherent in NATO membership.

Furthermore, they contend that, by its restrictive language this act would effectively abrogate our U.N. treaty obligations to pay our share of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The end result of such short-sighted restrictive action would be the elimination of the availability to the United States of U.N. burden-sharing resources.

We in the Congress must be extraordinarily careful not to permit overzealous partisanship to encourage the hurried enactment of legislation which restricts the ability of this, or any future President of the United States, to carry out his fundamental constitutional duty to protect the national security of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry be printed in the RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1995]

#### FOREIGN POLICY, HAMSTRUNG

(By Warren Christopher and William J. Perry)

This week Congress is to consider legislation that would undermine this and every future President's ability to safeguard America's security and to command our armed forces. The measure is deeply flawed. It is called the National Security Revitalization Act, but if adopted it would endanger national security.

We are committed to working with Congress in a bipartisan fashion. But if this measure is passed in its current form, we have told the President we will recommend that he veto it.

The bill's first flaw is that it would return the United States to a crash-schedule deployment of a national missile defense, designed to protect the U.S. from missile attacks. That deployment is not justified by any existing threat to our nation's security, and it would divert billions of scarce defense dollars and other resources from more pressing needs, particularly in the area of theater missile defenses.

We are building effective theater defense systems; they will protect U.S. forces abroad, and the ports and airfields they use, from Scud-like missiles in the hands of rogue states like North Korea, Iraq and Iran. The continental U.S. does not now face a ballistic missile attack from these states. But we are not complacent. We are conducting a broad research and development program that will, in a few years, be able to deploy a national missile defense system whenever a threat emerges.

Second, the bill unilaterally and prematurely designates certain European states