

question has to be asked, why? What is the rationale?

We all understand we have to cut somewhere, but does it make sense to be cutting this program and then turn around and spend a huge amount of money on the Market Promotion Program, for instance, where we give money to McDonalds and a whole bunch of big companies to sell their goods abroad, companies that can afford to advertise on their own?

Mr. President, we have some \$85 million, I think it is, in the Market Promotion Program. The Market Promotion Program gives Tyson Foods \$937,000; International Foods, \$179,000; Gold's Gym, \$226,000; Mott's International; Pepperidge Farm; Tropicana; Entenmanns; Tootsie Roll; Beer Nuts; Ocean Spray; Friendly's; Gortons; Perdue; Giant Food; General Mills; Pillsbury; Ralston Purina; M&M Mars; Campbell Soup; Haagen-Dazs; R.W. Frookie; Snapple; Chichita; Borden; Hershey; Brach's Candy; Miller beer—they all get money, but Youth Build is not going to get money.

It does not make sense, Mr. President. I think what the American people said last November is, "We want you to express some common sense on our behalf," and, for the life of me, I do not understand why we would want to be cutting a program like Youth Build which has been proven to work.

Last night, I listened to a young man by the name of Robert Clark. Robert Clark was in prison. Robert Clark is now a full-time student at a well-known university on the east coast of the United States. He is doing well. He has testified before committees in the Congress. He has done an extraordinary job of explaining to people the connection between a program like Youth Build and his capacity to rejoin society as a productive member. It just seems to me that if you are going to talk about investing in the future of this country, we ought to remember what makes a difference, Mr. President.

Robert Kennedy spoke of this in 1968 in a high school in Scottsbluff, NE, and he talked about the sense of community that we ought to be celebrating in a choice like this with respect to Youth Build. He said:

At every critical mark in our history, Americans have looked beyond the narrow borders of personal concern, remembering the bonds that tied them to their fellow citizens. These efforts were not acts of charity. They sprang from the recognition of a root fact of American life that we all share in each other's fortunes, that where one of us prospers, all of us prosper, and where one of us falters, so do we all.

He said in 1968, and we ought to think about it again as we make these choices in 1995, that:

It is this sense, more than any failure of good will or policy, that we have missed in America.

Mr. President, in the course of exercising choices in this legislation, it seems we are perhaps about to again miss that in America, and I hope we

will not. I hope we will recognize that perhaps this is an oversight, and we should make a different judgment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to support an effort to restore funding to the Corporation for National and Community Service. The case for national service depends on understanding that it uniquely offers a triple investment in the future productive capacity of our people and our communities: First, the service performed; second, the service experienced; and third, the postservice educational benefit.

I know the word "investment" has been abused and debated on the Senate floor over the years. For some, it is just a code word for Government spending. We must not, however, become so cynical that we do not see a real investment when a payoff is staring us in the face.

The first component of benefit of this investment is the word in the name of the organization—service. Critics have tried to attack national service in a number of ways.

During the debate on the authorizing legislation, we heard cries about how many more Pell grants we could fund with the money, or how many more job training programs we could fund with the same money. Though these criticisms make valid points as far as they go, they lose sight of the crucial fact that national service does not exist to provide student aid or job training. The most important benefit of this program is the service provided by AmeriCorps members.

Mr. President, I visited a number of these AmeriCorps projects, and before that, the national service projects that were the pilot projects authorized before this program. I have seen young people in a small town of Vidalia, GA, helping teach Spanish to young students that did not understand basic Spanish. Most importantly, these students were filling a huge void where there were no Spanish teachers in the community by helping immigrants learn to speak English, because they had no way of learning without someone who could converse with them.

I have seen young people also in the same community and in Thomson, GA, helping in nursing homes in crucial kinds of occupations with our elderly

citizens. I have seen them in homes for the elderly. I have seen them helping the elderly stay in their own homes, which is most important in terms of both their quality of life and in terms of actually saving taxpayers' dollars.

I have seen them in tutoring and mentoring positions for young kindergarten, first, second and third graders in inner-city schools. And I have seen them in connection with Habitat for Humanity building new homes for needy families and have begun construction on many other homes.

I have seen them in many other occupations, as have others who have observed this program throughout the United States.

The second kind of benefit national service provides is the personal and civic development of the participants. In recent years, too many Americans have forgotten the relationship between rights and responsibilities. We often see reports in the news media about various groups or individuals proclaiming that this Government service or that protection is a right. We are all so often reminded of the rights all Americans should enjoy that we lose sight too often of the other side of the same coin: The responsibilities that we share in order to make the rights possible.

Just as we have rights to freedom, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, those sacred rights carry with them equally sacred responsibilities.

National service is reconnecting the relationship between the two fundamental tenets—rights and responsibilities—of our democracy for thousands of young people. This program provides young people with opportunities to fulfill that obligation to give something back to their country and to their communities.

The third kind of benefit which is derived from the national service program is the postservice educational benefit. As most of my colleagues will agree, education is the best indicator we have of upward mobility. Not only does the participant increase his or her potential to get a high-paying job and become a contributing taxpaying member of the community, the community also benefits from citizens who run businesses, citizens who pay taxes, citizens who participate in civic organizations, and citizens who contribute to the community.

This sort of educational assistance becomes even more important in a time when our more traditional forms of educational financial assistance are facing severe funding restrictions and reductions.

I hope all of my colleagues understand this is not a program which fills members' time doing calisthenics or singing "Kum Bah Yah" around the campfire. They perform hard work desperately needed by local citizens, governments and businesses that is not being performed by others in the community.

They get their hands dirty. They are tired at the end of the day. They occasionally pound a thumb with a hammer in the building occupations which many of them are doing.

The bottom line is that the work they do is needed by our communities. Along the way, they acquire real world skills and maturity that will make them better citizens and help the country.

For Congress to decimate this program at a time when it has only begun, before any organized results can be compiled, would be to sell this program, and I believe our young people, and our Nation short.

There is a good analogy, Mr. President, to be found between national service and our Nation's Armed Forces. We do not maintain Armed Forces in order to provide valuable skills and develop good character in young men and women. Rather, Armed Forces personnel develop skills and character in the military as they carry out their primary mission of providing for our Nation's security. The same is true of national service. Members perform crucial important services in their communities, and along the way they gain important life skills.

Additionally, we often hear from some critics who attack national service as coerced voluntarism—as if the provision of a stipend for living expenses somehow cheapens the service performed or stains the motives of the participant.

I note the critics seldom raise the same objections to our Nation's All-Volunteer military force. I believe these points are made very clear in a recent op-ed by Charlie Moskos, a respected sociologist at Northwestern University, and I ask unanimous consent that this op-ed piece be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 14, 1995]

BUILDING A CONSTITUENCY FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

(By Charles Moskos)

My first and only meeting with Newt Gingrich was in the spring of 1981. The second-term congressman already had a reputation for new ideas and he wanted to talk about national service for young people. He certainly seemed supportive of the concept. Yet, Speaker Gingrich is now quoted as "totally, unequivocally opposed to national service." He lambasted the newly established AmeriCorps as "coerced voluntarism" and "gimmickry."

The quick explanation for this turn-around is that the Republican leader is making points against one of the most significant accomplishments of the Clinton administration. With a GOP majority on Capitol Hill, national service is targeted for elimination in the next budget authorization. Gingrich's present hostility to national service also has an upside, however. Now is the time to refocus public attention on the philosophy and program of AmeriCorps. To bring Gingrich back on board, supporters of national service should be responsive rather than confrontational.

First, clarify the terminology. AmeriCorps members are not "volunteers." They receive a minimum-wage stipend and a modest education benefit—\$4,725—for each year of service completed. AmeriCorps participants should be called corps members, servers or enrollees.

Gingrich's designation of "coerced voluntarism" is an oxymoron that misses the point. Does he object when we call our military an "All-Volunteer Force" where soldiers earn a decent salary? Or that a member of the Peace Corps is officially called a "Peace Corps Volunteer" when paid a stipend equivalent to that of an AmeriCorps server? And, while on the subject, let us not forget volunteerism does not always come free, either. In its first year of operation, the volunteerism-boosting Points of Light Foundation, a George Bush pet project, granted \$4 million to service organizations while spending \$22 million on promotions and administrative expenses.

AmeriCorps was set up to be run mainly through local agencies and non-profit organizations. But national service faces a core paradox. Everyone is for local control and decentralization, but only federally-run and centralized organizations have name recognition and credibility. The blunt fact is that not many Americans have never heard of AmeriCorps and even fewer know what it is doing. Contrast this with Franklin Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps, John Kennedy's Peace Corps and even Lyndon Johnson's VISTA. National service is, after all, national.

Even though the membership of AmeriCorps in its first year, 20,000, is greater than that of the Peace Corps at any time, its visibility does not faintly approach the Peace Corps. More striking, the glow of the highly centralized and Army-run CCC remains strong in the national consciousness, even though it expired a half century ago. Yet, the National Youth Administration, the larger but decentralized contemporary of the CCC, is all but forgotten.

Two changes are needed if AmeriCorps is to capture the public imagination. At the federal level, the National Civilian Community Corps, presently a minor component of AmeriCorps, must become a modern version of the CCC, one of the most successful programs of the New Deal era.

At the local level, AmeriCorps must focus its mission. Currently, it does too many things leaving a diffuse image. An impressive example of what national service can do comes from Germany. Conscientious objectors to the draft perform alternative service. One key duty—meals on wheels, transportation to shopping and medical facilities—allows the elderly to continue to live in their own homes. Savings are tremendous. The value of each server is estimated at more than \$25,000 per year above costs. These "civilian servers" are now so highly valued that they are used as an argument to maintain military conscription.

Whether federally or locally organized, the emphasis in national service must always be on the service delivered, not on the good done for the server. AmeriCorps tends to get mushy—or, as Gingrich puts it, "gimmicky"—on this score. Proponents of AmeriCorps too often stress how community service benefits the young person, rather than what the server is exactly doing. Young people doing calisthenics in youth corps T-shirts is not the way to guild a constituency for national service.

We do not have armed forces to mature young men and women. But the military performs these functions well precisely because it is not defined as remedial organization. The same must be the case for civilian service. We should remember that when FDR in-

troduced the CCC, he stressed the concrete works that would be accomplished not the self-improvement of the corps members. The standard for AmeriCorps should be simple: If the server disappeared would anybody miss her or him?

Another trouble spot must be pointed out—a skewed political base. Support for youth corps is by no means to come across that way. After all, it was the centrist Democratic Leadership Council that initiated the contemporary move to national service. Conservative icon William F. Buckley Jr. has long been an eloquent advocate for the cause. Liberal proponents of AmeriCorps must practice diversity when they seek counsel on national service. Bipartisan input is a prerequisite of bipartisan support.

One more thing liberals ought to raise with Newt Gingrich. Without AmeriCorps who will staff all those orphanages coming on line?

Mr. NUNN. We call the military services now a volunteer force, but they are paid substantially more, even at entry levels, than any of the young people in national service. I think that is appropriate.

The educational benefits are also higher, substantially higher, than the national service educational benefits. If we add educational benefit to the total pay package, there is no real comparison between the pay and benefits of the military, which is much higher than national service, and that is the way it should be, because military personnel are also in harm's way on many occasions.

It is a different occupation, but the thing that is very similar is that they are both called voluntary and they both are voluntary. No one is compelled to take either occupation or either program.

I think we should be very careful in saying on the one hand that national service is not voluntary because these young people are being paid, and the military is voluntary because they are also being paid and they are also in many of the occupations, getting special bonuses. They are still volunteers.

Considering all the benefits national service provides, at the community level, it is difficult to see why some of our colleagues object to it. Indeed, given the debates we have heard on unfunded mandates legislation and the, I think, justifiable move for continued devolution of responsibilities from the Federal to State and local governments in this body, I would hope that our colleagues would agree that national service represents the type of government we ought to support.

National service is not a Federal mandate for any specific type of service. That is left up to the communities, and the communities decide whether they want to participate at all. National service gives communities and service organizations the chance to voluntarily identify and perform the kind of service which best meets the local need, with the Federal Government providing most, but not all, of the funding.

At the same time, it allows young people to serve their communities and

to address real problems without Federal micromanagement.

Finally, Mr. President, I would make the point that the proposed rescission of national service funds is, to say the least, premature. The first full funding year is only half complete and the data on the programs' accomplishments is only available in anecdotal form.

We need analysis on the program. Rather than making a decision to cut this program based on incomplete information now available to the appropriations process, we should save this debate on the scope and the direction of the program for the authorizing committee next year, when more complete information is available.

I am confident that the program, if given a chance to do so, will admirably prove its worth. At least we should give it a chance.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to restore funding of the national service program. I urge them not to fail the students and the young people who are learning maturity and life skills through their service in the program. Most important, I urge them not to fail the communities, the churches, the schools, the businesses, and the individuals who benefit from the hard work of our young people. I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask to speak 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. I wanted to respond to the Senator from Georgia, who I have the utmost amount of respect for, and respect his views on the national service plan. I just happen to disagree with them. I wanted to comment on a couple of the points he made.

I have heard often this analogy that national service corps members are volunteers as much as people who are in our military are volunteers because we have an all-volunteer force. The reason we call it an all-volunteer force, it is the only area that I am aware of where we have the Government authority that can force people to do something they would not otherwise do. Force people to work. In other words, work in the military.

The Government, through our authority as a Government, can if we so choose, force people, conscript people into the military.

As I am sure the Senator from Georgia knows, there is a whole body of employment law out there that says an employer cannot force an employee to perform for the employer. If I am an

employer outside of the government, outside of the military—not just outside of the government, outside the military—I cannot force someone to go to work for me. If a person wants to leave my employment, I cannot force them to stay.

So the reason it is called a volunteer army is because the military has the authority to make a person work for them even if they do not want to.

To suggest that AmeriCorps and national service is volunteer, based on that motto, makes me a volunteer. No one forced me to run for the U.S. Senate. So I guess I volunteered for it. So I guess people could call me a volunteer. The young lady standing in front of me who is taking down my words, is, in fact, a volunteer. No one made her take this job. She took it because she volunteered for it.

So we are all volunteers. Well, that is nice. That is sort of fuzzy and makes the waters a little murky. If we are all volunteers, then—none of us are volunteers, really. And that is really the point. This is no more a volunteer than any other job in any other agency of the Federal Government.

In fact, I believe the Senator from Missouri who came up here yesterday, Senator BOND, had a chart that showed that about 10 percent, or 15 percent of AmeriCorps employees work for the Federal Government, work for the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Energy, the Department of Agriculture, the National Endowment for the Arts. A lot of them are, in fact, plain old Government employees, paid for through this AmeriCorps Program.

I just hope we get the rhetoric right here. This is not voluntarism. There really is not any other example that would suggest that someone who is making what an AmeriCorps volunteer makes is a volunteer.

Senator GRASSLEY was on the floor yesterday talking about employees from ACORN, which is a housing organization, funded with \$1 million for AmeriCorps. The average cost for each AmeriCorps volunteer is \$41,000. That is what each ACORN volunteer is paid in compensation packages, from the Federal Government.

The Legal Services Corporation has a \$1 million AmeriCorps grant. These volunteers make \$48,000 a year. Now, it is hard to sell, at least to me and I think a lot of Americans, that people making that amount of money are truly volunteers.

What the Senator from Georgia did say that I agree with is that there are worthwhile projects going on within AmeriCorps. I do not think there is any question there certainly is a need to help children learn how to read or help people who need some assistance. The AmeriCorps program does fill in some gaps and holes and can be very helpful.

What I have suggested in the past, and I suggest to the Senator from Georgia, is that there will be a bill

coming to the floor of the Senate this year, and it is a welfare reform bill that is going to have work programs in place for people who truly are in need of the work experience, the training, the education. Those people are the folks we should be targeting these kinds of projects on, these kinds of duties that can be done by people who truly need them.

The problem with AmeriCorps is you do not have to be poor to be in AmeriCorps. You do not have to be young. You always hear people defending AmeriCorps, saying, "All these young people, we need to help them." You can be in AmeriCorps if you are 60 years of age. You can be in AmeriCorps if you are a millionaire. There is no age limitation up to 60; there is no limitation on income. In fact, 25 percent of the people already in AmeriCorps have family incomes of \$50,000 or more.

So when you hear of all these wonderful images of poor young children out there doing these things and this is what these programs are for, that is just a few examples. That is not the norm. What we should do is take this idea of community service, which is a very beneficial one, and focus it on the people who need it the most and create those work programs for the people who are already receiving the Government benefit, and that is people on welfare who desperately need, desperately need the opportunities that these kinds of worthwhile jobs—and many of them are worthwhile jobs—would have.

So I am not against community service. I do not think anybody who stands up here says we are against community service. We believe community service is a laudable thing. We also believe it should still be a volunteer thing, not a paid position.

I think it undermines the whole volunteer spirit in America if you take a selected class of people and say these people are somehow better volunteers, and therefore should be paid, than those who are not.

So again, I commend the Senator from Georgia for his idealism, but I think we can better focus it on the people who are in need, the people who already receive Government assistance, the people who need the opportunity to move forward as opposed to folks who are being targeted for the AmeriCorps Program today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, the leaders of both parties have been meeting and working on an agreement and I believe we are about ready to make some requests here. I understand perhaps we will be ready to go with that in just a moment. So in order to facilitate the distinguished Democratic leader, if I could at this point observe the absence of a quorum so we could get this unanimous-consent agreement put in.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield for a question. We want to get this unanimous-consent request as quickly as possible, but I will be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. EXON. Do I understand from the Senator from Mississippi that finally, at long last, the two leaders are working and are, according to the information that he has, about to come on the floor to outline some unanimous-consent type of agreement that will move the process ahead?

Mr. LOTT. I believe that has been occurring. I know the leaders met within the last few minutes and they are looking over an agreement which we hope to be able to announce momentarily. I see the distinguished Democratic leader is here, so maybe we are ready. We are not quite ready yet?

Mr. EXON. I was about ready to try to get the amendment before us set aside for the purpose of calling up an amendment that I first presented at the desk way back last week, sometime Friday. I had it ready Wednesday, almost a week ago, and have been trying to accommodate everybody else. But there does not seem to be much accommodation.

But I guess I can wait for another 10 minutes to see whether or not we can bring some reality out of the morass that we seem to be in from the standpoint of procedure in the Senate as of now.

Mr. LOTT. I believe the Senate is underway and I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his patience.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SNOWE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELF-FUNDING FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I rise to speak on a portion of this consideration regarding the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It has been my concern for some time that we could make the Corporation for Public Broadcasting self-funding, or, if I may use the term, privatized, although I think self-funding would be better.

Presently the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a private corporation with Federal funding. At the end of their programming each day you see it says, "The Corporation for Public Broadcasting funded by the Federal Government"—a private corporation funded by the American people.

I am of the opinion that through a program that I recently presented in the Washington Post, the corporation can become private, can become self-funding, and it is not necessarily by in-

creasing advertising. It is rather by digitizing, compressing its programming, and making it available for sale to such outlets as Arts and Entertainment, to the Learning Channel, to the History Channel, and to the hundreds of new video dial tone channels that are springing up across the country from the regional telephone companies.

Also, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its public broadcasting entities could get a great deal larger percentage of the things that appear on the free public platform. They have already voted to start getting a larger percentage of that.

For example, whether it is Barney, or whether it is Bill Moyers' Journal, or whatever else, if there is money made from the sale of tapes of that show and paraphernalia, I think the taxpayers ought to be entitled to 20 percent or 30 percent of it—or maybe more—whatever they can negotiate in a business-like way.

In addition, public broadcasting will be digitizing and compressing parts of its spectrum, and they can rent part of that spectrum or sell it or use it in some way, and they can have far more money than they have now.

So my point is, Madam President, that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the other public broadcasting entities are sitting on a treasure trove that they can utilize. The taxpayers of this country do not have to subsidize them. They can do just as well. They can provide more money to rural radio and TV and more money to children's programming than they are now.

If this body wishes, when it comes to zeroing out and to replacing over a 3-year period or 2-year period their moneys, they can place a requirement for certain rural programming and for children's programming—just as when Conrail was privatized on this Senate floor and we placed certain covenants or requirements on Conrail to provide certain local service, just as we require airlines to provide certain safety for the public, just as we require that other private companies meet service requirements, such as the regional telephone companies who have a universal fund to provide long-distance services in rural areas and small towns. All of this can be done.

Vice President GORE talked about reinventing and privatizing. I think and have thought that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Public Broadcasting Service, and National Public Radio can do so.

Madam President, the defenders of the status quo have waged a nationwide campaign that is very misleading. They say that Senator PRESSLER and others are out to kill Big Bird or out to kill rural radio. Is it not strange that they do not talk about cutting anything inside the beltway? When we look at the National Public Radio building and its equipment; at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its salaries; at the nonprofit organiza-

tions that have sprung up alongside that receive their grants and which in turn pay salaries two and three times higher than Senators make—we should remember that this is taxpayers' money.

So I join in this effort that is on the Senate floor, and also I am working with the Budget Committee to have a 3-year plan to phase out the Federal subsidy.

Earlier this year, Madam President, there was some controversy about a questionnaire that I sent to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. As chairman of the oversight committee, I asked a lot of questions about where and how the money moved. In my State of South Dakota, we get \$1.7 million from Washington, DC, but instantly have to send over \$1 million back for programming. My State and small rural States should be able to shop around. Maybe they would want to buy some digitized compressed programming from Arts and Entertainment, or from Nickelodeon. This children's programming is marketed to France, incidentally, and dubbed. It is about the only cultural import the French welcome, educational children's programming made privately.

The point of the whole matter is that there are plenty of opportunities for public broadcasting to make money, and it is most unfortunate that they are not carrying that out. But they put forth the argument that we are trying to take away children's programming and rural radio. That is not true.

In my State, our State legislature voted down a resolution urging that more Federal moneys be sought for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting because people understand that there is a very misleading campaign underway here. My State is one of those that has the most rural radio perhaps of all.

Let me say, Madam President, that I have contributed every year to public broadcasting, long before this debate. I contributed again this year because I think it has its place. But those small States are not getting their fair share under the present formulas that are used. And far more of the moneys go to grants to their favorite foundations and nonprofit groups here inside the beltway that pay salaries up to \$750,000 a year as Senator DOLE published on this Senate floor, and other salaries of \$450,000, and so forth. Those are taxpayers' dollars, incidentally.

So the next time someone comes up to me and says, "Ah, you are against rural radio," I would say to them that one salary here paid at the favorite foundations of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is greater than my whole State gets in a year's time.

So let us put things into perspective. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its related entities here inside the beltway have become a bloated bureaucracy, and reform is needed.

They are making some reforms now, and I commend them for those reforms. One of the reforms was that they voted