

So I would oppose this amendment and I ask my colleagues to oppose it also.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of the following Executive Calendar nominations:

Calendar No. 175, Robert F. Rider; Calendar No. 176, John D. Hawke, and Calendar No. 177, Linda Lee Robertson.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, that any statements relating to the nominations appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations were considered and confirmed en bloc, as follows:

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Robert F. Rider, of Delaware, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for the term expiring December 8, 2004. (Reappointment)

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

John D. Hawke, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Linda Lee Robertson, of Oklahoma, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

The Senate resumed with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1278

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska, Senator KERREY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, thank you.

As I indicated earlier, this amendment simply conforms with the underlying theme of S. 652 which is that if we have competition the consumers will benefit. The current language of the bill moves us in the direction of less competition. You cannot go from 25 percent ownership of stations in a service area to 35 percent without decreasing the competition. Inescapably the consequence is decreasing the number of broadcast owners in a particular area.

So, in addition to the localism argument, which was very eloquently made by both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from North Carolina, the important issue when you are dealing with news—I point out a very important issue—when you are dealing with the question of how does the electorate, how does the public, how do the citizens themselves acquire information, is the issue of concentration of ownership. That is a very important issue.

So in addition to the idea that this shifts us away from local control of stations, there is also the very important idea of concentration in the industry, and lack of competition. It is highly likely that companies that we currently see as networks, or companies that we currently see as broadcasters, will be coming in at the local level saying we would like to provide what we previously regarded as dial tone and vice versa. This whole thing is going to get jumbled up in a hurry. As the Senator from South Dakota said several times, we allow people to get into each other's business. That is basically what the bill does.

So I hope Members who want competition, who want the consumers to benefit from that competition, will support the Dorgan amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will not use all of the remaining time. I am going to send a modification to the desk.

If I might have the attention of the Senator from South Dakota, who I think is now looking at the modification, the modification is purely technical in order to conform the amendment to the manner in which the underlying bill is drafted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. I have a right to modify the amendment without consent.

Mr. PRESSLER. We have a problem with one portion, which is to modify or remove such national or local ownership of radio and television broadcasting.

Mr. DORGAN. Radio has never been a part of the amendment that we offered today. It was not intended to be a part. I described the amendment earlier today as only affecting television stations. That is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER. In the amendment we have national or local ownership of radio and television broadcasting.

Mr. DORGAN. It is not the intent of the amendment to include radio. It is the intent to only include television, and that is the way I described it earlier today just after the noon hour.

Mr. PRESSLER. As I understand it, every Senator can modify his amendment at any time. That changes the amendment based on my understanding. The amendment I have in my hand reads radio and television broadcasting.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. PRESSLER. A Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota needs to ask unanimous consent in order to modify his amendment.

Mr. PRESSLER. In view of the fact that the amendment I have in my hand is to modify or remove such national or local ownership of radio and television broadcasting, and just on the very moment of the vote to take out radio, and I want to consult with some of my colleagues, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, my understanding of the parliamentary situation is that once all time is yielded back, under the unanimous-consent request, I would then be allowed to modify my amendment, which I sought to do. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It still would require unanimous consent to proceed under that scenario.

AMENDMENT NO. 1278, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to modify my amendment, and I send the modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I have 2 minutes remaining. In order to accommodate my friend from North Dakota, I would yield back the remainder of my time so that will put his request to modify in correct parliamentary procedure. Is that a correct assumption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not be necessary for the Senator to yield back time in order for the unanimous-consent modification of the amendment.

Mr. BURNS. Then I reserve the remainder of my time.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to modify the amendment? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1278), as modified, is as follows:

Strike paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of Section (207) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“(1) REVIEW AND MODIFICATION OF BROADCAST RULES.—The Commission shall:

“(A) modify or remove such national and local ownership rules only applying to television broadcasters as are necessary to ensure that broadcasters are able to compete fairly with other media providers while ensuring that the public receives information from a diversity of media sources and localism and service in the public interest is protected taking into consideration the economic dominance of providers in a market and

"(B) review the ownership restriction in section 613(a)(1)."

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have 2 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I shall not use the entire 2 minutes. Let me just say that when I proposed this amendment earlier today, I indicated the amendment was about removing the provision in the bill that eliminates the restrictions on broadcast ownership on television stations. The bill is drafted that way. The first two sentences strike those provisions dealing with television stations and there was some ancillary language that relates to the rules that will have to be redrawn at the FCC. That referred to the set of rules in which they were dealing with both television and radio stations, so the word "radio" was there but it had nothing to do with the strike. So we have since corrected that so that no one can misunderstand what the discussion is.

The discussion is that we believe the elimination of the ownership rules, the ownership restrictions, 12 stations and 25 percent of the market, the elimination is not in the public interest, and we believe very much that the provision that strikes those prohibitions ought to be taken out of this bill, and the provisions of the 12 television stations and 25 percent of the market ought to remain. That is the purpose of it. I already described what I think is the importance of it, and in the interest of my friend from South Dakota, who has been very cooperative on this, in the interest of his moving this along, I would yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. BURNS. When you start talking about, I guess, broadcast companies, I find it unlikely, coming out of that business, that any one company would come to buy all the broadcast stations, especially in television, in a specific market.

Now, we have limited it nationally to 25 percent by law under the cable rereg bill, 25 percent of the market to a specific company, but we did not say that you were limited to a certain amount of cable systems. In other words, you just do not own so many cable systems if that adds up to 25 percent.

What we are saying here is that you are limited not only as to the number of stations you can own but also a limit on the number of listeners or people who might be in that specific market nationally.

So I just think it is bad policy right now. We do not limit any other media on the amount of ownership nationally across this country.

The local station, if it is owned locally, does a much better job in com-

peting against an absentee owner. And that question came up in the hearings. I said even though I might do business in Georgia—and there was a Georgia businessman who owned a station in my State of Montana—it is still tough to do business against a local owner of a local station whenever the investment is there and the money is spent there.

So again I would say that even the marketplace itself limits ownership in television and, of course, I am objecting to any kind of an ownership restriction on radio stations altogether.

I reserve the remainder of my time. I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. BURNS. I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield back his time?

Mr. HELMS. I certainly do. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1278, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MACK (when his name was called). Present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 253 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Faircloth	Kohl
Baucus	Feingold	Lautenberg
Biden	Feinstein	Leahy
Bingaman	Glenn	Levin
Boxer	Gorton	Lieberman
Bradley	Graham	McConnell
Bumpers	Grams	Mikulski
Byrd	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Campbell	Harkin	Murray
Conrad	Hatfield	Pell
D'Amato	Heflin	Pryor
Daschle	Helms	Reid
DeWine	Johnston	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Domenici	Kennedy	Simon
Dorgan	Kerrey	Thomas
Exon	Kerry	Wellstone

NAYS—48

Abraham	Frist	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nunn
Bennett	Gregg	Packwood
Bond	Hatch	Pressler
Breaux	Hollings	Robb
Brown	Hutchison	Roth
Bryan	Inhofe	Santorum
Burns	Inouye	Shelby
Chafee	Jeffords	Simpson
Coats	Kempthorne	Smith
Cochran	Kyl	Snowe
Cohen	Lott	Specter
Coverdell	Lugar	Stevens
Craig	McCain	Thompson
Dole	Moynihan	Thurmond
Ford	Murkowski	Warner

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mack

So the amendment (No. 1278), as modified, was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 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. D'AMATO. 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. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I move to table the motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. On this question, the yeas and nays were ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Akaka	Feingold	Lautenberg
Baucus	Feinstein	Leahy
Biden	Ford	Levin
Bingaman	Glenn	Lieberman
Boxer	Gorton	McConnell
Bradley	Graham	Mikulski
Bumpers	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Byrd	Harkin	Murray
Campbell	Heflin	Pell
Conrad	Helms	Pryor
Daschle	Inouye	Reid
DeWine	Johnston	Robb
Dodd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Dorgan	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Exon	Kerry	Simon
Faircloth	Kohl	Wellstone

NAYS—52

Abraham	Gramm	Nickles
Ashcroft	Grams	Nunn
Bennett	Gregg	Packwood
Bond	Hatch	Pressler
Breaux	Hatfield	Roth
Brown	Hollings	Santorum
Bryan	Hutchison	Shelby
Burns	Inhofe	Simpson
Chafee	Jeffords	Smith
Coats	Kassebaum	Snowe
Cochran	Kempthorne	Specter
Cohen	Kyl	Stevens
Coverdell	Lott	Thomas
Craig	Lugar	Thompson
D'Amato	Mack	Thurmond
Dole	McCain	Warner
Domenici	Moynihan	
Frist	Murkowski	

So, the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. DOLE. So then the vote will be, again, on the issue. We can adopt the motion to reconsider by voice vote.

VOTE ON MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Dorgan amendment was agreed to. So the motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1278, AS MODIFIED, UPON RECONSIDERATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dorgan amendment No. 1278, as modified, upon reconsideration.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MACK (when his name was called). Present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 255 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Faircloth	Lautenberg
Baucus	Feingold	Leahy
Biden	Feinstein	Levin
Bingaman	Glenn	Lieberman
Boxer	Gorton	McConnell
Bradley	Graham	Mikulski
Bumpers	Grassley	Moseley-Braun
Byrd	Harkin	Murray
Campbell	Hefflin	Pell
Conrad	Helms	Pryor
Daschle	Inouye	Reid
DeWine	Johnston	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Domenici	Kerrey	Simon
Dorgan	Kerry	Wellstone
Exon	Kohl	

NAYS—52

Abraham	Gramm	Nunn
Ashcroft	Grams	Packwood
Bennett	Gregg	Pressler
Bond	Hatch	Robb
Breaux	Hatfield	Roth
Brown	Hollings	Santorum
Bryan	Hutchison	Shelby
Burns	Inhofe	Simpson
Chafee	Jeffords	Smith
Coats	Kassebaum	Snowe
Cochran	Kempthorne	Specter
Cohen	Kyl	Stevens
Coverdell	Lott	Thomas
Craig	Lugar	Thompson
D'Amato	McCain	Thurmond
Dole	Moynihan	Warner
Ford	Murkowski	
Frist	Nickles	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mack

So the amendment (No. 1278), as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I thank my colleagues. I think we are holding the committee bill together and moving forward.

There is now, under the unanimous consent as I understand it, to be a speech from Senator SIMON, which he has been waiting to give. He is prepared to go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order in the Chamber, please?

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1347 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1275

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from North Dakota and the Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN. I do this reluctantly, in part because I agree with them in terms that we have a real problem and we have to confront that problem. The question is how we confront it.

Let me commend him, Senator CONRAD, Senator DORGAN, also from North Dakota, and Senator LIEBERMAN, in terms of video games and what he has been able to do there. Senator HOLLINGS has been a leader in this. Senator HUTCHISON has shown leadership. The problem is real and there are those in the industry, just like there are those in the cigarette industry, who deny there is a real problem. But the research is just overwhelming. There is no question that a cause—not the cause, because there are many causes—but a cause of violence in our society is the violence people see on entertainment television.

I stress entertainment television because on news television—sometimes it is more violent than I would like—but on news television when you see that scene from Bosnia, you see relatives crying, you see violence in its grimness. In entertainment television, there is a tendency to glorify violence.

When even the President of the United States uses a phrase like "make my day," using it against Saddam Hussein, what he is saying is violence is a way of solving problems and violence is fun. Those are precisely the wrong messages.

We have been working on this for some time. This body, I am pleased to say, unanimously passed a bill saying the industry can get together without violating the antitrust laws to deal with the problem of violence. Since that has happened, there have been steps—major steps, frankly, by the broadcast industry; very small steps by the cable industry—in moving in a more positive direction. That ultimately is going to have an effect on our society.

If you look back at the old television series and movies, you will see our heroes and heroines smoking a great deal, drinking very heavily. That just quietly changed. The same thing is happening on broadcast television, but it is not happening, frankly, in the cable field as much as we would like. I applaud the steps that have been taken, but we need to do more.

I am also very reluctant to see Government get excessively into this problem. I spoke in Los Angeles in August 1993 to a unique gathering of 800 tele-

vision and movie producers and talked about this issue of violence in our films. It was received about as favorably out there as Senator Bob DOLE's recent comments. Let me just add that I agree with the general thrust of Senator DOLE's comments.

But one of the things I said in August 1993 was, if the industry was willing to set up monitoring where we could find out what is happening, independent monitoring that is recognized as solid, I would oppose any legislative answers. At first we got a very negative response from the industry. Finally, both the broadcast and cable industries have established—or have contracted with respected entities, UCLA and Mediascope, to do this. The first report on broadcast will come in September. The report on cable will come in January. And tentatively we will have that for 3 years.

I think it is important that we let the industry try to correct its problems on its own, that we applaud the steps that have been taken, that we say more steps are needed. I have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which will be voted upon immediately after we vote on the Conrad-Lieberman amendment—it is cosponsored by Senator DOLE and Senator PRESSLER—which urges the industry to do more in this area but does not get the Federal Government involved directly. When you start moving in the direction of getting the Federal Government involved—for example this deals with "the level of violence or objectionable content." When you talk about "objectionable content," you are talking about something that is not very precise. When you talk about content, I think the Federal Government has to be very, very careful.

If the industry on its own gets into this V-chip field, I applaud that. I welcome that. I am reluctant to have the Federal Government start moving into this field of content.

Let me add, it is not a substitute for the industry policing itself and having good programming, positive programming. Even if this is agreed to, we will still face the reality, for example, that in the high crime areas of our country young people watch a great deal more television than they do in the suburbs and rural areas of our country. And they are going to continue to see much too much violence and programs that I think are objectionable.

So my hope is that, frankly, we will defeat the Conrad-Lieberman amendment because we do not want the Federal Government getting its fist in there too heavily. I think we have to be careful. But let us pass the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which will send a signal, a very clear signal, a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I assume will pass unanimously, that sends a signal to the industry: Let us do better. We have serious concerns.

Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PRESSLER. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Senate majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I will just take a few minutes, I say to Senator SIMON.

First, I ask unanimous consent the vote on the motion to table the Conrad amendment occur at 8:10 p.m. to be followed immediately by a vote on the Simon amendment.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I support the goals of the amendments offered by my distinguished colleagues, Senator CONRAD and Senator LIEBERMAN.

Both Senators are absolutely right to criticize the television industry for programming that too often glorifies mindless violence and casual sex. One recent study commissioned by USA Weekend magazine recorded 370 instances of "crude language or sexual situations" during a 5-night period of prime-time programming, or 1 every 8.9 minutes; 208 of these incidents occurred between 8 and 9 p.m., the so-called family hour.

According to one study, children will have been exposed to nearly 18,000 televised murders and 800 televised suicides by the time they reach the ripe old age of 18.

Clearly, on the issue of violent and sexually oriented programming, the television industry has much, much to explain to concerned parents throughout the country.

So, Mr. President, Senator CONRAD, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I are in total agreement when it comes to identifying the problem that his amendment seeks to address. We part ways, however, when it comes to how best to resolve this problem in a way that is both effective and consistent with our free-speech traditions.

Senator CONRAD's amendment, as modified by the Lieberman second-degree, may not amount to censorship, but by establishing a 5-member Presidential Commission to create a "violence rating system," it takes us one step closer to government control over what we see and hear on television. As I have said on numerous occasions, we have more to lose than to gain from putting Washington in charge of our culture.

I am also concerned about the provisions in Senator CONRAD's amendment that would direct TV stations to transmit the ratings developed by the Presidentially appointed Commission as well as require that all TV sets be equipped with chip technology in order to block out programming found objectionable under the government-rating system.

These provisions are inconsistent with the general deregulatory approach of this bill—that less government control, less government regulations are what is needed most for a strong, competitive, consumer-oriented telecommunications industry.

The real solution to the problem of television's corrosive impact on our culture lies with concerned parents, informed consumers who have the good sense to turn off the trash, and corporate executives within the entertainment industry who are willing to put common decency above corporate profits.

That is why I have cosponsored the sense of the Senate amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator SIMON. This amendment is right-on-target: It states that "self-regulation by the private sector is * * * preferable to direct regulation by the Federal Government." And it urges the entertainment industry "to do everything possible" to limit the amount of violent and aggressive programming, particularly during the hours when children are most likely to be watching.

In other words: No regulation. No government involvement. No censorship. Just focusing the moral spotlight where it is needed most.

Mr. President, the television industry has tremendous power. In fact, television is perhaps the most dominant cultural force in America today. But with this power comes responsibility. It is my hope, and it is the hope of millions of Americans across this great country, that the television industry will finally get the message and preform a much-needed and urgent house-cleaning.

Let me also add that when I made a statement about the entertainment industry a couple of weeks ago it did get the attention of a lot of people. But I notice in all the surveys that followed that speech there were about as many people concerned about Government censorship as there were about the violence, the mindless violence, and casual sex in movies and TV.

I have been criticized, maybe with some justification, by some who say, "BOB DOLE, Senator DOLE, wants censorship." I never suggested censorship. I did not suggest the Government do anything. I suggested that shame is a powerful weapon, and that it ought to be used.

I also suggested that, while the entertainment industry has its first amendment rights, we have our first amendment rights to express outrage, as the Senator from Illinois has done, the Senator from New Jersey, Senator BRADLEY, and many others, in this Senate.

So I would hope that we would not let the Government take one inch, make one effort that would indicate that we are headed towards Government regulation, Government involvement, censorship, if you will, and give the industry a chance to clean up its act. The last thing we want is more Government, particularly in a bill. As I have suggested, we are trying to deregulate and be more competitive.

I hope that the Conrad amendment and the underlying amendment will be tabled, and that the amendment of the

Senator from Illinois would then be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to use his final minutes?

Mr. SIMON. Madam President, I would like to reserve the 2 minutes for later, if I could.

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

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask that Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator EXON, Senator BYRD, Senator NUNN, and Senator FEINSTEIN be shown as cosponsors of my amendment.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, the amendment that I am offering is not governmental choice in television. It is parental choice in television. There is a world of difference, and it is an important difference.

The amendment that I am offering provides for choice chips in new television sets so that parents can decide what comes into their homes—not the Government; parents. That is what the American people want, and that is what this amendment provides. It says when we start building new television sets let us include the new technology that will permit parents to decide what their children see—no Government bureaucrat, no Government agency; parents. That is precisely where the choice ought to lie.

Madam President, we do not dictate when the industry should provide the choice chip. We provide that there should be consultation between the industry and the FCC to determine the appropriate time for the choice chip to be included in new television sets. But we did say those chips ought to be available, and ought to be included in new sets, whether they are manufactured abroad or in this country for use in America. The American people want to be able to make these decisions.

I would direct my colleagues' attention to a USA Today poll that was taken on June 2 through the 4th. They asked the question:

Should "V-chips" be installed in TV sets so parents could easily block violent programming?

Yes, 90 percent; 90 percent said yes. They want to have the ability to choose. They want to have the ability to make the determination about what their kids see—not Government, parents.

This amendment empowers parents. Let parents decide. It leaves the decision where it belongs, with American families—not some Government agency, not some Government authority, but the American parents.

Second it provides for a rating system.

Mr. BREAU. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I would prefer not to. I would like to conclude my statement because I have very limited time.

Consumers would like to know the content of programming. So we provide for a rating system. In my amendment, it is not determined by any Government board. It is determined by industry getting together with all interested parties. They are given 1 year on a voluntary basis to determine a rating system—not some Government fiat, not some Government dictate, but the industry working together with all interested parties on a voluntary basis for 1 year to establish a rating system.

Do you know? I believe they could do it without any Government interference, without any Government involvement. But if they fail after 1 year, then, yes. We provide that the FCC step in and oversee the creation of the rating system.

Do you know what? We have seen this done in other industries. We asked the industry that is involved with recreational software to develop on a voluntary basis a rating system. They did it. They did an excellent job. This is what they came up with—a thermometer that shows levels of violence, shows sexual activity, shows language so that people can make a judgment for themselves. That is what we are calling for here—parental choice, not governmental choice.

Madam President, I ask my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, how much time remains, and who is it allocated to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 9 minutes, and the Senator from North Dakota has 4 minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. I give 3 minutes to my colleague from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AMENDMENT NO. 1347, AS MODIFIED, TO
AMENDMENT NO. 1275

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. Madam President, I first want to exercise my ability to send a modification of my second-degree amendment to the desk.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. This is a technical amendment which in part—

Mr. PRESSLER. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I exercised, I say to the chairman of the committee, my right to modify my second-degree amendment. It is a technical modification which in part responds to the suggestion of the ranking member of the committee to remove the section of the original amendment that would have established a system of fees to finance the grading board.

Mr. PRESSLER. What is the parliamentary situation? Does this take unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does require unanimous consent.

Does the Senator object?
Mr. PRESSLER. I must reserve the right to object.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I am happy to proceed with my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PRESSLER. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1347), as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, strike out line 12 and all that follows through page 4, line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 503. RATING CODE FOR VIOLENCE AND OTHER OBJECTIONABLE CONTENT ON TELEVISION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON VOLUNTARY ESTABLISHMENT OF RATING CODE.—It is the sense of Congress—

(1) to encourage appropriate representatives of the broadcast television industry and the cable television industry to establish in a voluntary manner rules for rating the level of violence or other objectionable content in television programming, including rules for the transmission by television broadcast stations and cable systems of—

(A) signals containing ratings of the level of violence or objectionable content in such programming; and

(B) signals containing specifications for blocking such programming;

(2) to encourage such representatives to establish such rules in consultation with appropriate public interest groups and interested individuals from the private sector; and

(3) to encourage television broadcasters and cable operators to comply voluntarily with such rules upon the establishment of such rules.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF RATING CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the representatives of the broadcast television industry and the cable television industry do not establish the rules referred to in subsection (a)(1) by the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, there shall be established on the day following the end of that period a commission to be known as the Television Rating Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Television Commission"). The Television Commission shall be an independent establishment in the executive branch as defined under section 104 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) MEMBERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Television Commission shall be composed of 5 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of whom—

(i) three shall be individuals who are members of appropriate public interest groups or are interested individuals from the private sector; and

(ii) two shall be representatives of the broadcast television industry and the cable television industry.

(B) NOMINATION.—Individuals shall be nominated for appointment under subparagraph (A) not later than 60 days after the date of the establishment of the Television Commission.

(D) TERMS.—Each member of the Television Commission shall serve until the termination of the commission.

(E) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Television Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(2) DUTIES OF TELEVISION COMMISSION.—The Television Commission shall establish rules for rating the level of violence or other objectionable content in television programming, including rules for the transmission by television broadcast stations and cable systems of—

(A) signals containing ratings of the level of violence or objectionable content in such programming; and

(B) signals containing specifications for blocking such programming.

(3) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman of the Television Commission shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including traveltime) during which the Chairman is engaged in the performance of duties vested in the commission.

(B) OTHER MEMBERS.—Except for the Chairman who shall be paid as provided under subparagraph (A), each member of the Television Commission shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including traveltime) during which the member is engaged in the performance of duties vested in the commission.

(4) STAFF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Television Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the commission.

(B) COMPENSATION.—The Chairman of the Television Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(5) CONSULTANTS.—The Television Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code. The commission shall give public notice of any such contract before entering into such contract.

(6) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as are necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Madam President, again, I am privileged to join with my colleague from North Dakota in this amendment. The fact is that every study we have seen shows the extraordinary unacceptable amount of violence on television. It affects our children. It makes them more violent. The fact is that it is hard to believe that amount of inappropriate, objectionable material that the majority leader has referred to as casual sex on television which affects the violence of our kids.

One survey I quoted in an earlier statement here said the kids themselves admitted that what they saw on television encouraged them to be involved in sexual activity earlier than they should have.

It is time finally in our society that we focus on some of the major forces that affect our values and our children's values. We are confronting the difficult question of the impact of the entertainment media which is so powerful on our values and on our lives in our society.

This amendment gives the Members of this Chamber the opportunity to do more than talk about this problem. This is an opportunity to do something about it—not to create censorship, far from it—but under the terms of this amendment to basically get the attention of the television industry.

Senator SIMON, our colleague, has been a leader in this. But the fact is, as I understand it, that it is because of his understanding of the television industry that he has offered his sense of the Senate. The fact is that the industry has not gotten the message.

The programs that our kids are seeing are giving them the wrong message, and it is affecting their behavior and challenging the ability of parents in this country to raise their kids the way they want to raise them. This amendment, modified by my second-degree amendment, simply gives the industry a year to create its own standards; if they do not, then sets up a rating board, two members from the industry, three from the public, to do the job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. This Senate ought to act on this problem.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, it is the intention of the Commerce Committee to hold hearings on this subject in the near future. Indeed, Senator HOLLINGS and many others have bills that they have filed, and they have been patiently waiting to have hearings so that we can start a legislative process.

For example, this amendment, before it was amended, said we would have had to look at the impact of assessing fees on broadcasters for funding a national commission on TV.

Now, that has been modified, but there still are many questions that I have about this. And I would inform Members that a Simon-Dole-Pressler amendment will be coming calling for renewed efforts by the broadcast industry to regulate violent programming. It is my strongest feeling that we should vote down the first amendment and adopt the sense-of-the-Senate amendment so that we can clearly state our views on this matter and proceed with legislation in a proper way with hearings and a markup.

I thought the Senator from Louisiana wished to speak. I would like to yield as much time as the Senator from Louisiana would consume.

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the chairman. I would just like to ask a question of the Senator who is the sponsor of the amendment. He spoke of the—what was it, the choice chip? It would seem to me that the TV sets already have choice chips. It is called the off and on switch, and when the parent thinks that the program is not proper for a small child in their home, they just go turn it off. And that is a choice chip by a different name. But they have the right to control what their children see right now.

I am not sure why we have to order companies to build some other kind of switch to regulate what children see. It is a parental responsibility, I think, to say this is a program that is suitable for my child or it is not. And if it is not, you take the little off-on switch and you go "flick" or you can take the remote control and go "push" and the program is gone—poof, it is gone, like we already have a choice chip on the TV right now.

I would like to ask, what is the problem with the existing chip?

Mr. CONRAD. The Senator asks a very good question, and the problem is very often the parents are not home to help participate in that choice. Millions of American families have both parents working. Millions of American families are so busy that they do not have a chance to monitor every minute of what their children are watching. And so what we are providing is when the parent is absent, they are able to program that television to exclude programming they find objectionable. Why not? Why should not parents have an ability to say that not just anyone can come into their home, uninvited, and give any message to their kid that they want to give without the parents being able to stop it?

Mr. BREAUX. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONRAD. I think the American people want the chance to say no.

Mr. BREAUX. I think it is a valid response.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 1349

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to take my remaining time. I have an amendment at the desk I would offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], for himself, Mr. DOLE, and Mr. PRESSLER, proposes an amendment numbered 1349.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following.

SEC. : FINDINGS.

The Senate finds that—

Violence is a pervasive and persistent feature of the entertainment industry. According to the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, by the age of 18, children will have been exposed to nearly 18,000 televised murders and 800 suicides.

Violence on television is likely to have a serious and harmful effect on the emotional development of young children. The American Psychological Association has reported that children who watch "a large number of aggressive programs tend to hold attitudes and values that favor the use of aggression to solve conflicts." The National Institute of Mental Health has stated similarly that "violence on television does lead to aggressive behavior by children and teenagers."

The Senate recognizes that television violence is not the sole cause of violence in society.

There is a broad recognition in the U.S. Congress that the television industry has an obligation to police the content of its own broadcasts to children. That understanding was reflected in the Television Violence Act of 1990, which was specifically designed to permit industry participants to work together to create a self-monitoring system.

After years of denying that television violence has any detrimental effect, the entertainment industry has begun to address the problem of television violence. In the Spring of 1994, for example, the network and cable industries announced the appointment of an independent monitoring group to assess the amount of violence on television. These reports are due out in the Fall of 1995 and Winter of 1996, respectively.

The Senate recognizes that self-regulation by the private sector is generally preferable to direct regulation by the federal government.

SEC. : SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the Sense of the Senate that the entertainment industry should do everything possible to limit the amount of violent and aggressive programming, particularly during the hours when children are most likely to be watching.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in closing the argument, let me say if the industry on its own moves in this direction, I will applaud the industry for doing it. But let us not make any mistake, we are moving beyond anything Government has ever done before. We are saying, if the industry in 1 year does not get this resolved, then a Government commission is going to determine violence and objectionable content. That is an intrusion that I hope we can avoid. And my reason for hoping we can avoid it is that, frankly, we are making some progress in the television industry. On the broadcast side, we are clearly making progress. No one denies that. On the cable side, frankly, very little progress has been made. And there I hope the industry can move ahead. But we are going to have monitoring. We are going to have our first report come in September of this year on broadcast, January of next year on cable. Let us let the industry try to resolve this matter on their own. It is a genuine problem. I agree with Senator CONRAD and Senator LIEBERMAN on that. But I think we have to be careful how far the Federal Government goes.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute 29 seconds.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I just have to correct the record with respect to the statement Senator SIMON made. My amendment does not have any Government agency determining what is objectionable content. It is not a governmental decision. It is parental choice. Parents have a right to decide. The only involvement of Government is if the industry does not move forward with putting in chips, the choice chips that will allow parents to make these decisions, it will be required on new television sets.

Second, with respect to a rating system so that parents can determine what is coming into their homes, if the industry, together with all interested parties, does not reach a determination within 1 year, then a commission will determine a rating system. They will not determine that something is objectionable and should be blocked from people's homes. Not at all. People can produce anything they want, but parents will have a right to choose what comes into their homes.

Under the Dole-Simon amendment, they are saying that the networks can come into your home, talk to your children, say anything they want, and you cannot stop them. We say that is wrong. We say that parents ought to be able to choose what their children see.

I hope my colleagues will support this commonsense amendment that gives parents the right to decide what comes into their homes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 3 minutes 50 seconds.

Mr. PRESSLER. I will use my time to urge Members to vote to table the Conrad amendment. And I urge Members to express their concern on this subject by voting for the Dole-Simon-Pressler amendment, which will be a sense-of-the-Senate, so Members will have an opportunity for a followup vote.

I urge all Members of the Senate to vote to table the Conrad amendment No. 1275.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PRESSLER. The Senator from New Jersey wants 1 minute. Even though he is not on my side, I will give him 1 minute but then I want the floor to make my motion.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, this is the opening round of a very important debate. Nobody disputes that too much violence

is coming into the home. It is coming into the home because it sells, because the market works, because people buy it.

So the question is, how do you stop it from coming into the home? My first preference would be to shame those who are making money out of selling trash. But if that fails, Mr. President, then clearly there has to be another way to try to prevent the trash from coming into the home. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from South Dakota and Connecticut is the beginning of saying, well, what if the market will not be subject to shame? What if it will continue to put forth trash?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Therefore, Mr. President, I think this is a very important Senate decision.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I must now move to table the Conrad amendment. The hour of 8:10 has arrived. I know the Senator from Florida wanted 1 minute. I do not know that that can be worked out, but I do now move to table the Conrad amendment No. 1275, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to ask if the Senator from South Dakota will yield 1 minute of his time to me.

Mr. PRESSLER. I do yield 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the Conrad-Lieberman amendment.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this is not an issue of censorship or excessive Government intrusion. This is essentially an issue of empowerment. We are empowering the parents of children to make an intelligent choice, which the children by their immaturity often are unable to make. Who better to ask in our society to be responsible for what comes into the minds of young people than those who love them the most and have the responsibility for their nurturing and upbringing?

I believe that we ought to be encouraging responsibility beyond just the pure dictates of the marketplace from many aspects of our society. I am very pleased that three Federal agencies—the Department of Defense, Amtrak, and the Postal Service—have joined together to establish some standards that will not place Federal advertising into programs that are excessively violent.

I hope that would be a standard of social responsibility that other sponsors would look to and that we would allow

parents to exercise that responsibility by empowering them to control what their children see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PRESSLER. I yield back all my time. This will be a vote on a motion to table.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 1275

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1275 offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MACK (when his name was called). Present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 256 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Ashcroft	Glenn	Packwood
Burns	Grassley	Pell
Craig	Jeffords	Pressler
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Robb
Dodd	Kyl	Santorum
Dole	Leahy	Simon
Faircloth	Lott	Specter
Feingold	Moseley-Braun	Thomas
Frist	Moynihan	

NAYS—73

Abraham	Exon	Lieberman
Akaka	Feinstein	Lugar
Baucus	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Gregg	Nickles
Bradley	Harkin	Nunn
Breaux	Hatch	Pryor
Brown	Hatfield	Reid
Bryan	Heflin	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Helms	Roth
Byrd	Hollings	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Simpson
Coats	Inouye	Smith
Cochran	Johnston	Snowe
Cohen	Kassebaum	Stevens
Conrad	Kennedy	Thompson
Coverdell	Kerrey	Thurmond
Daschle	Kerry	Warner
DeWine	Kohl	Wellstone
Domenici	Lautenberg	
Dorgan	Levin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Mack

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1275) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1347, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 1275

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on amendment No. 1347.

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the second-degree amendment No. 1347 offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1347), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. PRESSLER. I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 1349.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1275, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on amendment No. 1275 as amended.

The amendment (No. 1275), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1349

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 1349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on amendment No. 1349, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON].

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced, yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 257 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Akaka	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Bradley	Gregg	Nunn
Breaux	Harkin	Packwood
Brown	Hatch	Pell
Bryan	Hatfield	Pressler
Bumpers	Heflin	Pryor
Burns	Helms	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Campbell	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inhofe	Roth
Coats	Inouye	Santorum
Cochran	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cohen	Johnston	Shelby
Conrad	Kassebaum	Simon
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Simpson
Craig	Kennedy	Smith
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Dodd	Kyl	Thomas
Dole	Lautenberg	Thompson
Domenici	Leahy	Thurmond
Dorgan	Levin	Warner
Exon	Lieberman	Wellstone
Faircloth	Lott	
Feingold	Lugar	

So, the amendment (No. 1349) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I have 2 or 3 unanimous consent requests.

AMENDMENT NO. 1335

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume consideration of amendment 1335—it is the Kerrey of Nebraska amendment—the amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

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

So the amendment (No. 1335) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1350

(Purpose: To assure that the national security is protected when considering grants of common carrier license to foreign entities and other persons)

Mr. PRESSLER. I ask that the pending amendments be laid aside, and I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator EXON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], for Mr. EXON, for himself, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. BYRD, proposes an amendment numbered 1350.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 49, line 15 after "Government (or its representative)" add the following: "provided that the President does not object within 15 days of such determination"

On page 50 between line 14 and 15 insert the following:

"(C) THE APPLICATION OF THE EXON-FLORIO LAW.—Nothing in this section (47 U.S.C. 310) shall limit in any way the application of 50 U.S.C. App. 2170 (the Exon-Florio law) to any transaction."

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment related to the foreign ownership provisions of the telecommunications bill.

S. 652, the pending bill, adds new procedures to permit foreign ownership of common carrier licenses if the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] determines that the home country of the proposed foreign owner offers reciprocal and equivalent market opportunities to Americans.

The Exon-Dorgan-Byrd amendment clarifies that nothing in the new section limits or affects the application of the Exon-Florio law (50 App. 2170) which gives the President the power to investigate and if necessary prohibit or suspend a merger, takeover or acquisition of an American company by a foreign entity when the national security may be affected by such transaction.

Where the proposed FCC procedure would permit the foreign acquisition of a U.S. telecommunications company and its common carrier licenses, it is important to make clear that the new FCC procedure does not pre-empt existing law affecting foreign mergers, acquisitions and takeovers.

Most importantly, our proposed amendment would give the President 15

days to review actions of the FCC. Under this provision, the license could be granted only if the President does not object within 15 days. As Commander in Chief, and the conductor of foreign policy, there may be information available to a President which would not or should not be available to the FCC in making its findings under the proposed procedure in S. 652. The Exon-Dorgan-Byrd amendment assures that the President gets the final say if a common carrier license is granted to a foreign entity.

This amendment should be non-controversial and in no way undermines the foreign investment and ownership reforms of S. 652. It preserves important national security, foreign policy and law enforcement powers of the President.

I urge my colleagues to support this short but critically important amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], and am a co-sponsor of it along with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. The international marketplace in telecommunications equipment and service is a very robust, lucrative one, and the opportunities for U.S. companies abroad are vast. However, this marketplace is subject to many of the same kind of barriers to entry as has been the case for other American business sectors. Currently, the US Trade representative, Ambassador Kantor, has initiated a 301 case against the Japanese in the area of automobile parts, after years of frustration in trying to gain fair entry into the Japanese market. The Senate has strongly endorsed this action by a vote of 88-8 on a resolution offered by myself, the two leaders, and other Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Similar problems of access to foreign markets exist in the telecommunications sector, and the bill as reported from the Commerce Committee includes a provision to protect our country and our companies from unfair competition. The bill as reported by the Committee supports an incentives-based strategy for foreign countries to open their telecommunications markets to U.S. companies. It does this by conditioning new access to the American market upon a showing of reciprocity in the markets of the petitioning foreign companies. Current law, that is section 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, provides that a foreign entity may not obtain a common carrier license itself, and may not own more than 25 percent of any corporation which owns or controls a common carrier license. This foreign ownership limitation has not been very effective and has not prevented foreign carriers from entering the U.S. market. The FCC has had the discretion of waiving this limitation, if it finds that such action does not adversely affect the public interest.

Nevertheless, maintaining restrictions on foreign ownership is generally considered by U.S. industry to be useful as one way to raise the issue of unfair foreign competition and to maintain leverage abroad. Therefore, the bill established a reciprocal market access standard as a condition for the waiver of Section 310(b). It states that the FCC may grant to an alien, foreign corporation or foreign government a common carrier license that would otherwise violate the restriction in Section 310(b) if the FCC finds that there are equivalent market opportunities for U.S. companies and citizens in the foreign country of origin of the corporation or government.

Even though Section 310 has not prevented access into our market, the existence of the section has been used by foreign countries as an excuse to deny U.S. companies access to their markets. The provision in S. 652, applying a reciprocity rule, makes it clear that our market will be open to others to the same extent that theirs are open to our investment. This is as it should be.

The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska ensures that important factors of national security and the overall best interest of the U.S. from the perspective of law enforcement, foreign policy, the interpretation of international agreements, and national economic security are protected. The FBI has indicated to me its grave concerns over foreign penetration of our telecommunications market. Foreign governments whose interests are adverse to the U.S., foreign drug cartels, international criminal syndicates, terrorist organizations, and others who would like to own, operate, or penetrate our telecommunications market should be prohibited from doing so. Therefore, the Exon-Dorgan-Byrd amendment gives the president the authority to overturn an FCC decision to grant a waiver of the restrictions of Section 310. This is based, of course, on the superior information available to the President by virtue of the resources available to him across the board in the Executive branch. The president must have a veto in this field, and he should not hesitate to exercise this authority.

Mr. President, my second degree amendment provides that, in the event that the President should reject a recommendation by the FCC to grant a license to a foreign entity to operate in our market, the President shall provide a report to the Congress on the findings he has made in the particular case and the factors that he took into account in arriving at his determination. The Congress needs to be kept in the loop on the evolution of our telecommunications market. The reports can be provided in classified and/or unclassified form, as appropriate, since many of the national security factors that might pertain in a particular case are sensitive and should be protected.

In addition, Mr. President, my amendment has a second section which

deals with the issue of the actual nature of the foreign telecommunications market place. Given the highly lucrative nature of the telecommunications marketplace, the stakes of gaining access to foreign markets are high. It should be no surprise that securing effective market access to many foreign markets, including those of our allies, such as France, Germany and Japan, has been very difficult. Those markets remain essentially closed to our companies, dominated as they are by large monopolies favored by those governments. In fact, most European markets highly restrict competition in basic voice services and infrastructure. A study by the Economic Strategy Institute, in December 1994, found that "While the U.S. has encouraged competition in all telecommunication sectors except the local exchange, the overwhelming majority of nations have discouraged competition and maintained a public monopoly that has no incentive to become more efficient. U.S. firms, as a result of intense competition here in the U.S., provide the most advanced and efficient telecommunications services in the world, and could certainly compete effectively in other markets if given the chance of an open playing field." The same study found that "U.S. firms are blocked from the majority of lucrative international opportunities by foreign government regulations prohibiting or restricting U.S. participation and international regulations which intrinsically discriminate and overcharge U.S. firms and consumers." This study found that the total loss in revenues to U.S. firms, as a result of foreign barriers, is estimated to be close to \$100 billion per year between 1992 and the end of the century.

As my colleagues are aware, the negotiations which led to the historic revision of the GATT agreement, and which created the World Trade Organization, were unable to conclude an agreement on telecommunications services. Thus, separate negotiations are underway in Geneva today to secure such an agreement, in the context of the Negotiating Group on Basic Telecommunications. In the absence of such an agreement, we must rely on our own laws to protect our companies and to provide leverage over foreign nations to open their markets. To forego our own national leverage would do a great disservice to American business and would be shortsighted—the result of which would be not only a setback to our strategy to open those markets, but to pull the rug out from under our negotiators in Geneva seeking to secure a favorable international agreement for open telecommunications markets. Indeed, tough U.S. reciprocity laws are clearly needed by our negotiators to gain an acceptable, effective, market-opening agreement in Geneva in these so-called GATT (General Agreement on Trade in Services) negotiations.

The standard for access into the American market in the reported bill

requires that the FCC find that market opportunities in the home market of the applicant be equivalent to those desired in the U.S. in the specific telecommunications market segment involved. Thus, if an applicant wants to get into the American mobile telephone market, the mobile telephone market of the applicant must be open. I expect that the FCC will be very tough, and the President will be very tough, as provided for in the underlying amendment pending here, in making a determination that the home market of the applicant is really open for our investment and/or operations. My second degree amendment would also require the FCC and the President to look beyond that specific telecommunications market segment, and make an evaluation of the accessibility of the whole range of telecommunications market segments for American investment and/or operations. This is because the telecommunications market between the U.S. and our trading partners is often very asymmetrical. For instance, if a German company wants to get into the U.S. mobile phone market, we might find, and indeed we would find, that the German mobile phone market is open to U.S. business access. But the rest of the German market is mainly closed up tighter than a dry drum to U.S. investment or entry. So we at least need to inform ourselves of the real nature of the international marketplace, and I would expect that these evaluations would be made available to the public, in detail and in a timely way. Over the long run, if we determine a persistent pattern of imbalance and unfairness, as a whole, exists in telecommunications markets, further action to force foreign markets open will have to be considered.

Mr. President, this is an effort to advance our understanding of the nature of the evolving international marketplace for the range of exploding technologies in the telecommunications field, and to ensure that America is treated fairly and in a reciprocal manner. I congratulate the committee for the reciprocity provision and I hope that the modest contribution that Senators EXON, DORGAN, and I make with this amendment will add something of value to that provision.

AMENDMENT NO. 1351 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1350

(Purpose: To require a report on objections to determinations of the Federal Communications Commission for purposes of termination of foreign ownership restrictions and to revise the determinations of market opportunities for such purposes)

Mr. PRESSLER. I send a second-degree amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], for Mr. BYRD, for himself and Mr. EXON, proposes an amendment numbered 1351.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1 of the amendment, line 4, strike out "determination." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "determination. If the President objects to a determination, the President shall, immediately upon such objection, submit to Congress a written report (in unclassified form, but with a classified annex if necessary) that sets forth a detailed explanation of the findings made and factors considered in objecting to the determination."

On page 49, line 17, insert after the period the following: "While determining whether such opportunities are equivalent on that basis, the Commission shall also conduct an evaluation of opportunities for access to all segments of the telecommunications market of the applicant."

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I am pleased to support and cosponsor Senator BYRD's amendment to the Exon-Dorgan-Byrd foreign investment amendment. This friendly amendment would require the President to report to the Congress in a classified and unclassified form.

This report mirrors the reporting provisions of the 1993 Exon-Byrd amendment to the Exon-Florio law. I am pleased to lend my full support to my friend and colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. PRESSLER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

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

So the amendment (No. 1351) was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Exon amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

So the amendment (No. 1350), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I believe that that brings our activities on the telecommunications bill to a close today. I think we have made good progress, and I think the committee bill has held together. I know there are Senators present with speeches, but I wish to thank all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 45, S. 652, the telecommunications bill:

Trent Lott, Larry Pressler, Judd Gregg, Don Nickles, Rod Grams, Rick Santorum, Craig Thomas, Spencer Abraham, Bob Dole, Ted Stevens, Larry Craig, Mike DeWine, John Ashcroft, Robert Bennett, Hank Brown, and Conrad Burns.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 55

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:

Pursuant to the requirements of 42 U.S.C. 3536, I transmit herewith the 29th Annual Report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which covers calendar year 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 1995.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-969. A communication from the Director of the Institute of Museum Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-970. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the reports and testimony for April 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-971. A communication from the Executive Director of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend Title 5, United States Code, to provide additional investment funds for the thrift savings plan; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-972. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation

entitled "The Federal Employees Emergency Leave Transfer Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-973. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-974. A communication from the Chief Operating Officer/President of the Resolution Funding Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to internal controls for 1993 and 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-975. A communication from the Chair of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1994 annual report under the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-976. A communication from the Executive Director of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1994 annual report under the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-977. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-51, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-978. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-52, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-979. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-53, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-980. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-54, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-981. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-55, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-982. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-56, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-983. A communication from the chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-59, adopted by the Council on May 2, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BOND):

S. 917. A bill to facilitate small business involvement in the regulatory development processes of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. EXON: