

shown that what lies at the heart of a troubled neighborhood is complex and unique to that community and cannot be fixed, necessarily, with a brick and mortar approach to community development, or with a cops and robbers approach to law enforcement.

Prior to the implementation of this outstanding community policing program under Officer Allmond, we had been treating the symptoms without diagnosing the illness. It took Officer Robert Allmond and a very courageous community to show us what and where the problems really were.

This is the heart of community policing and I urge all my fellow Members to investigate this program and help create similar models in their own districts.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Office Robert Allmond as a member of one of Montgomery county's finest police departments. His service to the people of Abington Township have made that community one of the finest places on earth to live, work and raise our families.

CORRECTION OF VOTES IN COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee's report, House Report 104-463 on H. Res. 366, the rule for the consideration of H.R. 2854, the Agricultural Marketing Transition Act contains one erroneously reported rollcall vote due to a typographical error during the printing process. The vote was correctly reported in the original report filed with the Clerk.

Below is a correct version of that vote as contained in the Rules Committee report as filed with the House.

The amendment number referred to in the motion is to amendments filed with the Rules Committee.

The corrected rollcall vote for rollcall No. 290 is as follows.

RULES COMMITTEE ROLLCALL NO. 290

Date: February 27, 1996.

Measure: Rule for consideration of H.R. 2854, Agriculture Market Transition Act.

Motion By: Mr. Hall.

Summary of Motion: Make in order Volkmer Amendment No. 12, retain permanent law.

Results: Rejected, 3 to 7.

Vote by Member: Dreier, "nay," Goss, "nay," Linder, "nay," Pryce, "nay," McInnis, "nay," Waldholtz, "nay," Moakley, "yea," Frost "yea," Hall, "yea," and Solomon, "nay."

TRIBUTE TO TUSHIA N. FISHER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Ms. Tushia N. Fisher who is employed as a special assistant to the New York State Senate Minority Leader, Martin Connor. She is a student enrolled in the State University of New

York, Empire State College, in a combined master's degree program in political science.

Tushia is a remarkable example of a 1990's woman, dedicated to her family, striving to improve herself as a single parent, and dedicated to improving and empowering her community. Tushia believes that children are our future. She has embarked on a campaign, starting with her 6-year-old son Jamere Jamison, to improve the plight of African-American youth. Her efforts include volunteering at the Interfaith Hospital holiday drive, as well as the City Kids Foundation. Additionally, Tushia is an active member of Concord Baptist Church. She provides a wonderful example for single and dedicated parents about how to pursue personal and professional development while providing volunteer service to her community. I am happy to cite this wonderful community success story.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SELF- SUFFICIENCY ACT OF 1996

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that will start public broadcasting on the road to self-sufficiency. This bill is certainly not the total solution to the challenge that faces us. Rather, it is a first step in the process.

Last year, the House leadership, recognizing the need to cut Government spending and balance the budget, challenged public broadcasting to find alternative sources of funding for their operations. After some initial misgivings the industry responded to this challenge with enormous enthusiasm, seeing this not as a threat but rather as an opportunity. I have been very impressed with the thoughtful and insightful response, and while I cannot agree with all of the proposals, it is obvious that there is strong sentiment for innovation and change.

My bill can help to accomplish this move away from Government support and ensure that public broadcasting continues to serve the educational and entertainment needs of the American public, the purposes for which it was established. I believe that the overarching goal of reorganizing public broadcasting should be to return to the original concept of local, community stations, and funding for these stations should come from sources other than the Federal Government. It should come from local public subscription, city and State appropriations, sponsorship by educational institutions, regional foundations, mergers or local marketing agreements with profitable commercial stations, and flexible use of spectrum. It should also depend, now more than ever before, on the pursuit of innovative ideas and entrepreneurial activities.

It is now time for public broadcasting to become self-sufficient and prepared to compete in the dynamic marketplace of the 21st century. We are, therefore, embarking on a historic change from our Government's policy, the origins of which date back several decades. Public broadcasting, with the help of Federal and State governments, has evolved in its 30-year history into a mature industry providing quality programming to American

viewers. We want a healthy and independent future for public television and radio, and it is our responsibility to ensure that public broadcasting continues to serve the educational and entertainment needs of the public. It is our obligation not only because of its inherent value but also because we have decades of Government investment to protect.

Government support for public broadcasting began with Federal matching grants to construct educational television facilities in 1962. That 5-year program, although helpful, did not address the need for long-term financing. It was this financing problem that resulted in the establishment of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television in 1965, which was also funded by private money, this time from the Carnegie Foundation. The Carnegie Commission was the immediate catalyst for enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In addition to providing needed financing for public television and radio, the act created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB]. The act attempted to ensure CPB's role in developing an independent educational broadcasting system that provided high quality objective and balanced services to the local community.

As the industry has matured, it has been at the forefront of exciting innovation, including such things as distance learning, which combines television satellite, computer, video disk, and telephone to bring greater educational opportunities to students regardless of their geographic or economic situation. I believe most people would agree that over the years public television has consistently provided high quality programming to the American public. From historical series such as "The Civil War" and "Baseball" to the excellent children's programming such as "Barney and Friends" and "Sesame Street," public television has offered interesting, educational, and entertaining programs for just about everyone.

However, public broadcasting is not without its faults or its critics. Last Congress, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance held a hearing that was invaluable in revealing the gross inefficiencies of the system. Even some of the system's strongest supporters say that it is mismanaged and should realize new operating efficiencies through consolidations, automation, joint operating agreements, mergers, and other forms of partnerships. Others say that the industry has failed to take advantage of revenue sources through licensing and merchandising agreements.

This bill is designed to address many of these failings and correct many of the problems. It does so in several ways. First, it gives public broadcasting stations additional flexibility and offers new and innovative earned income options. For example, in markets where there are two overlapping stations, a licensee would be allowed to operate one as a commercial station and one as a "pure" public broadcasting station. The profits from the commercial station would be used to fund the second public broadcasting station. Neither station would be eligible for grants from CPB. In the case of duopolies, the licensee could elect to sell one station, as long as the proceeds from the sale go to the retained public broadcasting station. This station would not be eligible for CPB grants.

The bill would also allow VHF and UHF channel swaps. It further provides that stations

voluntarily surrendering their licenses for auction by the FCC would be allowed to keep 50 percent of the proceeds. The remainder would go to the U.S. Treasury. Under the bill, stations would now be allowed to accept compensation for broadcasting programs produced by, at the expense of, or furnished by persons other than the station licensee. This would allow partnerships with commercial entities. Finally, the bill expands the definition of underwriting.

Second, the bill has as one of its key purposes the elimination of redundancies within the entire public broadcasting system, including duplicative stations and burdensome bureaucracies. Consequently, CPB is prohibited from issuing more than one grant per market to television licensees, but is allowed more discretion for radio grants.

Third, it relieves the Corporation for Public Broadcasting of most of the congressionally imposed mandates that have limited CPB's ability to function in a sound, business-like manner. The bill eliminates most of the congressionally imposed mandates on CPB, including set-asides and unnecessary reporting requirements. The intent is to allow CPB to use good business judgment in its decision-making process and to prepare for its eventual privatization. Even after the transition to private non-profit corporation, CPB would still be required to report to Congress annually on the status of the trust fund.

The bill also changes the way that members of the board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would be selected. Presently, the President appoints the members. The bill establishes a selection committee composed of the Speaker and minority leader of the House and the majority and minority leaders in the Senate to nominate individuals, after consultation with the public broadcasting industry, with expertise in investment management, corporate finance, telecommunications, education, and public broadcasting. The President would appoint from this list. Afterward, the board would be appointed in accordance with the bylaws of the Corporation.

Finally, it establishes a public broadcasting national trust fund, using revenue to be derived from a now fallow resource, thereby ensuring that Government funding will cease. The bill directs the Federal Communications Commission to auction vacant noncommercial channels and to transfer the proceeds to the trust fund. The bill also directs the FCC to ensure that the auction brings in as much revenue as possible by moving the cities of licenses, if necessary, while avoiding harmful

interference. Before transferring auction proceeds to the trust fund, the Secretary of the Treasury is required to verify that the fund has been established in accordance with the law. CPB would manage the trust fund and distribute the income from the corpus. If CPB substantially violates the purposes of the law, the corpus would revert to the United States. The bill authorizes \$250 million in fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000, after which the trust fund would begin to dispense income from the corpus to fund public broadcasting.

This legislation would get the Federal Government out of the business of financing public television, but that goal cannot be achieved overnight without adversely affecting public radio and television. In view of the decades of Federal tax dollars that have been spent to ensure a public broadcasting system, the Government has a stake in ensuring that public broadcasting survives. I, for one, would not like to see decades of Federal funding for public broadcasting go to waste.

One thing is clear: reforming public broadcasting is a daunting task. First, it is a controversial and very emotional issue. Second, it is complex. Public broadcasting is composed of different and unique components and the solution for one may not necessarily be appropriate for the other. Third, the public and those of us in Congress have differing views about how to change the current system.

Despite the difficulty of the job that lies before us, and regardless of our views on public radio and television, we can all agree that Government money is scarce. The American people expect us to be fiscally responsible and examine all federally funded programs. They expect us to make the difficult choices about where to cut Federal spending. That is what good Government is all about. The American public deserves to have the highest quality television and radio programs. The approach taken in this bill will allow that fine tradition to continue, but this time, without Government funds.

RETIREMENT OF DAVID R. LAMBERT, AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSOCIATION

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, David R. Lambert was appointed as executive vice presi-

dent of the American Seed Trade Association [ASTA] on June 29, 1990, by the board of directors. ASTA, one of the Nation's oldest trade associations, will acknowledge the achievements of its executive vice president on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at a retirement celebration. As a long-time member and supporter of the ASTA, I am pleased to add my personal congratulations and hearty wishes for a happy and fruitful retirement.

During the course of Dave's tenure, many noteworthy accomplishments come to mind. One, though, that is particularly significant is his leadership when Congress considered and ultimately approved the Plant Variety Protection Act Amendments of 1994. An important intellectual property rights issue for seedsmen and farmers, these amendments went a long way in providing the real protection and ready assurance American farmers have come to know and expect from the seed industry. In shepherding these amendments, Dave effectively brought together the agricultural community and united the Congress in an issue that will surely affect America's agriculture for decades to come.

To list Dave's good deeds and successes would likely take several volumes. It would be more expedient perhaps to just itemize issues and areas like crop insurance reform, biotechnology, international trade, and export opportunities. The list would continue just like Dave's tenacity and dedication to the American seed industry.

Dave will no doubt continue to play a role in America's agriculture. Undoubtedly, after a distinguished 16-year career at the ASTA, Dave's 23 years of experience and service in Washington, DC, will be remembered by many. His work prior to joining the ASTA included a 7-year association with the National Grange. Prior to working in agricultural organizations, Dave was with the U.S. Army and retired as a lieutenant colonel.

ASTA will long remember Dave's outstanding leadership and vision. I will always recall how the ASTA helped position and support America's foundation to agriculture—the seed. I will also recall, with great fondness, how a small seed company in Iowa, Latham Seed Co., benefited from his dedication and insight.