

Joyner and Tom McMillen, cochairs of the President's Council, point out "the valuable life skills and lessons that are learned by youth and adults through participation in sports." I will ask that the full text of the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am delighted that National Sportsmanship Day was initiated in Rhode Island and I applaud all the students and teachers who are participating in this inspiring event today. Likewise, I congratulate all of those at the Institute for International Sport, whose hard work and dedication over the last 6 years have made this program so successful.

I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL
ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS,
WASHINGTON, DC, March 1996.

The President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports is pleased to recognize March 5, 1996, as National Sportsmanship Day. The valuable life skills and lessons that are learned by youth and adults through participation in sports cannot be overestimated.

Participation in sports contributes to all aspects of our lives, such as heightened awareness of the value of fair play, ethics, integrity, honesty and sportsmanship, as well as improving levels of physical fitness and health.

The President's Council congratulates the Institute for International Sport for its continued leadership in organizing this important day. We wish you every success in your efforts to broaden participation in and awareness of National Sportsmanship Day.

FLORENCE GRIFFITH
JOYNER,
Co-Chair.
TOM McMILLEN,
Co-Chair. ●

DIGITAL BROADCAST SPECTRUM AUCTIONS: CONSUMERS WILL PAY THE HIGHEST PRICE

THERE IS NO SPECTRUM GIVEAWAY

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate majority leader has said that he intends to stop the big spectrum giveaway in the telecommunications bill. The Senator from Kansas is referring to spectrum that the FCC has set aside for broadcasters to use to convert to digital television. He wants this spectrum to be put up for auction, which he believes will net billions of dollars in revenues for the Federal Treasury. And the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has announced that he will soon hold hearings on this issue.

I don't think the real question is not whether there should be auctions of broadcast spectrum. Rather, the question is when. Some, like the majority leader, have proposed up front auctions of spectrum intended for the transition to digital television. Others, such as myself, believe that the auctions should occur on the analog spectrum, after the transition occurs.

I am a strong supporter of auctions as a means of allocating spectrum. As my colleagues know, I joined the Senator from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, in

sponsoring an amendment last year which called for auctioning spectrum for a direct broadcast satellite license. The FCC concluded the auction for this license earlier this year, netting nearly \$700 million for the Federal Treasury.

I think if my colleagues will look through the rhetoric and focus on the serious policy consequences of this debate, they will realize that the very future of free over-the-air broadcasting is at stake. If up front auctions are required for the digital spectrum, as suggested by some of my colleagues, it is local television stations and the consumers who rely upon them as their only source of television that will be the losers.

At issue in this debate is the current plan of the FCC to allocate an additional 6 MHz of spectrum to broadcasters. The purpose of this allocation is to allow broadcast television to convert their broadcast signals from analog to digital, which will be a necessity in the digital world that is rapidly approaching the video industry, and in fact, is already here with direct broadcast satellite. Digital conversion will permit broadcast television to keep pace with the vast changes in telecommunications technology, and thereby help to make broadcast TV competitive.

The FCC is not planning on giving spectrum to the broadcasters. Rather, it intends to loan the additional spectrum to broadcasters for a period of years in order to permit a transition from analog to digital. After a certain point, the broadcasters will return their current analog spectrum—but not until Americans have become equipped with digital televisions. That has been the plan for years. The process of converting to digital television was born by the FCC over a decade ago. It is only in the rush of the moment when politicians are searching for revenue to balance the budget, that this plan has come into question.

DAVID AND GOLIATH AUCTIONS

Some believe that broadcasters should have to pay for this spectrum—rather than receive it on a loan basis. If the spectrum is placed up for auction, there is very little chance that local broadcast stations will have the resources to compete with the giant telecommunications corporations that want the spectrum for subscriber-based services. The proposals talked about up to this point will permit anyone to bid for the spectrum. Thus, the telecommunications giants like AT&T, MCI, the RBOC's, Microsoft, and others will be competing against local television stations for the spectrum. The fact is, up-front auctions mean that broadcast stations will not have a chance at the digital spectrum, and therefore, will never have the opportunity to compete in a digital world.

Everyone needs to realize how the cards will be stacked in this kind of auction. When we talk about broadcasters having to compete in an auction for this spectrum, we are talking

about little Davids going up against Goliath telecommunications corporations. The auctions will be between small, locally owned stations bidding against large, national corporations. The vast majority of broadcast stations in this country are small, locally owned stations and many of these stations have well under \$1 million in pretax revenues. Local broadcast stations cannot successfully compete against other interests vying for the spectrum. The other interests who plan to use the spectrum for more profitable subscriber-based services will simply overwhelm the local broadcasters' efforts.

Even if we assume that broadcasters would win the licenses at an auction, this would not ensure that broadcasters will have the opportunity to compete with other digital-quality services. A costly fight for the spectrum could make digital conversion financially prohibitive. We are told that local broadcast stations are going to have to invest nearly \$10 million per station to convert to digital. Investing in digital equipment and technology for small locally owned stations such as those in my home state of North Dakota is going to be challenging enough. Add on top of the equipment costs a sizable fee for the spectrum, and digital conversion for broadcasters will never become a reality. Tomorrow's TV will be like today's AM radio when the rest of the video world goes digital.

ANALOG VERSUS DIGITAL AUCTIONS

The administration has a different and equally troublesome proposal to auction the analog broadcast spectrum. Under the administration's proposal, broadcasters would have to accelerate the giveback of the analog spectrum after completing the conversion to digital. A 15-20 year process would be crammed in a 10-year window under this approach. While I strongly support the notion that broadcasters should have to give back the analog spectrum after converting to digital, and I further support the notion that this should be auctioned, the administration's proposal is seriously flawed because the acceleration is totally unrealistic. Under this approach, broadcasters would be required to vacate the analog spectrum they are currently using by the year 2005.

The consequences under this approach fall largely on the American consumer. When the broadcasters stop sending analog signals, existing television sets will be useless. Thus, under this approach, the administration is asking that all Americans replace all existing television sets with new, yet to be manufactured digital sets, within 10 years. The cost to the American consumer will likely exceed any revenue gained from this accelerated auction.

As I stated earlier, there really should be no question about whether or not broadcast spectrum should be auctioned. The timing of the auction is the question. It seems to me that the best

policy approach should guide this timing—not budget pressures. If we ask ourselves what is the best policy—what is best for the public interest and American consumers—we must conclude that broadcasters ought to be given the opportunity to convert to digital television. Once that conversion has been successfully completed, then the analog spectrum that is currently being used should be made available through an auction. If this process cannot realistically be completed within the arbitrary 7-year budget cycle we have created for ourselves, then we should not force ourselves into making a serious policy mistake.

CONCLUSION

Broadcast television is the universal video service in this country. In many rural and remote areas, where cable is not available, it is the only video service. Currently, a little more than one-third of Americans do not subscribe to cable. That's 33 million TV households that have no choice but to rely upon broadcast television. In addition, over 60 percent of all the TV sets in the United States—close to 138 million—are not hooked to cable.

If the FCC is permitted to move forward with its plan to allocate the needed spectrum for digital conversion, consumers will continue to have access to free television. Converting to digital will not give broadcasters a leg up—it is a necessity in the new digital age. Rather, it is consumers that will lose if this conversion does not occur. I am convinced that up front auctions for this spectrum will result in fewer choices for consumers. In areas where cable is available—and in homes where it is affordable—it will mean fewer choices. But for one-third of the population, it will mean no choice.

In my judgment, this is too high a price to pay for the short-term revenue gain in up front auctions. My concern is the future of free over-the-air television—not a financial giveaway to the broadcast industry. I urge my colleagues to examine this issue carefully. It is not the corporate welfare as some have claimed. Rather, it is a question of the survival of our local television stations and the universal service that only they can provide. I urge my colleagues to oppose the proposal of up front auctions and the unrealistic acceleration of auctioning the analog spectrum. Let's not be tempted by the revenue, instead carefully examine the policy implications behind spectrum auctions.●

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520 as amended by Public Law 103-283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriation for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the first quarter of fiscal year 1996 to be printed in the RECORD. The first quarter of fis-

cal year 1996 covers the period of October 1, 1995, through December 31, 1995. The official mail allocations are available for frank mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 104-53, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996.

The allocations follow:

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING DEC. 31, 1995

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per, capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	FY 96 Official mail allocation
Abraham	0	0.00000	0.00	\$0.00000	\$160.875
Akaka	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.447
Aschcroft	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.629
Baucus	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	46.822
Bennett	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.493
Biden	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.754
Bingaman	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.404
Bond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.629
Boxer	1,000	0.00003	\$247.60	0.00001	433.718
Bradley	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	139.706
Breaux	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	92.701
Brown	9,300	0.00268	3,152.24	0.00091	86.750
Bryan	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.208
Bumpers	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.809
Burns	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	46.822
Byrd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	59.003
Campbell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.750
Chafee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.698
Coats	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	112.682
Cochran	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.473
Cohen	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	52.134
Conrad	7,091	0.01115	5,748.14	0.00904	43.403
Coverdell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	131.465
Craig	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	49.706
D'Amato	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	262.927
Daschle	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.228
DeWine	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	186.314
Dodd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	80.388
Dole	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	70.459
Domenici	1,050	0.00066	254.20	0.00016	56.404
Dorgan	5,900	0.00928	1,091.59	0.00172	43.403
Eaton	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	57.167
Faircloth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	134.344
Feingold	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	102.412
Feinstein	1,737	0.00006	547.83	0.00002	433.718
Ford	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.009
Frist	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	106.658
Glenn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	186.314
Gorton	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.059
Graham	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	259.426
Gramm	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	281.361
Grassley	650	0.00015	542.74	0.00012	96.024
Gregg	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	73.403
Harkin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	50.569
Hatch	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	73.403
Heflin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.493
Hoffman	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	78.163
Holmes	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	89.144
Hollings	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	134.344
Hutchinson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	85.277
Inhofe	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	281.361
Inouye	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	82.695
Jeffords	12,700	0.02228	2,747.97	0.00482	42.858
Johnston	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.447
Kassebaum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	92.701
Kempthorne	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	70.459
Kennedy	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	49.706
Kerrey	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	117.964
Kerry	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	57.167
Kohl	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	117.964
Kyl	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	102.412
Lautenberg	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	93.047
Leahy	6,004	0.01053	2,798.18	0.00491	139.706
Levin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	42.858
Lieberman	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	160.875
Lott	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	80.388
Lugar	3,600	0.00064	877.65	0.00016	69.473
Mack	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	112.682
McCain	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	259.426
McConnell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	93.047
Mikulski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.009
Moseley-Braun	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	101.272
Moyihan	5,250	0.00029	1,283.37	0.00007	184.773
Murkowski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	262.927
Murray	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	42.565
Nickles	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.059
Nunn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	82.695
Pell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	131.465
Pressler	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.698
Pryor	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.228
Reid	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.809
Robb	19,645	0.01084	6,092.98	0.00336	56.208
Rockefeller	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	121.897
Roth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	59.003
Santorum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.754
Sarbanes	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	199.085
Shelby	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	101.272
Simon	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	89.144
Simpson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	184.773
Smith	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	41.633
Snowe	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	50.569
Specter	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	52.134
Stevens	951	0.00204	241.79	0.00052	199.085
Thomas	1,300	0.00026	349.06	0.00007	41.633
Thompson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	106.658
Thurmond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	85.277
Warner	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	121.897
Wellstone	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	96.024

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING DEC. 31, 1995—Continued

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per, capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	FY 96 Official mail allocation
Thomas	1,300	0.00026	349.06	0.00007	41.633
Thompson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	106.658
Thurmond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	85.277
Warner	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	121.897
Wellstone	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	96.024

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS TOWARD PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, much has happened since the Irish Republican Army broke its cease-fire with two bloody bombings in London. Those cowardly acts cast doubt on the viability of the entire peace process. But the people rose up en masse, as I had a feeling they would. Tens of thousands demonstrated in the streets of Dublin and elsewhere, demanding that the perpetrators of the violence give them back their peace.

Responding to the will of the people, the Irish and British Governments reached agreement on a way forward, including a date of June 10 for full-party talks. The peace process is back on track and moving ahead, and Sinn Fein and the IRA should waste no time in seizing this opportunity. Their participation is needed if lasting peace is to be achieved. As Irish Foreign Minister Dick Spring said in an eloquent speech to the Dail Eireann on February 29, the "fixed date surely now offers the basic assurances that the republican movement has sought. Given the intolerable human cost, and the grave political damage caused by the violence to date, how can the IRA explain the continuation, for one more day, of its renewed campaign?"

Mr. President, Foreign Minister Spring has been on a relentless quest for peace in Northern Ireland for much of his distinguished career. I know his hopes were dashed when the IRA ended its cease-fire, as were all of ours. But he did not lose hope. He persevered, and we all owe him and Prime Minister John Bruton our support and admiration for their determination, their fairness, and their commitment to a better life for all the people on that island.

I ask that Foreign Minister Spring's February 29 speech be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

STATEMENT BY TANAISTE AND MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS DICK SPRING, DAIL EIREANN, 29 FEBRUARY 1996

The British and Irish Governments have long shared a common analysis and a common objective: a comprehensive political settlement based on consent. We have also been united in agreement that this objective can only be attained through all party negotiations addressing comprehensively all the relevant relationships and issues in an interlocking three-stranded process. The necessity for all-party negotiations is also appreciated by all parties in Northern Ireland.

Where they, and we, have differed, has been on how to proceed into such negotiations. Was it possible to ensure that, on the one