

I want to thank my esteemed chairman for the clarity and tone of his remarks. Whichever way this vote will go, we will manage to get through this. But that we are doing this for the 17th time since 1980 suggests that we better look to our procedures in the future.

Mr. President, with thanks to the chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROTH. Will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROTH may have 1 minute.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his remarks. I must, once again, urge the defeat of the so-called Moynihan amendment. If it should carry, I think it is critically important that it be recognized that we would be jeopardizing the ability of the Treasury to manage the public debt.

As I said earlier, we may not have until March 21, or even March 15. Treasury, again, has informed us that next week cash levels will be imprudently low and under \$1 billion. That is the reason it is critically important that we enact H.R. 3021 without amendment. As I have assured the distinguished Senator from New York, then we will look at the longer term and work together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, 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. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. GORTON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN] are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Ford	Moynihan
Biden	Glenn	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Nunn
Bradley	Heflin	Pell
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Bryan	Johnston	Reid
Bumpers	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Simon
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Exon	Levin	
Feingold	Lieberman	

NAYS—47

Abraham	Grams	Murkowski
Bennett	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Harkin	Roth
Burns	Hatch	Santorum
Chafee	Hatfield	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Cohen	Inhofe	Snowe
Coverdell	Jeffords	Specter
Craig	Kassebaum	Stevens
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thomas
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Faircloth	Lott	Thurmond
Frist	Lugar	Warner
Gramm	McConnell	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Gorton, for

NOT VOTING—9

Ashcroft	D'Amato	Mack
Boxer	Dole	McCain
Campbell	Inouye	Moseley-Braun

So the amendment (No. 3465) was rejected.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 3021) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be

no more recorded votes today. However, I think it should be noted that we had hoped to move forward on the small business deregulation bill. There has been basically an objection to bringing that up at this time by one of the Democratic Members, perhaps other Members about bringing it up at this time. We are attempting though to reach an agreement on when that bill will be considered. It is one that passed overwhelmingly, unanimously, bipartisan, a good bill. I think everybody understands that. We have agreement on it. We should go ahead and move that legislation. I have discussed this with the distinguished Democratic leader. We are now trying to get an agreement on making sure that we get it up in a very short, reasonable period of time.

We will begin the omnibus appropriations bill on Monday morning. Amendments will be started on Monday with the votes to occur on Tuesday, and we will have some further specific announcement on the time of those votes. Also, we are expecting Members to have amendments ready on Monday on this omnibus appropriations bill. Again, I have discussed this with the Democratic leader. We do know already at least one amendment that will be ready on Monday is the Daschle omnibus amendment. We are working now, we are hoping maybe even here in the next few minutes to get some of the amendments, a list of the amendments that would be available on Monday.

I do want to emphasize also it is important that we get a reasonable agreement on time for handling this legislation because it will call for a conference with the House because there clearly will be differences between the two bodies' versions of the omnibus appropriations bill. We need to get it done in time so there can be a conference, an agreement in conference, and get this matter hopefully concluded by Thursday of next week.

There will be no votes on Friday and no votes on Monday, but I emphasize again we will begin debate on this omnibus appropriations bill with amendments to be offered. I hope Members will not try to hold their amendments to the second day. We just will not physically be able to accommodate that. We are going to work across the aisle to get an agreement on that at the appropriate time.

I do want to inform Members that later there will be a cloture motion laid down on Whitewater, and in all probability on the D.C. appropriations conference report.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. I notice the Democratic leader is here. Just one final point. I now ask unanimous consent we have a period for morning business to 3:30 p.m. with Members permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. LOTT. With that, I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

CURTIS BALDWIN MEMORIAL

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, on behalf of Majority Leader DOLE and myself, I would like to address the Senate on the death of Curtis Baldwin. I wish to take a moment to recognize a Senate staffer who made a meaningful contribution both to the Senate and his community.

Curtis Baldwin unexpectedly passed away this week at the young age of 36. He was born in Richland, GA, and graduated from Clark College in Atlanta.

For the past 7 years, Curtis was a Sergeant at Arms employee who was well known among his coworkers and the Senate staff as a goodhearted, dedicated, and loyal individual. Curtis will always be remembered as having a positive effect on people with his joyful disposition and contagious laugh.

In addition, he was an active and faithful member of the Congress Heights Methodist Church in Washington, DC, where he was a youth minister, a member of the board of trustees, and an assistant treasurer. Curtis found deep fulfillment in being a member of both the T.J. Horne Ensemble and the church choir. He celebrated life each day by being close to the Lord and his family.

Curtis will always be remembered in the hearts of those who knew him.

Mr. President, I thank you and I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

JOINT STANDARDS ON VIOLENCE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, last week the major leaders of the television and movie industries in the United States met with President Clinton, Vice President GORE, and in separate meetings with several of us in Congress to address the issues of glamorized violence and sexual exploitation.

President Clinton and the industry leaders are to be congratulated for coming together, an indication that both the leaders of Government and the industry take this issue seriously.

Second, while I opposed the Federal Government mandating the V-chip and the ratings system that goes with it, the fact that the industry has decided to address the pressure in the telecommunications bill for them to voluntarily set up a system rather than oppose the proposal in the courts will do some good. It is a signal to the American people that the industry is willing to show self-restraint and that good citizenship can prevail over the profits-at-any-cost philosophy.

My experience with this issue suggests that progress can continue to be

made without Government entering the constitutionally dangerous field of regulating content and without the industry impairing either its profits or its effectiveness. But because this field that is entered is new in the United States for the industry, there will be some stumbling along the way. The path of real progress is rarely easy in any type of endeavor.

The television-movie leaders deserve our congratulations not only for the step just announced but for a series of positive actions that have been taken over the past few years. The industry initially moved in a more conservative direction somewhat reluctantly, but as more and more leaders started self-examination and found pride and satisfaction in the good they were doing, the progress has become more measurable.

In 1986, when I began talking about violence on television, I was a lonely voice. The entertainment industry responded to my calls for a reduction in gratuitous and glamorized violence on television with almost universal denials of any link between violence on television and violence in our society. For even suggesting such a link, I was loudly and enthusiastically denounced by some.

When I asked that they work together to establish joint standards on violence, the networks told me that antitrust laws precluded them from doing so. When I introduced and Congress passed an antitrust exemption in 1990, signed into law by President Bush, to allow them to discuss this issue, they spent the first year and a half of the exemption doing nothing. Finally, halfway through the exemption, I took to the Senate floor to call the Nation's attention to this issue and the industry's inaction. Public hearings were held in the House and the Senate.

In response to this public pressure, the networks announced joint standards on violence in 1992. The broadcast networks led the way on this, followed by cable and the independents. The standards they developed were not as strong as I would have liked, not as strong as the British standards, for example, but a positive step forward.

In the summer of 1993, the networks established a parental advisory system. They took significant nonpublic actions to change the shape of things. The President of one of the broadcast networks told me that he viewed a film they had paid \$1.5 million for, and after viewing it he decided the network should take a loss and not show it because of its violence.

When the officials of one network met, initially, one or two sharply criticized what I was doing. Then one of the officers asked the question, "Do you let your children watch what we are producing?" He reported that question changed the whole tone of the meeting and what they would produce in the future.

Jack Valenti, head of the Motion Picture Association, and others, arranged

for me to meet with the Writers Guild and the Directors Guild, the creative people who help to shape what we view. A few of them were hostile, some reluctant, and others clearly welcomed a slightly different thrust.

In August 1993, the first-ever industrywide conference on the issue of gratuitous television violence was held. At that conference, I urged the industry to select independent monitors, not censors, to make any reports to the public about television programming. In early 1994, both the broadcast and cable networks announced they would do it and announced their selection for independent monitors.

These monitors, the UCLA Center for Communication Policy and Mediascope, have now each issued their first annual reports. Many critics dismissed these monitors as pawns of the industry because the industry is paying for their work.

These first reports clearly belie that suspicion. They are solid, critical examinations of television programming. They make concrete suggestions for ways to improve. The reports exceeded my greatest hopes.

These studies show that television violence is still a problem, but the very existence of the reports should encourage everyone concerned about this issue. The networks invested significant sums to fund this, and they have respected the independence of the monitors' work.

The industry has proposed a voluntary rating system to provide the public with more information about their programming. I applaud this voluntary effort. The question is where we go from here.

Laudable as the most recent step by the industry is—though I voted against that V-chip in the version that passed the Senate as an unwise and probably unconstitutional intrusion of the Federal Government in the field of content—I have concerns that some in industry and Government are looking to this as the answer to the question of gratuitous violence. It will help concerned parents. Perhaps of greater influence, it will affect advertising for those who accept that form of sustenance.

I have these concerns:

First, it will take years before the V-chip is in most American homes.

Second, the recent report on television by Mediascope suggests that while ratings help parents and are helpful with young children, boys between the ages of 11 and 14 are attracted by an R rating, not repelled by it. If the study had included young people between the ages of 15 and 19, my instinct is that the R rating would prove to be even more of a magnet.

Third, teenagers are mechanically very adept. Many will find their way around the V-chip, if by no other means, by going to a friend's home.

Fourth, and most important, the homes that most need to use the V-chip will not use it. Children in high-