

industries spawned by the new telecommunications law have stolen our eye from the land rush now under way in Radioland. A vast consolidation of ownership has begun among America's 10,000 commercial stations. Just two months after passage of the law erased the limits on the number of radio stations a single owner may acquire, a station-buying blowout is justifying critics' fears that the law is not spurring competition, but monopoly. An industry that once had to base its license renewals on service to a station's community has been let off the hook by Congress and the president.

Rita Zanello, a media analyst at Gruntal & Co. in New York, predicts that eight or 10 big station groups will eventually control the entire broadcasting industry. "You control pricing," she told the Chicago Tribune. "You eliminate your competition and have greater control over what you can charge."

To cite just a few examples of the radio land rush, Jacor Communications Inc. of Cincinnati spent nearly a billion dollars in February to acquire 26 radio stations and two television stations. Jacor now controls 62 percent of the radio revenues in the Cincinnati market, nearly half the Denver market, 30 percent of the Tampa market, and a quarter of the radio business in Portland, OR. In a single deal worth \$1.2 billion, announced earlier this month, the Sinclair Broadcasting Group of Baltimore acquired 34 radio stations in 27 markets, along with a group of television stations, becoming a miniconglomerate in a single bound.

With the purchase of three stations in March, Citadel Communications Corporation now owns seven of the most powerful AM and FM stations in Albuquerque's 36-station radio market. That includes KKOB, which blankets much of the southwest, and the city's only classical music station, KHFM. Arthur Schreiber, a former manager of KKOB and a veteran of the radio wars, predicts that Albuquerque's classical-music listeners will soon find themselves without choice on the air. "It's hard for me to believe that Citadel can meet its debt service by continuing to play classical music on a station that cost it \$5.6 million," says Mr. Schreiber.

The federal government is essentially licensing the drive to bigness. Station brokers predict that 1996 will be the most lucrative year ever for station trades. In a deregulatory environment, small, aggressive companies such as Jacor and Citadel can become mass-comm players in a single bound, with lenders anxious to supply cheap money.

But radio isn't just any business. Radio is an essential part of our civic capital. It speaks over publicly licensed frequencies to millions of listeners, at home, at work, and on the road. In the past stations were more than juke boxes. They provided breaking news and weather bulletins, specialized information for farmers, investors, community organizations, local governments, and emergency services. Before the start of deregulation in the 1980s, owners were limited to seven AM and seven FM stations, to ensure diverse voices and dispersed power.

The new barons of radio are absentee owners who convert their stations from local presences into cash cows for instant milking, their values ballooned for trading to the next buyer. The name of the game is to avoid being the "last sucker" stuck with debt if recession hits.

Radio, once the most trusted news source in America, has increasingly abandoned the role of local service-provider. Newsrooms in many stations have been cut to the bone—one or two readers, Schreiber says, "ripping and reading" news and weather supplied to all clients by a single news source, the Associated Press.

there is teeth-gritting sameness in the music they play, as dial-twisters who have traveled long distances in a car can testify—various shades of rock and country music.

Before deregulation, the Federal Communications Commission required buyers to hold their stations for at least three years before resale, to ensure local commitment. In the new environment, a wheeler-dealer can theoretically turn his station over as soon as the FCC approves the purchase. Media writer Ken Auletta was told by the head of a station ownership group: "It's commodity trading to us. We don't know [our] community. We're short-term players."

The fundamental question is unavoidable: Is mass communications solely a growth game for entrepreneurs, banks, and Wall Street, or is it also a social partner that justifies its existence by living up to its civic obligations? The late Donald H. McGannon, a respected industry leader of the 1950s and '60s as chairman of the Group W (Westinghouse) Stations, was a businessman with a vision who told his staff: "If we do the right thing in our cities and towns, the money comes." They did—and it did.

The times have changed. But not the relevance of McGannon's vision. Undoing the damage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 will be difficult, but it will have to happen. •

#### SUBMISSION OF CBO SCORING FOR INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL (S. 1718)

• Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on April 30, 1996, the Select Committee on Intelligence reported S. 1718, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 from committee. Knowing that this would be a relatively short legislative year and that the Armed Services Committee would take our bill on referral for up to 30 days of session—as it does every year, the committee marked up this bill at the earliest possible date. The Congressional Budget Office was not able to complete its scoring of our bill before we filed the report. We have now received the report of the Congressional Budget Office and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD so that Members will have an opportunity to review it before the Intelligence bill comes up for consideration by the full Senate.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, May 22, 1996.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,  
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 1718, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, as reported by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on April 30, 1996.

The bill would affect direct spending and receipts, and thus would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM  
(For June E. O'Neill, Director).  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST  
ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: S. 1718.

2. Bill title: Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

3. Bill status: As reported by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on April 30, 1996.

4. Bill purpose: This bill would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for intelligence activities of the United States government, the Community Management Staff of the Director of Central Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: Table 1 summarizes the budgetary effects of the unclassified sections of the bill on direct spending, revenues, and authorizations of appropriations for 1997. CBO could not obtain the necessary information to estimate the costs for the entire bill because parts are classified at a level above clearances now held by CBO employees.

6. Basis of estimate: The estimate assumes that S. 1718 will be enacted by October 1, 1996, and that the full amounts authorized will be appropriated. CBO used historical spending rates for estimating outlays.

#### DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES

Title V of S. 1718 defines economic espionage and contains provisions governing fines and forfeitures that would affect direct spending and revenues. Although the bill would provide for penalties that could accumulate to be in the millions of dollars in any one year, CBO cannot predict the frequency of successful prosecutions for economic espionage or the amounts of the fines that would be levied and collected. Nevertheless, the only net budgetary impact would stem from civil fines.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE UNCLASSIFIED SECTIONS OF S. 1718

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

|  | 1996 | 1997             | 1998             | 1999             | 2000             | 2001             | 2002             |
|--|------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>DIRECT SPENDING AND REVENUES</b>              |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Direct spending:                                 |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Estimated budget authority .....                 | 0    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Estimated outlays .....                          | 0    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| Revenues .....                                   | 0    | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) | ( <sup>1</sup> ) |
| <b>SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS ACTION</b> |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Spending under current law:                      |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Budget authority <sup>2</sup> .....              | 305  | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Estimated outlays .....                          | 350  | 39               | 19               | 5                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Proposed changes:                                |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Estimated authorization level .....              | 0    | 282              | 1                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Estimated outlays .....                          | 0    | 239              | 25               | 14               | 5                | 0                | 0                |
| Spending under the bill:                         |      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Estimated authorization level <sup>2</sup> ..... | 305  | 282              | 1                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Estimated outlays .....                          | 350  | 278              | 44               | 19               | 5                | 0                | 0                |

<sup>1</sup> CBO cannot estimate the direct spending and revenue impacts of the bill. Title V would affect both spending and revenues through fines and forfeitures associated with economic espionage. Over time, these effects would be offsetting except for civil fines as described in the text.

<sup>2</sup> The 1996 figure is the amount already appropriated.

**Fines.**—The imposition of new civil and criminal fines in S. 1718 could cause governmental receipts to increase. Civil fines would be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury. Criminal fines would be deposited in the Crime Victims Fund and would be spent in the following year; thus, direct spending from the fund would match the increase in revenues from criminal fines with a one-year lag.

**Forfeiture.**—A new forfeiture provision in S. 1718 could lead to more assets seized and forfeited to the United States as a result of economic espionage. Proceeds from the sale of any such assets would be deposited as revenues into the Assets Forfeiture Fund of the Department of Justice and spent out of the fund in the same year. Thus, direct spending from the Assets Forfeiture Fund would match any increase in revenues.

## SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS ACTION

The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$280 million for intelligence and intelligence-related activities for 1997 as well as such sums as may be necessary to establish the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Section 104 would authorize appropriations of \$95.5 million for 1997 for the Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence. Similarly, section 201 specifies an authorization of appropriations for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund of \$184.2 million. In addition, CBO estimates costs of \$3 million over two years to establish the new commission.

7. Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1998. The bill would have the following pay-as-you-go impact:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

|                          | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|
| Change in outlays .....  | 0    | (1)  | (1)  |
| Change in receipts ..... | 0    | (1)  | (1)  |

<sup>1</sup> CBO cannot estimate the direct spending and revenue impacts of the bill. Title V would affect both spending and revenues through fines and forfeitures associated with economic espionage. Over time, these effects would be offsetting except for civil fines as described in the text.

8. Estimated cost to State, local, and tribal governments: Section 4 of Public Law 104-4 excludes from application of that act legislative provisions that are necessary for the national security. CBO has determined that all the provisions of S. 1718 either fit within this exclusion or do not contain intergovernmental mandates as defined by Public Law 104-4.

9. Estimated impact on the private sector: CBO has determined that all the provisions of S. 1718 either fit within the national security exclusion or do not contain private-sector mandates as defined by Public Law 104-4.

10. Previous CBO estimate: None.

11. Estimate prepared by: Federal Cost Estimate: Jeannette Van Winkle. Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Karen McVey. Impact on Private Sector: Neil Singer.

12. Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine for Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.●

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have been asked to perform the wrap-up—a high honor to be acting majority leader—perhaps majority leader since there is no majority leader at the moment.

## ORDER FOR PRINTING A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the tributes to Senator DOLE be printed as a Senate document.

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

## AUTHORIZATION FOR THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 172 just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 172) authorizing the 1996 Summer Olympic Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4044

(Purpose: To make a minor technical amendment)

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, in behalf of Senator FORD, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], for Mr. FORD, proposes an amendment numbered 4044.

In section 1 strike “, and the Olympic Torch may be displayed on the Capitol Grounds overnight.”.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, The amendment that I offer to House Concurrent Resolution 172 conforms the language of the resolution to the authority sought by the sponsors of the Olympic Torch Relay. The plans for the relay has been modified since the introduction of the original resolution in the House. This amendment reflects those changes.

It is my understanding that the House leadership is prepared to accept this amendment and will expedite action on this measure when it is received in the House. Consequently, this amendment will not result in any delay of the Olympic Torch Relay events.

I commend my colleague from Georgia, Senator NUNN, for his efforts to facilitate this event and thank my colleagues for their assistance.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; further, that any statements relating thereto be placed at an appropriate place in the RECORD as if read.

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

The amendment (No. 4044) was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 172), as amended, was agreed to.

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 1996

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until the hour of 11:30 on Wednesday, June 12; further, that immediately following the prayer,

the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each with the following exception: Senator GRASSLEY for 10 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon, the Senate then resume debate on the conference report to accompany the concurrent budget resolution.

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

## PROGRAM

Mr. SPECTER. For the information of all Senators, on Wednesday the Senate will be resuming debate on the budget resolution conference report. Under a previous order, if the Senate has received the official papers on the conference report from the House by 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, the Senate will proceed at that time on a vote on adoption of that matter. If the Senate does not receive the papers from the House by that time, then a vote on the adoption of the conference report would then occur on Thursday, June 13, at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader.

The Senate may also be asked to turn to the consideration of any other items cleared for action. Therefore, other rollcall votes are possible on Wednesday.

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

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPECTER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator CRAIG.

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

The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB DOLE

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I will not keep us long in the closing hours of the U.S. Senate in what will certainly be recognized and reported as a historic day.

Madam President, this evening I want to add to my earlier remarks two thoughts that I think are appropriate as many of our colleagues have come to the floor today to express their sadness, their reminiscent thoughts, and in some instances our joy that BOB DOLE is now free to lead our party, my party, the Republican Party, in his quest for the Presidency.