

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from consideration of S. Res. 159, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 159) designating the week beginning September 16, 2001, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 159) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 159

Whereas there are 105 historically black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas black colleges and universities provide the quality education so essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in American history;

Whereas black colleges and universities have allowed many underprivileged students to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of historically black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK.

The Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 16, 2001, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week"; and

(2) requests that the President of the United States issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for historically black colleges and universities in the United States.

ORDER THE RECORD REMAIN OPEN UNTIL 3:30 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open today until 3:30 for statements and introduction of bills.

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

MEASURE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S. 1426

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that once H.R. 2888, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, is enacted into law, action on S. 1426 be vitiated and the bill then be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, I would like to extend my appreciation to everyone who allowed us to complete these nominations.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator WARNER, pursuant to section 3(b) of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, we ask unanimous consent that S. 1428, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, be sequentially referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period not to exceed 30 days.

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

TRIBUTE TO TERRY LYNCH

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in remembrance of a long-time former employee of mine, Terry Michael Lynch. Terry was killed Tuesday morning at the Pentagon in the tragic and senseless events of a day that will never be forgotten in America. Terry worked for me for over 15 years, both in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, and I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on the life of a dedicated family man and a true patriot.

Terry was born in 1952 in Youngstown, Ohio. Terry grew up as the son of a steel-factory administrator. He graduated from high school in Youngstown, and received both his bachelor's and master's degrees in history from Youngstown State. It was there that Terry met his wife of 24 years, Jackie.

Terry worked on Capitol Hill as an aide to former Alabama Republican Congressman Albert Lee Smith. Some of you might remember the Congressman. He began working for me in 1983, when I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. When I entered the race for the United States Senate in 1986, Terry was one of the first volunteers to take personal time away from his family here in Virginia and travel throughout Alabama doing any task that was needed. Terry came over to the U.S. Senate with me as my Legislative Assistant assigned to the Armed Services Committee and continued in that position from 1987 through 1994. In 1995, Terry became a professional staff member of the Senate Intelligence Committee and for two years brought his expertise to the Intelligence Committee. He subsequently worked as a member of the professional staff of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee

chaired by Senator SPECTER. Terry was most recently employed by the consulting firm of Booz Allen and Hamilton.

To say and give you all of this background does not touch the essence of Terry Lynch. He was one of the most loyal, caring, unpretentious, and compassionate human beings I have ever had the privilege of knowing. Terry was a foundation of strength and stability for everyone that knew and loved him. He was the kindest soul and the most dedicated and loving father to his two daughters, Tiffany and Ashley. Terry's passion for helping others, especially the men and women in uniform with which he so closely worked, was always evident over the course of his career. This week, former staff members have called from all over the world to express their deep grief. And, although they had not seen Terry in many years, he made such a strong impact on all of us that to this day, he still lives on in each of our hearts in some way. Terry Lynch's spirit and his memory will forever be with us—the people who worked with him and knew him in the House of Representatives, who worked with him and knew him in the Senate, and who worked with him and knew him in the Pentagon where he died.

We are all, I believe, better people for having known Terry Michael Lynch.

Terry was an intelligent man with a heart of gold. He was also a great American. His life should not have ended in this unfortunate and premature manner, because he had so much ahead of him. But I promise you I will do everything in my power to ensure that Terry's life, and the lives of all Americans affected by this terrible tragedy, did not end in vain.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred December 19, 1997 in Stockton, CA. A high school student was allegedly beaten by a group of youths who believed he was gay. Two youths, ages 16 and 17, were charged with civil rights violations.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I want to thank the managers of this bill for their hard work in putting forth this

legislation which provides federal funding for numerous vital programs.

This bill provides funding for fighting crime, enhancing drug enforcement, and responding to threats of terrorism. It further addresses the shortcomings of the immigration process, funds the operation of the judicial process, facilitates commerce throughout the United States, and supports the needs of the State Department and various other agencies.

Regrettably, this bill spends at a level 4.4 percent higher than the level enacted in fiscal year 2001 which is greater than the 4 percent increase in discretionary spending than the President wanted to adhere to.

In real dollars, this is \$720 million in additional spending above the amount requested by the President, and a \$1.7 billion increase in spending from last year. So far this year, with just five appropriations bills already passed, spending levels have already exceeded the President's budget request by more than \$6.6 billion.

A good amount of this increase is in the form of parochial spending for unrequested projects. In this bill, I have identified approximately 600 earmarks totaling \$2 billion, which is greater than the 470 earmarks, totaling \$1.5 billion, in the bill passed last year.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars in pork-barrel spending and legislative riders that are riddled throughout this bill. The multitude of unrequested earmarks buried in this measure will undoubtedly further burden the American taxpayers. While the amounts associated with each individual earmark may not seem extravagant, taken together, they represent a serious diversion of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars at the expense of numerous programs that have undergone the appropriate merit-based selection process.

For example, under funding for the Department of Justice, some examples of earmarks include: \$3 million to the University of Connecticut to fund the Prison Health Research Project; \$3 million for a grant to the Clearwater, Idaho EDA for the Lewis and Clark Bi-Centennial Bi-State Public Safety Project; \$1 million for a grant to the Alaska Native Justice Center Restorative Justice programs; \$1.6 million for the Montana Highway Patrol for computer upgrades; and \$725,000 for the City of Jackson, Mississippi, for their public safety automated technologies system.

Under funding for the Department of Commerce, some of the earmarks include: \$500,000 for the Central California Ozone Study; \$500,000 for the International Pacific Research Center at the University of Hawaii; \$1.25 million for the Alaska Near Shore Fisheries; \$350,000 for the South Carolina Taxonomic Center; \$1.75 million for the Alaska Fisheries Development Foundation; \$500,000 for weather radio transmitters in Wyoming; \$4 million for the Institute for Politics at Harvard Uni-

versity; and \$6 million for the Thayer School of Engineering at Dartmouth University for the nanocrystalline materials and biomass research initiative.

There are many more projects on the list that I have compiled, which will be available on my Senate Web site.

Mr. President, I must once again draw attention to the more questionable ways in which Americans' tax dollars serve the otherwise noble cause of U.S. diplomacy around the world as part of the State Department appropriations portion of this bill. As usual, several organizations and universities have received earmarked funds for international exchanges. Five particularly parochial earmarks deserve mention: the Joiner Fellowships in War, the Padnos International Center, the UNI-Cedar Falls Russo-American Exchange, the UNLV Global Business Exchange, and the UNR International Business Exchange each receive a \$100,000 earmark, to the surprise of, among others, officials of the State Department, who not only did not request funding for these programs, but in several cases were unaware they even existed.

Among other beneficiaries this year of unrequested spending that seems to serve primarily the interests of its patrons, Pacific salmon stand out: this bill appropriates \$45,419,000, or nearly twice the \$25 million requested by the Department of State, to implement the 1999 Pacific Salmon Treaty. Included in this figure is \$20 million above the Administration's request to capitalize the Northern and Southern Boundary Funds and \$419,000 above the Administration's request dedicated to the State of Washington for its salmon preservation efforts. The Committee report also takes it upon itself to absolve the State of Alaska of further harvest reductions under the 1999 Pacific Salmon Treaty.

Traveling dance and music troupes and Internet entrepreneurs are also being shown the money as a result of the Committee report's generous provision of \$750,000 to their cause, on the grounds that, in the Committee's words, "Performances by touring U.S. dance and music troupes have afforded our diplomats unusual access to oftentimes elusive senior policy-makers in Africa. At the same time, the lure of technological innovation, especially the explosion of the Internet, afford American educators and entrepreneurs a rare opportunity to develop lasting links with African elites." Our relations with African nations are important, and many countries torn by crippling poverty, famine, disease, civil unrest, and open warfare could use our help. I like a good dance performance as much as anyone, but I'm not positive this funding is the best way to help our friends or advance American interests in Africa.

For many years now I have opposed the Advanced Technology Program at the Department of Commerce on grounds that it is "corporate pork."

For many years, any of the Nation's leading companies have reaped the benefits of this grant program for research ideas that they could and should have pursued under their corporate budgets. Proponents of the program have cited that the program funds high-risk projects.

Several years ago, on the Senate Commerce Committee, we reviewed many of the funded projects under the program and found that many of the projects were not high-risk at all, but rather evolutionary or incremental development of existing technologies.

The President has stated that the future of the program would be subject to a Commerce Department's review. The fiscal year 2002 budget request has essentially eliminated funding for ATP. The Appropriations Committee has provided funding of \$204 million for fiscal year 2002, \$191 million above the President's request. Furthermore, to ensure that this funding is awarded in a timely manner, the Appropriations Committee, in report language, has prohibited obligations of any funds under the Department's Departmental Management account, which funds salaries and other expenses, until a plan on how timely awards are to be made. That is equivalent to saying make ATP awards or we will shut down the Department.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to curb our habit of directing hard-earned taxpayer dollars to locality-specific special interests and our inclusion of legislative riders which thwart the very process that is needed to ensure our laws address the concerns and interests of all Americans, not just a few who seek special protection or advantage.

AMENDMENT NO. 1538 TO H.R. 2500

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise to raise an issue regarding the meaning and effect of amendment No. 1538 to H.R. 2500. I am proud to have joined in sponsoring this amendment with Senators HARKIN, WARNER, INHOFE, COCHRAN, ALLARD, CAMPBELL, and JOHNSON.

Mr. HARKIN. It is the understanding of the Senator from New Hampshire that the proper meaning of that amendment would bar the State and Justice Departments from filing any statement of interest or in any manner intervening to oppose any civil action brought by a former prisoner of war against a corporation of the type referenced in the amendment?

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Yes. This is the intent of the amendment which passed this body by voice vote after a motion to table failed.

Mr. HARKIN. This is my understanding as well.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a provision that has been included in the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee manager's amendment to H.R. 2500 that is absolutely crucial to recovering threatened and

endangered species, while also protecting people and the economies of areas where these species are present.

I would like to thank the esteemed Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee and the Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee for recognizing the critical nature of this issue and including it in the manager's amendment.

The Endangered Species Act, ESA, requires Federal agencies to avoid actions that are likely to "jeopardize" the continued existence of threatened or endangered species or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. Agencies must "consult" with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service, who issue a biological opinion at the conclusion of consultation to assist the Federal agency to meet its substantive no-jeopardy obligation. The obligation to avoid jeopardy rests upon the Federal "action agency," not on the Services. These actions may include the construction of a highway or bridge, a stream restoration project to benefit listed fish species, a forest health activity such as thinning or prescribed fire to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire, or the operation of hydroelectric projects.

In the West, we have seen countless projects held up for inordinate amounts of time. They have caused economic hardship and job loss, while also draining the resources of the Federal Government. What is so significant about these resources being consumed by the consultation process is that in nearly all of these cases, projects did not jeopardize threatened or endangered species. In nearly every case, neither the species nor their habitats were at risk. In every case, this was a matter of doing paperwork that is required by the regulatory process. And, in no case, did this process do anything to increase a species' chances of survival or improve habitat for that species on-the-ground.

In 1986, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service issued joint regulations that divided consultations into "informal" and "formal." Informal consultations occur for any action that "may affect" a listed species. If the consulting Service finds that adverse affect on the species is likely, then formal consultation begins and the service will issue a formal biological opinion.

Since 1986, the consultation process has mushroomed into a lengthy and expensive process. Eight hundred and twenty two new species have been listed since then, including 21 new salmon listings in the past five years. Between 1987 and 1995 Federal agencies were required to complete more than 186,000 consultations with the Services on proposed programs and projects. The increasing number of critical habitat designations will only add to this burden. Despite efforts to manage the workload under existing rules, the

Services have been unable to quell growing criticism that they cannot do the job adequately.

Yet only three tenths of one percent of these projects, let me say that again, only three tenths of one percent or fewer than 600, were found to be likely to jeopardize a protected species or adversely modify critical habitat. A full 99.7 percent of all consultations involved projects that already complied fully with the ESA. Only one out of every 300 consultations involved a project with a potential to violate the ESA.

Each year Federal agencies are compelled to expend millions of Federal dollars for elaborate consultations on projects that pose no significant threat to species. Each of these consultations requires extensive studies and reports by the Federal action agency and one or both of the Services, and extends for months or years before ending with the inevitable no-jeopardy finding that was obvious from the start. The Services have increased their staffs every year for the past decade in order to complete more and more of these unneeded consultations that have no value for protected species.

These project delays further drain the Federal Treasury by increasing the ultimate costs of the stalled projects. The delays also cause millions of dollars more in lost economic opportunity for private citizens dependent on a stalled project. These consultations sap resources from those relatively few situations where a species actually needs protection from a proposed Federal agency project or program.

This out-of-control consultation process is contrary to Congress' intent in enacting the Endangered Species Act. The Supreme Court has observed that consultation is among the ESA's procedural safeguards intended "to avoid needless economic dislocation produced by agency officials zealously but unintelligently pursuing their environmental objectives." (Bennett v. Spear, 520 U.S. 154, 176-77 (1997).)

The joint consultation rules must be modified to mitigate the problem, reduce the workload and continue the same level of protection for the listed species. The regulations have caused large numbers of unneeded and burdensome consultations. None of these is required by the ESA and none of them is necessary in today's heightened sensitivity of endangered species responsibility to protect listed species.

It is impossible to make the argument that streamlining the consultation regulations will negatively affect species. In fact, a more efficient and effective process will help imperiled species by reducing unnecessary paperwork, and thus, reducing the resources needed to do the paperwork, and by redirecting this precious resources to making real, on-the-ground improvements for imperiled species.

My provision, which has been included in the bill, would direct the Services to review this situation and

revise their joint regulations accordingly. The review would consider the significant increase in number, cost, and duration of consultations since promulgation of the regulations in 1986 and would result in modifications to the regulations that will streamline the consultation process to ensure that: one, all forms of consultation are completed within the deadlines provided in section 7 of the ESA; two, the requirements for initiating consultation and for any information generated and documentation prepared by both the action agency and the consulting agency during consultation are fully consistent with section 7; and three, the consultation process is conducted in an efficient and useful manner to meet the purpose of section 7.

Section 7(b) of the ESA imposes a 90-day deadline, subject to certain extensions to which each agency must agree. If there is a permit applicant involved, consultation may not exceed 150 days without the applicant's consent. The 1986 regulations make no effort to follow these deadlines during the informal consultation stage, thus allowing this process to drag on and on.

A primary cause of the explosion in unneeded consultations is the extremely low threshold in the regulations for an action agency to initiate a consultation. The regulations require an action agency to initiate consultation for any proposed action that "may affect" either a listed species or critical habitat. In announcing the regulations, the Fish and Wildlife Service explained that they may affect threshold means that "any possible effect, whether beneficial, benign, adverse, or of an undetermined character, triggers the formal consultation requirement."

The regulations do not permit an action agency to decide that it does not need to consult on a "may affect" action, no matter how harmless the activity may be. A "may affect" action can be exempted from formal consultation only if a Service concurs in writing that the action is "not likely to adversely affect" a listed species or critical habitat. That finding itself requires a multi-step inter-agency administrative process called informal consultation, which often takes longer than the formal consultation it is intended to avoid.

The ESA does not contain the "may affect" consultation threshold. As a matter of fact, the Endangered Species Act does not contain any consultation threshold at all. The "may affect" threshold in the regulations is so far removed from the substantive no-jeopardy requirement in the ESA that large volumes of unnecessary consultations were virtually guaranteed to occur—and have.

Other sections of the regulations also compel large numbers of unnecessary consultations: consultation is required on any action authorized, funded, or carried out "in part" by a federal agency, even if the Federal involvement is minor or secondary to private or state

action; consultation is required for agency actions that are intended to benefit species; consultation is required for agency regulations with no direct on-the-ground impact; and consultation is required for agency actions that "indirectly" cause modification to the land, water, or air.

The regulations also impose burdensome documentation requirements, far beyond the ESA, that guarantee that even the most minor consultation will be long and slow. The action agency is required to initiate every formal consultation with a detailed written report on the manner in which the action may affect any listed species or critical habitat and an analysis of any cumulative effects, and must also provide the best scientific and commercial information available or which can be obtained during the consultation for an adequate review of the effects that an action may have upon listed species or critical habitat. Moreover, while the ESA only requires "biological assessments" to be prepared for "major construction activities," the joint regulations make this detailed analysis a virtual requirement for every agency action.

The joint regulations then mandate that a biological opinion include a detailed discussion of the effects of the action on listed species or critical habitat that addresses all of the indirect, interrelated, interconnected and cumulative effects as defined in the regulations. In contrast, the ESA only requires that a biological opinion set forth a summary of the information on which the opinion is based, detailing how the agency action affects the species or its critical habitat.

The Services have the authority under existing law to amend their regulations to improve the operation of the process. The agencies can initiate a rulemaking process to amend their regulations, with notice and opportunity for the public to comment, following the same procedures as were employed for the original 1986 regulations. No amendment of the ESA is required. The amendment I am offering merely directs the Services to use a portion of their fiscal year 2002 funds to review the consultation regulations and propose changes that will bring this process into line with the realities of the 21st Century and will enable all federal agencies to fulfill their obligations under the ESA.

The Endangered Species Act is besieged with problems that must be solved in order to adequately protect listed species and recover them. At the same time, many Western communities feel that they have been assaulted by the ESA in the last two decades. Win-win solutions often evade us as policymakers when it comes to issues that are as contentious as the Endangered Species, but this is truly a win-win for species AND people. Again, my sincere thanks to the chairman and Ranking Member of the Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee for their assist-

ance in finding solutions to this troubling issue.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, last year this Committee and Congress passed legislation to privatize INMARSAT [International Maritime Satellite Organization]. As part of the privatization, INMARSAT is required to hold an initial public offering [IPO]. INMARSAT's IPO deadline is set for December 31 of this year. Since the IPO market continues to be in bad shape, INMARSAT and its investment advisors would like time to see if the market improves.

INMARSAT was established in 1979 to improve maritime communications especially for distress and safety signals. Over the past two decades, INMARSAT has branched out to serve both maritime markets and increasingly any markets requiring mobility—shipping, oil and gas exploration and the FAA.

Since the IPO market has nosedived, INMARSAT has been waiting for conditions to improve. All of the extensions available to INMARSAT have now been used and the FCC has no more discretion to extend the deadline.

The dilemma is that if INMARSAT does not hold the IPO it will be in violation of U.S. law, and if it does hold the IPO, they could be found in breach of its fiduciary responsibility to its shareholders, possibly subjecting itself to shareholder lawsuits.

My amendment would simply give the FCC the ability to extend the deadline an additional 18 months to see if the IPO market improves. A large number of U.S. companies have pulled their IPOs off the market given market conditions. We are trying to privatize INMARSAT and we should allow them to act like a company.

IN SUPPORT OF THE BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS' NEW MIDDLE EAST RADIO NETWORK

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for a proposal by the Broadcasting Board of Governors to enhance and expand service to the Middle East. According to the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the mission of U.S. international broadcasting is to promote the open communication of information and ideas in support of democracy, and the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information, worldwide. In pursuit of this goal, the Broadcasting Board of Governors has proposed a new station, the Middle East Radio Network.

Would Senator BOXER care to enlighten us on the current U.S. Government sponsored Arabic language broadcasting in the Middle East?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I would and I thank the Senator for this opportunity to describe the important results of the board's most recent Language Service Review. This review found that our current broadcasting efforts in the

Middle East only reach approximately 2 percent of the population. The board's 2001 Language Service Review highlighted the importance of revitalizing America's Arabic programs in order to offset local Arabic radio broadcasts that often serve to incite violence in the region. An alternative must be offered to the hate radio that so often incites the population to violence.

In February, Broadcasting Board of Governors' representatives traveled throughout the Middle East to gather facts, to talk to government and media officials, and to begin to build a concept for success. The research emphasized the need for a greater U.S. media presence and increased local content to U.S. broadcasts. The researchers found that in spite of widespread opposition to the U.S. policies, there is a strong attraction to the American values of freedom and individualism. In addition, the Arab public would like information about U.S. businesses, technology and advances in medicine. I believe my colleague from Nebraska would like to discuss the Broadcasting Board of Governors' plans to address the shortcomings in our broadcasting services to the Middle East.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the Senator for the opportunity to speak about the new broadcast service proposed by the Broadcasting Board of Governors for fiscal year 2002. The goal is to provide broadcasts that will appeal to a broad Arabic-speaking audience by providing news and information about events in the region. The working name for this station is the Middle East Radio Network. It would be a 24 hour per day, 7 days per week Arabic-language station to be delivered via a combination of local MW and FM, and shortwave to areas where local delivery is not possible. Programming will include news, music, talk, and interactive programs with listener participation. The Broadcasting Board of Governors plans to feature reliable news and discussion of issues relevant to the audience in a format to appeal to young adults and to news-seekers of all ages. The programs will embody two important themes: individual choice and respect for others. In a region where more than half of the population is under 25, a successful station must appeal to young people who are the best hope to end the cycle of violence that has ravaged the region.

I know my colleague from Washington would like to discuss the delivery of this new service in the Middle East, and I invite her to comment.

Mrs. MURRAY. The expansion and enhancement of our radio programming in the Middle East are critical to the success of our policies in the region. The proposed service would reach audiences in the West Bank and Gaza, the Gulf, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, and Sudan in the most popular media of AM, FM and satellite program delivery. This is an area where we cannot afford to deliver our message through a third party