

COMMEMORATING THE 54th ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL'S STATEHOOD

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on this date 54 years ago, the State of Israel was founded. Today, all over the world, friends of Israel are observing this anniversary of Israel's independence.

The United States, under President Harry S. Truman, was the first country to formally recognize the State of Israel in 1948. We have a legacy of a special relationship based on shared values, among them support for democracy and human rights.

Preservation of the integrity, vitality and sovereignty of Israel is the cornerstone of U.S. policy in the Middle East, as well as a fundamental prerequisite for winning the global War on Terrorism.

On this day, when Israel and its allies should be celebrating, instead we see daily acts of violence and acts of terrorism that have led to the loss of innocent lives. The ability of the people of Israel and of the region to lead normal lives has been shattered.

The United States is committed to leading the international community in ending the conflict and beginning the slow walk back to negotiations for peace.

I urge President Bush and his Administration to recognize the importance of ongoing U.S. engagement in the Middle East at this crucial time. As the world's sole remaining superpower and the leader of the efforts to eradicate terrorism from the Earth, our commitment to allies such as Israel cannot and must not falter.

Once a framework for peace is in place, and we pray that day will soon come, there should be no question that the United States recognizes we will be called upon to play an ongoing role in the region, and we are prepared to accept that role.

Again, we offer our congratulations to the State of Israel on its 54th anniversary. And we assure our Israeli brothers and sisters that we share with them their quest for peace and the dream of turning swords into plowshares so that they can raise their children and grandchildren in a region of harmony.●

HONORING INSIGHT COMMUNICATIONS IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I rise to offer a proper salute to Insight Communications of Louisville, KY. The Cable Television Public Affairs Association recently presented Insight with the coveted Beacon Award in the category of education for introducing their "Young Women's Technology Fellowship" initiative to the Louisville Community.

The Fellowship initiative, which arose from a partnership established between Oxygen Media and Insight Communications, was a two-month

after-school program designed to provide advanced technical training and resources to twelve motivated young women who would typically be denied access to this level of technical education. During the curriculum, the young women were instructed to design an online magazine devoted to social issues. In the process, the girls were able to learn valuable computer applications as well as technical and journalistic skills while paying appropriate attention to social issues affecting the Louisville/Jefferson County community.

I applaud the efforts of Insight Communications and Oxygen Media. I would also like to thank these two organizations for their enduring commitment to education and service. The Fellowship program was an excellent forum for young women to not only learn invaluable technical and journalistic skills but also provide the community with pertinent information surrounding existing social issues.●

NATURAL GAS TRANSMISSION LINES AND ENHANCED COST RECOVERY

• Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, the demand for natural gas is expected to increase tremendously in this country over the next 15 years. By some accounts demand for natural gas will go from approximately 23 trillion cubic feet in 2000 to over 31 trillion cubic feet by 2015, a 34 percent increase. The existing natural gas transmission infrastructure simply cannot accommodate this increased demand.

Natural gas offers an environmentally friendly and secure source of energy, and we must ensure that we have the infrastructure in place to meet this increased demand. Otherwise, we could suffer adverse environmental consequences and undermine the potential for economic growth, which depends upon safe and secure sources of energy. Natural gas also has the added advantage of reducing our dependence on foreign energy sources, which in today's environment, is a major advantage.

The Senate Finance committee took several steps to address this issue. Improving the depreciation period for natural gas distribution lines and clarifying that natural gas gathering lines are seven-year property is a step in the right direction. However, I am concerned that the bill we are now considering, as well as the House-passed energy legislation, does not address cost recovery for natural gas transmission lines. Reliable estimates indicate that we will have to build over 38,000 miles of additional transmission lines, a fifteen percent increase over current capacity, to deliver the increased amount of natural gas that will be required to meet the increased demand over the next fifteen years. My concern is that if the Congress determines that enhanced cost recovery is necessary to generate the additional investment re-

quired to meet this enormous demand, that it is necessary to address the entire natural gas delivery system, including both distribution and transmission lines.

There is no doubt that the demands for capital investment in this area are very large indeed. Industry studies show that the natural gas industry will require almost \$50 billion in new investment for pipeline transmission lines over the next fifteen years, over \$3.2 billion per year, to meet this demand. These expenditures also include the United States portion of an Alaskan Gas Pipeline, which offers tremendous potential for this country in meeting its energy needs.

These are daunting sums. I am very concerned whether this capital can be raised in both the current economic climate and under our current cost recovery system. Over the past year, the companies we depend upon to raise the capital required to build these transmission lines lost over \$60 billion in market capitalization. This situation will impede their ability to raise the necessary capital in the market. Accelerated depreciation will help alleviate this problem by increasing cash flow, thus reducing a company's need to borrow money to build additional pipelines and lower the cost of capital that must be borrowed to complete the projects. Our committee recognized as much, as did the House, when it chose to lower the depreciation period for natural gas transmission lines from 20 to 15 years. I supported this decision, but we may not be able to utilize fully this increased distribution capacity if we do not take similar steps regarding transmission. After all, natural gas will not arrive at the distribution point unless the transmission infrastructure is sufficient to handle the increased amount of natural gas required.

There is no question that the capital investment required to ensure that we have adequate transmission pipelines to deliver natural gas is very significant. There is also no question that Congress needs to examine the entire delivery system to ensure that the benefits of any improved cost recovery are utilized efficiently and do not produce unwanted bottlenecks.

I think it would be appropriate for us to review carefully the need for shorter depreciation periods not just for distribution lines but for natural gas transmission lines as well when this matter goes to conference. Any decisions regarding natural gas depreciation must be made with an eye towards their effect on the system as a whole, including transmission lines.●

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 last 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 July 21, 1991 in Brattleboro, VT. A lesbian woman was struck by an attacker who was heard to say "There's another . . . queer." The assailant, Lauralee Akley, 19, was charged with committing a hate-motivated crime in connection with the incident.

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 and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.●

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, last month the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commissions, Newton Minow, delivered the Morris I. Liebman Lecture at Loyola College in Baltimore.

Mr. Minow's address was entitled "The Whisper of America," and is focused on the need for the United States to significantly increase the resources it devotes to international broadcasting.

I believe Mr. Minow makes a very thoughtful case for expanding our efforts in this area. In order that it may be available to a wider audience, and to call it to the attention of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHISPER OF AMERICA

In World War II, when the survival of freedom was still far from certain, the United States created a new international radio service, the Voice of America. On February 24, 1942, William Harlan Hale opened the German-language program with these words: "Here speaks a voice from America. Every day at this time we will bring you the news of the war. The news may be good. The news may be bad. We will tell you the truth."

My old boss, William Benton, came up with the idea of the Voice of America. He was then Assistant Secretary of State and would later become Senator from Connecticut. He was immensely proud of the Voice of America. One day he described the new VOA to RCA Chairman David Sarnoff, the tough-minded and passionate pioneer of American broadcasting. Sarnoff noticed how little electronic power and transmitter scope the VOA had via short-wave radio, then said, "Benton, all you've got here is the whisper of America."

Although The Voice of America, and later other international radio services, have made valuable contributions, our international broadcasting services suffer from miserly funding. In many areas of the world, they have seldom been more than a whisper. Today, when we most need to communicate our story, especially in the Middle East, our broadcasts are not even a whisper. People in every country know our music, our movies, our clothes, and our sports. But they do not

know our freedom or our values or our democracy.

I want to talk with you about how and why this happened, and what we must do about it. First, some history:

At first, the Voice of America was part of the Office of War Information. When the war ended, the VOA was transferred to the Department of State. With the beginning of the Cold War, officials within the government began to debate the core mission of the VOA: Was it to be a professional, impartial news service serving as an example of press freedom to the world? Or was it an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, a strategic weapon to be employed against those we fight? What is the line between news and propaganda? Should our broadcasts advocate America's values—or should they provide neutral, objective journalism?

That debate has never been resolved, only recast for each succeeding generation. In August 1953, for example, our government concluded that whatever the VOA was or would be, it should not be part of the State Department. So we established the United States Information Agency, and the VOA became its single largest operation.

A few years ago, Congress decided that all our international broadcasts were to be governed by a bi-partisan board appointed by the President, with the Secretary of State as an ex-officio member.

This includes other U.S. international broadcast services which were born in the Cold War, the so-called "Freedom Radios." The first was Radio Free Europe, established in 1949 as a non-profit, non-governmental private corporation to broadcast news and information to East Europeans behind the Iron Curtain. The second was Radio Liberty, created in 1951 to broadcast similar programming to the citizens of Russia and the Soviet republics. Both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were secretly funded by the Central Intelligence Agency, a fact not known to the American public until 1967, when the New York Times first reported the connection. The immediate result of the story was a huge controversy, because the radios had for years solicited donations from the public through an advertising campaign known as the Crusade for Freedom. Such secrecy, critics argued, undermined the very message of democratic openness the stations were intended to convey in their broadcasts to the closed, totalitarian regimes of the East.

In 1971, Congress terminated CIA funding for the stations and provided for their continued existence by open appropriations. The stations survived and contributed to American strategy in the Cold War. That strategy was simple: to persuade and convince the leaders and people of the communist bloc that freedom was better than dictatorship, that free enterprise was better than central planning, and that no country could survive if it did not respect human rights and the rule of law. Broadcasting into regimes where travel was severely restricted, where all incoming mail was censored, and all internal media were tools of state propaganda, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty communicated two messages that conventional weapons never could—doubt about the present and hope for the future.

They did so against repeated efforts by Soviet and East European secret police to sabotage their broadcast facilities, to create friction between the stations and their host governments, and even to murder the stations' personnel. In 1962, I personally witnessed an effort by Soviet delegates to an international communications conference in Geneva to eliminate our broadcasts to Eastern Europe. Because I was then Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Soviets assumed I was in charge of these

broadcasts. I explained that although this was not my department, I thought we should double the broadcasts.

Listening to the radios' evening broadcasts became a standard ritual throughout Russia and Eastern Europe. Moscow, no matter how hard it tried, could not successfully jam the transmissions. As a result, communism had to face a public that every year knew more about its lies. In his 1970 Nobel Prize speech, Aleksander Solzhenitsyn said of Radio Liberty, "If we learn anything about events in our own country, it's from there." When the Berlin Wall fell, and soon after the Soviet Union crumbled, Lech Walesa was asked about the significance of Radio Free Europe to the Polish democracy movement. He replied, "Where would the Earth be without the sun?"

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue to broadcast, from headquarters in downtown Prague, at the invitation of Vaclav Havel. The studios are now guarded by tanks in the street to protect against terrorists.

With very little money, Congress authorized several new services: Radio Free Asia, Radio Free Iraq, Radio Free Iran, Radio and TV Marti, Radio Democracy Africa, and Worldnet, a television service that broadcasts a daily block of American news. After 9/11, Congress approved funding for a new Radio Free Afghanistan. What most people don't know is that this service is not new—Congress authorized funds for Radio Free Afghanistan first in 1985, when the country was under Soviet domination. Even then the service was minimal—one half-hour a day of news in the Dari and Pashto languages. When the Soviets withdrew, we mistakenly thought the service was no longer needed. We dismantled it as the country plunged into chaos. We are finally beginning to correct our mistakes with a smart new service in the Middle East called "The New Station for the New Generation."

Indeed, as the Cold War wound down, we forgot its most potent lesson: that totalitarianism was defeated not with missiles, tanks and carriers, but with ideas—and that words can be weapons. Even though the Voice of America had earned the trust and respect of listeners for its accuracy and fairness, our government starved our international broadcasts. Many of the resources that had once been given to public diplomacy—to explaining ourselves and our values to the world—were eliminated. In the Middle East, particularly, American broadcasting is not even a whisper. An Arab-language radio service is operated by Voice of America, but its budget is tiny and its audience tinier—only about 1 to 2 percent of Arabs ever listen to it. Among those under the age of 30—60 percent of the population in the region—virtually no one listens.

As we fell mute in the Cold War's aftermath, other voices grew in influence.

AL JAZEERA

In the past few months, Westerners began to learn about Al Jazeera as a source of anti-American tirades by Muslim extremists and as the favored news outlet of both Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. The service had its beginnings in 1995, when the BBC withdrew from a joint venture with Saudi-owned Orbit Communications that had provided news on a Middle East channel. The BBC and the Saudi government clashed over editorial judgments, and the business relationship fell apart. Into the breach stepped a big fan of CNN, Qatar's Emir, Sheikh Hamed bin Khalifa Al Thani. He admired CNN's satellite technology and decided to bankroll a Middle East satellite network with a small budget. He hired most of the BBC's anchors, editors and technicians, and Al Jazeera was born.