

What the Bush campaign has to do is lift this campaign out of the rut it has drifted into, and tell the American people what is at stake.

This isn't an election just about issues. It isn't an election just about ideas.

It is an election about whether or not we can assure the American people that their government can indeed work for them again.

My friends, Ross Perot is one of the most amazing political phenomena of our time.

In himself he is not all that important. It is what he represents.

He isn't the first and won't be the last to say that democracy isn't working and that if you trust me with power, I'll solve all your problems.

That message—sometimes sinister, sometimes just silly—has been heard all over the world at various times in this century.

That siren call has enchanted good, decent people who are frustrated and disillusioned.

And on every occasion, people are attracted to such simplicity and ignorance because of genuine grievances with their government.

The role of the Republican Party, in my view, is to tell the American people we agree: we can't go on like this any longer. We need a new way in Washington.

But the kind of new way we need is one in which the President and the Congress share certain basic values.

This doesn't mean the President will always get what he wants.

Franklin Roosevelt, with tremendous majorities, didn't always get what he wanted.

What it means is that on the basic issues—of jobs, education, health, and the economy—the President has a fair chance to see his programs enacted, with the minority in Congress there to keep him honest.

The Democrats have had that chance under Roosevelt, Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter.

President Bush deserves that chance.

But he has to fight for it.

He has to fight for it by making clear to the American people that our system can work if we can get that trailer-truck marked "Divided Government" out of the roadway.

With all due respect, Mr. President, the problem isn't "Congress"—the problem is a Congress ruled by a party that has been in power too long and has become a government unto itself.

Ross Perot is the wake-up call for all those who believe that democratic government must be made to work and who are willing to spell out the ways it can work in the old-fashioned American way—before the elections.

Ross Perot, for all I know, may fade away once he comes under public scrutiny.

But recent media disclosures about his past do not seem to have stopped him, so I wouldn't count on it.

But I'll say it again, Perot isn't important.

It is what he represents that is important: he is the focal point of legitimate grievances with gridlocked, irrelevant, divided government.

If Ross Perot never existed, those grievances would be real.

It may turn out that the big story of this campaign was how Ross Perot awakened both political parties.

If so, he has done his country a great service.

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

BOB MICHEL'S CHALLENGE

(By David S. Broder)

House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel (R-Ind.) is one of those familiar Washington figures who usually draws more affection than deference. Since he came to Congress from Peoria in 1966, he has been known to

colleagues as a great companion for a songfest or a round of golf. But as one of the permanently outnumbered Republicans, he rarely put his stamp—and never his name—on a major piece of legislation.

So there was great surprise last week that it was old-shoe Bob Michel, 69, who defined the political, constitutional and institutional crisis facing this country in 1992 more bluntly than anyone else in either party has done.

In a speech that reflected more of Michel's own reactions than any outside advice, he made four basic points:

The candidacy of Ross Perot could very possibly throw the choice of the next president into the House of Representatives, by denying any one of the three candidates—Perot, George Bush and Bill Clinton—an electoral-college majority. The inside-the-House politicking, with each state delegation casting a single vote, no matter its size—would be "an utter disaster" for the country, an outrage to the whole concept of popular sovereignty.

Perot as a possible president is a scary prospect, not only because "he doesn't have a clue how to solve even one major issue," but because—to Michel's eye, at least—he has "the demagogue's gift for oversimplification" and could, if elevated to power, prove that "authoritarianism . . . can happen here."

More important than Perot himself is the fuel that is powering his undeclared candidacy—"the frustration of the American people when all they see when they look to Washington is squabbling, partisanship, media hype and legislative gridlock."

"If Ross Perot never existed," Michel said, "those grievances would be real."

The source of the frustration—the real reason the grievances exist—is "the fact of divided government in Washington. We have come to the point in American history where a president of one party simply cannot lead if the Congress is dominated by the other party."

That is the ugly secret of American politics and Washington's failure. But it has been a long time since any major politician in either party stood up on his hind legs and said it to the people.

Back in 1960, John F. Kennedy campaigned by saying that it made no sense to elect Rep. James or Sen. Smith, good Democrats both, to Congress "and then put Richard Nixon in the White House." He won—barely. Party loyalties, though weakened by the six years of divided government and the spread of ticket-splitting under Dwight D. Eisenhower, still meant something then.

But for 20 of the past 24 years we have had divided government—a Republican in the White House and Democrats controlling at least one and usually both houses of Congress. A whole generation has grown up thinking this is natural and normal.

The members of that "permanent" Democratic congressional majority certainly did not tell their constituents that they were wrong to split their tickets. They wanted to pretend that they would be "effective" no matter who was in the White House. Maybe they are bringing home the bacon, but they are not dealing with national problems.

Still less did Republican presidents and presidential candidates want to say, plainly, that it made no sense to elect them unless they had enough allies on Capitol Hill to pass their programs. Ronald Reagan came closest to doing it in 1980—and the results showed: a Republican Senate and a conservative-controlled House. But only for two years. He retreated into the usual Republican tolerance of divided government when the recession swamped the GOP in 1982.

Now Michel has broken the code of silence and showed the guts to plead for a Bush campaign that would say "the only way" to break the impasse that is so frustrating to the voters is to end divided government. Give one party—he'd prefer it were the Republicans—control of the White House and Congress and if they fail to deliver, "kick us out" in the next election.

Will Bush take the challenge? At the moment his campaign is so desperate and defensive, in the face of the Perot surge, that no one knows.

Will a leading congressional Democrat step forward to say what Michel has said—that the voters are simply courting more frustration if they reflect Democratic congressional incumbents and then split their tickets for Bush or Perot?

What is needed is a steady drum-fire of messages from the leaders of both parties at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue informing the public of the lesson that has been forgotten: that the collective responsibility that results from giving one party at a time "a chance to govern," as Michel put it, is the only real way to ensure accountability in a representative government.

What Bob Michel said is true. You can either vote for further frustration in the form of divided government, or you can pick a party to trust and hold to account, or you can put your country's future in the hands of Ross Perot and his promise to take charge—with all that is unknown about his real goals and all that is untested about his self-restraint in the exercise of vast power.

SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago George Will wrote a series of columns on public broadcasting that were syndicated in newspapers across America. While Mr. Will can be entertaining, and even sometimes correct, his attack on public broadcasting was way off the mark.

In response to these columns, Mr. Robert F. Larson, the president and general manager of Detroit's public television station, has composed an eloquent and stirring rebuttal to Mr. Will. In light of the importance of public broadcasting to the American people, I would like to share that letter with my colleagues.

While the House passed the reauthorization for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting last November, the Senate has not yet acted, and Members of the House may raise questions about public television when a final bill is brought before us later this year. In order to correct any misunderstandings about public television generated by Mr. Will's columns, I insert Mr. Larson's letter in full:

CHANNEL 58, WTVS,
Detroit, MI, May 7, 1992.

Mr. THOMAS BRAY,
Editorial Page Editor, Detroit News, Detroit, MI.

DEAR MR. BRAY: Channel 58 would like to take issue with George Will's columns published in The Detroit News editions of April 24 and May 3 that criticized federal funding for public broadcasting.

Above all, public television works. It has accomplished what Congress has asked of it and what the 1967 Carnegie Commission promised. It has produced programs that

have enriched our lives at home and in the classroom. Yet it faces perennial attempts to shut it down.

As Broadcasting Magazine observed 30 years ago: "If public broad-casting draws large audiences, it is attacked for seeking the masses; if it programs for small select groups, it is damned as an insufferable snob. If it tackles tough issues, it is trendy, left-wing, unrepresentative and misusing the taxpayers' money; if it presents fine drama and stimulating discussion, it is aloof and uninvolved."

This time around, the arch critic is conservative columnist George Will. Will objects to public funding of non-commercial television not because there is anything specifically wrong with it, but because he regards it as a luxury, an "ornament," and at a time of massive budget deficits, expendable. He says, it is time to pull the plug or, as Dr. Lawrence Jarvik of the Heritage Foundation has suggested, to sell it, copyrights and klystron tubes, to the highest bidder.

Maybe public television works too well for the tastes and purposes of its critics. Our programs reflect a wide range of opinions, not of a political or philosophical point of view. Public television insists that its audiences have the capacity to sort out truth from falsehood and reflects more confidence in the ability of viewers to make up their own minds than their self-appointed defenders do. The champions of uniform perspectives have identified only a dozen hours of "too liberal programs" out of 600 hours each year. A recent survey found that 79% of Americans found public television programming neither too liberal nor too conservative. PTV works . . . in its commitment to fairness, balance, and objectivity.

The special relationship public broadcasting has created with its audience is evident in the broad support it has attracted from foundations, corporations, and individual contributors. Last year, the 345 television stations that make up the national system received more than five times as much financial support from these sources as they received from the federal government. And WTVS, Detroit Public Television, received \$10 from its community for every dollar it received in federal funds.

But why any federal funds? These are the crucial "seed monies" from which have grown *The Civil War*, *The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*, and local programming and educational services such as telecourses for high school completion and college degrees. They telecourses for high school completion and college degrees. They are a good investment for the American taxpayer, and only one dollar per citizen per year goes to public television and radio. So the system works financially, and tax dollars are leveraged to serve the public with value far beyond appropriated dollars.

George Will brands public television an "upper middle-class entitlement." He says it is federally subsidized programming for an elite few. But it is Mr. Will himself who is sounding "elitist" in asserting that people not in that "upper middle class" aren't watching. Public television's viewership closely mirrors the American population. Public television reaches 87 million people a week. *Sesame Street* reaches nearly a quarter of all U.S. households with incomes under \$10,000. In general, more than half of all public television viewers (69%) live in households with incomes under \$40,000 a year.

Nor is public television merely federally subsidized competition for the commercial channels. It is an enterprise which has enlarged the vision of the entire industry. If commercial channels and television producers entered into areas of educational, public

affairs, and cultural programming that were once largely a public television monopoly, it is because public television demonstrated the viability of these programs and an audience for them. Those channels which George Will thinks should supplant public broadcasting exist technically because of its example and leadership. The future of broadcasting would be diminished without it.

Interestingly, no one is arguing about the significance of the past achievements of public broadcasting. Praise is unanimous for the contributions of *Nature*, *Nova*, *Masterpiece Theater*, *Joseph Campbell*, *Pavarotti*, *Sesame Street*, and *The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*. Why then are questions being raised about public television's place in the future? And why do we speculate that public television, which created the first satellite network, closed captioning for the hearing impaired, and descriptive video for the visually impaired will be overwhelmed and made superfluous by a proliferation of technologies and channels?

WTVS has entered what we believe will be the most dynamic, challenging, and useful period in its history. It is engaged in an adventure that employs new technologies and rests on an enlarged relationship with the community. The station has forged a new partnership with community organizations and agencies, religious institutions, the press, and commercial radio and television in order to work together for a better future for the children of Southeastern Michigan.

WTVS has been a forum for individuals and groups to express their concerns and to confront special interests. We have been a learning center, a medium for adult education, a provider of college credit courses, and resource station for literacy efforts, an electronic town meeting where thousands have come together. We have been a way-station for those planning strategies to combat substance abuse, a facilitator for coalitions of those concerned about children at risk, the unemployed, the homeless, and dropouts. We have called these efforts Project Graduation, *The Working Channel*, Project Literacy, *Detroit Black Journal*, *Club Connect*, *City for Youth* * * *

We have been seeking to discover how telecommunications can advance community problem solving. It is not enough to produce brilliant programs. We want to find out how this community resource can support the work of others in the community. In Detroit we have focused our resources on two priorities: the welfare of our children and race relations. These two challenges will occupy us for years to come. Not content with providing a mirror to our regions, we have accepted a more active role as a catalyst and agent for change. We shall be public broadcasters by participating in the life of the community we serve.

To Mr. Will we say, stretch a little. Free yourself from the ideological pouting of people like Jarvik. Weigh the accomplishments of public television. Consider its future. The new technologies you say threaten us offer new opportunities for public colloquy and community action.

Public television can bring people together in a quest for understanding and common purpose. It can be our electronic town hall, a city square where ideas and opinions are exchanged and where people who have been separated by racial and economic and cultural boundaries can come together in a new context. This is what we have been attempting to do in Detroit, and we believe that we are venturing out into the future of public television. In a time of enormous economic transition, urban decay, and resurgent racism, public television will be distinguished by the attention we give to our immediate geography, the communities we serve.

Public television will continue to be a vehicle for the dramas of Broadway, the music of our cities, and operas of Lincoln Center, the news of Washington and Wall Street, and the serious research into the natural world around us. But it will also expand its role as a meeting place and forum for the people, enlarging the definition and meaning of public television. Again to Mr. Will we say, we have just begun, and the dollars we are requesting to support public broadcasting will be multiplied in the value of communication services unavailable anywhere else. Public television works. Watch it work in the years ahead. Nipping at our heels will only make us run a little faster into a new era of public broadcasting. And we thank you for that.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. LARSON,
President and General Manager.

ONE PERSON CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a couple of weeks, delegations from around the world will gather in Rio to address environmental problems on a global scale. We'll be focused on thinking globally and acting locally—looking at things we can do in our communities to make a difference for the environment.

Thinking globally, acting locally embraces the theme that one person can make a difference. Whether it's fighting for protection of our environment or fighting for the protection of the basic human rights of all people, the message is the same—one person can make a difference.

Fellow Minnesotan, friend and an American who has tirelessly fought for human rights is Steve Endean, founder of the Human Rights Campaign Fund. Fighting against hate crimes and bigotry, ignorance and stubbornness—Steve has tirelessly championed basic human rights for Americans. His battles have not always been easy, his accomplishments not won without struggle, but his commitment and dedication embody the deeply rooted part of the human spirit—the thirst for human justice.

One person can make a difference—Steve Endean has. We can learn by his example and must continue fighting to carry out his work.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF DAYTON AND THE MIAMI VALLEY

HON. BOB MCEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to recognize that the Home Builders Association of Dayton and the Miami Valley will celebrate 50 years of serving the housing industry on June 3, 1992.

The Home Builders Association of Dayton and the Miami Valley is a professional association affiliated with the Ohio Home Builders Association and the National Association of

What the Bush campaign has to do is lift this campaign out of the rut it has drifted into, and tell the American people what is at stake.

This isn't an election just about issues.

It isn't an election just about ideas.

It is an election about whether or not we can assure the American people that their government can *in fact* work for them again.

My friends, *Ross Perot* is one of the most amazing political phenomena of our time.

In himself he is *not* all that important. It is what he represents.

He isn't the first and won't be the last to say that democracy isn't working and that if you trust me with power, I'll solve all your problems.

That message—sometimes sinister, sometimes just silly—has been heard all over the world at various times in this century.

That siren call has enchanted good, decent people who are frustrated and disillusioned.

And on every occasion, people are attracted to such simplicity and ignorance because of genuine grievances with their government.

The role of the Republican Party, in my view, is to tell the American people we agree: we can't go on like this any longer. We need a new way in Washington.

But the kind of new way we need is one in which the President and the Congress share certain basic values.

This doesn't mean the President will always get what he wants.

Franklin Roosevelt, with tremendous majorities, didn't always get what he wanted.

What it means is that on the basic issues—of jobs, education, health, and the economy—the President has a fair chance to see his programs enacted, with the minority in Congress there to keep him honest.

The Democrats have had that chance under Roosevelt, Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter. President Bush deserves that chance.

But he has to fight for it.

He has to fight for it by making clear to the American people that our system can work if we can get that trailer-truck marked "Divided Government" out of the roadway.

With all due respect, Mr. President, the problem isn't "Congress"—the problem is a Congress ruled by a party that has been in power too long and has become a government unto itself.

Ross Perot is the wake-up call for all those who believe that democratic government must be made to work and who are willing to spell out the ways it can work in the old-fashioned American way—before the elections.

Ross Perot, for all I know, may fade away once he comes under public scrutiny.

But recent media disclosures about his past do not seem to have stopped him, so I wouldn't count on it.

But I'll say it again, Perot isn't important. It is what he represents that is important: he is the focal point of legitimate grievances with gridlocked, irrelevant, divided government.

If Ross Perot never existed, those grievances would be real.

It may turn out that the big story of this campaign was how Ross Perot awakened both political parties.

If so, he has done his country a great service.

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1992]

BOB MICHEL'S CHALLENGE

(By David S. Broder)

House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.) is one of those familiar Washington figures who usually draws more affection than deference. Since he came to Congress from Peoria in 1966, he has been known to

colleagues as a great companion for a songfest or a round of golf. But as one of the permanently outnumbered Republicans, he rarely put his stamp—and never his name—on a major piece of legislation.

So there was great surprise last week that it was old-shoe Bob Michel, 69, who defined the political, constitutional and institutional crisis facing this country in 1992 more bluntly than anyone else in either party has done.

In a speech that reflected more of Michel's own reactions than any outside advice, he made four basic points:

The candidacy of Ross Perot could very possibly throw the choice of the next president into the House of Representatives, by denying any one of the three candidates—Perot, George Bush and Bill Clinton—an electoral-college majority. The inside-the-house politicking, with each state delegation casting a single vote, no matter its size—would be "an utter disaster" for the country, an outrage to the whole concept of popular sovereignty.

Perot as a possible president is a scary prospect, not only because "he doesn't have a clue how to solve even one major issue," but because—to Michel's eye, at least—he has "the demagogue's gift for oversimplification" and could, if elevated to power, prove that "authoritarianism . . . can happen here."

More important than Perot himself is the fuel that is powering his undeclared candidacy—"the frustration of the American people when all they see when they look to Washington is squabbling, partisanship, media hype and legislative gridlock."

"If Ross Perot never existed," Michel said, "those grievances would be real."

The source of the frustration—the real reason the grievances exist—is "the fact of divided government in Washington. We have come to the point in American history where a president of one party simply cannot lead if the Congress is dominated by the other party."

That is the ugly secret of American politics and Washington's failure. But it has been a long time since any major politician in either party stood up on his hind legs and said it to the people.

Back in 1960, John F. Kennedy campaigned by saying that it made no sense to elect Rep. Jones or Sen. Smith, good Democrats both, to Congress "and then put Richard Nixon in the White House." He won—barely. Party loyalties, though weakened by the six years of divided government and the spread of ticket-splitting under Dwight D. Eisenhower, still meant something then.

But for 20 of the past 24 years we have had divided government—a Republican in the White House and Democrats controlling at least one and usually both houses of Congress. A whole generation has grown up thinking this is natural and normal.

The members of that "permanent" Democratic congressional majority certainly did not tell their constituents that they were wrong to split their tickets. They wanted to pretend that they would be "effective" no matter who was in the White House. Maybe they are bringing home the bacon, but they are not dealing with national problems.

Still less did Republican presidents and presidential candidates want to say, plainly, that it made no sense to elect them unless they had enough allies on Capitol Hill to pass their programs. Ronald Reagan came closest to doing it in 1980—and the results showed: a Republican Senate and a conservative-controlled House. But only for two years. He retreated into the usual Republican tolerance of divided government when the recession swamped the GOP in 1982.

Now Michel has broken the code of silence and showed the guts to plead for a Bush campaign that would say "the only way" to break the impasse that is so frustrating to the voters is to end divided government. Give one party—he'd prefer it were the Republicans—control of the White House and Congress and if they fail to deliver, "kick us out" in the next election.

Will Bush take the challenge? At the moment his campaign is so desperate and defensive, in the face of the Perot surge, that no one knows.

Will a leading congressional Democrat step forward to say what Michel has said—that the voters are simply courting more frustration if they reflect Democratic congressional incumbents and then split their tickets for Bush or Perot?

What is needed is a steady drum-fire of messages from the leaders of both parties at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue informing the public of the lesson that has been forgotten: that the collective responsibility that results from giving one party at a time "a chance to govern," as Michel put it, is the only real way to ensure accountability in a representative government.

What Bob Michel said is true. You can either vote for further frustration in the form of divided government, or you can pick a party to trust and hold to account, or you can put your country's future in the hands of Ross Perot and his promise to take charge—with all that is unknown about his real goals and all that is untested about his self-restraint in the exercise of vast power.

SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago George Will wrote a series of columns on public broadcasting that were syndicated in newspapers across America. While Mr. Will can be entertaining, and even sometimes correct, his attack on public broadcasting was way off the mark.

In response to these columns, Mr. Robert F. Larson, the president and general manager of Detroit's public television station, has composed an eloquent and stirring rebuttal to Mr. Will. In light of the importance of public broadcasting to the American people, I would like to share that letter with my colleagues.

While the House passed the reauthorization for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting last November, the Senate has not yet acted, and Members of the House may raise questions about public television when a final bill is brought before us later this year. In order to correct any misunderstandings about public television generated by Mr. Will's columns, I insert Mr. Larson's letter in full:

CHANNEL 56, WTVS,
Detroit, MI, May 7, 1992.

Mr. THOMAS BRAY,
Editorial Page Editor, Detroit News, Detroit, MI.

DEAR MR. BRAY: Channel 56 would like to take issue with George Will's columns published in The Detroit News editions of April 24 and May 3 that criticized federal funding for public broadcasting.

Above all, public television works. It has accomplished what Congress has asked of it and what the 1967 Carnegie Commission promised. It has produced programs that

have enriched our lives at home and in the classroom. Yet it faces perennial attempts to shut it down.

As Broadcasting Magazine observed 30 years ago: "If public broad-casting draws large audiences, it is attacked for seeking the masses; if it programs for small select groups, it is damned as an insufferable snob. If it tackles tough issues, it is trendy, left-wing, unrepresentative and misusing the taxpayers' money; if it presents fine drama and stimulating discussion, it is aloof and uninvolved."

This time around, the arch critic is conservative columnist George Will. Will objects to public funding of non-commercial television not because there is anything specifically wrong with it, but because he regards it as a luxury, an "ornament," and at a time of massive budget deficits, expendable. He says, it is time to pull the plug or, as Dr. Lawrence Jarvik of the Heritage Foundation has suggested, to sell it, copyrights and klystron tubes, to the highest bidder.

Maybe public television works too well for the tastes and purposes of its critics. Our programs reflect a wide range of opinions, not one, political or philosophical point of view. Public television insists that its audiences have the capacity to sort out truth from falsehood and reflects more confidence in the ability of viewers to make up their own minds than their self-appointed defenders do. The champions of uniform perspectives have identified only a dozen hours of "too liberal programs" out of 600 hours each year. A recent survey found that 79% of Americans found public television programming neither too liberal nor too conservative. PTV works . . . in its commitment to fairness, balance, and objectivity.

The special relationship public broadcasting has created with its audience is evident in the broad support it has attracted from foundations, corporations, and individual contributors. Last year, the 345 television stations that make up the national system received more than five times as much financial support from these sources as they received from the federal government. And WTVS, Detroit Public Television, received \$10 from its community for every dollar it received in federal funds.

But why any federal funds? These are the crucial "seed monies" from which have grown The Civil War, The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour, and local programming and educational services such as telecourses for high school completion and college degrees. They telecourses for high school completion and college degrees. They are a good investment for the American taxpayer, and only one dollar per citizen per year goes to public television and radio. So the system works financially, and tax dollars are leveraged to serve the public with value far beyond appropriated dollars.

George Will brands public television an "upper middle-class entitlement." He says it is federally subsidized programming for an elite few. But it is Mr. Will himself who is sounding "elitist" in asserting that people not in that "upper middle class" aren't watching. Public television's viewership closely mirrors the American population. Public television reaches 87 million people a week. Sesame Street reaches nearly a quarter of all U.S. households with incomes under \$10,000. In general, more than half of all public television viewers (59%) live in households with incomes under \$40,000 a year.

Nor is public television merely federally subsidized competition for the commercial channels. It is an enterprise which has enlarged the vision of the entire industry. If commercial channels and television producers entered into areas of educational, public

affairs, and cultural programming that were once largely a public television monopoly, it is because public television demonstrated the viability of these programs and an audience for them. Those channels which George Will thinks should supplant public broadcasting exist technically because of its example and leadership. The future of broadcasting would be diminished without it.

Interestingly, no one is arguing about the significance of the past achievements of public broadcasting. Praise is unanimous for the contributions of Nature, Nova, Masterpiece Theater, Joseph Campbell, Pavarotti, Sesame Street, and The MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour. Why then are questions being raised about public television's place in the future? And why do we speculate that public television, which created the first satellite network, closed captioning for the hearing impaired, and descriptive video for the visually impaired will be overwhelmed and made superfluous by a proliferation of technologies and channels?

WTVS has entered what we believe will be the most dynamic, challenging, and useful period in its history. It is engaged in an adventure that employs new technologies and rests on an enlarged relationship with the community. The station has forged a new partnership with community organizations and agencies, religious institutions, the press, and commercial radio and television in order to work together for a better future for the children of Southeastern Michigan.

WTVS has been a forum for individuals and groups to express their concerns and to confront special interests. We have been a learning center, a medium for adult education, a provider of college credit courses, and resource station for literacy efforts, an electronic town meeting where thousands have come together. We have been a way-station for those planning strategies to combat substance abuse, a facilitator for coalitions of those concerned about children at risk, the unemployed, the homeless, and dropouts. We have called these efforts Project Graduation, The Working Channel, Project Literacy, Detroit Black Journal, Club Connect, City for Youth . . .

We have been seeking to discover how telecommunications can advance community problem solving. It is not enough to produce brilliant programs. We want to find out how this community resource can support the work of others in the community. In Detroit we have focused our resources on two priorities: the welfare of our children and race relations. These two challenges will occupy us for years to come. Not content with providing a mirror to our regions, we have accepted a more active role as a catalyst and agent for change. We shall be public broadcasters by participating in the life of the community we serve.

To Mr. Will we say, stretch a little. Free yourself from the ideological pouting of people like Jarvik. Weigh the accomplishments of public television. Consider its future. The new technologies you say threaten us offer new opportunities for public colloquy and community action.

Public television can bring people together in a quest for understanding and common purpose. It can be our electronic town hall, a city square where ideas and opinions are exchanged and where people who have been separated by racial and economic and cultural boundaries can come together in a new context. This is what we have been attempting to do in Detroit, and we believe that we are venturing out into the future of public television. In a time of enormous economic transition, urban decay, and resurgent racism, public television will be distinguished by the attention we give to our immediate geography, the communities we serve.

Public television will continue to be a vehicle for the dramas of Broadway, the music of our cities, and operas of Lincoln Center, the news of Washington and Wall Street, and the serious research into the natural world around us. But it will also expand its role as a meeting place and forum for the people, enlarging the definition and meaning of public television. Again to Mr. Will we say, we have just begun, and the dollars we are requesting to support public broadcasting will be multiplied in the value of communication services unavailable anywhere else. Public television works. Watch it work in the years ahead. Nipping at our heels will only make us run a little faster into a new era of public broadcasting. And we thank you for that.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. LARSON,
President and General Manager.

ONE PERSON CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a couple of weeks, delegations from around the world will gather in Rio to address environmental problems on a global scale. We'll be focused on thinking globally and acting locally—looking at things we can do in our communities to make a difference for the environment.

Thinking globally, acting locally embraces the theme that one person can make a difference. Whether it's fighting for protection of our environment or fighting for the protection of the basic human rights of all people, the message is the same—one person can make a difference.

Fellow Minnesotan, friend and an American who has tirelessly fought for human rights is Steve Endean, founder of the Human Rights Campaign Fund. Fighting against hate crimes and bigotry, ignorance and stubbornness—Steve has tirelessly championed basic human rights for Americans. His battles have not always been easy, his accomplishments not won without struggle, but his commitment and dedication embody the deeply rooted part of the human spirit—the thirst for human justice.

One person can make a difference—Steve Endean has. We can learn by his example and must continue fighting to carry out his work.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF DAYTON AND THE MIAMI VALLEY

HON. BOB MCEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1992

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to recognize that the Home Builders Association of Dayton and the Miami Valley will celebrate 50 years of serving the housing industry on June 3, 1992.

The Home Builders Association of Dayton and the Miami Valley is a professional association affiliated with the Ohio Home Builders Association and the National Association of