Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the telecommunications bill.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business from now until 3 o'clock, with Members permitted to speak for 5 minutes therein.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, was leaders' time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leaders' time has been reserved.

## EXERCISING GOOD CITIZENSHIP

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week, I ventured out to Hollywood and called upon the executives of the entertainment industry to exercise some good citizenship and put an end to the steady flow of mindless violence and loveless sex they serve up each day to our young people. I said that a ''line has been crossed—not just of taste, but of human dignity and decency. It is crossed every time sexual violence is given a catchy tune. When teen suicide is set to an appealing beat. When Hollywood's dream factories turn out nightmares of depravity.''

Although I made it very clear that government censorship was not the answer, the response to my remarks has been predictable and predictably ferocious. All the usual suspects—Oliver Stone, Ed Asner, Norman Lear—have been out in force, rushing to Hollywood's defense and lashing out at anyone who would dare criticize the entertainment industry for its excesses.

I will continue to speak out because people like Bill Bennett, PAUL SIMON, PETE DOMENICI, BILL BRADLEY, and C. Delores Tucker all happen to be right: cultural messages can and do bore deep into the hearts and minds of our impressionable young. And when these messages are negative ones—repeated hour after hour, day after day, week after week—they can strip our children of that most precious gift of all: Their innocence.

Apparently, the American people share this concern, particularly when it comes to television, perhaps the most dominant cultural force in America today. A recent survey conducted by USA weekend magazine revealed that an astonishing 96 percent of the 65,000 readers surveyed are ''very or somewhat concerned about sex on TV,'' 97 percent are ''very or somewhat concerned'' about the use of vulgar language on television shows, and another 97 percent are ''very or somewhat concerned'' about television violence. Jim Freese, the principal of Homestead High School in Fort Wayne, IN, put it this way: ''I'm seeing more instances of inappropriate language around school. It is part of the vocabulary, and often they do not think about some of the words because they hear them so often on TV. It is a steady diet. Program after program has this inappropriate language.''

According to a study commissioned by USA Weekend, 370 instances of ''crude language or sexual situations'' were recorded during a five-night period of prime-time programming, or one every 8.9 minutes. Two hundred and eight of these incidents occurred between 8 and 9 p.m., the so-called family hour.

Of course, we have more to lose than to gain by putting Washington in charge of our culture. Instead, it is my hope that the decision-makers within the entertainment industry will voluntarily accept a calling beyond the bottom line and help our Nation maintain the innocence of our children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cover article from the USA Weekend magazine be reprinted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

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

[From USA Weekend, June 2–4, 1995]

TURNED OFF

(By Dan Olmsted and Gigi Anders)

It was, in its crude way, a perfect TV moment for our times: 9 p.m. ET on a Wednesday this spring on Grace Under Fire, the top-5 ABC sitcom. Divorced mom Grace is talking in the kitchen with 10-year-old Quentin, who has been visiting his dad. Let's listen in, along with the 28.3 million people watching the show on a typical night, 5.6 million of them under age:

Grace: How come your daddy didn't come in and say hey?

Kid: Aw, he was in a hurry. He had a date with some slut.

Grace: Quentin? I'm going to wash your mouth out with fabric softener. Where did you hear that word?

Kid: Dad's house. It was a cable.

These days, that episode neatly demonstrates, the raw stuff isn't on just cable anymore. Sex, and what your mother called ''vulgar language,'' now play nightly on the four major networks—for laughs, shock value, sizzle and ratings, and because producers say viewers want verisimilitude, and this is how reality looks and sounds in 1990s America.

But such programming may turn off a sizeable number of viewers—including 97 percent, or 63,000, of the 65,142 readers who took part in USA Weekend's survey on TV violence and vulgarity. The key finding: Many viewers want to wash out TV's mouth with something stronger than fabric softeners. They're especially upset that much of the unclean stuff is coming out of the mouths of relative babes like Quentin and into the eyes and ears of kids.

The written survey, which ran in our March 3–5 issue, follows a similar one two years ago that drew 71,000 responses. The earlier survey came amid concern about TV violence and congressional hearings on the subject; is showed violence was readers' top concern, with sexual content a close second.

This year the figures are reversed (see chart, opposite page): Sexual content tops the list of ''troublesome programming,'' with violence second.

The results are not scientific, but they're over-whelming—make for a comparison with two years ago. Viewers still find TV violence troubling but seem increasingly concerned about rawness, especially on the networks' prime-time shows.

Concern over violence remains high, to be sure: 88 percent of readers who responded to the write-in are ''very concerned'' about it, compared with 95 percent in 1993.

''We limit our kids' TV viewing because of the violence, and because too much TV of any kind turns their minds to jelly,'' says Sue Sherer, 40, of Rochester, N.Y., a mother of three (ages 11, 9 and 7) and PTA president who filled out the survey. ''We rob kids of innocence when we expect them to grow up so fast and mirror kids like those on Roseanne. I don't want them to be naive, either, but I'd like them to be children. And TV is a great vandal of that.''

Responding to the concern over vulgarity, USA Weekend monitored five evenings of prime-time network TV (8–11 p.m. ET). We enlisted journalism students from The American University School of Communication in Washington, DC., who videotaped each program and noted incidents of crude language or sexual situations (see chart below).

The result: 370 incidents over five nights—after giving the tube the benefit of the doubt on close calls. ''I was surprised,'' said Alan Tatum, one of the AU students who helped us. Even on ''family'' shows, ''it almost seems the producers feel they need to throw in bodily humor every so often.''

Every 8.9 minutes, on average. And 208 incidents—well over half—occurred in ''the family hour.''

A cultural Rubicon of sorts was crossed in the past few weeks, when ABC moved Roseanne to 8 p.m. ET and two family-hour staples, Blossom and Full House, went off the air.

First sanctioned by the National Association of Broadcasters code in the early 1970s, the family hour (8–9 p.m. Eastern and Pacific time; 7–8 p.m. elsewhere) was long considered the proper time to appeal to kids. It meant Happy Days and Laverne & Shirley, The Cosby Show and Family Ties. But in more recent years, thanks largely to competition from cable and the emergence of the Fox network in 1986, programmers have been so eager to recapture a dwindling TV audience that the family hour has become inhabited by adult and young-adult hits such as Mad About You, Martin, Melrose Place and Beverly Hills, 90210. In fact, following the stunning success of NBC's Thursday night comedy blitz, ABC has been trying to create a solid block of its own on Wednesday by reshuffling two of its edgier sitcoms, Roseanne and Ellen, into the family hour.

For all the national discussion about values, even such family-hour shows as Fresh Prince of Bel-Air and The Nanny are laden with sexual innuendo and hot-blooded humor. And Martin has all the subtlety of a Friar's Club roast.

There's a sense that TV, which in the '50s and early '60s made happily married couples like Ricky and Lucy and Rob and Laura sleep in separate beds, is making up for lost time.

Programmers say it's not that simple. ''TV is changing,'' says James Anderson, a vice president of Carsey-Werner, which produces Roseanne. ''The show reflects the climate we're in. There's a big discussion going on over what should be shown during the family hour. It's necessary, I guess, but any show that pushes the envelope usually gets penalized in some way. And Roseanne does push it.''

He cites the show's complex treatment this season of Roseanne's pregnancy—worrying whether there was something wrong with the baby she was carrying—as an example of provocative but responsible programming. ''Parents who say they dislike the show and

wouldn't let their kids watch are uncomfortable about having to discuss the issues raised on the show with the children.''

But, he suggests, the genie isn't going back into the bottle. ''The face of TV is going to be seriously redefined over the next couple of years. I mean, Melrose Place is on at 8, and they have way more T&A than Roseanne does.'' Fox and Melrose Place did not respond to requests for comment.

CBS senior vice-president Martin Franks defended his network's programming, while acknowledging some early-evening broadcast fare is inappropriate for kids. ''I have a 13-year-old and an 11-year-old, and I don't let them watch The Simpsons [Fox, 8 p.m. ET Sundays]. I don't want my kids talking that way.''

He compared the high level of dissatisfaction recorded by the USA Weekend survey to asking viewers if they dislike ''attack ads'' during political campaigns: ''Of course the answer is going to be yes, yet people watch them and are being affected.'' Many people who complain about network programs also would complain ''if we pre-empted them for a presidential press conference,'' Franks argues.

''Adults ought to be able to watch something. Someone at this point who is surprised by The Simpsons or Roseanne or Seinfeld is living under a rock.''

All four networks have offices of standards and practices that monitor shows for taste and content. (The industrywide National Association of Broadcasters code is defunct.) ''You can argue they miss something or their judgment is different from yours,'' Franks says of the censors, but they take the job seriously: ''They make suggestions to change scripts before they're even shot.''

The bigger question: Is it worth wondering whether course language and risqué fare have any social impact? Or is that like Dan Quayle attacking Murphy Brown, easy to dismiss as an overblown attack on a fictional character? Educators, for one group, don't think it's far-fetched.

''I've been a principal for 20 years, and I've seen significant changes. And one of the factors is TV,'' says Jim Freese of Homestead High School in Fort Wayne, Ind., where students filled out the survey. ''I'm seeing more instances of inappropriate language around school. It's part of the vocabulary, and often they don't think about some of the words because they hear them so often on TV. It's a steady diet: Program after program has this violence and inappropriate language.''

Last month, U.S. Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison, R–Texas, proposed legislation giving parents access to a ''report card'' rating the violence in TV shows. Funded by the government and compiled quarterly by a neutral organization such as a university, the report would list the most violent shows and their sponsors; viewers could then pressure the sponsors to withdraw their ads.

The movies' rating system ''has worked very well,'' Hutchison told USA Weekend, adding that the magazine's survey reinforces other studies, as well as comments from her constituents. ''Parents are sitting with their children thinking a show will be all right, and all of a sudden there is something very inappropriate.'' The report card would offer parents a ''comfort level,'' knowing certain programs would not contain violence or vulgar language.

Not surprisingly, the older our survey respondents, the greater the concern. For instance, 95 percent of those over 65 are ''very concerned'' about TV violence, vs. 70 percent of those under 36. Older readers worry that younger viewers aren't concerned. ''Most of my students find the issues under question acceptable,'' says Nancy Movall of Newell, Iowa, whose high school visual communications class took the survey. ''I wonder if it's because they have been raised in a world that sees violence far too often and thus have become more tolerant of it.''

Also filling out the survey: 14 inmates at the South Dakota State Penitentiary, who marked ''very concerned'' about either sex, violence or vulgarity on TV a total of 20 times.

Some language in prime time is now so strong, we've chosen not to print it on our cover:

From The Wright Verdicts, 9 p.m. ET Friday on CBS: ''You lousy bastard!''

From NYPD Blue, 10 p.m. ET Tuesday on ABC: ''You're lucky I don't kick your ass.''

From the CBS movie With Hostile Intent, 9–11 p.m. ET: ''. . . kiss my butt a little harder . . . probably getting laid . . . Let's go get naked . . . Aw, hell, I'm stuck with a bitch tonight . . . Roberta's on the rag . . . ''

From Fox's Melrose Place, 8–9 p.m. ET: ''. . . I want you to go home with me . . . I want you to unbutton my blouse and pull up my skirt . . . I'll be up for hours unless I can find a way to relieve my tension.''

From NBC's Friends, 9:30 p.m. ET: ''Now we need the semen of a righteous man.''

Of course, Friends is a smash: Melrose fans aren't likely to picket Aaron Spelling because of too-steamy plots; and Roseanne, in many critics' eyes, is quality TV.

''Thinking adults are hardly going to turn into a heaping pile of gelatin because they hear the word ''ass' on the air,'' argues Los Angeles Daily News television critic Ray Richmond. ''I don't see this 'vulgarity' as a loosening of standards, but rather as a reflection of the reality around us.''

Plus, more than two-thirds of U.S. homes now have cable, he notes, and the government's ''set of rules for network TV doesn't apply to cable or pay-per-view programs, and they're all on the same remote control in people's living rooms and bedrooms. People who believe TV's going to hell in a handbasket are overreacting.''

But is there a middle ground between prudery and prurience? Beneath the comic coarseness of Grace's response to Quentin's use of ''slut'' is advice that's hard to disagree with. ''You shouldn't use that word,'' she tells her son. ''It's demeaning to women, and men who say it. And furthermore, if it weren't for women like them, I wouldn't know how to rat my hair real big and put on blue eyeshadow.

''So show a little respect.''

## COMMENDATION OF CAPT. SCOTT F. O'GRADY AND U.S. AND NATO FORCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask it be read on behalf of myself, Senator HELMS, Senator WARNER, and many others. I am not certain of all the cosponsors. This has been cleared, I understand, on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 132) commending Captain O'Grady and U.S. and NATO forces:

Whereas on June 2, 1995, Bosnian Serb forces using sophisticated surface to air missiles shot down a United States Air Force F–16 aircraft piloted by Captain Scott F. O'Grady while on combat patrol as part of NATO-commanded Operation Deny Flight;

Whereas in late 1994, reports indicate the United Nations vetoed NATO proposed operations to attack Bosnian Serb surface to air missile sites;

Whereas effective measures to defend against Bosnian Serb air defenses did not occur during Captain O'Grady's mission on June 2, 1995;

Whereas thousands of United States Armed Forces and armed forces of NATO allies were involved in search operations to recover Captain O'Grady;

Whereas Captain O'Grady, in the finest tradition of American military service, survived for six days and nights through courage, ingenuity and skill in territory occupied by hostile Bosnian Serb forces;

Whereas on June 8, 1995 Captain O'Grady was rescued in a daring operation by United States Marines;

Whereas aircraft involved in the rescue operation were attacked by Serb forces but no casualties occurred;

Therefore be it resolved by the Senate that it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Captain O'Grady deserves the respect and admiration of all Americans for his heroic conduct under life-threatening circumstances;

(2) the relief and happiness felt by the family of Captain O'Grady is shared by the United States Senate;

(3) all members of the United States and NATO armed forces involved in the search and rescue operations, in particular the members of the United States Marine Corps involved in the extraction of Captain O'Grady, are to be commended for their brave efforts and devotion to duty;

(4) U.S. and NATO air crews should not be put at risk in future operations over Bosnia unless all necessary actions to address the threat posed by hostile Serbian air defenses are taken.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this is a time for celebration—a brave American pilot, Capt. Scott O'Grady, has been rescued from Bosnian Serb-held territory. He is back at Aviano Air Base in Italy and will soon be on his way home to see his family.

I am pleased to submit this resolution on behalf of myself and many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle commending Captain O'Grady, and the U.S. marines who rescued him, for their courage and professionalism.

In the interests of getting this resolution adopted today, I agreed to modify several provisions, although I have a hard time to understand why they are objectionable. But first it was objected to stating the obvious—that many missions prior to Captain O'Grady's were not accompanied by adequate action against hostile air defenses. And second, objection to urging appropriate responses to the attack on Captain O'Grady. The term ''appropriate'' covers a lot, but apparently some want no response at all to the attack on Captain O'Grady or the attack on the rescue aircraft. But having said that, those provisions have been removed to satisfy my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I think we all want to make a statement and I believe this resolution makes an appropriate statement. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, one of the Senate's combat veterans, said yesterday that it would be appropriate to respond to this incident by bombing Serb missile sites.

Mr. President, events like this should make all Americans proud and appreciative of the sacrifices made by men