

the chicken circuit and making political speeches, and I liked the Senate," he said.

In 1976, Charles Kirbo of Atlanta, President Carter's personal friend and adviser, felt out Mr. Ribicoff about running for vice president. The answer was no, again.

In the Senate, he listed his major accomplishments as joining John Stennis, a conservative southern Democrat, to insist on equal enforcement of new school desegregation regulations in the North and South; the creation of a Department of Education and the revision of foreign trade regulations.

Perhaps his greatest test came in 1978, when President Carter proposed the sale of advanced American warplanes to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, over strong objections by Israel, the American Jewish lobby and American Jews.

In an unusual secret Senate session Mr. Ribicoff supported the sale, warning his colleagues that the Soviet Union was threatening the entire Middle East and its oil supply, and that America had to have friends there in addition to Israel.

He saw lifelong friends turn on him as the pressure mounted.

But he led Carter's supporters to the controversial victory and said he felt completely vindicated by subsequent events in the area, including the Camp David accords.

During a Democratic fund-raiser in Hartford on Oct. 28, 1978, Carter acknowledged it.

"Our commitment to Israel, our allegiance to Israel, is unshakable," Carter said. "Sometimes there are nuances or complications or facts that can't be revealed at the time. But over a period of weeks, I think you have always seen that when Abe Ribicoff votes in Congress for a controversial issue, like for instance, the sale of F-15s to Egypt, it seems to some that he may have made a mistake or I have made a mistake in advocating it.

"But we would never have induced President Sadat to come to Camp David had it not been for that vote," Carter said.

KNOWING WHEN TO QUIT

On May 3, 1979, Mr. Ribicoff summoned the press to his Washington office for what was expected to be a routine announcement that he was seeking re-election.

"As [former Senate Majority Leader] Mike Mansfield said," Mr. Ribicoff told the gathering, "There is a time to stay and a time to go."

"I've watched them come and go and I have admiration for the men who know how to go out at the top of their careers. A person who's been in power a long time should know how to step aside and open up the political process."

He had ended it—once again unexpectedly—at the top of his form. His announcement stunned his party and his colleagues.

"Most people stay one term too long," he said later, convinced his timing had been right.

"There is no such thing as a replaceable person. . . . Everyone is replaceable," he said.

When Mr. Ribicoff retired from the Senate in 1981, he joined the New York law firm of Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays & Handler. But he continued to advise presidents, governors and Congress.

In the 1990s, he would discuss how his brand of politics seemed worn. Civility was no longer an important character trait; nastiness was. When Democrats returned to Chicago for their convention in 1996, Mr. Ribicoff wanted nothing to do with it. Ironically, the man best remembered for engaging in harsh intraparty warfare had found today's politics too harsh.

"Everybody in politics today plays dirty," Mr. Ribicoff said in a 1996 interview. "Every-

body wants to say bad things about everything."

What he did in 1968 was spontaneous and heartfelt, not calculated to win political points. Today's politicians use their tempers as weapons to win poll points, and Mr. Ribicoff wanted none of that.

"I'm not a politician anymore," he said.

Mr. Ribicoff would continue working in New York, though he contracted Alzheimer's disease in later years.

When Mr. Ribicoff retired from the Senate, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, his longtime friend and ally, and former Senate Minority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr., R-Tenn., led the Senate tributes.

Kennedy said Mr. Ribicoff would be remembered "by all of us as a colleague who was both loved and listened to as a skillful leader on all the sensitive issues of foreign and domestic policy we face together."

Baker said Mr. Ribicoff had been "a giant of the U.S. Senate."

His Connecticut colleagues at the time, Republican U.S. Sen. Lowell P. Weicker Jr., praised him as a "great friend and a valued mentor."

"A government already comprised of too few Ribicoffs honestly can't stand the loss of Connecticut's senior senator," Weicker said.

Looking back over his life, during a 1986 interview, Mr. Ribicoff said it was not a piece of legislation but people who made the greatest impact on him—the people of Connecticut during the floods of 1955.

"I saw the grandeur of the whole state in the faces of the average citizen, their leaders and how they acted," he said, "Everyone pitched in, Connecticut came together. That's a memory I will always treasure."

Besides his wife and two children, he leaves a stepson, Peter Mathes, and six grandchildren.

The funeral will be at 11 a.m. Wednesday at Temple Emanu-El, 1 E. 65th St., at Park Avenue, in New York City.

[From the New Britain Herald, Feb. 23, 1998]

ABE RIBICOFF, NB NATIVE, DEAD AT 87

NEW YORK (AP).—Abraham A. Ribicoff, a former U.S. Senator and governor of Connecticut who served as secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the Kennedy administration, died Sunday. He was 87.

Ribicoff, who suffered from Alzheimer's disease, died at a nursing home in Riverdale, N.Y., said ABC's Barbara Walters, a family friend.

Ribicoff, a Democrat, had a public service career that spanned more than four decades.

"Connecticut and the nation have lost a patriot," Connecticut Gov. John G. Rowland said in a statement Sunday. "Abraham Ribicoff was one of the greatest leaders in Connecticut history. Beyond having served in all three branches of government, he stood for what was right regardless of the personal consequences."

Ribicoff began his career as a state legislator in the Connecticut General Assembly and went on to serve as a municipal judge, a congressman, governor of Connecticut, a member of Kennedy's Cabinet, a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations and, for the last 18 years of his career, a U.S. senator.

As a senator, Ribicoff gained national prominence at the 1968 Democratic National Convention, when he made a blistering speech criticizing Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley for the strong-arm tactics used to control protesters.

"I don't think anyone involved in politics will forget his speech out in Chicago," Connecticut Democratic Party Chairman Ed Marcus said Sunday. "He certainly left his mark on the political landscape of this country."

* * * * *

Former Connecticut Gov. Lowell P. Weicker Jr., a Republican turned independent, who served with Ribicoff in the Senate, lauded Ribicoff as a man of courage who was never afraid to go out on a limb for what he believed.

"Abe Ribicoff did what he thought was right and the devil take the consequences," Weicker said.

Ribicoff was known as a perfectionist and as one who got along with those in both parties.

His years as governor were marked by reforms of the state's judiciary system, the elimination of county governments and education improvements. He helped win national acclaim for Connecticut when he instituted a program to suspend the driver's licenses of speeders. The program helped decrease highway fatalities.

Ribicoff retired from the Senate in 1981 to join the New York law firm of Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays & Handler, but he didn't stay out of politics entirely and remained a popular adviser to presidents, governors and congressional committees. He chaired a Reagan administration commission on military base closings and testified before a panel on political campaign reform.

Ribicoff clearly enjoyed his status as an elder statesman.

"I've been around the track a lot," he said in a May 1993 interview. "I had the best of the years (in politics) and I don't want a single year back."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak up to 12 minutes.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MINNESOTA BROADCASTERS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the public interest contributions of the radio and television broadcasters in my home state of Minnesota. As a former broadcaster, I appreciate their efforts in our communities, and their accomplishments should not be overlooked.

Last month, I reflected upon how radio has become an influential medium in the lives of many Americans throughout its 78 years of operation in the United States. As my colleagues know, January was recognized as "National Radio Month." Today, I wanted to highlight in broader terms, the extraordinary influence and unselfish nature of both radio and television broadcasts.

Broadcasts over the 12,200 radio stations in the U.S. serve a variety of purposes. Radio communicates with listeners during time of emergency, informs them of noteworthy community events such as fundraising drives, educates them about developing stories and current events, and entertains during long drives across our states. Americans listen to the radio an average of three hours and twelve minutes on weekdays, and four hours and 42 minutes on weekends.

Similar to the listening power of radio, television has also become a vital part of our daily lives. Since the

first television broadcast test in the U.S. took place during the 1920s, this medium has evolved and grown from approximately 36 broadcast television stations in 1948 to more than 1,550 stations across the country today. According to the National Association of Broadcasters, 98 percent of U.S. households currently own television receivers. And television is the main news source for 70 percent of the American public.

Mr. President, many of our country's radio and television stations have participated in public service to their communities, not only out of statutory obligation for the licenses they receive, but because they have become part of their communities' way of life. I am proud of a recent Minnesota Broadcasters Association survey of station executives in which all 16 commercial television stations and 50 percent of the 242 radio stations responded. As impressive as these findings are, I am sure they represent only a microcosm of the public interest contributions of our nation's broadcasters.

I was pleased to learn that radio and television stations across Minnesota raised more than \$19.4 million for charities between June 1996 and June 1997, including \$65 million in donated air time for Public Service Announcements. The hundreds of public service announcements broadcast each week highlighted such issues as AIDS awareness, disaster relief, safety campaigns, drunk driving, and drug and crime education programs.

Additionally, of those stations surveyed, 100 percent of television stations and 95 percent of radio stations have helped charitable causes or needy individuals through fund-raising and other types of support.

I know my constituents who suffered through the midwest floods of 1997 are grateful to those stations in Minnesota who were involved in local news broadcasts, public service announcements, public affairs programming, and off-air campaigns to aid disaster victims.

A typical example of the Minnesota broadcasters' efforts during last year's spring floods is how Minnesota radio and television stations worked together with their listeners to raise \$1.6 million to help and assist the flood victims. These stations also produced a video titled "Beyond the Flood," donating the profits to the hundreds of thousands of Minnesotans who had their lives disrupted by the floods.

Mr. President, the statistics I have cited do not tell the whole story. There have been hundreds of examples of how Minnesota's broadcasters have provided extraordinary local public service to communities around Minnesota.

Additional past noteworthy accomplishments that come to mind include efforts by WJON-AM and its two sister stations in St. Cloud to raise money to buy bulletproof vests for the police departments. Its goal was \$50,000, but ultimately raised \$75,000. And stations 92 KQRS-FM and 93.7 KEGE-FM in Min-

neapolis have worked with Minnesota Job Services to set up a free interactive telephone hotline to connect employers with qualified applicants. Amazingly, this service registers 10,000 calls each month.

Finally, some of my colleagues in the Senate have advocated that Congress or the Federal Communications Commission mandate "free" or further discounted air time for political candidates. While I share the concern of many of my colleagues over the decreasing level of voter participation over the last few years, I believe proponents of this idea should more closely examine the level to which broadcasters are already raising the political awareness of the electorate through news coverage and free debate time. In 1996, two-thirds of Minnesota radio stations and four in ten television stations offered free air time to political candidates, with many of those stations actually holding the events.

Many more stations aired a local political affairs program or segment dealing with the local elections, and special segments profiling candidates and their positions on the issues. And nearly all of the stations surveyed appealed to their audiences to vote, whether through public service announcements, public affairs programming or the news. These efforts by Minnesota's broadcasters have helped to restore the people's faith and participation in our democracy.

Through disaster relief efforts, holiday safety initiatives, fund-raising drives, school announcements, public affairs programming, and weather emergency information, Minnesota broadcasters have demonstrated their commitment and dedication to public service.

I am proud to say that in some instances, these efforts have been recognized by the Minnesota Broadcasters Association through their "Media Best Awards" and by the National Association of Broadcasters annual "Crystal Radio Awards."

I applaud the leadership shown by all of Minnesota's stations, and am pleased to have shared their accomplishments with the Senate.

OMB'S STUDY OF THE NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to express concern at the continued efforts of some Members of Congress to use dairy farmers and consumers as vehicles for political manipulation.

Late in the day on Friday, February 12, the Office of Management and Budget released a study requested by Congress which is reported to be an analysis of the economic effects of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact. Unfortunately, it appears only to be a masterful work of political manipulation that skillfully avoids answering the core question of what actually is the impact of the Northeast Dairy

Compact. As a watered-down compromise, the report sheds little light on the plight of dairy farmers both inside the Compact region and around the nation. Meanwhile, the New England milk tax continues to take its toll on the most vulnerable consumers.

Senator FEINGOLD and I were the authors of the amendment which directed OMB to undertake an unbiased, independent study of the direct and indirect economic effects of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact. Did we receive an unbiased study? Hardly. I was informed that Compact supporters had plenty of input. Lacking the same political clout, opponents did not. What the American people have received is a sanitized product of regional politics. It's one more example of this administration's failed dairy policy.

The OMB has made it painfully clear that they had neither the time, data, nor resources to produce a meaningful analysis. This is not a legitimate excuse for producing a report with exorbitant levels of "statistical uncertainty." We attempted to work with OMB in addressing the issue of the inadequate time frame for conducting a meaningful study. At the beginning of the year, OMB asked for my assistance in requesting a time-extension before the release of the report. I worked with them to obtain the short extension they requested, in the interest of not rushing through the project. This was the only time an extension was requested even though I made it clear I would work with them in obtaining further extensions as necessary.

So, why did OMB wait until the week before the initially scheduled release of the study to inform us that not enough time had passed to produce a significant, decisive report? If OMB could see there still was a problem with insufficient data due to the limited time the Compact has been in effect, they should have made a formal request for an extension.

There was no attempt to seek an extension to allow a meaningful study, only a veiled attempt to get this request off their plate—even if it resulted in an inferior product compromising the integrity of OMB. Aren't the best economists in the government at OMB? This study questions that presumption.

The attitude in a staff briefing conducted by OMB three weeks ago was that it did not want this task, and sought to get rid of it as soon as possible. We expect OMB to conduct professional and unbiased studies. Apparently, that is not possible.

Even without a decent report, we all know the Compact hurts consumers. Milk prices have increased an average of 17 cents a gallon throughout New England. Those most adversely impacted include low-income families, children, and elderly residents on fixed incomes.

Over the past year, a number of newspaper articles have appeared in the New England region that have questioned the legitimacy of the Compact. I ask unanimous consent that a