



SUITE 155
400 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202/737-3220

C-SPAN and SENATE TELEVISION: AN OVERVIEW

- IF THE SENATE ALLOWS TELEVISION COVERAGE OF ITS PROCEEDINGS, WILL C-SPAN COVER THEM? Yes. *C-SPAN is capable of picking up the Senate feed as soon as it becomes available and transmitting it nationwide via satellite. The C-SPAN network has a second satellite channel ready and waiting for Senate television.*
- THE SENATE RESOLUTION CALLS FOR A BROADCASTING TEST PERIOD, DURING WHICH ONLY AUDIO WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE PRESS, HOW WOULD C-SPAN RESPOND TO THIS ARRANGEMENT? *C-SPAN is prepared to put the temporary Senate "audio only" feed on its satellite channel immediately and make it available to its affiliates as a public service.*
- WHO WOULD PICK UP THIS TYPE OF AUDIO FEED AND HOW? *Some cable systems could use it as an audio service over the FM band; others, as background audio on an "alpha-numeric" channel -- those showing billboarded texts. A few larger cable systems could elect to give an interim Senate audio feed its own channel on the cable system with a billboarded notice explaining what it is. If and when Senate video begins, these cable systems could easily make the transition to gavel-to-gavel television coverage of the Senate.*
- WHY IS C-SPAN INTERESTED IN GAVEL-TO-GAVEL COVERAGE OF THE SENATE? *In March 1979, C-SPAN cable network began offering uncut coverage of the U.S. House of Representatives proceedings to affiliated cable systems. Coverage of House and Senate committee hearings followed in later years. Coverage of the U.S. Senate would complete the picture, giving interested Americans a window on their elected representatives in Washington.*
- WOULD CABLE SYSTEMS HAVE ENOUGH CHANNEL SPACE TO ACCOMMODATE A SECOND C-SPAN CHANNEL THAT OFFERED SENATE TELECASTS? *Some most certainly will. However, channel space for a second C-SPAN network is a problem for some cable system operators. While C-SPAN plans to remain committed*

(more/over)

to gavel-to-gavel coverage of the House on our original network, the Senate debates will often be worked into that channel's programming lineup to make certain that as many cable subscribers as possible have access to the Senate.

- WHAT IS C-SPAN? C-SPAN is the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network, a round-the-clock cable network.
- HOW IS C-SPAN FUNDED? C-SPAN is financed without public funds. It is a creation of the cable television industry -- which continues to provide most of its funding -- which wanted to provide unique public affairs programming to its customers.
- WHO WATCHES C-SPAN? About 23 million cable tv households hooked-up to C-SPAN via 2,000 affiliated cable systems. Another 1 million households can tune-in to C-SPAN on satellite dishes. That means that about 70 million Americans have access to C-SPAN's unedited coverage of public events. In Washington, D.C., about 600 buildings -- including the White House and most of the federal agencies -- receive the C-SPAN network's programming through a special microwave hook-up, run by the Capitol Connection, Inc.
- HOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO RECEIVE C-SPAN ACTUALLY WATCH THE CONGRESS IN SESSION AND OTHER C-SPAN TELECASTS? C-SPAN's programming is intentionally not measured by standard audience ratings, so it is not known how many people tune-in to a particular telecast. C-SPAN is not supported by advertising dollars which demand high audience numbers. That's because C-SPAN's directors feel that the public service aspects of our programming should be free of the restrictions caused by the need to attract large numbers of people to, for example, a particular hearing.
- HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION ABOUT C-SPAN? C-SPAN's public relations department can be reached at (202) 737-3220. Susan Swain is prepared to answer any questions on C-SPAN and Senate proceedings.

C-SPAN Survey on Senate Television/ Breakdown by Responses

YES--53 responses

Andrews (R-ND)
Armstrong (R-CO)
Bumpers (D-AR)
Byrd (D-WV)
Chafee (R-RI)
Cochran (R-MS)
Cohen (R-ME)
Cranston (D-CA)
D'Amato (R-NY)
DeConcini (D-AZ)
Denton (R-AL)
Dixon (D-IL)
Dole (R-KS)
Evans (R-WA)
Ford (D-KY)
Garn (R-UT)
Gore (T-TN)
Gramm (R-TX)
Harkin (D-IA)
Hatch (R-UT)
Heflin (D-AL)
Heinz (R-PA)
Humphrey (R-NH)
Inouye (D-HI)
Kassebaum (R-KS)
Kasten (R-WI)
Kerry (D-MA)
Lugar (R-IN)
Mathias (R-MD)
Matsunaga (D-HI)
McClure (R-ID)
Melcher (D-MT)
Mitchell (D-ME)
Moynihan (D-NY)
Murkowski (R-AK)
Packwood (R-OR)
Pell (D-RI)
Pressler (R-SD)
Quayle (R-IN)
Riegle (D-MI)
Rockefeller (D-WV)
Roth (R-DE)
Sarbanes (D-MD)
Sasser (D-TN)
Simon (D-IL)
Specter (R-PA)
Stevens (R-AK)
Symms (R-ID)
Trible (R-VA)
Thurmond (R-SC)
Weicker (R-CT)
Wilson (R-CA)
Gorton (R-WA)

LEANS YES --
15 responses

Abdnor (R-SD)
Baucus (D-MT)
Biden (D-DE)
Boren (D-OK)
Chiles (D-FL)
Exon (D-NE)
Hart (D-CO)
Hollings (D-SC)
Kennedy (D-MA)
Leahy (D-VT)
Metzenbaum (D-OH)
Nickles (R-OK)
Rudman (R-NH)
Warner (R-VA)
Zorinsky (D-NE)

NO--14 Responses

Burdick (D-ND)
Danforth (R-MO)
Durenberger (R-MN)
Eagleton (D-MO)
Goldwater (R-AZ)
Hawkins (R-FL)
Hecht (R-NV)
Helms (R-SC)
Johnston (D-LA)
Laxalt (R-NV)
Long (D-LA)
Proxmire (D-WI)
Stafford (R-VT)
Stennis (D-MS)

Leans No --
14 Responses

Bentsen (D-TX)
Bingaman (D-NM)
Boschwitz (R-MN)
Dodd (D-CT)
East (R-NC)
Glenn (D-OH)
Grassley (R-IA)
Hatfield (R-OR)
Levin (D-MI)
Mattingly (R-GA)
Nunn (D-GA)
Pryor (D-AR)
Simpson (R-WY)
Wallop (R-WY)

Undecided -- 4 Responses

Bradley (D-NJ)
Domenici (R-NM)
Lautenberg (D-NJ)
McConnell (R-KY)

C-SPAN's SENATE TV SURVEY

This survey, conducted in the summer of 1985—and recently updated—reflects the attitudes of U.S. senators toward televised coverage of their proceedings. Results indicated: **68** in favor, **14** opposed, **14** leaning against, and **4** undecided.

ALABAMA		LOUISIANA		OHIO	
Heflin (D)	Yes	Long (D)	No	Glenn (D)	Leans no
Denton (R)	Yes	Johnston (D)	No	Metzenbaum (D)	Leans yes
ALASKA		MAINE		OKLAHOMA	
Stevens (R)	Yes	Cohen (R)	Yes	Boren (D)	Leans yes
Murkowski (R)	Yes	Mitchell (D)	Yes	Nickles (R)	Leans yes
ARIZONA		MARYLAND		OREGON	
Goldwater (R)	No	Mathias (R)	Yes	Hatfield (R)	Leans no
DeConcini (D)	Yes	Sarbanes (D)	Yes	Packwood (R)	Yes
ARKANSAS		MASSACHUSETTS		PENNSYLVANIA	
Bumpers (D)	Yes	Kennedy (D)	Leans yes	Heinz (R)	Yes
Pryor (D)	Leans no	Kerry (D)	Yes	Specter (R)	Yes
CALIFORNIA		MICHIGAN		RHODE ISLAND	
Cranston (D)	Yes	Riegle (D)	Yes	Pell (D)	Yes
Wilson (R)	Yes	Levin (D)	Leans no	Chafee (R)	Yes
COLORADO		MINNESOTA		SOUTH CAROLINA	
Hart (D)	Leans yes	Durenberger (R)	No	Thurmond (R)	Yes
Armstrong (R)	Yes	Boschwitz (R)	Leans no	Hollings (D)	Leans yes
CONNECTICUT		MISSISSIPPI		SOUTH DAKOTA	
Weicker (R)	Yes	Stennis (D)	No	Pressler (R)	Yes
Dodd (D)	Leans no	Cochran (R)	Yes	Abdnor (R)	Leans yes
DELAWARE		MISSOURI		TENNESSEE	
Roth (R)	Yes	Eagleton (D)	No	Gore (D)	Yes
Biden (D)	Leans yes	Danforth (R)	No	Sasser (D)	Yes
FLORIDA		MONTANA		TEXAS	
Chiles (D)	Leans yes	Melcher (D)	Yes	Bentsen (D)	Leans no
Hawkins (R)	No	Baucus (D)	Leans yes	Gramm (R)	Yes
GEORGIA		NEBRASKA		UTAH	
Nunn (D)	Leans no	Zorinsky (D)	Leans yes	Garn (R)	Yes
Mattingly (R)	Leans no	Exon (D)	Leans yes	Hatch (R)	Yes
HAWAII		NEVADA		VERMONT	
Inouye (D)	Yes	Laxalt (R)	No	Stafford (R)	No
Matsunaga (D)	Yes	Hecht (R)	No	Leahy (D)	Leans yes
IDAHO		NEW HAMPSHIRE		VIRGINIA	
McClure (R)	Yes	Humphrey (R)	Yes	Warner (R)	Leans yes
Symms (R)	Yes	Rudman (R)	Leans yes	Trible (R)	Yes
ILLINOIS		NEW JERSEY		WASHINGTON	
Dixon (D)	Yes	Bradley (D)	U	Gorton (R)	Yes
Simon (D)	Yes	Lautenberg (D)	U	Evans (R)	Yes
INDIANA		NEW MEXICO		WEST VIRGINIA	
Lugar (R)	Yes	Domenici (R)	U	Byrd (D)	Yes
Quayle (R)	Yes	Bingaman (D)	Leans no	Rockefeller (D)	Yes
IOWA		NEW YORK		WISCONSIN	
Grassley (R)	Leans no	Moynihan (D)	Yes	Proxmire (D)	No
Harkin (D)	Yes	D'Amato (R)	Yes	Kasten Jr. (R)	Yes
KANSAS		NORTH CAROLINA		WYOMING	
Dole (R)	Yes	Helms (R)	No	Wallop (R)	Leans no
Kassebaum (R)	Yes	East (R)	Leans no	Simpson (R)	Leans no
KENTUCKY		NORTH DAKOTA			
McConnell (R)	U	Burdick (D)	No		
Ford (D)	Yes	Andrews (R)	Yes		

U — undecided
Source: C-SPAN

to gavel-to-gavel coverage of the House on our original network, the Senate debates will often be worked into that channel's programming lineup to make certain that as many cable subscribers as possible have access to the Senate.

- WHAT IS C-SPAN? C-SPAN is the Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network, a round-the-clock cable network covering varied public events without commentary.
- HOW IS C-SPAN FUNDED? C-SPAN is financed without public funds. It is a creation of the cable television industry -- which continues to provide most of its funding -- which wanted to provide unique public affairs programming to its customers.
- WHO WATCHES C-SPAN? About 23 million cable tv households hooked-up to C-SPAN via 2,000 affiliated cable systems. Another 1 million households can tune-in to C-SPAN on satellite dishes. That means that about 70 million Americans have access to C-SPAN's unedited coverage of public events. In Washington, D.C., about 600 buildings -- including the White House and most of the federal agencies -- receive the C-SPAN network's programming through a special microwave hook-up, run by the Capitol Connection, Inc.
- HOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO RECEIVE C-SPAN ACTUALLY WATCH THE CONGRESS IN SESSION AND OTHER C-SPAN TELECASTS? C-SPAN's programming is intentionally not measured by standard audience ratings, so it is not known how many people tune-in to a particular telecast. C-SPAN is not supported by advertising dollars which demand high audience numbers. That's because C-SPAN's directors feel that the public service aspects of our programming should be free of the restrictions caused by the need to attract large numbers of people to, for example, a particular hearing.
- HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION ABOUT C-SPAN? C-SPAN's public relations department can be reached at (202) 737-3220. Susan Swain is prepared to answer any questions on C-SPAN and Senate proceedings.



SUITE 155
400 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202 / 737-3220

C-SPAN and SENATE TELEVISION: AN OVERVIEW

- IF THE SENATE ALLOWS TELEVISION COVERAGE OF ITS PROCEEDINGS, WILL C-SPAN COVER THEM? *Yes. C-SPAN is capable of picking up the Senate feed as soon as it becomes available and transmitting it nationwide via satellite. The C-SPAN network has a second satellite channel ready and waiting for Senate television.*
- THE SENATE RESOLUTION CALLS FOR A BROADCASTING TEST PERIOD, DURING WHICH ONLY AUDIO WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE PRESS, HOW WOULD C-SPAN RESPOND TO THIS ARRANGEMENT? *C-SPAN is prepared to put the temporary Senate "audio only" feed on its satellite channel immediately and make it available to its affiliates as a public service.*
- WHO WOULD PICK UP THIS TYPE OF AUDIO FEED AND HOW? *Some cable systems could use it as an audio service over the FM band; others, as background audio on an "alpha-numeric" channel -- those showing billboarded texts. A few larger cable systems could elect to give an interim Senate audio feed its own channel on the cable system with a billboarded notice explaining what it is. If and when Senate video begins, these cable systems could easily make the transition to gavel-to-gavel television coverage of the Senate.*
- WHY IS C-SPAN INTERESTED IN GAVEL-TO-GAVEL COVERAGE OF THE SENATE?
In March 1979, C-SPAN cable network began offering uncut coverage of the U.S. House of Representatives proceedings to affiliated cable systems. Coverage of House and Senate committee hearings followed in later years. Coverage of the U.S. Senate would complete the picture, giving interested Americans a window on their elected representatives in Washington.
- WOULD CABLE SYSTEMS HAVE ENOUGH CHANNEL SPACE TO ACCOMMODATE A SECOND C-SPAN CHANNEL THAT OFFERED SENATE TELECASTS? *Some most certainly will. However, channel space for a second C-SPAN network is a problem for some cable system operators. While C-SPAN plans to remain committed*

(more/over)

Feb. 10, 1986

- (1) UPI article
- (2) 2 pages from the record
- (3) "how C-SPAN will respond"
- (4) Senate TV survey
- (5) C-SPAN households by state
- (6) US News article

Dear _____:

Last week, the U.S. Senate wrapped up a full week of debate over radio and television coverage of Senate proceedings in a deadlock.

At issue are a number of rules changes that some Senators feel are necessary to the introduction of television cameras; other Senators feel these rules changes will alter the institution of the Senate itself. The original broadcasting resolution reported out of the Senate Rules Committee this Fall took away the issue of rules changes ~~from the debate~~ ^{by} and ^{is} called for a test period during which ^{closed-circuit} television would be delivered through a ~~closed circuit~~ system to the Senate offices ^{so} ~~and they could debate~~ its impact ^{could be debated} while watching the images.

^{In 1984} ~~Two years ago~~, similar procedural snarls killed the Senate television resolution advanced by then-Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker.

^{The senate is in recess until February 18th, but} Republican leader Robert Dole has promised to bring the resolution to the floor once again after ^{they reconvene.} ~~this week's recess.~~ However, observers feel that the gridlock will require much compromise among the parties.

~~In case you~~

We have assembled a packet of information that includes some articles and a segment of the debate on Senate tv, in case you are considering an editorial on the topic.

Sincerely,

Susan Swain
Public Relations Dir

enclosures(6)

... not article

During the week of debate, the issue received very little attention from the press. Without press attention, the issue of greater public access to the Senate through the media will remain inside the Senate chamber.

I hope you will consider the ^{topic set} question of media coverage of the Senate an important topic for an editorial ^{sometime} before the Senate reconvenes on February 18th. A packet of information is enclosed for your ~~use~~.

Sincerely,

Susan Swain
Director, Public Relations

enclosures (6)



SUITE 155
400 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202 / 737-3220

Rankings by C-SPAN Households

State	C-SPAN Subscribers	State Subscribers	Cable Household Penetration	Total TV Households	TV Household Penetration
1. California	2,439,739	3,820,238	63.9%	9,339,900	26.1%
2. New York	1,689,620	2,421,022	69.8%	6,443,940	26.2%
3. Texas	1,544,723	2,535,379	60.9%	5,647,390	27.4%
4. Florida	1,254,165	2,156,130	58.2%	4,246,740	29.5%
5. Ohio	1,041,910	1,877,338	55.5%	3,974,690	26.2%
6. New Jersey	953,683	1,345,212	70.9%	2,664,020	35.8%
7. Pennsylvania	848,503	2,260,455	37.5%	4,351,740	19.5%
8. Michigan	847,674	1,202,604	70.5%	3,211,000	26.4%
9. Illinois	833,005	1,434,866	58.1%	4,188,750	19.9%
10. Massachusetts	679,261	1,054,012	64.4%	2,101,540	32.3%
11. North Carolina	512,073	921,644	55.6%	2,192,660	23.4%
12. Virginia	484,058	803,044	60.3%	1,970,300	24.6%
13. Connecticut	477,750	725,408	65.9%	1,123,700	42.5%
14. Washington	473,391	821,483	57.6%	1,642,450	28.8%
15. Louisiana	462,558	782,929	59.1%	1,573,050	29.4%
16. Indiana	459,855	786,209	58.1%	1,941,560	23.7%
17. Georgia	435,399	979,905	44.4%	2,014,800	21.6%
18. Missouri	414,563	645,554	64.2%	1,826,500	22.7%
19. Wisconsin	380,145	585,003	65.0%	1,733,930	21.9%
20. Arizona	360,071	408,718	88.1%	1,121,670	32.1%
21. Tennessee	358,326	703,364	50.9%	1,680,310	21.3%
22. Oklahoma	357,611	568,549	62.9%	1,252,390	28.6%
23. Alabama	343,702	604,742	56.8%	1,416,740	24.3%
24. Kentucky	314,052	622,391	50.5%	1,336,320	23.5%
25. Colorado	306,499	443,870	69.1%	1,220,170	25.1%
26. Maryland	299,637	405,929	73.8%	1,529,330	19.6%
27. Oregon	284,704	464,667	61.3%	1,014,200	28.1%
28. Iowa	270,784	460,628	58.8%	1,101,750	24.6%
29. Kansas	264,464	472,211	56.0%	920,830	28.7%
30. South Carolina	243,094	439,169	55.4%	1,141,160	21.3%
31. Minnesota	236,496	407,088	58.1%	1,500,782	15.8%
32. Nebraska	193,802	282,317	68.6%	591,850	32.7%
33. Hawaii	155,000	292,512	53.0%	323,720	47.9%
34. Rhode Island	143,504	151,452	94.8%	350,380	41.0%
35. New Hampshire	118,657	178,913	66.3%	347,670	34.1%
36. New Mexico	115,724	223,847	51.7%	490,640	23.6%
37. Mississippi	108,790	379,814	28.6%	865,830	12.6%
38. Montana	95,800	150,924	63.5%	305,750	31.3%
39. Arkansas	90,260	376,308	24.0%	828,970	10.9%
40. West Virginia	76,318	402,845	18.9%	706,720	10.8%
41. Idaho	72,007	163,655	44.0%	345,140	20.9%
42. Utah	69,897	121,921	57.3%	506,250	13.8%
43. Nevada	68,081	130,023	52.4%	362,210	18.8%
44. Maine	64,662	197,758	32.7%	419,800	15.4%
45. Wyoming	56,412	131,842	43.8%	191,520	29.5%
46. South Dakota	54,531	105,085	51.9%	257,380	21.2%
47. North Dakota	52,118	117,775	44.3%	244,830	21.3%
48. Alaska	51,946	63,508	81.8%	170,000	30.6%
49. Vermont	43,785	80,181	54.6%	189,750	23.1%
50. Delaware	33,473	146,498	22.8%	214,530	15.6%
Dist. of Columbia	*	—	—	239,670	—
TOTAL	21,533,282	36,856,939	58.4%	85,376,760	25.2%

7/30/85

C-SPAN's SENATE TV SURVEY

This survey, conducted in the summer of 1985—and recently updated—reflects the attitudes of U.S. senators toward televised coverage of their proceedings. Results indicated: **68** in favor, **14** opposed, **14** leaning against, and **4** undecided.

ALABAMA		LOUISIANA		OHIO	
Heflin (D)	Yes	Long (D)	No	Glenn (D)	Leans no
Denton (R)	Yes	Johnston (D)	No	Metzenbaum (D)	Leans yes
ALASKA		MAINE		OKLAHOMA	
Stevens (R)	Yes	Cohen (R)	Yes	Boren (D)	Leans yes
Murkowski (R)	Yes	Mitchell (D)	Yes	Nickles (R)	Leans yes
ARIZONA		MARYLAND		OREGON	
Goldwater (R)	No	Mathias (R)	Yes	Hatfield (R)	Leans no
DeConcini (D)	Yes	Sarbanes (D)	Yes	Packwood (R)	Yes
ARKANSAS		MASSACHUSETTS		PENNSYLVANIA	
Bumpers (D)	Yes	Kennedy (D)	Leans yes	Heinz (R)	Yes
Pryor (D)	Leans no	Kerry (D)	Yes	Specter (R)	Yes
CALIFORNIA		MICHIGAN		RHODE ISLAND	
Cranston (D)	Yes	Riegle (D)	Yes	Pell (D)	Yes
Wilson (R)	Yes	Levin (D)	Leans no	Chafee (R)	Yes
COLORADO		MINNESOTA		SOUTH CAROLINA	
Hart (D)	Leans yes	Durenberger (R)	No	Thurmond (R)	Yes
Armstrong (R)	Yes	Boschwitz (R)	Leans no	Hollings (D)	Leans yes
CONNECTICUT		MISSISSIPPI		SOUTH DAKOTA	
Weicker (R)	Yes	Stennis (D)	No	Pressler (R)	Yes
Dodd (D)	Leans no	Cochran (R)	Yes	Abdnor (R)	Leans yes
DELAWARE		MISSOURI		TENNESSEE	
Roth (R)	Yes	Eagleton (D)	No	Gore (D)	Yes
Biden (D)	Leans yes	Danforth (R)	No	Sasser (D)	Yes
FLORIDA		MONTANA		TEXAS	
Chiles (D)	Leans yes	Melcher (D)	Yes	Bentsen (D)	Leans no
Hawkins (R)	No	Baucus (D)	Leans yes	Gramm (R)	Yes
GEORGIA		NEBRASKA		UTAH	
Nunn (D)	Leans no	Zorinsky (D)	Leans yes	Garn (R)	Yes
Mattingly (R)	Leans no	Exon (D)	Leans yes	Hatch (R)	Yes
HAWAII		NEVADA		VERMONT	
Inouye (D)	Yes	Laxalt (R)	No	Stafford (R)	No
Matsunaga (D)	Yes	Hecht (R)	No	Leahy (D)	Leans yes
IDAHO		NEW HAMPSHIRE		VIRGINIA	
McClure (R)	Yes	Humphrey (R)	Yes	Warner (R)	Leans yes
Symms (R)	Yes	Rudman (R)	Leans yes	Trible (R)	Yes
ILLINOIS		NEW JERSEY		WASHINGTON	
Dixon (D)	Yes	Bradley (D)	U	Gorton (R)	Yes
Simon (D)	Yes	Lautenberg (D)	U	Evans (R)	Yes
INDIANA		NEW MEXICO		WEST VIRGINIA	
Lugar (R)	Yes	Domenici (R)	U	Byrd (D)	Yes
Quayle (R)	Yes	Bingaman (D)	Leans no	Rockefeller (D)	Yes
IOWA		NEW YORK		WISCONSIN	
Grassley (R)	Leans no	Moynihan (D)	Yes	Proxmire (D)	No
Harkin (D)	Yes	D'Amato (R)	Yes	Kasten Jr. (R)	Yes
KANSAS		NORTH CAROLINA		WYOMING	
Dole (R)	Yes	Helms (R)	No	Wallop (R)	Leans no
Kassebaum (R)	Yes	East (R)	Leans no	Simpson (R)	Leans no
KENTUCKY		NORTH DAKOTA		U — undecided	
McConnell (R)	U	Burdick (D)	No	Source: C-SPAN	
Ford (D)	Yes	Andrews (R)	Yes		

Richmond Times-Dispatch

Senators debate merits of camera

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Senators opened debate Monday on whether to televise their proceedings and proponents argued the relentless eye of the camera would inhibit rather than encourage "grandstanding." They remained deadlocked on the issue yesterday.

Sen. Albert Gore Jr., D-Tenn., who has served in the other chamber, contended that televising House proceedings "has helped rein in grandstanding."

But Sen. Russell B. Long, D-La., who has opposed previous efforts to televise Senate deliberations, warned of the seductiveness of the cameras.

"Every senator cherishes in his bosom the hope that he can be eloquent some day," said the son of one of the Senate's great orators, Huey Long, the Louisiana "Kingfish."

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr., R-Md., chairman of the Rules Committee that approved the resolution providing for a closed-circuit test of gavel-to-gavel coverage, spoke for the measure, saying, "The eye of the camera is very quick to spot the phony. It never blinks."

The committee reported that rules changes that might be necessary to streamline Senate procedures if television is permitted should be considered along with the resolution, which also provides for radiobroadcasts.

Republican leader Robert Dole of Kansas said television would provide "an accurate historical record of what transpires in the Senate."

Sen. Larry Pressler, R-S.D., said cameras on the floor could have recorded for posterity the facial expressions of Sens. John Glenn, D-Ohio, and Jake Garn, R-Utah, the only senators to have ventured into space, when they rose to speak on the loss of

the Challenger Seven.

It was, Pressler said, "A little moment of history lost forever."

Mathias said televising proceedings would help citizens understand government and quoted Samuel Johnson, the 18th century moralist, as saying, "The greatest inducement to a clear conscience is the suspicion that someone is watching."

Democratic leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia said, "We should not hide behind tradition, but rather take every advantage available to us to prove our best known tradition — that we are the greatest deliberative body in the world."

Only about a half dozen senators were on the floor during the debate and only a couple of dozen spectators were in the visitors' gallery.

Jack Murphy of Saranac Lake, N.Y., listened to the debate and said later he favored televising the proceedings.

"When you have an interest in a particular subject, you could feel like you were involved," he said.

But John Gibson, a visitor from Scottsboro, Ala., was not much impressed. "If they did televise it," Gibson said, "I don't think anybody would watch it."

February 7, 1986

Richmond Times-Dispatch

Senators debate merits of camera

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Senators opened debate Monday on whether to televise their proceedings and proponents argued the relentless eye of the camera would inhibit rather than encourage "grandstanding." They remained deadlocked on the issue yesterday.

Sen. Albert Gore Jr., D-Tenn., who has served in the other chamber, contended that televising House proceedings "has helped rein in grandstanding."

But Sen. Russell B. Long, D-La., who has opposed previous efforts to televise Senate deliberations, warned of the seductiveness of the cameras.

"Every senator cherishes in his bosom the hope that he can be eloquent some day," said the son of one of the Senate's great orators, Huey Long, the Louisiana "Kingfish."

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr., R-Md., chairman of the Rules Committee that approved the resolution providing for a closed-circuit test of gavel-to-gavel coverage, spoke for the measure, saying, "The eye of the camera is very quick to spot the phony. It never blinks."

The committee reported that rules changes that might be necessary to streamline Senate procedures if television is permitted should be considered along with the resolution, which also provides for radiobroadcasts.

Republican leader Robert Dole of Kansas said television would provide "an accurate historical record of what transpires in the Senate."

Sen. Larry Pressler, R-S.D., said cameras on the floor could have recorded for posterity the facial expressions of Sens. John Glenn, D-Ohio, and Jake Garn, R-Utah, the only senators to have ventured into space, when they rose to speak on the loss of

the Challenger Seven.

It was, Pressler said, "A little moment of history lost forever."

Mathias said televising proceedings would help citizens understand government and quoted Samuel Johnson, the 18th century moralist, as saying, "The greatest inducement to a clear conscience is the suspicion that someone is watching."

Democratic leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia said, "We should not hide behind tradition, but rather take every advantage available to us to prove our best known tradition — that we are the greatest deliberative body in the world."

Only about a half dozen senators were on the floor during the debate and only a couple of dozen spectators were in the visitors' gallery.

Jack Murphy of Saranac Lake, N.Y., listened to the debate and said later he favored televising the proceedings.

"When you have an interest in a particular subject, you could feel like you were involved," he said.

But John Gibson, a visitor from Scottsboro, Ala., was not much impressed. "If they did televise it," Gibson said, "I don't think anybody would watch it."

February 7, 1986

C-SPAN's SENATE TV SURVEY

This survey, conducted in the summer of 1985—and recently updated—reflects the attitudes of U.S. senators toward televised coverage of their proceedings. Results indicated: **68** in favor, **14** opposed, **14** leaning against, and **4** undecided.

ALABAMA		LOUISIANA		OHIO	
Heflin (D)	Yes	Long (D)	No	Glenn (D)	Leans no
Denton (R)	Yes	Johnston (D)	No	Metzenbaum (D)	Leans yes
ALASKA		MAINE		OKLAHOMA	
Stevens (R)	Yes	Cohen (R)	Yes	Boren (D)	Leans yes
Murkowski (R)	Yes	Mitchell (D)	Yes	Nickles (R)	Leans yes
ARIZONA		MARYLAND		OREGON	
Goldwater (R)	No	Mathias (R)	Yes	Hatfield (R)	Leans no
DeConcini (D)	Yes	Sarbanes (D)	Yes	Packwood (R)	Yes
ARKANSAS		MASSACHUSETTS		PENNSYLVANIA	
Bumpers (D)	Yes	Kennedy (D)	Leans yes	Heinz (R)	Yes
Pryor (D)	Leans no	Kerry (D)	Yes	Specter (R)	Yes
CALIFORNIA		MICHIGAN		RHODE ISLAND	
Cranston (D)	Yes	Riegle (D)	Yes	Pell (D)	Yes
Wilson (R)	Yes	Levin (D)	Leans no	Chafee (R)	Yes
COLORADO		MINNESOTA		SOUTH CAROLINA	
Hart (D)	Leans yes	Durenberger (R)	No	Thurmond (R)	Yes
Armstrong (R)	Yes	Boschwitz (R)	Leans no	Hollings (D)	Leans yes
CONNECTICUT		MISSISSIPPI		SOUTH DAKOTA	
Weicker (R)	Yes	Stennis (D)	No	Pressler (R)	Yes
Dodd (D)	Leans no	Cochran (R)	Yes	Abdnor (R)	Leans yes
DELAWARE		MISSOURI		TENNESSEE	
Roth (R)	Yes	Eagleton (D)	No	Gore (D)	Yes
Biden (D)	Leans yes	Danforth (R)	No	Sasser (D)	Yes
FLORIDA		MONTANA		TEXAS	
Chiles (D)	Leans yes	Melcher (D)	Yes	Bentsen (D)	Leans no
Hawkins (R)	No	Baucus (D)	Leans yes	Gramm (R)	Yes
GEORGIA		NEBRASKA		UTAH	
Nunn (D)	Leans no	Zorinsky (D)	Leans yes	Garn (R)	Yes
Mattingly (R)	Leans no	Exon (D)	Leans yes	Hatch (R)	Yes
HAWAII		NEVADA		VERMONT	
Inouye (D)	Yes	Laxalt (R)	No	Stafford (R)	No
Matsunaga (D)	Yes	Hecht (R)	No	Leahy (D)	Leans yes
IDAHO		NEW HAMPSHIRE		VIRGINIA	
McClure (R)	Yes	Humphrey (R)	Yes	Warner (R)	Leans yes
Symms (R)	Yes	Rudman (R)	Leans yes	Trible (R)	Yes
ILLINOIS		NEW JERSEY		WASHINGTON	
Dixon (D)	Yes	Bradley (D)	U	Gorton (R)	Yes
Simon (D)	Yes	Lautenberg (D)	U	Evans (R)	Yes
INDIANA		NEW MEXICO		WEST VIRGINIA	
Lugar (R)	Yes	Domenici (R)	U	Byrd (D)	Yes
Quayle (R)	Yes	Bingaman (D)	Leans no	Rockefeller (D)	Yes
IOWA		NEW YORK		WISCONSIN	
Grassley (R)	Leans no	Moynihan (D)	Yes	Proxmire (D)	No
Harkin (D)	Yes	D'Amato (R)	Yes	Kasten Jr. (R)	Yes
KANSAS		NORTH CAROLINA		WYOMING	
Dole (R)	Yes	Helms (R)	No	Wallop (R)	Leans no
Kassebaum (R)	Yes	East (R)	Leans no	Simpson (R)	Leans no
KENTUCKY		NORTH DAKOTA			
McConnell (R)	U	Burdick (D)	No		
Ford (D)	Yes	Andrews (R)	Yes		

U — undecided
Source: C-SPAN

Please note: This is not a vote count on S. Res 28, but rather a survey of Senators' attitudes towards televised coverage of their proceedings that was conducted by C-SPAN in the summer of 1985 and updated in the ensuing months.

C-SPAN Survey on Senate Television/ Breakdown by Responses

YES--53 responses

Andrews (R-ND)
 Armstrong (R-CO)
 Bumpers (D-AR)
 Byrd (D-WV)
 Chafee (R-RI)
 Cochran (R-MS)
 Cohen (R-ME)
 Cranston (D-CA)
 D'Amato (R-NY)
 DeConcini (D-AZ)
 Denton (R-AL)
 Dixon (D-IL)
 Dole (R-KS)
 Evans (R-WA)
 Ford (D-KY)
 Garn (R-UT)
 Gore (T-TN)
 Gramm (R-TX)
 Harkin (D-IA)
 Hatch (R-UT)
 Heflin (D-AL)
 Heinz (R-PA)
 Humphrey (R-NH)
 Inouye (D-HI)
 Kassebaum (R-KS)
 Kasten (R-WI)
 Kerry (D-MA)
 Lugar (R-IN)
 Mathias (R-MD)
 Matsunaga (D-HI)
 McClure (R-ID)
 Melcher (D-MT)
 Mitchell (D-ME)
 Moynihan (D-NY)
 Murkowski (R-AK)
 Packwood (R-OR)
 Pell (D-RI)
 Pressler (R-SD)
 Quayle (R-IN)
 Riegle (D-MI)
 Rockefeller (D-WV)
 Roth (R-DE)
 Sarbanes (D-MD)
 Sasser (D-TN)
 Simon (D-IL)
 Specter (R-PA)
 Stevens (R-AK)
 Symms (R-ID)
 Tribble (R-VA)
 Thurmond (R-SC)
 Weicker (R-CT)
 Wilson (R-CA)
 Gorton (R-WA)

LEANS YES --
15 responses

Abdnor (R-SD)
 Baucus (D-MT)
 Biden (D-DE)
 Boren (D-OK)
 Chiles (D-FL)
 Exon (D-NE)
 Hart (D-CO)
 Hollings (D-SC)
 Kennedy (D-MA)
 Leahy (D-VT)
 Metzenbaum (D-OH)
 Nickles (R-OK)
 Rudman (R-NH)
 Warner (R-VA)
 Zorinsky (D-NE)

NO--14 Responses

Burdick (D-ND)
 Danforth (R-MO)
 Durenberger (R-MN)
 Eagleton (D-MO)
 Goldwater (R-AZ)
 Hawkins (R-FL)
 Hecht (R-NV)
 Helms (R-SC)
 Johnston (D-LA)
 Laxalt (R-NV)
 Long (D-LA)
 Proxmire (D-WI)
 Stafford (R-VT)
 Stennis (D-MS)

Leans No --
14 Responses

Bentsen (D-TX)
 Bingaman (D-NM)
 Boschwitz (R-MN)
 Dodd (D-CT)
 East (R-NC)
 Glenn (D-OH)
 Grassley (R-IA)
 Hatfield (R-OR)
 Levin (D-MI)
 Mattingly (R-GA)
 Nunn (D-GA)
 Pryor (D-AR)
 Simpson (R-WY)
 Wallop (R-WY)

Undecided -- 4 Responses

Bradley (D-NJ)
 Domenici (R-NM)
 Lautenberg (D-NJ)
 McConnell (R-KY)

Please note: This is not a vote count on S. Res 28, but rather a survey of Senators' attitudes towards televised coverage of their proceedings that was conducted by C-SPAN in the summer of 1985 and updated in the ensuing months.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 937

Once you start television here, who would have the courage to get up here and say, "Stop it"? Even if it were a great mistake, nobody is going to say, "We will take away that right of the American people." Can you imagine the number of people who would have become C-SPAN junkies to the Senate and who might, for some crazy reason, be interested in the folk ways and some of the inane debates we have in the Senate? You could never take that away from them. They would flood us with cards and letters.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I am surprised that it has been stopped until now.

I guess I have to say that, in my mind, it would be no more difficult to stop television in the Senate after such an experiment that it is now, if the public opinion in favor of televising the Senate is the force which will prove to be unstoppable. That force exists today. The public opinion polls are overwhelming.

I understand the Senator's point, and I wanted to respond briefly to the earlier one, because a very similar argument was made before. I am speaking now of the argument that if we open up the Senate to television coverage and more people are aware of what the Senate is doing, that will change the character of debate.

A little over 200 years ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons. The question before the House was: Should newspaper reporters be allowed to cover the proceedings of the House of Commons?

There was a violent argument, and those opposed to opening up the proceedings to newspaper reporters said it will change the character of debate. One of them said: "The day may come when our speeches will be printed and hawked about the streets."

The statement proved to be prophetic, because our statements in the U.S. Senate are now printed and occasionally hawked about the streets.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is not sufficient?

Mr. GORE. But would the Senator from Louisiana turn back the clock and prevent newspaper reporters from having access to these debates, so that we could talk only to ourselves, so that our behavior on the floor would not be influenced by considerations of how our statements might appear to those outside this Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the Senator allow me to select which newspaper reporters?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the humor of the response. But, seriously, in philosophical terms, the argument is very similar. I wonder if the Senator sees that similarity?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It may be the same argument in philosophical terms. Of course, the answer is that neither I nor any colleague I know of would want to keep the print media out. It may be the same in philosophical terms, but it is not the same in practical terms; because, again, television is

the medium of politics, and television is the medium of the impression rather than of serious debate.

It has come to be, I think, that the print media goes into a question much more deeply than does television, with the exception of C-SPAN and maybe a few programs. The whole nightly news is about 20 minutes of news and 10 minutes of ads, or something like that proportion. About 7 or 8 minutes of the news is probably human interest stories.

Looking in on various human interest stories, it is the print media where you get the serious news.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN, the Senator also said.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And C-SPAN, that is correct.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN is a large part of what we are debating here because, as the Senator said, the evening television newscasts have only snippets and the coverage of the Senate debates on the evening television newscasts would consist of very short segments. The main coverage would be by C-SPAN and by other outlets that we may not know about yet that might choose to take advantage of a gavel-to-gavel signal.

Schools, for example, might wish to view the debates. But the point I was making is, if the Senator agrees that C-SPAN is in that rare category of serious indepth journalism that gives you all the facts and does not just treat its subjects emotionally and in terms of ephemeral images, then the Senator must be reassured about the fact that C-SPAN has already announced that it will provide gavel-to-gavel coverage on a second C-SPAN channel as soon as the Senate gives the go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I praised C-SPAN here at some length. I do not know whether I would say that it would be indepth coverage because I do not know that covering the proceedings on the floor of the Senate is necessarily indepth.

Mr. GORE. It would depend on us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would depend on us, but actually what goes on here on the floor of the Senate is sometimes where the action is. More frequently, the action is somewhere else.

Mr. GORE. Of course, committee meetings are already open to television coverage for the most part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. It does not seem to have done much damage there.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not done, I do not think, any damage, other than the heat of the light sometimes makes it a little too much, and it clearly has affected the conduct of Senators on a hearing which otherwise would be rather desultory; if not desultory, at least would be efficient in the sense that the speakers could make their statements and questions would be crispy and to the point. You put the television there and I will say this, it increases attendance and it makes

people show up on time, especially in those committees like the Budget Committee where your order of asking questions is determined by what time you get there.

Mr. GORE. That is not all bad, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think maybe the business of the committee could be done better with fewer questions and fewer Senators to show up, but at least on the surface to get people there on time and greater numbers, it is supposed to be better. But every Senator who uses up his full allowance of time to ask questions and it is frequent as it was in our last Budget Committee meeting when by the time we finished the first round of questions by that time—it was a 2 o'clock meeting—it was 4 o'clock by the time we finished and television was packing up and all the Senators had left and only one witness had testified. I mean, we had our James Miller, Director of OMB, and he was the only one who could testify. We also had Ruddy Penner and Mr. Boucher from GAO, and neither one of those got on before 4 o'clock.

Whether that was for good or for evil that people showed up on time and asked all their questions, it dramatically changed the way Senators reacted. It made them speak longer and it made all of them speak.

The point is I think you put TV here it is going to make Senators speak longer, and I fear all of them will want to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Some people argue for full access by television to the Senate Chambers according to rules which would allow individual stations and/or networks to bring their own cameras into the gallery whenever they chose, along with their own lights and whatever paraphernalia they felt was essential to their journalistic enterprise.

I argued as a Member of the other body and I have argued here as a member of the Rules Committee that it would be a mistake for the Senate to offer untrammelled access of that kind for reasons that parallel the concerns expressed by the Senator from Louisiana about what happens at some committee hearings.

If we had a situation where a horde of cameras would come in and focus their lights and lenses on a particular subject as it was debated, then the cameras themselves would influence the Senate's sense of priorities.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this resolution is it not true that that signal, through how many cameras are run by the Senate, is electronically and simultaneously available to all the networks and everyone in the world who wants it?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But the point I am making is this: here inside this Chamber there would be no dif-

Please note: We selected these two pages of the Senate TV debate to illustrate some of the points of discussion. For the full debate, please consult the Congressional Record for the week of Feb. 3-7.

ference that any Senator could perceive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The lights would be a little hotter, would they not?

Mr. GORE. No; they would be of equal intensity throughout the entire time the Senate was in session.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I mean, could they have television with these lights?

Mr. GORE. No. Excuse me. Let me make my point a little more clearly. I did not mean to say there would be no difference in the lighting after television compared to now. The lights would be brighter after television. The point I was making was different. Gavel to gavel during every moment of that time the Senate Chamber would appear the same. There would be no distortion of the Senate's proceedings according to the priorities of the television networks. When a particular Senator got up to speak they would not come rushing in. When a particular subject was brought up for debate, they would not come rushing in or leave at the whim.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They would already be there. They need not rush. They would be there every instant of the day so that every Senator who spoke would know that all the networks were already there.

Mr. GORE. But Senators would not know that the television cameras or that the people working for the networks were going to pay particularly close attention to the statement he or she was making at that time. In the committee context, when the television cameras come in, it does sometimes affect behavior. I think it wears off, as a matter of fact, as Members realize that it is a kind of a run-of-the-mill thing, but here on the Senate floor there would be no perceptible expression of interest on the part of a news editor. There would be no way of telling what was of a particular interest and concern. I raise that. It may sound like a convoluted point, but I raise it because I think it is one of the keys to the experience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does not the Senator know that every word that he would speak on the floor of the Senate would be available out there at least for 17 million Americans? I think that is the figure he said.

Mr. GORE. Twenty-three million.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-three million who are available for C-SPAN. I do not know what percentage of those who use C-SPAN, but let us say it is 3 or 4 million. I can tell you the Senator from Louisiana rarely has an audience of 3 or 4 million, and the ability to get an audience like that and speak to them at all times is enough, I can tell the Senator, to make a lot of Senators speak a tad longer and more often.

Mr. GORE. Let me finish the point I was going to make and then come back to that.

I think one of the keys to the favorable impact of television on the proceedings of the House of Representa-

tives has been that it is nonintrusive. Its presence is even. It does not perturb the proceedings of the other body. It is always present and, therefore, Members get used to it and begin to ignore it.

Coming to the point just made by the Senator from Louisiana if you knew that 2 or 3 million people were tuned into C-SPAN's coverage of the Senate as you spoke, you would also know if you reflected on it that only a fraction of them lived in Louisiana. You would know that they represented a broad cross section of all walks of life. You would know that they came to the issue being debated at any given time with no special expertise, only open minds and common sense.

The knowledge that such a cross section of American citizens was paying attention to the words spoken in this Chamber could only have a beneficial effect. Because, if, for example, an individual Senator wanted to play to the audience, so to speak, to which audience would that Senator play? The only audience available at the time would be such a diverse cross section of Americans that their only common denominator would be common sense. If its impact then was to encourage Senators to play to the common sense of the American people, that would be a very beneficial result, as it has been in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can tell the Senator that I strongly disagree with him. It is occasionally true that issues here on the floor of the Senate can be as well understood by broad cross sections appealing only to common sense. More frequently, the debates here involve what would appear to people out there in America as being esoteric considerations, technical considerations which Senators would understand, but which Americans may not. Therefore, I think one of your first results of television in the Senate would be that Senate debate would be not calculated to sway other Senators so much as to go out there on the airwaves to this cross section, maybe even hoping for network coverage, and based on commonsense considerations.

Now I do not mean to downgrade commonsense. But I am saying that when the length of what a Senator says is likely to be changed, the frequency with which he speaks is likely to be changed by television and the content of what he says is likely to be changed by television, because it would be a speech to them as opposed to our colleagues, I say that that is not a positive development. It may have a slight positive effect in maybe informing people of the issues of the day, but it would detract from the ability of this body to do its business when the water is already up to our noses in terms of being able to finish the work of this Senate in time to get home for Christmas.

In fact, it would not take many more days when you just could not finish at all and they would be banging the

gavel down on December 31, saying, "Under the rules of this Senate, this Congress has come to an end." Sorry; bang; goodbye.

Mr. GORE. I do not want to interject too much because the Senator may wish to complete the statement he began earlier. But just to make two brief points, first of all, I have often found it extremely helpful if Senators debating technical or esoteric issues can translate them into commonsense terms, to use the phrase we have bandied about here, because I personally find it much easier to understand them when they are so expressed and I do not think I am alone in this Chamber in that regard.

Second, and in conclusion as far as I am concerned—I will not further interrupt the Senator—I want to emphasize just one more time the experience of the House with respect to the length of the debates, because the Senator from Louisiana just said again that the impact would be to lengthen speeches on the floor of the Senate. It may well be that the rules here would override human nature, would override the disciplining effect of television broadcast coverage. But the only way to find out is by having a test period and trying it out. The American people want it by an overwhelming percentage. The majority of Senators want it, apparently.

What is proposed here is such a modest step to try it out, first on closed circuit; see exactly what it is like; see which arguments are correct and which are not correct. I just hope that our colleagues will approve this modest experiment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator, as I say, makes a very powerful argument which I think runs counter to the experience of modern politics and counter to human nature. As the boob tube comes to the Senate, I think it is going to change us dramatically for the ill.

I hope, if we do get television here in the Senate, we do two things: first of all, we make our experimental period a real test where the signal goes out to America, because a test that just has the lights and the camera and no people to see it is no test at all. That is not going to affect the way Senators speak, if they know that nobody is going to see them. It is the fact that they are speaking to all those millions of people out there and might get on the nightly news that would affect the way they do it.

Second, in addition to having a real test, I hope we could say "Only by unanimous consent." And it may be that television with unanimous consent—that is, when you have a time agreement—could work well. It certainly would be fair to all concerned and it would not prevent us from getting our business done. It may prevent you from getting unanimous consent but, once you got it, at least you would have time under control.

ference that any Senator could perceive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The lights would be a little hotter, would they not?

Mr. GORE. No; they would be of equal intensity throughout the entire time the Senate was in session.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I mean, could they have television with these lights?

Mr. GORE. No. Excuse me. Let me make my point a little more clearly. I did not mean to say there would be no difference in the lighting after television compared to now. The lights would be brighter after television. The point I was making was different. Gavel to gavel during every moment of that time the Senate Chamber would appear the same. There would be no distortion of the Senate's proceedings according to the priorities of the television networks. When a particular Senator got up to speak they would not come rushing in. When a particular subject was brought up for debate, they would not come rushing in or leave at the whim.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They would already be there. They need not rush. They would be there every instant of the day so that every Senator who spoke would know that all the networks were already there.

Mr. GORE. But Senators would not know that the television cameras or that the people working for the networks were going to pay particularly close attention to the statement he or she was making at that time. In the committee context, when the television cameras come in, it does sometimes affect behavior. I think it wears off, as a matter of fact, as Members realize that it is a kind of a run-of-the-mill thing, but here on the Senate floor there would be no perceptible expression of interest on the part of a news editor. There would be no way of telling what was of a particular interest and concern. I raise that. It may sound like a convoluted point, but I raise it because I think it is one of the keys to the experience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does not the Senator know that every word that he would speak on the floor of the Senate would be available out there at least for 17 million Americans? I think that is the figure he said.

Mr. GORE. Twenty-three million.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-three million who are available for C-SPAN. I do not know what percentage of those who use C-SPAN, but let us say it is 3 or 4 million. I can tell you the Senator from Louisiana rarely has an audience of 3 or 4 million, and the ability to get an audience like that and speak to them at all times is enough. I can tell the Senator, to make a lot of Senators speak a tad longer and more often.

Mr. GORE. Let me finish the point I was going to make and then come back to that.

I think one of the keys to the favorable impact of television on the proceedings of the House of Representa-

tives has been that it is nonintrusive. Its presence is even. It does not perturb the proceedings of the other body. It is always present and, therefore, Members get used to it and begin to ignore it.

Coming to the point just made by the Senator from Louisiana if you knew that 2 or 3 million people were tuned into C-SPAN's coverage of the Senate as you spoke, you would also know if you reflected on it that only a fraction of them lived in Louisiana. You would know that they represented a broad cross section of all walks of life. You would know that they came to the issue being debated at any given time with no special expertise, only open minds and common sense.

The knowledge that such a cross section of American citizens was paying attention to the words spoken in this Chamber could only have a beneficial effect. Because, if, for example, an individual Senator wanted to play to the audience, so to speak, to which audience would that Senator play? The only audience available at the time would be such a diverse cross section of Americans that their only common denominator would be common sense. If its impact then was to encourage Senators to play to the common sense of the American people, that would be a very beneficial result, as it has been in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can tell the Senator that I strongly disagree with him. It is occasionally true that issues here on the floor of the Senate can be as well understood by broad cross sections appealing only to common sense. More frequently, the debates here involve what would appear to people out there in America as being esoteric considerations, technical considerations which Senators would understand, but which Americans may not. Therefore, I think one of your first results of television in the Senate would be that Senate debate would be not calculated to sway other Senators so much as to go out there on the airwaves to this cross section, maybe even hoping for network coverage, and based on commonsense considerations.

Now I do not mean to downgrade commonsense. But I am saying that when the length of what a Senator says is likely to be changed, the frequency with which he speaks is likely to be changed by television and the content of what he says is likely to be changed by television, because it would be a speech to them as opposed to our colleagues. I say that that is not a positive development. It may have a slight positive effect in maybe informing people of the issues of the day, but it would detract from the ability of this body to do its business when the water is already up to our noses in terms of being able to finish the work of this Senate in time to get home for Christmas.

In fact, it would not take many more days when you just could not finish at all and they would be banging the

gavel down on December 31, saying, "Under the rules of this Senate, this Congress has come to an end." Sorry; bang; goodbye.

Mr. GORE. I do not want to interject too much because the Senator may wish to complete the statement he began earlier. But just to make two brief points, first of all, I have often found it extremely helpful if Senators debating technical or esoteric issues can translate them into commonsense terms, to use the phrase we have bandied about here, because I personally find it much easier to understand them when they are so expressed and I do not think I am alone in this Chamber in that regard.

Second, and in conclusion as far as I am concerned—I will not further interrupt the Senator—I want to emphasize just one more time the experience of the House with respect to the length of the debates, because the Senator from Louisiana just said again that the impact would be to lengthen speeches on the floor of the Senate. It may well be that the rules here would override human nature, would override the disciplining effect of television broadcast coverage. But the only way to find out is by having a test period and trying it out. The American people want it by an overwhelming percentage. The majority of Senators want it, apparently.

What is proposed here is such a modest step to try it out, first on closed circuit; see exactly what it is like; see which arguments are correct and which are not correct. I just hope that our colleagues will approve this modest experiment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator, as I say, makes a very powerful argument which I think runs counter to the experience of modern politics and counter to human nature. As the boob tube comes to the Senate, I think it is going to change us dramatically for the ill.

I hope, if we do get television here in the Senate, we do two things: first of all, we make our experimental period a real test where the signal goes out to America, because a test that just has the lights and the camera and no people to see it is no test at all. That is not going to affect the way Senators speak, if they know that nobody is going to see them. It is the fact that they are speaking to all those millions of people out there and might get on the nightly news that would affect the way they do it.

Second, in addition to having a real test, I hope we could say "Only by unanimous consent." And it may be that television with unanimous consent—that is, when you have a time agreement—could work well. It certainly would be fair to all concerned and it would not prevent us from getting our business done. It may prevent you from getting unanimous consent but, once you got it, at least you would have time under control.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 937

Once you start television here, who would have the courage to get up here and say, "Stop it"? Even if it were a great mistake, nobody is going to say, "We will take away that right of the American people." Can you imagine the number of people who would have become C-SPAN junkies to the Senate and who might, for some crazy reason, be interested in the folk ways and some of the inane debates we have in the Senate? You could never take that away from them. They would flood us with cards and letters.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I am surprised that it has been stopped until now.

I guess I have to say that, in my mind, it would be no more difficult to stop television in the Senate after such an experiment that it is now, if the public opinion in favor of televising the Senate is the force which will prove to be unstoppable. That force exists today. The public opinion polls are overwhelming.

I understand the Senator's point, and I wanted to respond briefly to the earlier one, because a very similar argument was made before. I am speaking now of the argument that if we open up the Senate to television coverage and more people are aware of what the Senate is doing, that will change the character of debate.

A little over 200 years ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons. The question before the House was: Should newspaper reporters be allowed to cover the proceedings of the House of Commons?

There was a violent argument, and those opposed to opening up the proceedings to newspaper reporters said it will change the character of debate. One of them said: "The day may come when our speeches will be printed and hawked about the streets."

The statement proved to be prophetic, because our statements in the U.S. Senate are now printed and occasionally hawked about the streets.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is not sufficient?

Mr. GORE. But would the Senator from Louisiana turn back the clock and prevent newspaper reporters from having access to these debates, so that we could talk only to ourselves, so that our behavior on the floor would not be influenced by considerations of how our statements might appear to those outside this Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the Senator allow me to select which newspaper reporters?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the humor of the response. But, seriously, in philosophical terms, the argument is very similar. I wonder if the Senator sees that similarity?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It may be the same argument in philosophical terms. Of course, the answer is that neither I nor any colleague I know of would want to keep the print media out. It may be the same in philosophical terms, but it is not the same in practical terms; because, again, television is

the medium of politics, and television is the medium of the impression rather than of serious debate.

It has come to be, I think, that the print media goes into a question much more deeply than does television, with the exception of C-SPAN and maybe a few programs. The whole nightly news is about 20 minutes of news and 10 minutes of ads, or something like that proportion. About 7 or 8 minutes of the news is probably human interest stories.

Looking in on various human interest stories, it is the print media where you get the serious news.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN, the Senator also said.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And C-SPAN, that is correct.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN is a large part of what we are debating here because, as the Senator said, the evening television newscasts have only snippets and the coverage of the Senate debates on the evening television newscasts would consist of very short segments. The main coverage would be by C-SPAN and by other outlets that we may not know about yet that might choose to take advantage of a gavel-to-gavel signal.

Schools, for example, might wish to view the debates. But the point I was making is, if the Senator agrees that C-SPAN is in that rare category of serious indepth journalism that gives you all the facts and does not just treat its subjects emotionally and in terms of ephemeral images, then the Senator must be reassured about the fact that C-SPAN has already announced that it will provide gavel-to-gavel coverage on a second C-SPAN channel as soon as the Senate gives the go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I praised C-SPAN here at some length. I do not know whether I would say that it would be indepth coverage because I do not know that covering the proceedings on the floor of the Senate is necessarily indepth.

Mr. GORE. It would depend on us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would depend on us, but actually what goes on here on the floor of the Senate is sometimes where the action is. More frequently, the action is somewhere else.

Mr. GORE. Of course, committee meetings are already open to television coverage for the most part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. It does not seem to have done much damage there.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not done, I do not think, any damage, other than the heat of the light sometimes makes it a little too much, and it clearly has affected the conduct of Senators on a hearing which otherwise would be rather desultory; if not desultory, at least would be efficient in the sense that the speakers could make their statements and questions would be crispy and to the point. You put the television there and I will say this, it increases attendance and it makes

people show up on time, especially in those committees like the Budget Committee where your order of asking questions is determined by what time you get there.

Mr. GORE. That is not all bad, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think maybe the business of the committee could be done better with fewer questions and fewer Senators to show up, but at least on the surface to get people there on time and greater numbers, it is supposed to be better. But every Senator who uses up his full allowance of time to ask questions and it is frequent as it was in our last Budget Committee meeting when by the time we finished the first round of questions by that time—it was a 2 o'clock meeting—it was 4 o'clock by the time we finished and television was packing up and all the Senators had left and only one witness had testified. I mean, we had our James Miller, Director of OMB, and he was the only one who could testify. We also had Ruddy Penner and Mr. Boucher from GAO, and neither one of those got on before 4 o'clock.

Whether that was for good or for evil that people showed up on time and asked all their questions, it dramatically changed the way Senators reacted. It made them speak longer and it made all of them speak.

The point is I think you put TV here it is going to make Senators speak longer, and I fear all of them will want to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Some people argue for full access by television to the Senate Chambers according to rules which would allow individual stations and/or networks to bring their own cameras into the gallery whenever they chose, along with their own lights and whatever paraphernalia they felt was essential to their journalistic enterprise.

I argued as a Member of the other body and I have argued here as a member of the Rules Committee that it would be a mistake for the Senate to offer untrammelled access of that kind for reasons that parallel the concerns expressed by the Senator from Louisiana about what happens at some committee hearings.

If we had a situation where a horde of cameras would come in and focus their lights and lenses on a particular subject as it was debated, then the cameras themselves would influence the Senate's sense of priorities.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this resolution is it not true that that signal, through how many cameras are run by the Senate, is electronically and simultaneously available to all the networks and everyone in the world who wants it?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But the point I am making is this: here inside this Chamber there would be no dif-

Please note: We selected these two pages of the Senate TV debate to illustrate some of the points of discussion. For the full debate, please consult the Congressional Record for the week of Feb. 3-7.

Is Senate lost in the shadows?

■ Minority Leader Robert Byrd, august in manner and white of mane, stood before his colleagues and uttered the awful truth: "The Senate is fast becoming the invisible half of Congress."

Senators again were debating whether to televise their proceedings, only this time proponents' pleas rang with new urgency: Day after day, the Senate is being upstaged, they said, not only by the most telegenic President ever but also by "the other body." Ever since the House of Representatives anointed its own TV system in 1979, its members have basked in electronic glory: Their floor speeches are broadcast coast to coast on cable, and excerpts are picked up by news programs. Meanwhile, citizens who yearn to see the Senate in action, one senator

noted, must "fly to Washington, take a taxicab to the Capitol, get a ticket . . . and then stand in line for one of only 611 seats in the gallery."

When debate began in early February on a proposed three-to-six-month test of a Senate TV system, senators were told that the camera's eye would do much to pep up their discourse, now said to be drooping. Lamented Paul Simon (D-Ill.): "I saw more members of the Senate in the dining room at breakfast than there are here on the floor."

Would electronic scrutiny ever cause embarrassment, revealing frivolity or inattention? The unspoken question was answered by Albert Gore (D-Tenn.): "The camera would be focused only on the senator speaking, so [a] senator who might be in an important committee meeting" would feel no need "to rush over to the floor . . . to be seen."

Opponents weren't persuaded. "I fear the television tail is going to be wagging the business of the nation," declared J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.). Russell Long (D-La.) warned that Senate debate, once rekindled, "could go on forever."

Champions of TV insisted the House had laid such worries to rest. Said Gore: "We have nothing to fear but the dark."

U.S. News & WORLD REPORT

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Feb. 17, 1986

Is Senate lost in the shadows?

■ Minority Leader Robert Byrd, august in manner and white of mane, stood before his colleagues and uttered the awful truth: "The Senate is fast becoming the invisible half of Congress."

Senators again were debating whether to televise their proceedings, only this time proponents' pleas rang with new urgency: Day after day, the Senate is being upstaged, they said, not only by the most telegenic President ever but also by "the other body." Ever since the House of Representatives anointed its own TV system in 1979, its members have basked in electronic glory: Their floor speeches are broadcast coast to coast on cable, and excerpts are picked up by news programs. Meanwhile, citizens who yearn to see the Senate in action, one senator

noted, must "fly to Washington, take a taxicab to the Capitol, get a ticket . . . and then stand in line for one of only 611 seats in the gallery."

When debate began in early February on a proposed three-to-six-month test of a Senate TV system, senators were told that the camera's eye would do much to pep up their discourse, now said to be drooping. Lamented Paul Simon (D-Ill.): "I saw more members of the Senate in the dining room at breakfast than there are here on the floor."

Would electronic scrutiny ever cause embarrassment, revealing frivolity or inattention? The unspoken question was answered by Albert Gore (D-Tenn.): "The camera would be focused only on the senator speaking, so [a] senator who might be in an important committee meeting" would feel no need "to rush over to the floor . . . to be seen."

Opponents weren't persuaded. "I fear the television tail is going to be wagging the business of the nation," declared J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.). Russell Long (D-La.) warned that Senate debate, once rekindled, "could go on forever."

Champions of TV insisted the House had laid such worries to rest. Said Gore: "We have nothing to fear but the dark."

U.S. News & WORLD REPORT

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Feb. 17, 1986



SUITE 155
400 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202 / 737-3220

Rankings by C-SPAN Households

State	C-SPAN Subscribers	State Subscribers	Cable Household Penetration	Total TV Households	TV Household Penetration
1. California	2,439,739	3,820,238	63.9%	9,339,900	26.1%
2. New York	1,689,620	2,421,022	69.8%	6,443,940	26.2%
3. Texas	1,544,723	2,535,379	60.9%	5,647,390	27.4%
4. Florida	1,254,165	2,156,130	58.2%	4,246,740	29.5%
5. Ohio	1,041,910	1,877,338	55.5%	3,974,690	26.2%
6. New Jersey	953,683	1,345,212	70.9%	2,664,020	35.8%
7. Pennsylvania	848,503	2,260,455	37.5%	4,351,740	19.5%
8. Michigan	847,674	1,202,604	70.5%	3,211,000	26.4%
9. Illinois	833,005	1,434,866	58.1%	4,188,750	19.9%
10. Massachusetts	679,261	1,054,012	64.4%	2,101,540	32.3%
11. North Carolina	512,073	921,644	55.6%	2,192,660	23.4%
12. Virginia	484,058	803,044	60.3%	1,970,300	24.6%
13. Connecticut	477,750	725,408	65.9%	1,123,700	42.5%
14. Washington	473,391	821,483	57.6%	1,642,450	28.8%
15. Louisiana	462,558	782,929	59.1%	1,573,050	29.4%
16. Indiana	459,855	786,209	58.1%	1,941,560	23.7%
17. Georgia	435,399	979,905	44.4%	2,014,800	21.6%
18. Missouri	414,563	645,554	64.2%	1,826,500	22.7%
19. Wisconsin	380,145	585,003	65.0%	1,733,930	21.9%
20. Arizona	360,071	408,718	88.1%	1,121,670	32.1%
21. Tennessee	358,326	703,364	50.9%	1,680,310	21.3%
22. Oklahoma	357,611	568,549	62.9%	1,252,390	28.6%
23. Alabama	343,702	604,742	56.8%	1,416,740	24.3%
24. Kentucky	314,052	622,391	50.5%	1,336,320	23.5%
25. Colorado	306,499	443,870	69.1%	1,220,170	25.1%
26. Maryland	299,637	405,929	73.8%	1,529,330	19.6%
27. Oregon	284,704	464,667	61.3%	1,014,200	28.1%
28. Iowa	270,784	460,628	58.8%	1,101,750	24.6%
29. Kansas	264,464	472,211	56.0%	920,830	28.7%
30. South Carolina	243,094	439,169	55.4%	1,141,160	21.3%
31. Minnesota	236,496	407,088	58.1%	1,500,782	15.8%
32. Nebraska	193,802	282,317	68.6%	591,850	32.7%
33. Hawaii	155,000	292,512	53.0%	323,720	47.9%
34. Rhode Island	143,504	151,452	94.8%	350,380	41.0%
35. New Hampshire	118,657	178,913	66.3%	347,670	34.1%
36. New Mexico	115,724	223,847	51.7%	490,640	23.6%
37. Mississippi	108,790	379,814	28.6%	865,830	12.6%
38. Montana	95,800	150,924	63.5%	305,750	31.3%
39. Arkansas	90,260	376,308	24.0%	828,970	10.9%
40. West Virginia	76,318	402,845	18.9%	706,720	10.8%
41. Idaho	72,007	163,655	44.0%	345,140	20.9%
42. Utah	69,897	121,921	57.3%	506,250	13.8%
43. Nevada	68,081	130,023	52.4%	362,210	18.8%
44. Maine	64,662	197,758	32.7%	419,800	15.4%
45. Wyoming	56,412	131,842	43.8%	191,520	29.5%
46. South Dakota	54,531	105,085	51.9%	257,380	21.2%
47. North Dakota	52,118	117,775	44.3%	244,830	21.3%
48. Alaska	51,946	63,508	81.8%	170,000	30.6%
49. Vermont	43,785	80,181	54.6%	189,750	23.1%
50. Delaware	33,473	146,498	22.8%	214,530	15.6%
Dist. of Columbia	*	—	—	239,670	—

7/30/85

Mr. JOHNSTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 937

Once you start television here, who would have the courage to get up here and say, "Stop it"? Even if it were a great mistake, nobody is going to say, "We will take away that right of the American people." Can you imagine the number of people who would have become C-SPAN junkies to the Senate and who might, for some crazy reason, be interested in the folk ways and some of the inane debates we have in the Senate? You could never take that away from them. They would flood us with cards and letters.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I am surprised that it has been stopped until now.

I guess I have to say that, in my mind, it would be no more difficult to stop television in the Senate after such an experiment that it is now, if the public opinion in favor of televising the Senate is the force which will prove to be unstoppable. That force exists today. The public opinion polls are overwhelming.

I understand the Senator's point, and I wanted to respond briefly to the earlier one, because a very similar argument was made before. I am speaking now of the argument that if we open up the Senate to television coverage and more people are aware of what the Senate is doing, that will change the character of debate.

A little over 200 years ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons. The question before the House was: Should newspaper reporters be allowed to cover the proceedings of the House of Commons?

There was a violent argument, and those opposed to opening up the proceedings to newspaper reporters said it will change the character of debate. One of them said: "The day may come when our speeches will be printed and hawked about the streets."

The statement proved to be prophetic, because our statements in the U.S. Senate are now printed and occasionally hawked about the streets.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is not sufficient?

Mr. GORE. But would the Senator from Louisiana turn back the clock and prevent newspaper reporters from having access to these debates, so that we could talk only to ourselves, so that our behavior on the floor would not be influenced by considerations of how our statements might appear to those outside this Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the Senator allow me to select which newspaper reporters?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the humor of the response. But, seriously, in philosophical terms, the argument is very similar. I wonder if the Senator sees that similarity?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It may be the same argument in philosophical terms. Of course, the answer is that neither I nor any colleague I know of would want to keep the print media out. It may be the same in philosophical terms, but it is not the same in practical terms; because, again, television is

the medium of politics, and television is the medium of the impression rather than of serious debate.

It has come to be, I think, that the print media goes into a question much more deeply than does television, with the exception of C-SPAN and maybe a few programs. The whole nightly news is about 20 minutes of news and 10 minutes of ads, or something like that proportion. About 7 or 8 minutes of the news is probably human interest stories.

Looking in on various human interest stories, it is the print media where you get the serious news.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN, the Senator also said.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And C-SPAN, that is correct.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN is a large part of what we are debating here because, as the Senator said, the evening television newscasts have only snippets and the coverage of the Senate debates on the evening television newscasts would consist of very short segments. The main coverage would be by C-SPAN and by other outlets that we may not know about yet that might choose to take advantage of a gavel-to-gavel signal.

Schools, for example, might wish to view the debates. But the point I was making is, if the Senator agrees that C-SPAN is in that rare category of serious indepth journalism that gives you all the facts and does not just treat its subjects emotionally and in terms of ephemeral images, then the Senator must be reassured about the fact that C-SPAN has already announced that it will provide gavel-to-gavel coverage on a second C-SPAN channel as soon as the Senate gives the go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I praised C-SPAN here at some length. I do not know whether I would say that it would be indepth coverage because I do not know that covering the proceedings on the floor of the Senate is necessarily indepth.

Mr. GORE. It would depend on us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would depend on us, but actually what goes on here on the floor of the Senate is sometimes where the action is. More frequently, the action is somewhere else.

Mr. GORE. Of course, committee meetings are already open to television coverage for the most part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. It does not seem to have done much damage there.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not done, I do not think, any damage, other than the heat of the light sometimes makes it a little too much, and it clearly has affected the conduct of Senators on a hearing which otherwise would be rather desultory; if not desultory, at least would be efficient in the sense that the speakers could make their statements and questions would be crispy and to the point. You put the television there and I will say this, it increases attendance and it makes

people show up on time, especially in those committees like the Budget Committee where your order of asking questions is determined by what time you get there.

Mr. GORE. That is not all bad, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think maybe the business of the committee could be done better with fewer questions and fewer Senators to show up, but at least on the surface to get people there on time and greater numbers, it is supposed to be better. But every Senator who uses up his full allowance of time to ask questions and it is frequent as it was in our last Budget Committee meeting when by the time we finished the first round of questions by that time—it was a 2 o'clock meeting—it was 4 o'clock by the time we finished and television was packing up and all the Senators had left and only one witness had testified. I mean, we had our James Miller, Director of OMB, and he was the only one who could testify. We also had Ruddy Penner and Mr. Boucher from GAO, and neither one of those got on before 4 o'clock.

Whether that was for good or for evil that people showed up on time and asked all their questions, it dramatically changed the way Senators reacted. It made them speak longer and it made all of them speak.

The point is I think you put TV here it is going to make Senators speak longer, and I fear all of them will want to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Some people argue for full access by television to the Senate Chambers according to rules which would allow individual stations and/or networks to bring their own cameras into the gallery whenever they chose, along with their own lights and whatever paraphernalia they felt was essential to their journalistic enterprise.

I argued as a Member of the other body and I have argued here as a member of the Rules Committee that it would be a mistake for the Senate to offer untrammelled access of that kind for reasons that parallel the concerns expressed by the Senator from Louisiana about what happens at some committee hearings.

If we had a situation where a horde of cameras would come in and focus their lights and lenses on a particular subject as it was debated, then the cameras themselves would influence the Senate's sense of priorities.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this resolution is it not true that that signal, through how many cameras are run by the Senate, is electronically and simultaneously available to all the networks and everyone in the world who wants it?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But the point I am making is this: here inside this Chamber there would be no dif-

Please note: We selected these two pages of the Senate TV debate to illustrate some of the points of discussion. For the full debate, please consult the Congressional Record for the week of Feb. 3-7.

ference that any Senator could perceive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The lights would be a little hotter, would they not?

Mr. GORE. No; they would be of equal intensity throughout the entire time the Senate was in session.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I mean, could they have television with these lights?

Mr. GORE. No. Excuse me. Let me make my point a little more clearly. I did not mean to say there would be no difference in the lighting after television compared to now. The lights would be brighter after television. The point I was making was different. Gavel to gavel during every moment of that time the Senate Chamber would appear the same. There would be no distortion of the Senate's proceedings according to the priorities of the television networks. When a particular Senator got up to speak they would not come rushing in. When a particular subject was brought up for debate, they would not come rushing in or leave at the whim.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They would already be there. They need not rush. They would be there every instant of the day so that every Senator who spoke would know that all the networks were already there.

Mr. GORE. But Senators would not know that the television cameras or that the people working for the networks were going to pay particularly close attention to the statement he or she was making at that time. In the committee context, when the television cameras come in, it does sometimes affect behavior. I think it wears off, as a matter of fact, as Members realize that it is a kind of a run-of-the-mill thing, but here on the Senate floor there would be no perceptible expression of interest on the part of a news editor. There would be no way of telling what was of a particular interest and concern. I raise that. It may sound like a convoluted point, but I raise it because I think it is one of the keys to the experience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does not the Senator know that every word that he would speak on the floor of the Senate would be available out there at least for 17 million Americans? I think that is the figure he said.

Mr. GORE. Twenty-three million.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-three million who are available for C-SPAN. I do not know what percentage of those who use C-SPAN, but let us say it is 3 or 4 million. I can tell you the Senator from Louisiana rarely has an audience of 3 or 4 million, and the ability to get an audience like that and speak to them at all times is enough, I can tell the Senator, to make a lot of Senators speak a tad longer and more often.

Mr. GORE. Let me finish the point I was going to make and then come back to that.

I think one of the keys to the favorable impact of television on the proceedings of the House of Representa-

tives has been that it is nonintrusive. Its presence is even. It does not perturb the proceedings of the other body. It is always present and, therefore, Members get used to it and begin to ignore it.

Coming to the point just made by the Senator from Louisiana if you knew that 2 or 3 million people were tuned into C-SPAN's coverage of the Senate as you spoke, you would also know if you reflected on it that only a fraction of them lived in Louisiana. You would know that they represented a broad cross section of all walks of life. You would know that they came to the issue being debated at any given time with no special expertise, only open minds and common sense.

The knowledge that such a cross section of American citizens was paying attention to the words spoken in this Chamber could only have a beneficial effect. Because, if, for example, an individual Senator wanted to play to the audience, so to speak, to which audience would that Senator play? The only audience available at the time would be such a diverse cross section of Americans that their only common denominator would be common sense. If its impact then was to encourage Senators to play to the common sense of the American people, that would be a very beneficial result, as it has been in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can tell the Senator that I strongly disagree with him. It is occasionally true that issues here on the floor of the Senate can be as well understood by broad cross sections appealing only to common sense. More frequently, the debates here involve what would appear to people out there in America as being esoteric considerations, technical considerations which Senators would understand, but which Americans may not. Therefore, I think one of your first results of television in the Senate would be that Senate debate would be not calculated to sway other Senators so much as to go out there on the airwaves to this cross section, maybe even hoping for network coverage, and based on commonsense considerations.

Now I do not mean to downgrade commonsense. But I am saying that when the length of what a Senator says is likely to be changed, the frequency with which he speaks is likely to be changed by television and the content of what he says is likely to be changed by television, because it would be a speech to them as opposed to our colleagues, I say that that is not a positive development. It may have a slight positive effect in maybe informing people of the issues of the day, but it would detract from the ability of this body to do its business when the water is already up to our noses in terms of being able to finish the work of this Senate in time to get home for Christmas.

In fact, it would not take many more days when you just could not finish at all and they would be banging the

gavel down on December 31, saying, "Under the rules of this Senate, this Congress has come to an end." Sorry; bang; goodbye.

Mr. GORE. I do not want to interject too much because the Senator may wish to complete the statement he began earlier. But just to make two brief points, first of all, I have often found it extremely helpful if Senators debating technical or esoteric issues can translate them into commonsense terms, to use the phrase we have bandied about here, because I personally find it much easier to understand them when they are so expressed and I do not think I am alone in this Chamber in that regard.

Second, and in conclusion as far as I am concerned—I will not further interrupt the Senator—I want to emphasize just one more time the experience of the House with respect to the length of the debates, because the Senator from Louisiana just said again that the impact would be to lengthen speeches on the floor of the Senate. It may well be that the rules here would override human nature, would override the disciplining effect of television broadcast coverage. But the only way to find out is by having a test period and trying it out. The American people want it by an overwhelming percentage. The majority of Senators want it, apparently.

What is proposed here is such a modest step to try it out, first on closed circuit; see exactly what it is like; see which arguments are correct and which are not correct. I just hope that our colleagues will approve this modest experiment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator, as I say, makes a very powerful argument which I think runs counter to the experience of modern politics and counter to human nature. As the boob tube comes to the Senate, I think it is going to change us dramatically for the ill.

I hope, if we do get television here in the Senate, we do two things: first of all, we make our experimental period a real test where the signal goes out to America, because a test that just has the lights and the camera and no people to see it is no test at all. That is not going to affect the way Senators speak, if they know that nobody is going to see them. It is the fact that they are speaking to all those millions of people out there and might get on the nightly news that would affect the way they do it.

Second, in addition to having a real test, I hope we could say "Only by unanimous consent." And it may be that television with unanimous consent—that is, when you have a time agreement—could work well. It certainly would be fair to all concerned and it would not prevent us from getting our business done. It may prevent you from getting unanimous consent but, once you got it, at least you would have time under control.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 937

Once you start television here, who would have the courage to get up here and say, "Stop it"? Even if it were a great mistake, nobody is going to say, "We will take away that right of the American people." Can you imagine the number of people who would have become C-SPAN junkies to the Senate and who might, for some crazy reason, be interested in the folk ways and some of the inane debates we have in the Senate? You could never take that away from them. They would flood us with cards and letters.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I am surprised that it has been stopped until now.

I guess I have to say that, in my mind, it would be no more difficult to stop television in the Senate after such an experiment that it is now, if the public opinion in favor of televising the Senate is the force which will prove to be unstoppable. That force exists today. The public opinion polls are overwhelming.

I understand the Senator's point, and I wanted to respond briefly to the earlier one, because a very similar argument was made before. I am speaking now of the argument that if we open up the Senate to television coverage and more people are aware of what the Senate is doing, that will change the character of debate.

A little over 200 years ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons. The question before the House was: Should newspaper reporters be allowed to cover the proceedings of the House of Commons?

There was a violent argument, and those opposed to opening up the proceedings to newspaper reporters said it will change the character of debate. One of them said: "The day may come when our speeches will be printed and hawked about the streets."

The statement proved to be prophetic, because our statements in the U.S. Senate are now printed and occasionally hawked about the streets.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is not sufficient?

Mr. GORE. But would the Senator from Louisiana turn back the clock and prevent newspaper reporters from having access to these debates, so that we could talk only to ourselves, so that our behavior on the floor would not be influenced by considerations of how our statements might appear to those outside this Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the Senator allow me to select which newspaper reporters?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the humor of the response. But, seriously, in philosophical terms, the argument is very similar. I wonder if the Senator sees that similarity?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It may be the same argument in philosophical terms. Of course, the answer is that neither I nor any colleague I know of would want to keep the print media out. It may be the same in philosophical terms, but it is not the same in practical terms; because, again, television is

the medium of politics, and television is the medium of the impression rather than of serious debate.

It has come to be, I think, that the print media goes into a question much more deeply than does television, with the exception of C-SPAN and maybe a few programs. The whole nightly news is about 20 minutes of news and 10 minutes of ads, or something like that proportion. About 7 or 8 minutes of the news is probably human interest stories.

Looking in on various human interest stories, it is the print media where you get the serious news.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN, the Senator also said.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And C-SPAN, that is correct.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN is a large part of what we are debating here because, as the Senator said, the evening television newscasts have only snippets and the coverage of the Senate debates on the evening television newscasts would consist of very short segments. The main coverage would be by C-SPAN and by other outlets that we may not know about yet that might choose to take advantage of a gavel-to-gavel signal.

Schools, for example, might wish to view the debates. But the point I was making is, if the Senator agrees that C-SPAN is in that rare category of serious indepth journalism that gives you all the facts and does not just treat its subjects emotionally and in terms of ephemeral images, then the Senator must be reassured about the fact that C-SPAN has already announced that it will provide gavel-to-gavel coverage on a second C-SPAN channel as soon as the Senate gives the go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I praised C-SPAN here at some length. I do not know whether I would say that it would be indepth coverage because I do not know that covering the proceedings on the floor of the Senate is necessarily indepth.

Mr. GORE. It would depend on us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would depend on us, but actually what goes on here on the floor of the Senate is sometimes where the action is. More frequently, the action is somewhere else.

Mr. GORE. Of course, committee meetings are already open to television coverage for the most part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. It does not seem to have done much damage there.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not done. I do not think, any damage, other than the heat of the light sometimes makes it a little too much, and it clearly has affected the conduct of Senators on a hearing which otherwise would be rather desultory; if not desultory, at least would be efficient in the sense that the speakers could make their statements and questions would be crispy and to the point. You put the television there and I will say this, it increases attendance and it makes

people show up on time, especially in those committees like the Budget Committee where your order of asking questions is determined by what time you get there.

Mr. GORE. That is not all bad, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think maybe the business of the committee could be done better with fewer questions and fewer Senators to show up, but at least on the surface to get people there on time and greater numbers, it is supposed to be better. But every Senator who uses up his full allowance of time to ask questions and it is frequent as it was in our last Budget Committee meeting when by the time we finished the first round of questions by that time—it was a 2 o'clock meeting—it was 4 o'clock by the time we finished and television was packing up and all the Senators had left and only one witness had testified. I mean, we had our James Miller, Director of OMB, and he was the only one who could testify. We also had Ruddy Penner and Mr. Boucher from GAO, and neither one of those got on before 4 o'clock.

Whether that was for good or for evil that people showed up on time and asked all their questions, it dramatically changed the way Senators reacted. It made them speak longer and it made all of them speak.

The point is I think you put TV here it is going to make Senators speak longer, and I fear all of them will want to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Some people argue for full access by television to the Senate Chambers according to rules which would allow individual stations and/or networks to bring their own cameras into the gallery whenever they chose, along with their own lights and whatever paraphernalia they felt was essential to their journalistic enterprise.

I argued as a Member of the other body and I have argued here as a member of the Rules Committee that it would be a mistake for the Senate to offer untrammelled access of that kind for reasons that parallel the concerns expressed by the Senator from Louisiana about what happens at some committee hearings.

If we had a situation where a horde of cameras would come in and focus their lights and lenses on a particular subject as it was debated, then the cameras themselves would influence the Senate's sense of priorities.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this resolution is it not true that that signal, through how many cameras are run by the Senate, is electronically and simultaneously available to all the networks and everyone in the world who wants it?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But the point I am making is this: here inside this Chamber there would be no dif-

Please note: We selected these two pages of the Senate TV debate to illustrate some of the points of discussion. For the full debate, please consult the Congressional Record for the week of Feb. 3-7.

Mr. JOHNSTON.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 937

Once you start television here, who would have the courage to get up here and say, "Stop it"? Even if it were a great mistake, nobody is going to say, "We will take away that right of the American people." Can you imagine the number of people who would have become C-SPAN junkies to the Senate and who might, for some crazy reason, be interested in the folk ways and some of the inane debates we have in the Senate? You could never take that away from them. They would flood us with cards and letters.

Mr. GORE. Frankly, I am surprised that it has been stopped until now.

I guess I have to say that, in my mind, it would be no more difficult to stop television in the Senate after such an experiment that it is now, if the public opinion in favor of televising the Senate is the force which will prove to be unstoppable. That force exists today. The public opinion polls are overwhelming.

I understand the Senator's point, and I wanted to respond briefly to the earlier one, because a very similar argument was made before. I am speaking now of the argument that if we open up the Senate to television coverage and more people are aware of what the Senate is doing, that will change the character of debate.

A little over 200 years ago, there was a debate in the House of Commons. The question before the House was: Should newspaper reporters be allowed to cover the proceedings of the House of Commons?

There was a violent argument, and those opposed to opening up the proceedings to newspaper reporters said it will change the character of debate. One of them said: "The day may come when our speeches will be printed and hawked about the streets."

The statement proved to be prophetic, because our statements in the U.S. Senate are now printed and occasionally hawked about the streets.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And that is not sufficient?

Mr. GORE. But would the Senator from Louisiana turn back the clock and prevent newspaper reporters from having access to these debates, so that we could talk only to ourselves, so that our behavior on the floor would not be influenced by considerations of how our statements might appear to those outside this Chamber?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would the Senator allow me to select which newspaper reporters?

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the humor of the response. But, seriously, in philosophical terms, the argument is very similar. I wonder if the Senator sees that similarity?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It may be the same argument in philosophical terms. Of course, the answer is that neither I nor any colleague I know of would want to keep the print media out. It may be the same in philosophical terms, but it is not the same in practical terms; because, again, television is

the medium of politics, and television is the medium of the impression rather than of serious debate.

It has come to be, I think, that the print media goes into a question much more deeply than does television, with the exception of C-SPAN and maybe a few programs. The whole nightly news is about 20 minutes of news and 10 minutes of ads, or something like that proportion. About 7 or 8 minutes of the news is probably human interest stories.

Looking in on various human interest stories, it is the print media where you get the serious news.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN, the Senator also said.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And C-SPAN, that is correct.

Mr. GORE. And C-SPAN is a large part of what we are debating here because, as the Senator said, the evening television newscasts have only snippets and the coverage of the Senate debates on the evening television newscasts would consist of very short segments. The main coverage would be by C-SPAN and by other outlets that we may not know about yet that might choose to take advantage of a gavel-to-gavel signal.

Schools, for example, might wish to view the debates. But the point I was making is, if the Senator agrees that C-SPAN is in that rare category of serious indepth journalism that gives you all the facts and does not just treat its subjects emotionally and in terms of ephemeral images, then the Senator must be reassured about the fact that C-SPAN has already announced that it will provide gavel-to-gavel coverage on a second C-SPAN channel as soon as the Senate gives the go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I praised C-SPAN here at some length. I do not know whether I would say that it would be indepth coverage because I do not know that covering the proceedings on the floor of the Senate is necessarily indepth.

Mr. GORE. It would depend on us.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would depend on us, but actually what goes on here on the floor of the Senate is sometimes where the action is. More frequently, the action is somewhere else.

Mr. GORE. Of course, committee meetings are already open to television coverage for the most part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. GORE. It does not seem to have done much damage there.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not done, I do not think, any damage, other than the heat of the light sometimes makes it a little too much, and it clearly has affected the conduct of Senators on a hearing which otherwise would be rather desultory; if not desultory, at least would be efficient in the sense that the speakers could make their statements and questions would be crispy and to the point. You put the television there and I will say this, it increases attendance and it makes

people show up on time, especially in those committees like the Budget Committee where your order of asking questions is determined by what time you get there.

Mr. GORE. That is not all bad, is it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think maybe the business of the committee could be done better with fewer questions and fewer Senators to show up, but at least on the surface to get people there on time and greater numbers, it is supposed to be better. But every Senator who uses up his full allowance of time to ask questions and it is frequent as it was in our last Budget Committee meeting when by the time we finished the first round of questions by that time—it was a 2 o'clock meeting—it was 4 o'clock by the time we finished and television was packing up and all the Senators had left and only one witness had testified. I mean, we had our James Miller, Director of OMB, and he was the only one who could testify. We also had Ruddy Penner and Mr. Boucher from GAO, and neither one of those got on before 4 o'clock.

Whether that was for good or for evil that people showed up on time and asked all their questions, it dramatically changed the way Senators reacted. It made them speak longer and it made all of them speak.

The point is I think you put TV here it is going to make Senators speak longer, and I fear all of them will want to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Some people argue for full access by television to the Senate Chambers according to rules which would allow individual stations and/or networks to bring their own cameras into the gallery whenever they chose, along with their own lights and whatever paraphernalia they felt was essential to their journalistic enterprise.

I argued as a Member of the other body and I have argued here as a member of the Rules Committee that it would be a mistake for the Senate to offer untrammelled access of that kind for reasons that parallel the concerns expressed by the Senator from Louisiana about what happens at some committee hearings.

If we had a situation where a horde of cameras would come in and focus their lights and lenses on a particular subject as it was debated, then the cameras themselves would influence the Senate's sense of priorities.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under this resolution is it not true that that signal, through how many cameras are run by the Senate, is electronically and simultaneously available to all the networks and everyone in the world who wants it?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. But the point I am making is this: here inside this Chamber there would be no dif-

Please note: We selected these two pages of the Senate TV debate to illustrate some of the points of discussion. For the full debate, please consult the Congressional Record for the week of Feb. 3-7.

ference that any Senator could perceive.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The lights would be a little hotter, would they not?

Mr. GORE. No; they would be of equal intensity throughout the entire time the Senate was in session.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I mean, could they have television with these lights?

Mr. GORE. No. Excuse me. Let me make my point a little more clearly. I did not mean to say there would be no difference in the lighting after television compared to now. The lights would be brighter after television. The point I was making was different. Gavel to gavel during every moment of that time the Senate Chamber would appear the same. There would be no distortion of the Senate's proceedings according to the priorities of the television networks. When a particular Senator got up to speak they would not come rushing in. When a particular subject was brought up for debate, they would not come rushing in or leave at the whim.

Mr. JOHNSTON. They would already be there. They need not rush. They would be there every instant of the day so that every Senator who spoke would know that all the networks were already there.

Mr. GORE. But Senators would not know that the television cameras or that the people working for the networks were going to pay particularly close attention to the statement he or she was making at that time. In the committee context, when the television cameras come in, it does sometimes affect behavior. I think it wears off, as a matter of fact, as Members realize that it is a kind of a run-of-the-mill thing, but here on the Senate floor there would be no perceptible expression of interest on the part of a news editor. There would be no way of telling what was of a particular interest and concern. I raise that. It may sound like a convoluted point, but I raise it because I think it is one of the keys to the experience of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Does not the Senator know that every word that he would speak on the floor of the Senate would be available out there at least for 17 million Americans? I think that is the figure he said.

Mr. GORE. Twenty-three million.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Twenty-three million who are available for C-SPAN. I do not know what percentage of those who use C-SPAN, but let us say it is 3 or 4 million. I can tell you the Senator from Louisiana rarely has an audience of 3 or 4 million, and the ability to get an audience like that and speak to them at all times is enough, I can tell the Senator, to make a lot of Senators speak a tad longer and more often.

Mr. GORE. Let me finish the point I was going to make and then come back to that.

I think one of the keys to the favorable impact of television on the proceedings of the House of Representa-

tives has been that it is nonintrusive. Its presence is even. It does not perturb the proceedings of the other body. It is always present and, therefore, Members get used to it and begin to ignore it.

Coming to the point just made by the Senator from Louisiana if you knew that 2 or 3 million people were tuned into C-SPAN's coverage of the Senate as you spoke, you would also know if you reflected on it that only a fraction of them lived in Louisiana. You would know that they represented a broad cross section of all walks of life. You would know that they came to the issue being debated at any given time with no special expertise, only open minds and common sense.

The knowledge that such a cross section of American citizens was paying attention to the words spoken in this Chamber could only have a beneficial effect. Because, if, for example, an individual Senator wanted to play to the audience, so to speak, to which audience would that Senator play? The only audience available at the time would be such a diverse cross section of Americans that their only common denominator would be common sense. If its impact then was to encourage Senators to play to the common sense of the American people, that would be a very beneficial result, as it has been in the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can tell the Senator that I strongly disagree with him. It is occasionally true that issues here on the floor of the Senate can be as well understood by broad cross sections appealing only to common sense. More frequently, the debates here involve what would appear to people out there in America as being esoteric considerations, technical considerations which Senators would understand, but which Americans may not. Therefore, I think one of your first results of television in the Senate would be that Senate debate would be not calculated to sway other Senators so much as to go out there on the airwaves to this cross section, maybe even hoping for network coverage, and based on commonsense considerations.

Now I do not mean to downgrade commonsense. But I am saying that when the length of what a Senator says is likely to be changed, the frequency with which he speaks is likely to be changed by television and the content of what he says is likely to be changed by television, because it would be a speech to them as opposed to our colleagues, I say that that is not a positive development. It may have a slight positive effect in maybe informing people of the issues of the day, but it would detract from the ability of this body to do its business when the water is already up to our noses in terms of being able to finish the work of this Senate in time to get home for Christmas.

In fact, it would not take many more days when you just could not finish at all and they would be banging the

gavel down on December 31, saying, "Under the rules of this Senate, this Congress has come to an end." Sorry; bang; goodbye.

Mr. GORE. I do not want to interject too much because the Senator may wish to complete the statement he began earlier. But just to make two brief points, first of all, I have often found it extremely helpful if Senators debating technical or esoteric issues can translate them into commonsense terms, to use the phrase we have bandied about here, because I personally find it much easier to understand them when they are so expressed and I do not think I am alone in this Chamber in that regard.

Second, and in conclusion as far as I am concerned—I will not further interrupt the Senator—I want to emphasize just one more time the experience of the House with respect to the length of the debates, because the Senator from Louisiana just said again that the impact would be to lengthen speeches on the floor of the Senate. It may well be that the rules here would override human nature, would override the disciplining effect of television broadcast coverage. But the only way to find out is by having a test period and trying it out. The American people want it by an overwhelming percentage. The majority of Senators want it, apparently.

What is proposed here is such a modest step to try it out, first on closed circuit; see exactly what it is like; see which arguments are correct and which are not correct. I just hope that our colleagues will approve this modest experiment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator, as I say, makes a very powerful argument which I think runs counter to the experience of modern politics and counter to human nature. As the boob tube comes to the Senate, I think it is going to change us dramatically for the ill.

I hope, if we do get television here in the Senate, we do two things: first of all, we make our experimental period a real test where the signal goes out to America, because a test that just has the lights and the camera and no people to see it is no test at all. That is not going to affect the way Senators speak, if they know that nobody is going to see them. It is the fact that they are speaking to all those millions of people out there and might get on the nightly news that would affect the way they do it.

Second, in addition to having a real test, I hope we could say "Only by unanimous consent." And it may be that television with unanimous consent—that is, when you have a time agreement—could work well. It certainly would be fair to all concerned and it would not prevent us from getting our business done. It may prevent you from getting unanimous consent but, once you got it, at least you would have time under control.

Richmond Times-Dispatch

Senators debate merits of camera

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Senators opened debate Monday on whether to televise their proceedings and proponents argued the relentless eye of the camera would inhibit rather than encourage "grandstanding." They remained deadlocked on the issue yesterday.

Sen. Albert Gore Jr., D-Tenn., who has served in the other chamber, contended that televising House proceedings "has helped rein in grandstanding."

But Sen. Russell B. Long, D-La., who has opposed previous efforts to televise Senate deliberations, warned of the seductiveness of the cameras.

"Every senator cherishes in his bosom the hope that he can be eloquent some day," said the son of one of the Senate's great orators, Huey Long, the Louisiana "Kingfish."

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias Jr., R-Md., chairman of the Rules Committee that approved the resolution providing for a closed-circuit test of gavel-to-gavel coverage, spoke for the measure, saying, "The eye of the camera is very quick to spot the phony. It never blinks."

The committee reported that rules changes that might be necessary to streamline Senate procedures if television is permitted should be considered along with the resolution, which also provides for radiobroadcasts.

Republican leader Robert Dole of Kansas said television would provide "an accurate historical record of what transpires in the Senate."

Sen. Larry Pressler, R-S.D., said cameras on the floor could have recorded for posterity the facial expressions of Sens. John Glenn, D-Ohio, and Jake Garn, R-Utah, the only senators to have ventured into space, when they rose to speak on the loss of

the Challenger Seven.

It was, Pressler said, "A little moment of history lost forever."

Mathias said televising proceedings would help citizens understand government and quoted Samuel Johnson, the 18th century moralist, as saying, "The greatest inducement to a clear conscience is the suspicion that someone is watching."

Democratic leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia said, "We should not hide behind tradition, but rather take every advantage available to us to prove our best known tradition — that we are the greatest deliberative body in the world."

Only about a half dozen senators were on the floor during the debate and only a couple of dozen spectators were in the visitors' gallery.

Jack Murphy of Saranac Lake, N.Y., listened to the debate and said later he favored televising the proceedings.

"When you have an interest in a particular subject, you could feel like you were involved," he said.

But John Gibson, a visitor from Scottsboro, Ala., was not much impressed. "If they did televise it," Gibson said, "I don't think anybody would watch it."

February 7, 1986

Is Senate lost in the shadows?

■ Minority Leader Robert Byrd, august in manner and white of mane, stood before his colleagues and uttered the awful truth: "The Senate is fast becoming the invisible half of Congress."

Senators again were debating whether to televise their proceedings, only this time proponents' pleas rang with new urgency: Day after day, the Senate is being upstaged, they said, not only by the most telegenic President ever but also by "the other body." Ever since the House of Representatives anointed its own TV system in 1979, its members have basked in electronic glory: Their floor speeches are broadcast coast to coast on cable, and excerpts are picked up by news programs. Meanwhile, citizens who yearn to see the Senate in action, one senator

noted, must "fly to Washington, take a taxicab to the Capitol, get a ticket . . . and then stand in line for one of only 611 seats in the gallery."

When debate began in early February on a proposed three-to-six-month test of a Senate TV system, senators were told that the camera's eye would do much to pep up their discourse, now said to be drooping. Lamented Paul Simon (D-Ill.): "I saw more members of the Senate in the dining room at breakfast than there are here on the floor."

Would electronic scrutiny ever cause embarrassment, revealing frivolity or inattention? The unspoken question was answered by Albert Gore (D-Tenn.): "The camera would be focused only on the senator speaking, so [a] senator who might be in an important committee meeting" would feel no need "to rush over to the floor . . . to be seen."

Opponents weren't persuaded. "I fear the television tail is going to be wagging the business of the nation," declared J. Bennett Johnston (D-La.). Russell Long (D-La.) warned that Senate debate, once rekindled, "could go on forever."

Champions of TV insisted the House had laid such worries to rest. Said Gore: "We have nothing to fear but the dark."

U.S. News & WORLD REPORT

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Feb. 17, 1986

extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of S. Res. 28, TV in the Senate.

I think it is safe to say there will be no votes on Monday. We will have hopefully a lively discussion. It is a very important matter to every Member of this body, and I hope we will have a full debate, and I am certain we will, and we do have at least an understanding there will be no votes after 6 p.m.

I think it is fair to say in this case there will be no votes on Monday. There will be debate.

Then, at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, we will resume consideration of S. 638, the Conrail sale, and it is my hope, based on conversations with the principals on all sides, that we could conclude, finally dispose of that bill maybe midafternoon or early evening, and then, depending on what time it may be, return to TV in the Senate, hopefully

conclude action on TV in the Senate next week and the following week, if we conclude TV in the Senate, it will be my intention to bring up the Genocide Convention.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for calling up S. Res. 28 on Monday next. He is keeping his commitment that was made several weeks ago when I asked the distinguished majority leader if he would give assurance that S. Res. 28 would be brought up before the Senate early in the Second Session, and that commitment was made during the First Session, the closing days of the First Session. He has kept his commitment and fulfilled his assurance, as I knew he would.

I just want the RECORD to show that I and those who are very supportive of this resolution are appreciative of the distinguished leader calling up S. Res. 28 very early in the session and, as he indicated last year, he would try to do that immediately following the disposition of the Conrail legislation.

I commend him and I thank him.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

In my view I think the Senate is ready to act. It seems to me there has

been a rather decided change just in the past 6 or 8 months. I will confess this Senator has changed some of his views.

I would hope that we could put together a responsible package and do it in fairly short order.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move the Senate stand in recess until 12 noon on Monday, February 3, 1986.

The motion was agreed to and, at 7:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until Monday, February 3, 1986, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1986:

BOARD OF INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

James Albert Michener, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board for International Broadcasting for a term expiring April 28, 1987, reappointment.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION AGENCY

Carlos Salman, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1988, reappointment.

C-SPAN Survey on Senate Television/ Breakdown by Responses

YES--53 responses

Andrews (R-ND)
Armstrong (R-CO)
Bumpers (D-AR)
Byrd (D-WV)
Chafee (R-RI)
Cochran R-MS)
Cohen (R-ME)
Cranston (D-CA)
D'Amato (R-NY)
DeConcini (D-AZ)
Denton (R-AL)
Dixon (D-IL)
Dole (R-KS)
Evans (R-WA)
Ford (D-KY)
Garn (R-UT)
Gore (T-TN)
Gramm (R-TX)
Harkin (D-IA)
Hatch (R-UT)
Heflin (D-AL)
Heinz (R-PA)
Humphrey (R-NH)
Inouye (D-HI)
Kassebaum (R-KS)
Kasten (R-WI)
Kerry (D-MA)
Lugar (R-IN)
Mathias (R-MD)
Matsunaga (D-HI)
McClure (R-ID)
Melcher (D-MT)
Mitchell (D-ME)
Moynihan (D-NY)
Murkowski (R-AK)
Packwood (R-OR)
Pell(D-RI)
Pressler (R-SD)
Quayle (R-IN)
Riegle (D-MI)
Rockefeller (D-WV)
Roth (R-DE)
Sarbanes (D-MD)
Sasser (D-TN)
Simon (D-IL)
Specter (R-PA)
Stevens (R-AK)
Symms (R-ID)
Tribble (R-VA)
Thurmond (R-SC)
Weicker (R-CT)
Wilson (R-CA)
Gorton (R-WA)

LEANS YES --
15 responses

Abdnor (R-SD)
Baucus (D-MT)
Biden (D-DE)
Boren (D-OK)
Chiles (D-FL)
Exon (D-NE)
Hart (D-CO)
Hollings (D-SC)
Kennedy (D-MA)
Leahy (D-VT)
Metzenbaum (D-OH)
Nickles (R-OK)
Rudman (R-NH)
Warner (R-VA)
Zorinsky (D-NE)

NO--14 Responses

Burdick (D-ND)
Danforth (R-MO)
Durenberger (R-MN)
Eagleton (D-MO)
Goldwater (R-AZ)
Hawkins (R-FL)
Hecht (R-NV)
Helms (R-SC)
Johnston (D-LA)
Laxalt (R-NV)
Long (D-LA)
Proxmire (D-WI)
Stafford (R-VT)
Stennis (D-MS)

Leans No --
14 Responses

Bentsen (D-TX)
Bingaman (D-NM)
Boschwitz (R-MN)
Dodd (D-CT)
East (R-NC)
Glenn (D-OH)
Grassley (R-IA)
Hatfield (R-OR)
Levin (D-MI)
Mattingly (R-GA)
Nunn (D-GA)
Pryor (D-AR)
Simpson (R-WY)
Wallop (R-WY)

Undecided -- 4 Responses

Bradley (D-NJ)
Domenici (R-NM)
Lautenberg (D-NJ)
McConnell (R-KY)

Please note: This is not a vote count on S. Res 28, but rather a survey of Senators' attitudes towards televised coverage of their proceedings that was conducted by C-SPAN in the summer of 1985 and updated in the ensuing months.