

even though three-fourths are eligible for the relief. This bill will help rural families apply for food stamps online or by telephone. It eliminates the need to travel to food stamp offices. In addition, the bill also supports stronger public-private partnerships to distribute information about nutrition assistance programs.

Finally, the bill increases federal support for emergency food programs, which have had sharp increases in requests for help in the past year. Many food banks find themselves unable to meet the heavy new demands. America's Second Harvest reports that 23.3 million people—equal to the combined population of the 10 largest U.S. cities—received emergency hunger relief last year—two million more than in 1997. One-in-five local charitable agencies were already facing problems that threatened their ability to serve hungry people in their communities—before the current economic crisis.

For all of these reasons, it is critical that we maintain the \$6.2 billion funding level for the nutrition title of this bill. This amount is urgently needed and it must be part of the final bill. The policy changes that will be accomplished will make an enormous difference in the lives of many families. Fewer children will go to bed hungry and arrive at school hungry and unfed.

The current downturn in the economy means that even more families, including farm families, are facing the impossible choice between feeding their children and paying the rent, a choice no person should have to make. We have the resources to make the modest investment that is necessary. Once again, I commend Senator HARKIN and Senator LUGAR for their skillful work and I urge my colleagues to support the needed funding levels for nutrition.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, it would appear that after more than a decade of discussions about campaign finance reform, the House of Representatives and the Senate may be nearer an accord on a historic change of how Federal elections are conducted in the United States. It is none too soon. Confidence in our political process has been undermined, the integrity of the Congress itself has been questioned, and the system is badly in need of repair.

We are very indebted to a number of people in this institution and different

institutions around the country, but in a strange irony, at a stroke before midnight, one of the elements that has been driving reform is undermining a critical component of the change.

Much of what America knows about the abuses of campaign reform has come through the media. Across the Congress today, the Broadcasters Association, led by scores of lobbyists representing millions of dollars of donations of the very type and scale that we seek to control, is undermining the bill.

Campaign finance reform, as passed by this Senate and the legislation pending in the House, includes a critical component for controlling and reducing the cost of television advertising.

The amendment, widely accepted in both Houses of Congress, is based on the proposition that controlling the amount of money raised must be met by an ability to control the amount of money spent. Controlling campaign fundraising without helping with the cost of campaigns will simply result in a diminished national political debate. Candidates will raise less money, and if the cost of advertising remains as high, we will lose the competitive debate, the exchange of ideas so vital to our democracy.

As any candidate for Federal office in the United States is painfully aware, the cost of campaigns is the cost of television advertising. Eighty-five percent of the cost of a Senate campaign goes to the television networks.

Under the amendment as passed by this institution, the networks would be required to sell time at the lowest unit rate available; that is, whatever rate they have set for their customers and sold at their lowest cost they must make available to a candidate for Federal office.

This provision was in previous Federal law since 1971, but in 1990 an FCC audit found that 80 percent of the stations had failed to give the lowest rate available. During the 2000 elections, a typical candidate had 65 percent of their advertising sold at above that lowest rate.

With my amendment now placed in the McCain-Feingold bill, passed by this Senate by a 69-to-31 vote on a bipartisan basis, that provision is now strengthened. It becomes mandatory, and it has the best chance of controlling these costs.

The chart on my left shows the scale of the problem: The percentage of ads actually sold at the lowest unit rate in the fall of 2000. Congress believed it made this a requirement before, but it has been evaded in the majority of cases.

Let's look at a few examples: Minneapolis, WCCO, 95 percent of the ads sold were not at the lowest rate; Detroit, WXYZ, 88 percent were not sold at the lowest rate. In my own market in northern New Jersey, WNBC New York, 78 percent were not sold at the lowest rate.

In the year 2000, the buying of these television ads cost candidates \$1 billion. This chart indicates as well the deluge of these ads, the amount of them now being placed on television.

Very simply, if we cannot hold in the McCain-Feingold bill and the Shays-Meehan bill in the House this element of controlling cost, this vital compromise that is campaign finance reform will be broken. It must be raising and it must be spending, and I ask the television networks to forgo these excess profits on the Federal airways, licensed by the Federal Government for the public good. Be part of reform. Don't undermine the reform. Let's change the system now for everybody's benefit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, SENATOR HERB KOHL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a tribute on the occasion of the birthday of one of our colleagues in the Senate, that of Senator HERB KOHL, Senior Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

I have known Senator KOHL for many years, since he first came to the Senate in 1989, and over that period of time, my respect and admiration for Senator KOHL has grown as I have watched him learn the role of a legislator and master the methods and the means of becoming a fine United States Senator.

Senator KOHL is hard-working, tenacious, and will fight to the end for the interests of this institution and those of his state. A few years ago when the Senate was debating legislation regarding the dairy industry, I remarked that Senator KOHL was the Stonewall Jackson of Wisconsin, standing firm for the interests of the dairy farmers in his state. When it comes to fighting for his state, or other issues of importance to him, such as measures to help and protect our nation's children, there is no one to outshine Senator KOHL in his dedication for the values he holds dear. That is one of the distinguishing characteristics of a good Senator.

But HERB KOHL is more than just a fine United States Senator, he is a good and decent man. His hallmark is honest modesty, a man of few words, but words of great meaning and words that deserve being heard. He is consistently kind to the people who work around him, especially his staff, who will follow him faithfully through thick and thin. His word is his bond, and to this Senator, there is no greater tribute than recognition of that fact.

Senator KOHL represents what is best about Senators and about Americans generally. He is a self-made man whose parents came to this country during the last century without an ability to speak the English language. From those humble beginnings, they and their son and other family members worked to develop a family grocery business in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, that became successful and grew to have national recognition. If you drive around

the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, you will notice Kohl stores, and they are evidence of the contribution Senator KOHL and his family have made to the commercial strength of this country.

The types of success that Senator KOHL has known have been the result of constant effort, a solid education in the Wisconsin public schools, and an understanding that hard work, honesty, intellectual clarity, and dedication to strong values are the key components to a successful career in either the business world or public service.

So, I want to honor Senator KOHL on this special day and pay him the recognition that he is due for all his work on behalf of the people of Wisconsin and all who serve here in the United States Senate.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DAVID SATCHER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a public servant who will soon complete his tenure as the 16th Surgeon General of the United States. Dr. David Satcher has served this Nation with distinction and performed the duties of the position of Surgeon General in an exemplary manner.

Dr. Satcher was born in Anniston, AL on March 2, 1941. He and his wife Nola have raised four children. Dr. Satcher graduated from Morehouse College in Atlanta in 1963 and received his M.D. and Ph.D. from Case Western Reserve University in 1970. He has completed numerous fellowships and holds many honorary degrees and distinguished honors. He has taught students, chaired Departments, and served as President of the Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee. As a public servant, he served as the Director for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry before assuming his current position as Surgeon General. During the period February 1998 through January 2001, Dr. Satcher simultaneously served as Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General of the United States.

Dr. Satcher is a learned, well-educated man of great accomplishment. Yet, in spite of his many degrees and awards, he set a simple goal of wanting to be a Surgeon General remembered for listening to the American people. He not only listened to those whose voices could be heard, but extended his reach to those who for far too long have suffered silently, those in our nation suffering with mental illness.

I first became acquainted with Dr. Satcher during his confirmation. I remember asking him to consider addressing the issue of suicide and its impact on the Nation. I was concerned about what we as a nation could do in an effort to prevent the nearly 30,000 lives lost annually to suicide. As Surgeon General, Dr. Satcher convened a consensus conference on suicide in

Reno, Nevada in 1998. He brought together scientists, clinicians, survivors, advocates and state mental health staff to examine the science of suicide prevention, that is what we knew and what we didn't know, and from this published the Surgeon General's Call to Action for Suicide Prevention. His next step was to develop a National Strategy for Suicide Prevention. In May 2001 this strategy to guide our national suicide prevention efforts was published. As we speak today, states, communities, tribes, and many others are coming together to discuss ways in which we can prevent suicide in America.

Dr. Satcher demonstrated time and time again his ability to engage the public and the private sectors to come together as we examined health problems facing our nation and sought solutions on how to address them. In the suicide prevention effort, Congress called for the development of a national strategy to guide our national response. Dr. Satcher embraced this challenge, provided the necessary leadership and vision to bring it about, and recognized from the outset that government alone could not provide the complete background nor could they singularly define the solution. He called upon the non-profit community, experts in research, clinical practitioners, and just as importantly, listened to the survivors who freely shared their experiences to ensure that our national effort was inclusive of all perspectives. The national problem of suicide warranted a comprehensive solution and, thanks to Dr. Satcher's leadership, the components considered were from all communities who had a perspective which needed to be heard.

I for one am truly grateful for the service of Dr. David Satcher. I care deeply about the issue of suicide in America for a number of reasons. Unfortunately, Nevada has the highest suicide rate in the nation. In fact, the top ten states for suicide are all west of the Mississippi. I believe we can make a difference by studying the facts and developing evidenced based programs to prevent the tragic loss of life due to suicide. I also lost my father to suicide many years ago. I've said many times before that back then we did not know as much about depression and treatment as we do now. Today, science and research have made incredible advances and through medication and counseling help is available and effective treatments can and do make a difference.

We have an obligation to help those suffering from mental illness or substance abuse to ensure they receive the treatment that can afford them a quality of life they deserve. I believe Dr. Satcher has made an incredible difference and helped countless individuals through his work as Surgeon General. We still have a long way to go in reducing stigma and affording access to mental health treatment in this nation, but we are further along today as

a result of the leadership provided by Dr. Satcher.

In closing, I wish to thank Dr. Satcher for his courageous work and dedicated public service. I am particularly grateful for his efforts in raising awareness and educating Americans about mental illness and suicide in America. We are a better nation as a result of his service as Surgeon General. He will be remembered by this Senator as the Surgeon General who listened to the American people. In my judgement, he not only listened, but he acted as well.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred April 6, 1997 in Tyler, TX. Two men attacked another man who the assailants perceived to be gay. The attackers, Billy Glenn Adams, 30, and James Dean Dickerson, 33, were charged with aggravated assault in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, every February our nation pauses to recognize the tremendous contributions of African-Americans to the history of our nation. In 1926, Dr. Carter G. Woodson established Negro History Week because he saw that most of the contributions African-Americans had made to American culture and industry were being ignored by historians.

We have come a long way since 1926. More and more of our history books acknowledge the contributions of African-Americans. Our schools have made it part of their curriculum. Libraries and museums create exhibits. Television executives highlight the contributions of African-American actors and screenwriters and our celebration of Black history has been expanded to an entire month. But we still have a long way to go.

We need Black History Month because people may not be aware of African-Americans who have added to the richness and greatness of our country. It is appropriate that as we stand in our nation's Capitol, which was built by the back-breaking labor of free and slave African-Americans, we talk about the contributions African-Americans