

people in the body to make sure the language is agreeable.

So I think we still have a good shot of doing it tonight. As I told the Senator from Florida, I recognize the importance of getting this money as quickly as possible in the people's hands, where they are not worried about money coming in. They are going to be able to take care of the people in Florida and emergencies around the country.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. As the Senator and I discussed last night, I was told by the Director of FEMA they are basically running out of money. By the end of the week, they are not going to have any cash to expend. So I think that ups the urgency of this appropriations.

I also appreciate the statement by the majority leader that this is just a first step. When we look at the needs, just for FEMA, from the first hurricane, Charley, it is going to exceed the \$2 billion request by the President. And that does not include all of the other agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Small Business Administration, the Economic Development Administration, the Defense costs. NASA has costs. You can go on down the list.

For example, compared to Hurricane Andrew 12 years ago, the FEMA cost then was \$2.9 billion. But the overall cost to the Federal Government, including all of the other agencies, was over \$6 billion. And that was just one hurricane, a magnitude greater than Charley, but now we have two. And Lord help us if we have three. But we are dealing in a range of probably \$4.5 billion out of these two.

So is it my understanding from the majority leader that it would be his intention, as he had discussed last night in our telephone conversation, that we would take up additional emergency appropriations next week?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in response to my colleague from Florida, I want to make it very clear, it is impossible to determine what the real requirement is going to be in Florida. The important thing is to look at this supplemental as a first major step to keep the emergency care, the shelters, the response flowing, and that there will be another supplemental. I will not have quite the sense of time urgency, meaning in hours. As you said, with FEMA not having sufficient funds by tomorrow, it means we need to act tonight or first thing in the morning. And we will follow up with appropriate deliberations as information comes forward and there are accurate requests being made and we can assess the full extent of the damage. But even with that, we need to do it quickly. It is not something we want to push way off into the future.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the majority leader and the minority leader for their cooperation because clearly the State of Florida is reeling under this one-two punch to which we have

been subjected. As a result, we have to act and act quickly.

I had a number of people in the press down in Florida asking me where the money was going to come from. If there is a reason for the Federal Government, it is to respond in times of emergency, whether that be a national emergency such as a war or a national emergency in times of natural disaster.

We have always done it. I remember when I came to Congress in 1979, one of the first votes I cast was in relation to the eruption of Mount St. Helens in the State of Washington. That place needed a great deal of Federal assistance to overcome all of the deficiencies that had happened to that society in the midst of that natural disaster.

Now we have not only the disaster of one hurricane but having the State crisscrossed with a big X over the center of the State almost like a bull's eye by the second hurricane. And thank the Good Lord it was not a category 4, which a day out it was a category 4. In this particular case, it had winds up to 145 miles an hour. Well, by the time it hit, it had subsided to a category 2, with winds up to 105 miles an hour. There is a huge difference in the destructive force of the winds going from 105 to 145 miles an hour. The destructive potential of that wind goes up exponentially as you raise the wind speed.

But what happened with Frances, even though it subsided to having winds up to 105 miles an hour when it hit the coast, with gusts up to 120 miles per hour, it lingered, it slowed, it stalled, it wobbled, and it was so massive it covered up the entire State of Florida so that parts that were thought to be immune from this hurricane because of the track of the hurricane, suddenly were engulfed in fierce winds and driving rain which has caused enormous flooding problems.

So it will be my intention, once we pass this emergency supplemental of \$2 billion—which is not going to anywhere cover just the costs for FEMA for the first hurricane—to come back for appropriate additional funds for the first hurricane as well as the second hurricane.

For example, besides FEMA, there are the expenses of the Department of Agriculture. We are going to have huge crop losses from Charley and now also from Frances. There is also the Small Business Administration, which has a number of relief programs in addition to low-interest loans; the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce; and the millions of dollars to assist the Department of Transportation, as well as the American Red Cross.

I mentioned some damage done to the Department of Defense, and NASA, for that matter. As a matter of fact, from the first hurricane, NASA incurred costs of \$750,000, and the hurricane only just scraped the edge of the space center. This one did significant damage, taking out 1,000 very large

panels on the vehicle assembly building, which is the largest building in volume where the space shuttle is stacked vertically. When we come together as the Federal Government, it is time to respond.

I thank my colleagues for their favorable consideration of this request. I remind them that we are not through yet. We have some major additional emergency supplemental appropriations. When we compare this to another major natural disaster such as Andrew, we can see the Federal Government spent over \$6 billion on the cost of recovery from Andrew. It won't be that much for these two storms, but it will be substantial.

I am very grateful to the Senate for listening to the pleas of the two Senators from Florida as we ask for its help in this time of need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I expect most Senators feel as do I: Whatever resources are needed by the citizens of Florida to recover should be provided by the Senate. I certainly will be one Senator who wants to support the \$2 billion emergency supplemental that is necessary now and whatever additional resources are needed to help Floridians recover from these devastating storms. The storm season is not even over at this point. Most of us do not understand, perhaps, the experience of the citizens of Florida. I did want to make the point earlier that when we do the second piece, there are some other parts of the country that are going to have to be dealt with. That was the point I was making.

I want to make sure everybody understands: Whatever resources are needed by the citizens of Florida, I believe the Senate should stand ready to say to them, you are not alone; this country wants to help in times of need and in times of emergency.

#### NETWORK COVERAGE OF CONVENTIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the two political conventions. My speech will not be about the politics of the conventions but about the coverage of the conventions.

Senator LOTT and I have worked all of this year and the major part of last year on an issue dealing with the concentration of broadcast ownership in a rule that was crafted by the Federal Communications Commission that would allow even greater concentration in broadcast ownership. That rule would have allowed in the larger cities for one company to purchase three television stations, eight radio stations, the cable system, and the largest newspaper, and that would be fine.

Many Republicans and Democrats don't think that is fine. We think the concentration of ownership of media

properties will mean that fewer and fewer Americans, probably fewer than a handful of Americans, will determine what the rest of the American people see, hear, and read. We don't think that is helpful.

A Federal court has overturned the rule the FCC developed and sent it back to them, saying "redo it." Senator LOTT and I and others hope the FCC will do this the right way. The right way would be to promote more economic opportunity and broader ownership, not concentrated ownership in radio and television and newspapers.

This relates to the coverage of the Republican and Democratic Conventions. I thought it was interesting this year that the coverage of the two political conventions was so spartan as to almost be nonexistent with respect to the major networks.

Michael Copps, a commissioner at the FCC, wrote an op-ed piece on the subject. I ask unanimous consent to print it in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 2004]

SHOW ME THE CONVENTION

(By Michael J. Copps)

As a Democratic commissioner on the Federal Communications Commission, I may not agree with many positions taken by speakers this week at the Republican National Convention. Even so, I believe our broadcast media owe us more coverage of an event that remains an important component of the presidential campaign. Yet tonight, if people around the country tune in to the commercial broadcast TV networks, most will not see any live convention coverage. That's not right.

Let's remember that American citizens own the public airwaves, not TV executives. We give broadcasters the right to use these airwaves for free in exchange for their agreement to broadcast in the public interest. They earn huge profits using this public resource. During this campaign season broadcasters will receive nearly \$1.5 billion from political advertising.

What do we get in return for granting TV stations free use of our airwaves? Unfortunately, when it comes to coverage of issues important to our nation, the answer is less and less. Coverage of the 2000 presidential election on the network evening news dropped by a third compared to reporting on the 1996 election. During the last election cycle we heard directly from presidential candidates for an average of 9 seconds a night on the news. Local races? Forget it. In 2002—the most recent midterm elections—more than half of local newscasts contained no campaign coverage at all. Local coverage has diminished to the point that campaign ads outnumber campaign stories by four to one. What coverage there is focuses inordinately on polls and handicapping the horse race.

TV executives tell us that the convention and campaign coverage provided by the cable channels is sufficient. I don't think so. Around 35 million Americans don't get cable, often because they cannot afford it. To put it in perspective, that's more than the combined populations of Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota. Furthermore, broadcasters legally undertake to serve the public interest themselves in exchange for free spectrum—their licenses don't allow them to

pass the buck to cable. Remember also that the vast majority of cable channels are national, not local. So don't look for local campaign coverage on cable, except in the few towns where local cable news exists. Most Americans still must look to their local broadcaster for news of local campaigns and issues.

The F.C.C. is doing nothing to help as the situation deteriorates. It has weakened almost every explicit duty stations once had for serving the public interest, like ensuring that stations cover local issues and offer viewers a diversity of opinion. Just as bad, the commission eliminated protections against media consolidation last year, even though critics warned that this would result in even less local coverage. Luckily a federal court rejected this decision, so we have another chance to save these rules.

The F.C.C. has also failed to set guidelines for how broadcasters will meet their public interest responsibilities when digital TV and multicasting become more widespread. To make matters worse, the F.C.C. now practically rubber-stamps TV license renewals, usually without auditing station records to determine whether licensees are fulfilling their public interest responsibilities or checking with communities to ensure that stations are meeting local needs.

Whether we are Democrats, Republicans or independents, we all can agree that democracy depends on well-informed citizens. So as you flip through the channels tonight while the convention is largely ignored, consider whether TV broadcasters, sustained by free access to the public airwaves in exchange for programming in the public interest, are holding up their end of the deal.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Copps makes the point that we give broadcasters the right to use the airwaves in exchange for their agreement to broadcast in the public interest. They don't own the airwaves. They are licensed to use them in exchange for broadcasting in the public interest. They also earn substantial money in broadcasting properties from advertising during television campaigns. It is expected they will earn nearly \$1.5 billion from political advertising.

What do we get in return? We get almost no coverage any longer, very spartan coverage of the two political conventions. Television and other executives say: That is because people can watch the conventions on cable television. Well, there are more channels. There is cable. But 35 million Americans don't get cable television.

Let me take a look at what has happened, as Mr. Copps describes it in his piece. On Monday, August 30, the Republican Convention was held in New York. This is a Monday evening. None of the networks decided they would cover the Republican Convention. It is strange for me to be protesting that, but nonetheless I think the networks have a responsibility and should have had a responsibility to provide extensive coverage of both political conventions. So on Monday night, they did not show the American people the speech by Senator McCain, our colleague. Incidentally, I think that speech should have been heard by the American people. They didn't air the speech by Rudy Giuliani. The American people should have heard that

speech. Why is it they couldn't have done that?

Let me show you what they were airing on Monday evening. They had "Access Hollywood." That was important. Then they went to "Fear Factor." That is where you sometimes tune in and you see people eating a bowl of maggots or whatever other disgusting thing happens on "Fear Factor." I have seen it as I have used the remote control to change the channels. "Complex Malibu," they aired—eight couples begin the competition by working on a master bedroom—and NFL preseason, and the "Last Comic Standing."

The American people couldn't get the Republican Convention that evening because this is what was aired on television. This was a Monday evening, the first evening of the convention.

What about the Democratic Convention? The networks decided they wouldn't broadcast on Tuesday evening of the Democratic Convention. They broadcast three nights, 1 hour each evening for three nights. On Tuesday evening, July 27, the keynote speaker Barak Obama spoke, Teresa Heinz spoke. The American people didn't get to listen to those speeches. They should have been able to.

Here is what was going on. They aired that evening "Trading Spouses, Meet Your New Mommy," "Wheel of Fortune," "Last Comic Standing," "Quintuplets," "The Amazing Race," eight teams travel from Argentina to St. Petersburg, Russia. The networks were too busy. They didn't want to put on 2 hours a night for four nights, or four hours a night, they used to do that.

Some people say the conventions are staged. Really? Well, there are a lot of stories at the conventions. But those stories are not covered these days by the major broadcast networks. Why? Because they are only broadcasting 1 hour a night, three nights; 3 hours, total 6 hours, for both the Republican and the Democratic National Conventions; 6 hours every 4 years. How does that relate to the obligation to serve in the public interest? How does that relate to what Senator LOTT and I and others have been talking about, how a few people decide what the American people read or hear? How many people do you think made the decision we will only offer 3 hours to the American people of the Republican National Convention on the major networks? How many people do you think made the decision we will only offer 3 hours of the Democratic Convention?

I think both the Republican Convention and the Democratic Convention were shortchanged. Why do I say that? Because the fact is, we make decisions in the political process. Our major national conventions are a significant part of the process. The dialog, the discussion, the debate in those conventions is a significant part of showing and telling the American people what these political parties are about. I

know we get plenty of television in politics. But most of it is 30-second incendiary, negative ads talking about who is the worst rather than who is the best. Very few of them have any ideas or talk about issues.

The question is, as Commissioner Copps points out in his editorial published in the New York Times, are the networks serving this country's interests by deciding they shall air only 3 hours every 4 years of a major political convention?

In 1976, the three major television networks provided more than 50 hours of television convention coverage. In 1996, 20 years later, that had dropped to 12 hours. This year it dropped to 6 hours.

The New York Daily News said that before cable and satellite, ABC, CBS, and NBC turned over their prime time to the conventions as a matter of civic duty.

It is interesting to me that these conventions are staged so tightly. One of the reasons they are created as tightly as they are with respect to agenda is to fit into the very short time period the networks now offer for the coverage of the conventions.

Mr. President, the issue of broadcast ownership and the concentration of broadcast ownership remains at the FCC. The question is, what will they do with these rules and how will the rules affect what people see and hear in the future? How does concentration of economic ownership in broadcast properties affect what we saw this year, the coverage of only 3 hours of the Republican and Democratic Conventions? I have described significant speakers the American people did not have an opportunity to see or hear. Someone made a decision it wasn't worth it. This is what Senator LOTT and I and others have been concerned about for a long while—about the concentration of ownership in broadcast properties.

Again, I am not against big in every circumstance. I don't think big is always bad or small is always beautiful. But in broadcast properties—radio, television, and newspapers—I think broad-based economic ownership best serves this democracy. I think when we see more and more concentration, where you have fewer and fewer people—in some cases a handful—deciding what the American people will see, hear, and read, frankly, I think that is unhealthy. One sign of that is what they decided to air at a time when they decided the two political conventions by the national Republican party and the national Democratic party were unworthy. I think it goes without saying that they have shortchanged the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of my remarks Senator HARKIN be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

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

#### ISSUES BEFORE THE SENATE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it has been quite a while since the Senate has been in session. I spent the entire time traveling up and down my State learning a lot from my people, as I always do. I am coming back here ready to work for as long as it takes to protect the American people, to do what we can about the health care crisis, Medicare, and the rest. How much we get done is going to be up to us. Of course, the leadership around here has to go to the bills that will make us safe, help our seniors, take up the issue of health care, and will get the deficits under control. That is their job. We will see what happens.

I hope we go to Homeland Security appropriations because there is a lot of work we need to do on that bill to make sure it truly does protect the American people.

#### BEST WISHES TO FORMER PRESIDENT CLINTON

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to use this opportunity to send my best wishes to President Clinton as he recovers from very serious surgery, which, thank the Lord, appears to be successful. I know the first few days are the toughest. We have had a number of calls into our office from my constituents. I wanted to say that if they want to send a message to President Clinton, they should, if they have access to a computer, go to the following site: [www.clintonpresidentialcenter.org](http://www.clintonpresidentialcenter.org).

Then they can go to the right side of the page and there is a link where they can send personal best wishes to President Clinton.

As usual, President Clinton is going to teach the country something about heart disease. I thought I would take a moment to say this is something I have been working on for years, since 1997. I introduced the Women's Cardiovascular Disease Research and Prevention Act. I was proud to do it with Congresswoman Maxine Waters. Together, we wrote this bill and it was to expand and coordinate the efforts of fighting heart attack, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases in women.

A lot of women don't think cardiovascular disease—heart attack and stroke—is a threat to them. Yet, if you look at the numbers, nearly 500,000 women die of cardiovascular disease each year. The number is far less for breast cancer. Of course, we live in fear of breast cancer, which kills far fewer. But cardiovascular disease in women is the biggest killer. More than 20 percent of Americans have some kind of cardiovascular disease, with over half being women.

So President Clinton, I know, is going to do very well. He has taught us so many things about issues and I know he will teach us a lot about how to prevent heart disease and how to make sure, if you have a family his-

tory, you take the right exams so that you find out early if you have it. I am proud my bill became law in 1998 as part of a larger bill on women's health.

#### AMERICAN DEATHS IN IRAQ

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, according to CNN this morning, there have been 999 total U.S. deaths in Iraq. We are one away from 1,000 deaths. When the President stood on the carrier with the "mission accomplished" sign behind him, 138 of our soldiers had died. That was May 1, 2003. Since the President declared mission accomplished—and he did it, as many of us said on both sides of the aisle, without a plan for the aftermath of the war, which was brilliantly executed—we have lost 861 more soldiers.

When I was home, I met with veterans from this war and the one in Afghanistan. Mr. President, 6,916 Americans have been injured in Iraq. According to a report in the L.A. Times, 57 percent have been injured so severely that they are unable to return to duty. I asked what the suicide rate was in Iraq. I learned from the military that the suicide rate is very high—64 percent higher than the suicide rate in our country, and it is 34 percent higher than in any other war theater. So we better be ready for the veterans who are coming back from that war, with 6,916 wounded.

The Washington Post got hold of the veterans budget of this administration, and what did they learn? They learned that the Bush draft budget for 2006 includes an overall VA cut of \$910 million. If we love our soldiers—and I believe we all do—how could we possibly cut the VA budget at a time when we are getting close to, at this point, 7,000 injured vets coming home?

The total of California's deaths is 254. I have paid tribute to each and every one of those who died from California—those who were either born in California, lived in California, or went to Iraq or Afghanistan from a California base. Today, I want to pay tribute to 48 more casualties that happened between the time we left 6 weeks ago and now.

This relates to those killed in Iraq, not Afghanistan, since July 5. All of them are from California or based in California. So I will go through these names.

LCpl John Vangyzen, age 21. Lance Corporal Vangyzen died on July 5 as a result of enemy action in Al Anbar Province. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, at Twentynine Palms, CA.

LCpl Michael S. Torres, age 21, died July 5 as a result of enemy action in Al Anbar Province, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, Twentynine Palms, CA.

Cpl Dallas L. Kerns died on July 5 as a result of enemy action in Al Anbar Province. He was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 7th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, at Twentynine Palms, CA.

LCpl Justin T. Hunt died July 6 as a result of enemy action in Al Anbar