

lead the platoon and advance alone against a machine gun nest which had his men pinned down. He tossed two hand grenades with devastating effect before his right arm was shattered by a German rifle grenade at close range. With his left hand, he tossed his last grenade and attacked the Italian Fascists with a submachine gun. Then he was hit in his right leg and fell down the hill. INOUE refused to be evacuated until his men were deployed in defensive positions.

First Lieutenant INOUE spent 20 months in Army hospitals after losing his right arm. He returned to Hawaii as a Captain with a Distinguished Service Cross, Bronze Star, Purple Heart with cluster, and 12 other medals and citations.

After graduating with a law degree from George Washington University, he entered politics, and after Hawaii became a state DAN INOUE won election to the United States House of Representatives as the state's first Congressman. He was reelected to a full term in 1960 and won election to the United States Senate in 1962. Mr. President, I cannot fully express to you or others the deep respect I have for this man, to the leadership he has provided to this country and the sacrifices he has made during these accomplishments. Senator INOUE continues to inspire admiration and respect among all who serve with him—Republicans and Democrats alike. DAN INOUE is a leader and hero to Americans across the country and a man that I am proud to consider my colleague as well as my friend.

I am pleased that the President has chosen to recognize his service and bestow upon such a deserving man as DAN INOUE the Medal of Honor. It is my hope that young people around our country will look to DAN INOUE and his many traits and accomplishments—Army officer, Congressman, Senator—and realize as he does that first and foremost, he is an American. In this regard I would like to quote Major General Jacob Devers, Chief of the Army Field Offices, "These men . . . more than earned the right to be called just Americans, not Japanese Americans. Their Americanism may be described only by degree, and that the highest."

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to my dear colleague, Senator DANIEL INOUE. Today, Senator INOUE receives the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroic service to our nation. This honor is richly deserved—and long overdue.

Senator INOUE's life is one of service and patriotism. He began his service when he was just seventeen, leaving his home in Honolulu to aid wounded civilians on the day of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As a Japanese American, he faced bigotry, resentment, and outright persecution. Even while facing

this discrimination, he withdrew from his medical studies at the University of Hawaii and enlisted in the Army as soon as Japanese Americans were permitted to serve.

Stationed in Italy with the war's end nearing, 2nd lieutenant INOUE led his men into his final battle. Though he was shot and his platoon was pinned by gunfire, he continued on alone. Bravely he tossed two hand grenades before his right arm was shattered by a German rifle grenade. He threw a final grenade with his left arm before another shot in the leg forced him to retreat. It is for this tremendous act of courage that Senator INOUE receives this long overdue honor.

Senator INOUE is being honored for his courage in battle. We also know that Senator INOUE's service to our country extends far beyond his bravery in war. When Senator INOUE was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1959, he was the first American of Japanese ancestry to serve in the House. Since 1962, Senator INOUE has served with great distinction in the Senate.

Every day, we witness first-hand Senator INOUE's commitment to the people of Hawaii and the people of the United States. He is a leader on national security and international human rights. As a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, he works tirelessly to ensure that we meet the day to day needs of our constituents—and the long term needs of our nation. Since my earliest days on the Appropriations Committee, I've learned from Senator INOUE—particularly in the area of defense policy.

Even in a war filled with heroes, Senator INOUE's heroism was extraordinary. It is with deep respect and affection that I offer my most sincere congratulations to Senator INOUE for being awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

SECTION 527 ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted to tighten regulations on 527 organizations—organizations created to influence political campaigns in the United States; that section of the Tax Code allows them to operate without disclosure of their contributors or without limitations on their expenditures, and, indeed, on a tax-deductible basis.

The vote last week was genuinely historic in the Senate. It was the first time since 1993 that a campaign finance reform measure passed the Senate.

I congratulate Senator LIEBERMAN on his leadership in bringing the Senate to this important moment of judgment.

These "527 organizations," as they have come to be known, are the latest threat to the integrity of our Nation's

electoral process, with unlimited funds unaccountable from unknown sources.

If this legislation does not become law, they threaten to change the entire electoral process of the country. Every reform instituted not only since Watergate but, indeed, in this century could be undone.

There is no assurance that even those limited protections—from the progressive movement in the times of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson that barred unlimited and undisclosed corporate contributions—and reforms could remain in place if these 527 organizations are allowed to operate and, indeed, to proliferate.

The Senate's vote last week sent a very strong message that for whatever we are unable to do on campaign finance reform we can at least agree that complete and full disclosure is required and that we will not allow the Tax Code to be misused for the raising of unknown political funds.

It is, however, important that the public not accept this limited achievement as the sum total of all the Congress can do on campaign finance reform. It is only a beginning. Indeed, it is a modest beginning.

It is also true that our efforts on soft money in McCain-Feingold have been frustrated. For a variety of reasons, it is now very clear McCain-Feingold and limitations on soft money contributions are not going to be enacted in this Congress. Some of the barriers are political. Some are legislative. Indeed, as my friend, MITCH MCCONNELL, has pointed out, some are very real and constitutional. There are real problems to enacting a complete soft money ban. Federal courts have spoken on the subject. There are many who believe their individuals rights might be limited. That debate will continue for years on the merits.

Now the Congress is left with a partial achievement on 527 organizations, a frustration on soft money prohibitions. The question is whether anything else can be done. Indeed, a great deal more could be done that is both easier to achieve and in some respects more important.

There is primarily a single reason that campaign fundraising is rising exponentially in the Nation. It is very simple. Campaign expenditures are rising exponentially in the Nation. It is becoming more and more expensive to communicate with the American people through more and more news outlets. It is the heart of the problem.

A recent study has indicated that records are being broken across the Nation in the cost of political advertising. The study, led by the Alliance for Better Campaigns, cited the Senate primary in my own State of New Jersey as evidence of how broken the campaign finance system has now become and that the same broadcasters in the news media who are leading national efforts

for campaign finance reform are a central part of the problem.

Television stations in New York and Philadelphia during the recent New Jersey Democratic primary took in a record \$21 million in advertising. The chart shows the stations in New York and Philadelphia, the four rated stations, the amount of time they actually devoted to hard news. We have these stations in New York and Philadelphia bringing in \$21 million in revenue from political advertising. Yet in actual news coverage of the campaigns per evening—two stations in Philadelphia—one is giving 19 seconds of coverage per evening; another, 1 second; in New York, the two top stations, WNBC and WCBS, 23 seconds and 10 seconds, respectively.

Advertising rates soar. News coverage collapses. Candidates are left with no choice. There being no other means to communicate with people who live in our States, they must buy more advertising time at ever-higher and higher rates. Indeed, in the final 2 weeks of the New Jersey primary, voters in Philadelphia and New York markets were 10 times more likely while watching a news program to see a campaign advertisement than a news story—10 times more likely to see an advertisement than a legitimate news story on an issue in the campaign.

That, my colleagues, is the heart of the problem. However, it is not only a senatorial problem or not only a problem in my own region of the country. During the month before the March 7, Super Tuesday primary, the national networks aired a nightly average of only 36 seconds discussing an issue of importance to the national voters. The situation that Democrats and Republicans face in the New Jersey primary is identical to what AL GORE and George W. Bush face in the national elections—no news coverage, rising rates, higher expenditures. It is, of course, part and parcel of this problem that is driven by the individual rates for specific advertising time.

An example of this would be, in New York City, a 30-second advertisement can now cost as much as \$50,000. In Chicago, the same advertisement could cost \$20,000. Television stations in the Nation's top 75 media markets took in a record of \$114 million in the first 4 months of this year in political advertising.

There is no other nation in the world where the public airwaves are licensed to a private corporation which will then set commercial rates as the cost of discussing public policy issues with the Nation's voters. This wouldn't happen in Britain, Canada, Italy or France. These airwaves belong to the American people. The issues, be they Democrat, Republican, or Independent, be they from some other group or political party, are issues of importance to the American people. Yet the broad-

casting networks are using them as a revenue source while they incredibly claim to be campaigning for campaign finance reform.

There is no mistaking that the power to change the campaign finance system belongs in the Congress. We could lead to a solution. For a variety of political reasons, legislative reasons, and constitutional reasons, that is not going to happen. The question now is whether the television networks will spend the remainder of this electoral season complaining about this political problem of reaching a solution or be part of the answer. I believe they should lead by example.

Only a year ago, Mr. Kennard, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, raised the prospect of, by regulation, lowering the cost of television advertising. Rather than \$50,000 in New York or \$20,000 in Chicago, the FCC could mandate, if the networks are unwilling to do it voluntarily, a lower cost. Since television accounts for 80 or 90 percent of the cost of the Senate or Presidential campaign, lowering the cost of that advertising would dramatically remove pressure on fundraising. The problem could begin to solve itself. The FCC chose not to do so under pressure from Members of Congress.

The question remains, Why do the networks not do so themselves? I understand the networks looking to the Congress for an answer. They should. They are entitled to look to us, and they are entitled to expect an answer. But I also look back to them. Rather than 20 seconds a night for candidates to discuss the future of our Nation, rather than using the national airwaves to discuss every latest crime trend or weather pattern or cultural abnormality, the national airwaves could be used to actually discuss the Nation's future—not 10 seconds a night or 20 seconds a night but 10 minutes a night or 15 minutes a night so candidates believe there is an alternative to communicating with the American people other than buying the public airwaves to do so.

Second, the networks, most obviously, could enhance this national debate and reduce the cost of this fundraising, remove the pressure on fundraising by dramatically reducing these costs. Political advertising is now the third largest source of revenue for the television networks. We have become an industry supporting the networks themselves, only behind retail sellers of merchandise in the Nation, spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this Presidential and congressional campaign. A reduction of those rates to allow challengers to compete with incumbents and lesser-financed candidates to compete with multimillionaires would enhance the American political system and start setting an example of how the Nation can begin to

change the dominance of money in the American political system.

I hope at some point the networks, as good corporate citizens and as Americans, no less as people who claim to be for campaign finance reform, would hear this message and join this movement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Rhode Island, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until 11 a.m.

Thereupon, at 10:22 a.m., the Senate recessed until 11:01; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2522, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

SESSIONS amendment No. 3492, to provide an additional condition on assistance for Colombia under Plan Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order that I deliver my statement while seated at my desk.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3498

(Purpose: Relating to support by the Russian Federation for Serbia)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be in