

noted conservationists, among them John Muir and Aldo Leopold.

The passenger pigeon, which, in 1871, numbered over 136 million in the central part of the state, became extinct in Wisconsin in 1899 when the last one was shot. Wisconsin resident John Muir, founder of the Sierra Club, wrote of the passenger pigeon, "of all God's feathered people that sailed the Wisconsin sky, no other bird served us so wonderful." A monument to this bird is located in Wyalusing State Park in Grant County.

Portage resident Aldo Leopold, author of the seminal environmental work "A Sand County Almanac," wrote, "the oldest task in human history [is] to live on a piece of land without spoiling it."

Some of the "unspoiled" pieces of land in Wisconsin include the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests, and the 40,000-acre Necedah National Wildlife Refuge, which is home to almost 200 species of birds, including sandhill cranes, bald and golden eagles, and wild turkeys.

Roche a Cri State Park, located in Adams and Juneau Counties, includes examples of rocks carved by the erosion of water and wind, including Castle Rock, Mill Bluff, and Friendship Mound.

Over the past 150 years, Wisconsin has also amassed an impressive list of inventions and industrial and business credits. In my own hometown of Janesville, George Parker was granted a patent for his fountain pen in 1889. The first typewriter was patented by Christopher Latham Sholes in Milwaukee in 1868. The first snowmobile was invented in the town of Sayner and Kleenex was invented in Neenah. The Ringling Brothers Circus began in Baraboo in 1884.

Many Wisconsin companies are household names: Lands' End, Oshkosh B'Gosh, the Kohler Company, Oscar Meyer, Johnson Controls, Harley Davidson, S.C. Johnson Wax, Miller Brewing Company, Snap-On Tools, and many more.

In addition to its success in business, the state has enjoyed success in sports. Names like Vince Lombardi and Erik and Beth Heiden evoke memories of championships won and Olympic glory. The Badgers, Packers, Brewers and Bucks, and many other professional and amateur teams throughout the state, are examples of the determination and dedication, teamwork and sacrifice that are representative of the competitive spirit of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, as is evident in these examples, Wisconsinites have greatly contributed to the history and prosperity of the United States over the last 150 years. I am proud to be a Wisconsinite, and I am honored to represent the people of Wisconsin in the United States Senate. I congratulate the people of Wisconsin on this historic anniversary, invite them to reflect on the state's distinguished past, and encour-

age them to remain committed to our state motto by looking "Forward" to the next 150 years.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I congratulate my friend from Wisconsin for his statement on behalf of his State. I have warm feelings about Wisconsin, as a southern neighbor in the State of Illinois.

I am happy to report that of my three children, one is a graduate of Marquette, my son; my daughter is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin at Madison; and our third child married a young man from Janesville, the Senator's hometown, so we have our bases covered in Wisconsin.

That does not suggest I will be rooting for the Packers when they play the Bears, but I thank the Senator for his comments on behalf of his great State.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, to some people, Wisconsin means cheese. To that I say, yes, and we're proud of it. The great state of Wisconsin has a dairy industry that has thrived for 150 years despite our country's discriminatory milk pricing policies.

To some people, Wisconsin means beer. To that I say, yes, and we're proud of it. Brewing was among the first industries to help propel Wisconsin's economy forward, creating thousands of jobs and incomes that supported many families. They were not amused with Prohibition.

But Wisconsin means much more. As we celebrate 150 years of Wisconsin statehood this year we are reminded of the state's rich history, its natural beauty and its determined people.

In 1848, as a wave of immigrants flooded into America, many of the brightest among them chose to settle in Wisconsin. The state still displays the influence of its earliest settlers, from Poland, Russia, Ireland, Germany and Scandinavia. Wisconsin continues to draw newcomers because of its strong economy, its first-rate education system and the appealing mix of villages and cities that exist side by side. And we have the Green Bay Packers.

Wisconsin's natural beauty is unsurpassed. We are fortunate to have as our borders two Great Lakes and the Mississippi River. Wisconsin is called a 'sporting paradise' because of its lakes, rivers and forests. We boast fishing, hunting, skiing and world-class golf. Our national forests are breathtaking. People in Wisconsin know the value of our environment and have worked hard to protect it. Wisconsin's spas and resorts and restaurants have earned the attention of glossy travel magazines, who have discovered the charm of vacationing in Wisconsin. We don't mind visitors because we realize that not everyone is lucky enough to be born here.

Wisconsin residents can relax in a small, picturesque lakeside town or explore a vibrant and sophisticated city without traveling far from home. Over the years we have built a thriving arts

community that includes the theater, symphony and ballet. For those of us who have an interest in sports, we have exciting teams to follow. For over 150 years, our state has been home, home to Olympic athletes, respected scholars, famous celebrities and great artists. Frank Lloyd Wright left us the gift of Taliesin. Wisconsin has an independent streak that runs through our economy and our politics, and a work ethic that is the envy of employers nationwide. Wisconsin has some of the best minds in the country working in some of the best research facilities on behalf of all Americans. And we make Harley Davidson motorcycles.

But the best thing about Wisconsin in 1998 is the same as in 1848: the people. Their dedication to family, friends, neighbors and community is not a quaint notion from the past, but alive today. Wisconsin is a place where families gather for Sunday dinner. Where lost wallets are returned with all the cash. Where a neighbor offers a ride to work when the car is in the shop. Where friends come to the doorstep with a casserole to welcome a new baby or to console the loss of a grandparent. That's what we celebrate most about Wisconsin and that's why I have tremendous respect for the people I represent.

Much of what we value about Wisconsin has, in the best sense, remained unchanged from its start, 150 years ago. I am fortunate to have lived in Wisconsin all of my life and grateful for the opportunities my family had. Wisconsin is a great place to be a kid, to raise a family and to grow old. It is a reminder of all this country had to offer 150 years ago, and an example of the best it can put forward in the next century.

THE TOBACCO INDUSTRY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning I rise to discuss an issue which I hope Americans will come to realize is one of the most timely issues facing the U.S. Congress. Consider for a moment this is supposed to be a year of short sessions on Capitol Hill. Members of the House and Senate, anxious to return to their States and districts, hope to do the people's business in short order and go back home. They suggest that perhaps we have about 68 days of session remaining for this calendar year, which is an amazingly short session.

I am concerned that we not forget during the course of the remaining days the high priority that faces us when it comes to the tobacco legislation. It is a high priority because each day, every day in the United States of America, 3,000 children start smoking for the first time. A third of those kids will ultimately become addicted and their lives will become shortened because of tobacco-related death and disease. This is a tragedy that is repeated every single day. So far this year, about 240,000 children in America have

started their nicotine addiction. We have a chance through tobacco legislation to start reducing that number substantially. Every day that we wait, every day that we miss, we are certain that more kids will become addicted to this product.

The tobacco companies understand there is a lot at stake here. Of course, they saw the lawsuits from 42 different States attorneys general and concluded that they needed to reach some kind of a settlement. They have gone on now to buy full-page ads in newspapers. In this morning's Wall Street Journal they urge the public to consider the importance of a tobacco settlement. It is nothing short of amazing that the tobacco industry, which years ago thumbed its noses at the public policy leaders of the United States and the public health experts, now starts talking in very positive terms about the fact that we need to do something—a massive, sustained assault against underage smoking, paid for by the tobacco companies, when each and every day they are addicting 3,000 more children.

I say to the people who are following this debate it is no accident that these kids start smoking. They are appealed to by the advertising of tobacco companies. It is subtle, it is pervasive, and from their point of view, it is very effective.

I hope that in this debate on tobacco legislation we do not lose sight of what is really at stake. First, right now in the State of Minnesota where Attorney General Skip Humphrey is vigorously prosecuting an action against tobacco companies, we are learning every single day of the depth of the deception of the tobacco companies. Because of Attorney General Humphrey's courage and initiative, they now have some 39,000 documents which the tobacco companies over the years have refused to publicize, which are now being ordered to be made public by the court. Tobacco companies, naturally, don't want us to see them, so they have taken this case on appeal. There are another 103,000 documents which may involve children in advertising and other topics which should be released.

I hope that these documents see the light of day because, as these documents are disclosed, we begin to realize the insidious campaign by the tobacco industry to lure our youth into addiction. The tobacco companies have systematically lied about what they know about their products. They have known for a long, long time that their products cause death and disease. They have known that their products are addictive. They have known that they are appealing to children. And yet they have categorically denied it. One of the most outrageous scenes in the history of Congress occurred before a subcommittee chaired by Congressman Waxman several years ago when the executives of the tobacco companies stood up under oath and swore that tobacco was not addictive. What an out-

rage. And the same executives of the same companies came before that committee and said, "No, we are not appealing to children. No, we are not trying to encourage high nicotine tobacco to addict people even more." We can't believe a word they say. Now, when their successors in ownership in these tobacco companies buy full-page ads and tell the American people what a great deal they have for them, I hope there is a healthy degree of skepticism across America.

Let me tell you something else that needs to be taken into consideration in this debate. Not only has the tobacco industry systematically hidden the truth from the American people, they have had the opportunity in their own research to realize the devastation of their product and they have refused to acknowledge it. Time and again, we learn of the suppression of scientific research which could have saved lives.

Thinking of the billions of dollars of profits that this industry has made at the expense of death and disease in America is an outrage.

They have also tried to manipulate nicotine levels. They don't just take the tobacco leaves that come from the field and put them in the cigarettes and sell them to America. They like to spike the nicotine in there, get the addiction levels higher so you can't quit. How many people have you run into who said, "I wish I could quit. I have tried everything. I chew the gum, put on the patch, go through hypnosis, go through acupuncture, try everything imaginable, and I cannot quit."

The tobacco companies had a role in that because they were making their product more addictive. They focused their marketing at children—imagine that. We are so concerned, and rightly so, about the scourge of drugs in America, narcotics and what it means to America's kids, but the single greatest addiction of our children is the addiction to nicotine, tobacco, and ultimately death and disease are a result of it. They have known this. The tobacco companies have been hawking their products to kids across America for decades. They lose a substantial number of their best customers each year. They lose about 400,000 who die because of tobacco-related death and disease and then about 1.5 million who quit. They have to find 2 million new customers each year. You know what. They won't find them in adults. They find them in playgrounds, in school yards, in children who make a decision to smoke and, unfortunately, become addicted.

Let me tell you what we have to look for in legislation here on Capitol Hill. We have to have performance standards that hold tobacco companies accountable so that we can look year to year to see if the number of children across America is being reduced for smoking. That can be done. It can be done by an aggressive advertising campaign, an aggressive campaign to enforce the laws across America in terms of illegal

sales to minors. Any bill that comes to us for consideration on the floor that doesn't have performance standards for children should be rejected.

Second, we have to give the Food and Drug Administration the power to fight this industry. Don't believe we can pass this bill and walk away. We have to give the agency the power to regulate nicotine, to make sure the tobacco companies don't get up to their old tricks again and come up with this high nicotine tobacco leaf to addict people even more. We have to make sure the tobacco industry pays and pays, in an amount that will not only compensate for the losses they have created across America, but to discourage kids from buying this product. I believe \$1.50 per pack as a fee is a minimum—a minimum. To go less than that is really to not address the serious problem that faces us.

This whole question of immunity, that is what it is about. That is why they are buying the ads. The tobacco companies want off the hook. They don't want people who are addicted today and die tomorrow to either sue personally or have their estates bring a lawsuit. They want to get out of this courtroom scene in a hurry. They want to get back to the boardroom scene where they make billions of dollars. I tell you this, we should not trade away the liability of these companies, because we believe as politicians that is the only way to hold this industry accountable. I hope there is enough political will among Democrats and Republicans to make sure that we have an agreement that is sensible.

Finally, let us not, in the name of reaching a tobacco settlement, protect America's kids and endanger children around the world. The strategy of the tobacco companies in America is to export their product overseas. We used to have an image of America abroad, the stars and stripes, the great American image. You know what it is today? It is the cancer cowboy, the Marlboro man. You can find him on the streets and billboards in Warsaw, Poland; Bangkok, Thailand, all around the world. The new image of America, a sad image of America, an image of death and disease being promoted by the companies that are shameless in their efforts to exploit and addict children around the world. We cannot stand for that. It is a moral embarrassment to the United States of America if our legislation does not include strict limitations on the sale and advertising of American tobacco products overseas. We can do it. We should do it.

For a century this Congress has enjoyed a reputation as a leader in the world in public health. Let us not in this next century bear the burden of a country that has exported death and disease by American tobacco. I hope that we pass this bill and pass it soon. For those who wonder whether we can get it done, I ask them to consider the following. Count the days remaining in the session. Count the children who become addicted to this product every

day; count the lives that will be lost if we don't act; count on our responsibility in the Senate and the House to move this legislation as quickly as possible.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. TORRICELLI addressed the Chair.

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

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, all of our hopes for campaign finance reform in this session of the Congress were once again frustrated. A year of investigations, legislative proposals, and public debate were met with a filibuster led by the Republican leadership. Perhaps it really should not have come as much of a surprise to any of us. In the last decade, this Senate has considered 321 different pieces of legislation for campaign finance reform, which filled 6,742 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and all of this with no change.

So now, for the 117th time in 10 years, the Senate has voted on an element of campaign finance reform to absolutely no avail. It is a problem of near-crisis proportions, not simply because of the burden it places on candidates for public office, not simply because of the compromises it seems to make in public policy. There is a problem far more fundamental. As evidenced in the confidence of our own people in their system of Government, the United States remains perhaps the only developed democracy in the world where its leadership is chosen by a minority of its citizens. Americans are expressing themselves in our system of Government not with their voices but with their feet, because they choose not to walk into a voting booth.

If it was bad enough that this Congress would not act, now this frustration with reform is in an entirely different form. President Clinton has challenged the FCC to institute at least one element of reform—in my judgment, perhaps the most important element of reform—by mandating a reduction in the cost of television advertising, on the simple theory that if the cost of advertising is less, candidates will be raising less. If the cost of advertising is less, candidates without great financial resources will still seek public office and not find a barrier to expression. It is not a perfect answer, but it is at least a contribution. This was the President's challenge. The FCC has before it that question.

But it was not enough to have a filibuster to defeat the McCain-Feingold reform legislation. Now an effort is being made to include in the President's supplemental funding request in the appropriations process a prohibition on the FCC actually ordering a reduction in rates. The scale of the problem the FCC would deal with is enormous. Since 1977, the cost of congressional campaigns has risen over 700

percent. The central element of this rising spiral of costs is television advertising. In 1996, candidates spent over \$400 million to purchase television advertising on federally licensed, public airwaves. Hundreds of candidates were traveling to virtually every State, thousands of communities, to raise hundreds of millions of dollars to buy time on federally licensed airwaves that belong to the American people. It is almost incredible to believe.

There has been, since 1988, a 76 percent increase in this financial burden on public candidates for television advertising. Political advertising on the public airwaves dominates all other forms of campaign spending. President Clinton and Senator Dole spent nearly two-thirds of all their financial resources to buy television time. One half of all the money raised by U.S. Senate candidates was similarly spent on television advertising. In the larger industrial States for the principal media markets, the numbers are far greater—in Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Miami, or Boston. In my own State of New Jersey, in the Senate race in 1996, fully 80 percent of all financial resources went to buy television advertising. Some 30 seconds of access to the voting population on television could cost in excess of \$50,000.

Can it be any wonder that candidates are spending all of their time raising money rather than discussing issues? Can there be any question why candidates without great financial resources, simply possessing a desire to serve and a creativity for dealing with public policy, do not feel they can enter the electoral process? The principal barrier is the public airwaves themselves—something the people of the United States already own. Yet, it's being denied to our own people to discuss issues about our country's own future.

Congress has had a chance to deal with this problem, and it has not. The original version of the McCain-Feingold reform legislation contained reductions in television advertising. It was removed. A challengers' amendment was offered to the McCain-Feingold reform bill that would have provided for a reduction. It was not adopted. I introduced an amendment that would have allowed for a 75 percent reduction. My amendment could not be offered. These are the reasons why I believe President Clinton challenged the FCC to act. To this Congress, our responsibility should be clear. Since the Congress failed to enact campaign finance reform, at least get out of the way so that the FCC can act responsibly and institute at least one element of reform. The Congress has had a decade, hundreds of opportunities, and did nothing. At least now remain silent so that others who will act responsibly can do something to deal with this mounting national problem.

It is not as if we do not have in the FCC the legal ability to require the television networks to reduce the cost of

advertising. And it is not as though this request is without precedence. In 1952, the FCC set aside 12 percent of all television channeling time for education purposes, for noncommercial use. In 1967, President Johnson set aside part of the spectrum for public broadcasting. For the FCC now to require a reduction in rates has not only precedence but overwhelming precedence. Candidates for public office now pay a reduced rate, albeit insufficiently reduced. Perhaps even greater, however, is that the FCC is providing up to \$20 billion worth of free licenses to broadcasters for digital television, a part of the spectrum on a digital basis, requiring the broadcasters to pay nothing, and probably the greatest grant to private industry since the opening of Federal lands to the railroads. The broadcasters were provided this license on a single basis, on a single request that they fulfill a public obligation to the people of this country.

I can think of no greater opportunity to fulfill that public obligation in meeting a more serious national problem than the FCC now—after the granting of these digital television licenses to broadcasters, asking them to provide reduced rates or free television time. The scale of the burden is so minimal.

Last year, television networks billed, for commercial and other advertising, \$42 billion. Of this total advertising expenditure, 1.2 percent was for political advertising. The cost of reducing the rates for political advertising, that 1.2 percent, would still allow for a growth in the overall advertising revenue of the networks next year. So if the FCC acted on any reasonable basis, it would not result in less broadcaster revenues next year and, in year-to-year terms, it would be simply a small reduction in the rate of growth. This we would hesitate to ask after providing \$20 billion worth of free new licenses to the networks that are already operating on publicly owned airwaves of the people of the United States?

Perhaps it isn't that the burden isn't too great; perhaps it isn't a legal problem at all; perhaps it is that there are Members of this institution of the Congress that like the idea that there is a threshold price for entry to public office in the United States. The price of entering public office in the United States is not an academic degree; it is not a command of the issues; it is not a given level of commitment to public service; it is the ability to buy television time to communicate views. Increasingly, that means people of great personal wealth use their own resources. If it is not their own resources, it is the ability to use those resources of great financial interests in the United States that command all of the candidate's time and attention. Perhaps it is that people like this threshold price of entry and what it means for certain interests in the Senate, partisan or otherwise.

Well, it leaves us with this simple situation: The Congress had its chance