

But it was more than just one moment. When these nine men and women walked into Central High School, they opened more than a door, they opened the flood gates. For them and for the rest of our country, the battle didn't end at the schoolhouse steps. Their struggle lasted for years and, in reality, it still continues. My husband and I are both products of an integrated public school system in Arkansas. We are personally grateful to the Little Rock Nine for making our school experience rich with diversity. I truly value the lifelong lessons that I learned at an early age and I might not have had the wonderful privilege of studying with children of all races were it not for the Little Rock Nine. There is still much work to be done to bring complete civil rights and equality to our Nation.

Today, as we pause to remember Daisy Bates and to honor the Little Rock Nine, I hope we will be renewed and refreshed in our efforts. I'm encouraged by the words of Daisy Bates' niece, Sharon Gaston, who said, "Just don't let her work be in vain. There's plenty of work for us to do." I hope my colleagues will join me in extending appreciation and commendation to the Little Rock Nine. And in remembering a matriarch of the civil rights movement, Daisy Gaston Bates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. L. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. L. CHAFEE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. L. CHAFEE and Mr. JEFFORDS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1891 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN and I be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes as in morning business for the purposes of introduction of an important bill.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear the request. What was it?

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator BINGAMAN and I want to introduce a bill that is very historic to New Mexico, and we would like to each speak for about 5 minutes on it. We do not ask for any action. It will be referred to its appropriate committee.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1892 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. AKAKA. I ask unanimous consent to be given 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 1888 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

REJECTING THE DAKOTA WATER RESOURCES ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about some important legislative matters and to announce to my colleagues I cannot and will not clear a bill called S. 623, the Dakota Water Resources Act, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. It would authorize a half billion dollars to divert additional water from the Missouri River system for additional uses, including transfer to the Cheyenne and Red River systems. We

cannot and will not tolerate the diversion of water. This is strongly opposed by the Governor of my State, by the State of Minnesota, by Taxpayers for Common Sense, and a whole list of environmental groups including the National Wildlife Federation, the Audubon Society, Friends of the Earth and American Rivers. The Canadian Government opposes it, the Governor of Minnesota and the Minnesota DNR oppose it.

I understand why the Dakota Senators want to fight for this. It would be a tremendous boon for their States. But I am not going to be blackmailed because 52 other unrelated bills are being held up over this matter. There are strong substantive objections to this bill. It is not appropriate in this process to try to ram this through, to try to steal water from the Missouri River.

I serve notice on my colleagues, if they have a problem because their bills are being held up in an attempt to blackmail me, it is not going to work. We have worked in good faith with the Senators from North Dakota in the past, helping them with their problems, but I do not intend to be blackmailed into allowing diversion of the Missouri River water.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business. If they have a consent agreement worked out, then I will hold off.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, I shan't object.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEAHY. I said I shan't object.

Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I noticed Senator GRASSLEY, who worked very hard on this bill, is trying to get a consent agreement. I will hold off if he is ready to go forward. Otherwise, I will proceed because I have the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Take 5 minutes?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I gather the consent agreement is not worked out. I did ask consent for the right to speak up to 10 minutes. I gather they can work things out during that period of time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Oregon have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from Oregon has 5 minutes.

SENIOR PRESCRIPTION INSURANCE COVERAGE EQUITY ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have been coming to the floor for a number

of days now in an effort to try to get a focus back on this prescription drug issue which seems to involve a lot of finger pointing and a lot of partisan bickering. As part of that effort, I have been urging seniors to send in copies of their prescription drug bills. Just as this poster says, the senior can send in a copy of the prescription drug bill, and write to each of us in the Senate here in Washington, DC.

I have been actually coming to the floor and reading some of these bills for a number of weeks. Just in the last couple of days, I heard from a woman in Portland—she is 84; she has diabetes and a heart condition. She has only Social Security to support herself. She is spending over a third of that Social Security check every month on prescription drugs. She is now at a point where it is hard to pay the taxes on her home.

I heard from another gentleman recently. He has a monthly Social Security check of \$633. The cost of his drugs is \$644 a month. He is spending more for his prescription drugs each month than he is actually getting in income. So every month this senior is having to choose between food and fuel and fuel and health care. So as a result of this effort to get from seniors copies of their prescription drug bills, we are hearing about the kind of suffering that seniors are enduring around this country.

Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE and I have a bipartisan prescription drug bill. It would cover all senior citizens on an ability-to-pay basis. More than 50 Senators of both political parties are now on record as supporting a funding plan for this legislation. I know other Senators have approaches they would like to try. What is important is that we get a bipartisan focus on this issue. Every public opinion poll shows seniors and families across this country are having difficulty making ends meet when it comes to the high cost of essential health care services.

Our approach is marketplace oriented. There are not price controls. It is not one size fits all. The Snowe-Wyden legislation is called SPICE, the Senior Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity Act. It is designed to deal with the double whammy our seniors are facing on their prescriptions. First, Medicare does not cover the drugs they need and, second, when a senior citizen walks into a drug store, in effect that senior is subsidizing the big buyers, the health maintenance organizations, and other health plans that are able to get discounts.

So seniors have this double whammy now in front of them when it comes to their prescriptions. I hope more will, as these posters indicate, send us copies of their prescription drug bills. I think on the basis of these bills that we are getting from seniors across the country—each of us in the Senate here in Washington, DC—we can bring about bipartisan support to actually respond to the needs of the seniors.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate? The Senator

is addressing the Senate. May we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we still do not have order. May we have order in the Senate? You may have to rap that gavel to be heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President. The Senator from West Virginia has been a great ally of the Nation's older people, and I very much appreciate his thoughtfulness. I believe my time is almost up.

I intend to keep coming to the floor of the Senate to read from these bills that we are getting from the Nation's senior citizens. We have 54 Members of the Senate already on record as having voted for a specific plan to fund a prescription drug benefit for older people. We can do this in a bipartisan way. We have the chairman of the Aging Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, who has led our efforts on the committee on so many issues.

I am going to keep coming back to the floor and read from these bills. Again and again, we are hearing from seniors who cannot afford important drugs such as their diabetes medicines.

I will wrap up by saying, when I am asked the question whether our Nation can afford prescription drug coverage, my response is we cannot afford not to cover prescriptions.

A lot of these drugs help seniors stay healthy, keep their blood pressure down, or help to reduce cholesterol. I have cited previously an anticoagulant drug. It costs senior citizens about \$1,000 a year. With those kinds of medicines, we can help prevent strokes that involve expenses of more than \$100,000.

I am going to keep coming back to this floor to focus on the needs of seniors. We ought to do this in a bipartisan way. That is what is behind the Snowe-Wyden legislation. A lot of our colleagues have other ideas for addressing this issue.

As this poster says, I hope seniors will continue to send copies of their prescription drug bills to us in the Senate, Washington, DC.

I will keep coming to this floor until we can get the bipartisan action we need that provides real relief for the Nation's older people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator

from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, now be recognized to offer his amendment No. 2748, and he be recognized for up to 12 minutes for general debate on the amendment. I further ask consent that the amendment be laid aside, with a vote occurring on or in relation to the amendment at 5 o'clock, with no second-degree amendment in order prior to the vote. I further ask consent that votes occur on or in relation to the following two amendments in sequence at 5 o'clock, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes, and there be 4 minutes for explanation prior to each vote. Those amendments are No. 2521 offered by Senator DURBIN and No. 2754 offered by Senator DODD. I further ask consent that following the sequencing of the amendments, Senator SCHUMER then be recognized to call up an amendment and to speak for up to 2 minutes and the amendment then be laid aside.

I further ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 5 o'clock be equally divided in the usual form. I further ask consent when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 625 tomorrow, I be recognized to call up our amendment No. 2771 on which there will be a 4-hour time limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, if I could ask my friend, the manager of this bill, it is my understanding that the time between now and 5 o'clock would be evenly divided between the majority and minority?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes.

Mr. REID. During that period of time, Senators DODD and DURBIN would be able to speak on those two amendments?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is right.

Mr. REID. Also, during that same period of time, it is my understanding—for example, Senator SCHUMER wanted to offer amendments during that period of time. He would be allowed to do that?

Mr. GRASSLEY. We have it stated here.

Mr. REID. After the votes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. After the votes.

Mr. REID. We want Senator SCHUMER to use some of the time of Senator DODD and Senator DURBIN prior to the 5 o'clock vote.

Mr. GRASSLEY. To answer your question with a further question, this would be to call up, spend a little bit of time explaining them, and lay them aside?

Mr. REID. That is right.

Further, Mr. President, I ask my friend from Iowa, Senator FEINGOLD, I am told, was not expecting a vote tonight.

Is that true?

Mr. FEINGOLD. That is correct.

Mr. REID. He was not expecting a vote on his amendment tonight. So unless there is some reason the majority believes a vote should go forward on that, Senator FEINGOLD would prefer