

osteoporosis? How can we refuse, at least through their elective Representatives, to let their voices be heard?

So we debate tonight simply asking for some vital things. We ask for the ability of patients to be treated in the emergency room wherever that emergency occurs. We ask for the ability of people to get the specialists that are medically called for and that they need, not for excessive use, not for things they do not need, but for things they need. We ask, if that HMO makes an egregious and reckless mistake, for the ability to sue it, not out of malice but out of fairness, out of recompense, and out of a desire to correct an abuse that may have occurred.

As I mentioned, these are not large demands in the grand scheme of things, but they are very important to millions of Americans who either have an ill loved one, or have an illness themselves, or who worry that they might.

So I ask, and I am joined by so many of my colleagues, particularly those of us on this side of the aisle, I ask the majority leader to allow this issue to come to the floor, to allow a full and open debate. I do not know what the results will be, but I can tell you this: If we do that, we will be, indeed, fulfilling our obligation as the people's Senators, as the people's Representatives, and we will be living up to the fine and high traditions of this Senate.

I yield the floor.

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. DASCHLE. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I hoped to get over here prior to the time my colleagues left the floor, but let me compliment Senators KENNEDY, DURBIN, BOXER, SCHUMER, and others who participated in the colloquy this afternoon on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We are very hopeful that over the course of the next two weeks the Senate can reach an agreement on proceeding to the bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights.

We will be more than happy to enter into negotiations with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle with one understanding, that we have the opportunity to offer amendments. In fact, we have suggested at least 20 amendments to ensure that we have a good debate. We don't want to have a sham debate on something of this import. On a bill that we will take up tomorrow, the State Department authorization bill, both sides have agreed to consider 52 amendments. We passed the Defense authorization bill a month ago, and we agreed to over 100 amendments. We have reached an agreement on virtually every bill that has come to the floor. In fact, the juvenile justice bill

had 35 amendments with over 18 roll-call votes.

But I think the key question is, if tomorrow we can agree, as Republicans and Democrats, to consider 52 amendments on a bill that has, frankly, very little relevance to the day-to-day lives of every American, as important as it is for other reasons, then, my goodness, it would seem to me we could agree to 20 amendments on the Patients' Bill of Rights.

One of the amendments we feel very strongly about offering is an amendment to expand the scope of the bill. I just want to talk briefly about that before I move to another issue. Probably the single biggest difference—I won't say the only big difference, because there are many—but one of the most important differences between the Republican bill and the Democratic bill has to do with what we call scope. By scope, we simply mean who is covered.

By everybody's recognition, the Republican bill covers 48 million Americans. Those 48 million Americans fall into one category: those employed by large businesses that are self-insured. Those are the only American people today who are covered under the Republican bill.

I have a chart. This is so important. This chart says it so well. This chart shows what the Republican bill does not do, and why we feel so strongly about offering amendments. Mr. President, 48 million Americans are covered through a plan that self-funds insurance within the company. Here are all the people who are not covered; 75 million Americans are not covered who have individual insurance policies or an HMO that is purchased but not funded by their employer. In other words, if you are an employee of a company with self-funded insurance, you are covered. If you work for an employer who contracts with an insurance company or an HMO, you are not covered.

There are only 48 million people in that category—those who work for a self-insured employer. There are 75 million Americans who are working for employers who purchase their insurance through separately-funded insurance companies and HMOs. There are another 23 million Americans who have their insurance through their jobs in State and local governments, and then there are 15 million Americans who have individual insurance plans. All of those people are not covered in the Republican plan. Two-thirds of all of those with health insurance are not covered.

I do not know why they would not be covered under the Republican plan. I am sure our Republican colleagues have a good rationale for not including all of these people. I have heard them say they are covered in some of the State plans. That is the problem.

What if you move from one State to another? The average American family now moves three times in the life of the family as children are growing up. What if you move? What if you get

transferred? You may not be covered. How do you know? Are you going to call the State capital and find out? We say: Cover them all. Cover all 75 million Americans who are working for companies that have insurance coverage. Cover all State and local government employees. Cover all people who have individual policies and, yes, cover everybody who is working for a self-insured company.

That is just one of the many differences—and we want to talk more about that in the future—but it is why we ought to have amendments. Some suggest let's just have an up-or-down vote on the Republican bill and an up-or-down vote on the Democratic bill. That will not cut it. We will not have an opportunity to talk about issues like this.

I really hope we will have the opportunity to have that debate in the next 2 weeks. We will have the opportunity, because if we cannot get an agreement, we will be forced then to offer it as an amendment to another bill.

WHO CALLS THE SHOTS ON CAPITOL HILL, THE GUN LOBBY OR AVERAGE AMERICANS?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to briefly talk about another issue, because it is pending in the House at this time and I think it is very important to talk about the gun control issue.

Last month, the day before the Senate voted to close the gun show loophole, a prominent Republican Senator made a prediction. He said it really did not matter how the Senate voted, because the House would water down any gun restrictions we pass.

That is what was predicted. The gun lobby and its supporters in the House have now made good on that threat. But even though we were warned, we are still stunned that the power of one lobbyist organization can be so demonstrably effective as they appear to have been thus far.

The gun lobby's approach to gun control in the Senate was a sham. It is a sham in the House. The first House Republican leadership announcement was that they would divide the juvenile bill into two separate bills: one focusing on youth crime and culture, the other on gun control.

We all recognize what that announcement was. It was a move to dilute or even kill the modest gun control measures that had passed in the Senate just a few short weeks ago. Now the House Republican leadership has decided not to bring its sham bill to the floor of the House until 8 o'clock tonight, well after the evening news. I think we know why. The pro-gun forces clearly do not want the American public to know what is going to happen after 8 o'clock tonight.

It may be after 8 o'clock tonight when the House begins its gun debate, but it is certainly high noon for those of us who care about this issue. It is time we find out who is going to win

this showdown: the gun lobby or the American people.

Littleton, CO, marked a turning point for most Americans, and now we will find out if it marked a turning point for the pro-gun forces on Capitol Hill—or if it is just business as usual. Are we going to make it harder for children and criminals to get guns—or easier? Is it as dramatic a moment, is it as clear a choice as many of us in the Senate believe it is?

Today, we are warning those who are about to vote in the House: The gun lobby tried every excuse and half-measure they could come up with to defeat the modest restrictions in the Senate, and they failed.

Why? Because we know what America wants. America wants to close the gun show loophole. Sham proposals that do not cover all gun shows and allow criminals to get guns are not enough. Weak measures that only allow 24—or even 72 hours—are not enough. Law enforcement must have up to three business days to complete background checks, when necessary, to make sure that guns do not end up in the hands of criminals. Nothing less is acceptable.

The gun lobby says it is, but I guarantee that any family who has lost a child to gun violence will disagree. Listen to your conscience and your constituents, not to the extremist wing of the gun lobby.

I come from gun country. Most South Dakotans feel pretty strongly about guns. They are part of our culture, our heritage. I have owned a gun since I was 8 years old. But even in South Dakota, the vast majority of people believe we need to do more to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals.

Tonight, the House of Representatives has a chance to build on the conscientious proposals that passed in the Senate. It is a narrow window of opportunity for Congress to act in a way that will make a real difference for our children and for our communities. Let us listen, let us stop the maneuvering, let us do something now. Tonight is the night. Mr. President, 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock, 1 o'clock, 3 o'clock, it does not matter. Do the right thing. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

ENDING ABUSIVE AND EXPLOITATIVE CHILD LABOR

MR. HARKIN. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes to speak about why I was necessarily absent from voting yesterday and explain how I would have voted had I been here.

For the better part of a decade, I have been working to help end abusive and exploitative child labor around the globe and even in our backyard. I have come to the floor many times over the last several years to speak about this issue, submitting resolutions, working with the International Labor Organiza-

tion, and others, to do what we can to end abusive and exploitative child labor.

The ILO, the International Labor Organization, estimates that 250 million children worldwide are economically active—that means they are working—and many work in dangerous environments which are detrimental to their emotional, physical, and moral well-being.

Yesterday was a very historic day. For the first time in the 80-year history of the International Labor Organization, the President of the United States addressed that body. The President traveled to Geneva and asked me to accompany him because of my work on this issue.

I cannot really find the words to describe the impact of the President of the United States standing in front of a couple thousand people, all of whom have been working for years to end child labor, speaking as the President of the United States—it was the first time in the history of the ILO that a President ever spoke to this organization—about one issue: child labor.

I could not have been more proud of our Nation and of President Clinton for the words he spoke, for the position he took on this issue. He endorsed this new convention. There is a new convention that was just signed today, a new convention to end the most abusive and exploitative forms of child labor around the globe. We were there. We signed it at the meeting. I am hopeful the President will very soon transmit this new convention to the Senate for ratification.

It was a great speech President Clinton gave to the ILO. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by the President of the United States to the International Labor Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, on June 16.

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

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION CONFERENCE, UNITED NATIONS BUILDING, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, JUNE 16, 1999

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Director General Somavia, for your fine statement and your excellent work.

Conference President Mumuni, Director General Petrovsky, ladies and gentlemen of the ILO: It is a great honor for me to be here today with, as you have noticed, quite a large American delegation. I hope you will take it as a commitment of the United States to our shared vision, and not simply as a burning desire for us to visit this beautiful city on every possible opportunity.

I am delighted to be here with Secretary Albright and Secretary of Labor Herman; with my National Economic Advisor Gene Sperling, and my National Security Advisor Sandy Berger. We're delighted to be joined by the President of the American Federation of Labor, the AFL-CIO, John Sweeney, and several other leaders of the U.S. labor movement; and with Senator Tom Harkin from Iowa who is the foremost advocate in the United States of the abolition of child labor. I am grateful to all of them for coming with me, and to the First Lady and our daughter

for joining us on this trip. And I thank you for your warm reception of her presence here.

It is indeed an honor for me to be the first American President to speak before the ILO in Geneva. It is long overdue. There is no organization that has worked harder to bring people together around fundamental human aspirations, and no organization whose mission is more vital for today and tomorrow.

The ILO, as the Director General said, was created in the wake of the devastation of World War I as part of a vision to provide stability to a world recovering from war, a vision put forward by our President, Woodrow Wilson. He said then, "While we are fighting for freedom we must see that labor is free." At a time when dangerous doctrines of dictatorship were increasingly appealing the ILO was founded on the realization that injustice produces, and I quote, "unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled."

Over time the organization was strengthened, and the United States played its role, starting with President Franklin Roosevelt and following through his successors and many others in the United States Congress, down to the strong supporters today, including Senator Harkin and the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Patrick Moynihan.

For half a century, the ILO has waged a struggle of rising prosperity and widening freedom, from the shipyards of Poland to the diamond mines of South Africa. Today, as the Director General said, you remain the only organization to bring together governments, labor unions and business, to try to unite people in common cause—the dignity of work, the belief that honest labor, fairly compensated, gives meaning and structure to our lives; the ability of every family and all children to rise as far as their talents will take them.

In a world too often divided, this organization has been a powerful force for unity, justice, equality and shared prosperity. For all that, I thank you. Now, at the edge of a new century, at the dawn of the information Age, the ILO and its vision are more vital than ever—for the world is becoming a much smaller and much, much more interdependent place. Most nations are linked to the new dynamic, idea-driven, technology-powered, highly competitive international economy.

In digital revolution is a profound, powerful and potentially democratizing force. It can empower people and nations, enabling the wise and far-sighted to develop more quickly and with less damage to the environment. It can enable us to work together across the world as easily as if we were working just across the hall. Competition, communications and more open markets spur stunning innovation and make their fruits available to business and workers worldwide.

Consider this: Every single day, half a million air passengers, 1.5 billion e-mail messages and \$1.5 trillion cross international borders. We also have new tools to eradicate diseases that have long plagued humanity, to remove the threat of global warming and environmental destruction, to lift billions of people into the first truly global middle class.

Yet, as the financial crisis of the last two years has shown, the global economy with its churning, hyperactivity, poses new risks, as well, of disruption, dislocation and division. A financial crisis in one country can be felt on factory floors half a world away. The world has changed, much of it for the better, but too often our response to its new challenges has not changed.

Globalization is not a proposal or a policy choice, it is a fact. But how we respond to it