

mention just a few. Perhaps most importantly, the reports dramatically and inappropriately exaggerate the costs of the Gore plan. First, they suggest that the Vice President's \$360 billion Medicare "lock box" represents new spending that somehow would use Social Security funds and increase the budget deficit. This claim is preposterous. In fact, the Medicare lock box reserves funds for debt reduction, not new spending. It wouldn't spend a penny of Social Security surpluses, or any surpluses, for that matter. Yet by, in effect, counting as spending the \$360 billion Medicare lock box, and an additional \$99 billion of General Fund transfers to Medicare, the Republican staff has artificially created a \$450 billion raid on Social Security that simply does not exist. And, Mr. President, that's just the beginning.

The GOP staff also charges the Vice President with the costs of budget proposals put forward by President Clinton, even though the Gore plan clearly does not endorse the entire Clinton budget. This results in doublecounting many similar proposals put forward by both Clinton and Gore, such as their different retirement savings plans. And, of course, it exaggerates the real cost of the Gore/Lieberman plan. Another way that the GOP staff inflates the costs of the Gore plan is to adopt its own scoring rules. The GOP staff went well beyond the scoring of the Congressional Budget Office or the Office of Management and Budget. It created its own special methods of evaluating the costs of the Vice President's proposals. And it shouldn't come as any surprise that they lead to much higher cost estimates.

Take, for example, the Vice President's Retirement Savings Plus proposal, which the Gore campaign says would cost \$200 billion. The Republican staff cites a figure of \$750 billion. This number is simply made up, and is not backed up by any official CBO or OMB estimate. Similarly, the GOP staff exaggerates the cost of Vice President GORE's preschool proposal. Their report characterizes the Gore plan as if it were an open-ended entitlement, with no state match. That leads to much higher costs. In fact, though, the Gore proposal is for block grants that require a state match.

Another trick that the GOP staff used to create a misleading impression about the Vice President's proposal was to deviate from standard practice and use a so-called "freeze baseline." In other words, the GOP staff counted as a cost of his plan \$1.2 trillion in discretionary spending, and related interests costs, that simply reflect the costs of maintaining current policy. These costs normally are considered part of the budget baseline, not new spending. The well-respected, nonpartisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities made this point in a sharp critique of the GOP staff report. The Center concluded that the Budget Committee's analysis, and I quote, "is marred by several seri-

ous flaws"—unquote—which the Center said inflate the cost estimate assigned to the Gore plan.

Mr. President, the Republican staff was so intent on slandering the Vice President as a big spender that they went to extremes in characterizing some of his proposals. The GOP staff calls anything new spending—even tax cuts. Look at what they include in their long list of new "spending and regulatory programs":

Marriage penalty relief.

A long-term care tax credit.

A disabled workers tax credit.

Mr. President, is marriage penalty relief "new spending"? Even George Orwell wouldn't go that far. In fact, the GOP staff's blacklist goes beyond tax cuts. It even includes gun control. Closing the gun show loophole. Banning junk guns. Requiring mandatory gun safety locks.

Mr. President, would closing the gun show loophole amount to a return of Big Government? Would requiring gun manufacturers to include trigger locks amount to a whole new spending program? I don't think so.

Mr. President, I could go on and on about the Republican report, but I won't. And, frankly, the misstatements and distortions in their report are only part of the problem. This report should not have been produced in the first place. It's obviously intended to be used in the presidential campaign to harm the Vice President. And it's just not the type of report that should be produced with taxpayer dollars. Campaign materials should be produced by campaigns, Mr. President, not congressional staff. And, at a minimum, if reports on issues related to the campaign are issued, especially this close to an election, they ought to at least be fair and accurate. I don't think that's too much to ask, Mr. President.

Let me recite some facts on GORE and the size of Government.

Under the Clinton-Gore administration Government is smaller: Between 1981 and 1992, the size of the Federal civilian workforce increased. Since 1993, however, the Federal workforce has been reduced by 377,000—a 17 percent decline.

The Federal workforce is now the smallest since the Kennedy administration in 1960.

Under the Clinton-Gore administration Federal spending is lower: Spending as a share of GDP increased between 1981 and 1992—rising from 21.7% to 22.5%. Since 1992, however, federal government spending as a share of the economy has been cut from 22.2 percent to 18.7 percent in 1999—its lowest level since 1966.

Although Bush promises to reduce government, under him, Texas government spending increased at twice the rate of the federal government. While the Federal workforce has been reduced by 17 percent, under George Bush, Texas has added 6,200 bureaucrats—a 2-percent increase.

With that, I will yield the floor.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000—Continued

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the passage of H.R.782, The Older Americans Amendments Act of 1999. Even with the support of seniors' advocacy groups, it has taken the Congress a full five years to reach bipartisan agreement on this legislation. We should not miss this opportunity to keep our commitment to our most vulnerable senior citizens. I want to applaud the persistence, commitment, and leadership of Chairman JEFFORDS and Senators DEWINE, MIKULSKI and KENNEDY, their staffs, and other colleagues on the HELP committee who have been unwilling to give up during this long process.

With the enactment of the Older Americans Act in 1965, Congress created a new Federal program specifically designed to meet the social services needs of older people. In 1972, Congress added the best known program "Meals on Wheels" which brought nutritionally balanced meals to seniors' homes or to seniors in congregate settings. In Minnesota alone, 185,000 seniors benefit from this seniors' meal program. Whenever I talk with seniors or their family members in Minnesota, I hear about this valuable service that provides seniors with necessary nutrition and, in the congregate settings, necessary socialization.

On the 35th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, it is fitting that in a bipartisan bicameral manner we vote to continue the Act's broad policy objectives of providing programs related to health, housing, long-term care, employment, retirement, and community services for low and moderate income seniors. I hope the Senate will overwhelmingly pass this legislation, as did the House yesterday, and signal America's continuing commitment to our senior citizens.

In addition to Meals on Wheels, this legislation continues the popular senior jobs program which provides financial help for needy seniors, provides them with a sense of meaning and usefulness, and also expands their opportunities for needed socialization. During the 1999-2000 program year, Green Thumb (one of the grantees) in Minnesota has exceeded the major goals set by Congress and the Department of Labor, DOL, for job placement, while serving 1,188 mature job seekers. In addition, Minnesota seniors provided nearly 640,000 hours of community services to almost 500 public and non-profit "host agencies", including schools, hospitals, rest homes, libraries, parks, senior dining sites and senior centers, museums, and many more.

During this past winter, Green Thumb in Minnesota engaged in a special partnership with the Census Bureau to assist in recruiting older census workers. As a result of Green Thumb's advertising, over 2,700 mature workers were referred to the Census Bureau. With support of the Older

Americans Act, Green Thumb provided job counseling and training to most of these workers.

In total, for the 1999–2000 program year, approximately 2,260 Minnesota seniors were placed in jobs through all the grantee programs in the state. Programs like these are invaluable for the seniors involved, for their families, and for communities. We must vote to continue them.

This legislation also contains a number of new programs which I wholeheartedly endorse because I believe they will protect seniors and provide support for their families and communities. Most noteworthy is the National Family Caregiver Program which is authorized at \$125 million. Minnesota will receive about \$1.8 million for the program. The Caregiver Program will provide grants to states for the following long-term care services: information about available services to caregivers, whether they be spouses, children, or grandchildren; assistance to caregivers in gaining access to services; individual counseling; organization of support groups and caregiver training to help families make decisions and solve problems related to their care giving roles; and, perhaps most important of all, respite services to provide families temporary relief from care giving responsibilities.

This legislation also authorizes new programs for protection of older women from domestic violence and sexual abuse, rural health care model programs, and computer training. There are also grants to establish multidisciplinary centers of gerontology to do research and train people in different disciplines to work with the elderly. As our elderly population grows so does the need for appropriately-trained people to meet their health and social needs.

Every program in The Older Americans Amendments Act of 1999 is needed and will contribute to the emotional and physical well being of our seniors, those who love them, and the communities in which they live. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I support H.R. 782, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1999. This legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, has been a long time coming. For five long years, senior citizens have been anxiously awaiting the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act, and seniors in my home state of West Virginia have felt betrayed by the failure of Congress to reauthorize this bill. Betrayed, Mr. President. That is why I am so pleased that, in the final days of the 106th Congress, the Senate has the opportunity to vote on this much-needed legislation.

According to the West Virginia Bureau of Senior Services, in Fiscal Year 1999, the Older Americans Act made it possible for approximately 50,459 seniors in West Virginia to have access to vital services like transportation, congregate and home delivered meals,

adult day care, and health screenings. In addition, 676 seniors in West Virginia were able to move into the workforce through Title V, the Senior Community Service Employment Program. These programs have surely helped many, many seniors, Mr. President, and I am pleased that the Senate is demonstrating how important our nation's oldest citizens are by reauthorizing the Older Americans Act.

I am also pleased that this legislation would establish a new National Family Caregiver Support program, which would include respite, adult day care, and home care services for individuals with the greatest social and economic needs. With West Virginia having the country's oldest population for the second year in a row, and with more than fifteen percent of West Virginia's seniors who are age sixty and older considered to be living in a state of poverty, the National Family Caregiver Support program will offer much-needed assistance for home-bound seniors and their families, who are struggling to cope with the emotional and financial burdens placed on them.

In June of this year, I was fortunate to attend, and speak at, the first-ever International Conference on Rural Aging, held in my home state of West Virginia. This conference was an historic opportunity for global leaders in the aging community to converge and explore the various challenges facing the exploding senior population, both in the United States and across the globe. Of the many issues that were addressed at the conference, including the lack of access to quality health care and vital services, loss of independence and autonomy, and lack of proper elderly nutrition, I am proud to say that the Older Americans Act offers seniors programs that support their desire to remain in their own homes and live independently. The Older Americans Act gives seniors, in both urban and rural areas, the opportunity to maintain a high-quality of life and the opportunity to feel like active participants in their communities. Among the highest concerns of the elderly in the United States, the need for reauthorization of the Older Americans Act has been labeled a critical priority for keeping pace with the rapidly growing aging population.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that Copernicus was 70 when he argued that the sun, not the Earth, is the center of the cosmos. Grandma Moses was in her 70s when she started painting. Claude Monet painted his famous water lilies at the age of 74. My friend from Ohio, former Senator John Glenn, ventured back into space at the age of 76. Benjamin Franklin was 79 when he invented bifocals. These remarkable individuals were most certainly contributing to society well into what society would consider the "Golden Years." By reauthorizing the Older Americans Act, we are not only giving many other "golden seniors" the opportunity to contribute to society, but

we are acknowledging the sense that we value them and we are proud to invest in them. I am proud to support this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it is truly a privilege to be here today to speak in support of this important reauthorization of the Older Americans Act. I want to thank Senators JEFFORDS, DEWINE, MIKULSKI and KENNEDY for their leadership and steadfast work toward bringing this for us to consider today. As you know, this is the first reauthorization of these programs in eight long years. The House passed H.R. 782 on a vote of 405-2 yesterday. It's time has come today.

The Older Americans Act is the most important Federal senior's services program and has provided essential services to our nation's seniors for the last 35 years. In particular, the program has provided services to those seniors who are vulnerable because poverty, frailty or isolation. As America gets older, we have a growing need for the services and programs authorized by the OAA. We in Iowa have the highest percentage of seniors over the age of 85 in the country. We are ranked 5th in the nation in our percentage of seniors over the age of 65. The services provided through the Older Americans Act provide a lifeline to many of my constituents.

I'm proud to support the strengthening of programs such as congregate and home delivered meals, family caregiver support, in-home services for the frail elderly such as those with Alzheimer's disease, home health, and the senior community service program. These programs help Iowa seniors live independently and remain in their homes and communities.

One of my constituents told me recently what the OAA means to her: Virginia Mehl, who lives in a rural town in Iowa, had never worked away from her farm home. At the age of 79, faced with the death of her husband, she had to go and find work, cleaning an office. Suffering from fibromyalgia, she was having a real tough time. Thankfully, someone pointed her to Green Thumb, one of the organizations administering the senior community service employment program. With their help, Mrs. Mehl learned computer and office skills, enabling her to be placed in the office where she now works. She told me: "Green Thumb is the best thing that ever happened to me. [I have] the opportunity to learn new skills, meet new people, and pay for my aqua-exercise classes which I need for my disease."

Mrs. Mehl is just one example of how the Older Americans Act has been an extraordinary vehicle for helping hundreds of thousands of senior Americans obtain the training and job experience needed to improve their lives and provide economic independence, changing the negative stereotypes about aging, encouraging seniors to embrace new technology and keep up with the changing face of our economy.

Seniors in our States have been calling on us since 1995 to reauthorize these important programs. Today, at long last, and with strong bipartisan cooperation, we will do just that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to echo the strong support of my colleagues for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

In July, we celebrated the 35th anniversary of the Older Americans Act, a milestone for a program that has meant so much to millions of America's seniors. The Older Americans Act brings critical support services to the elderly in communities throughout this nation and has greatly benefitted seniors in my State.

The long overdue reauthorization of this Act is particularly significant for the State of Rhode Island. The Older Americans Act has had a long and rich legacy in my State since the Act's inception. Indeed, former Rhode Island Congressman John Fogarty played a key role in authoring the original Act, and I am pleased to have played a role in the reauthorization of this historic Act.

Since 1965, thousands of Rhode Island seniors have enjoyed the benefits of Older Americans Act programs—from congregate and home delivered meals, senior center programs, protective and legal services for the elderly, among other essential programs and services, all of which have brought comfort and enrichment to the lives of seniors in my State. For example, this year, Older Americans Act funding has helped to provide the following services to seniors in my State: 667,101 congregate meals at 74 sites; 540,008 home delivered meals; and 3,500 clients served through the home visitation program.

For many unfortunate reasons, authorization of this legislation lapsed in 1995 and since that time, Congress has been wrangling with its reauthorization. And if it were not for the hard work and sheer determination on the part of Senators JEFFORDS, KENNEDY, DEWINE, and MIKULSKI and their staffs frankly we would not be here this afternoon. I would also like to recognize Janette Takamura, the Assistant Secretary for Aging, for her insights and expertise that have proven invaluable throughout this process and for her tremendous leadership at the Administration on Aging. Indeed, getting to this point has not been easy. I commend my colleagues for their diligence and willingness to compromise on key issues, and I have been pleased to support these efforts.

Their long and hard work has resulted in a thoughtful and balanced bill that lays out a vision for Older Americans Act programs for the next several decades. Specifically, this legislation streamlines and updates existing programs and authorizes new programs designed to meet the needs of the growing population of American seniors and their families in the coming century.

In particular, as an original cosponsor of S. 707, legislation introduced by Sen-

ators GRASSLEY and BREAUX, I would like to highlight the inclusion of the Family Caregiver Support program in the Older Americans Act reauthorization. The Family Caregiver Support program is designed to meet the critical needs of families who are caring for loved ones with chronic illnesses or disabilities. This program will support respite services for caregivers, counseling and caregiver training and information about additional support services in the community.

Family caregivers are the unsung heroes in the provision of long-term care in this country. Nationally, more than 7 million Americans serve as caregivers for relatives, friends and loved ones. Last Fall, I held a Special Senate Committee on Aging field hearing in Rhode Island to explore the burdens and challenges that face family caregivers in my State.

My home State of Rhode Island has the third highest concentration of people over the age of 65 in the Nation, has enjoyed a longstanding commitment to community-based services for the elderly.

Consequently, over 90 percent of Rhode Island seniors are living outside of institutional-based care settings, thanks in large part to the selfless contributions of families and friends in providing elders with the support they need to remain in their homes and communities.

Indeed, my State has already begun to work on creative ways to provide caregivers the resources they need. Recently, the Rhode Island Department of Elderly Affairs was one of 16 national recipients of an Administration on Aging demonstration grant to develop and implement a model to provide training, support and qualified respite care for Alzheimer's families. Monies provided through the new Family Caregiver program under the Older Americans Act will greatly help to fortify and expand ongoing home- and community-based initiatives in my State.

I would also like to commend my colleagues for the inclusion of funding under Title IV to help States start to address the transportation needs of our Nation's seniors. Indeed, in Rhode Island, there is a growing demand from senior centers for transit vans to move seniors who cannot drive and are not served by regular mass transit. This is an issue of growing importance in my State, and I look forward to further considering ways to improve senior transit.

In closing, I would again like to express my appreciation to my colleagues and their staffs for their tremendous efforts to reauthorize this monumental piece of legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Older Americans Act amendments of 2000. Seniors are a vital part of our community. The programs authorized by this Act help make sure low-income and frail seniors have every opportunity to

stay independent, in their own homes, and remain a part of the community. Through meals on wheels and the congregate meal program thousands of seniors in Washington state whether homebound or not, receive nutritious meals and an opportunity to socialize with their peers. Through community service employment many low-income seniors who have poor job prospects have been meaningfully employed in a wide range of activities including education, health care, senior centers and nutrition services for older people. This reauthorization makes sure these needs will continue to be met.

In addition this bill funds activities to protect the rights of the vulnerable elderly through the long-term care ombudsman program which provides volunteer advocates for seniors living in nursing homes and other long-term facilities; through programs to prevent elder abuse, neglect and exploitation; and through assistance programs for insurance and other public benefits.

This year's authorization also includes an important new addition to the Older Americans Act—the National Family Caregiver Support program. Thousands of families are choosing to care for their senior parents and grandparents in their own homes. This can be a wonderful option for seniors who are no longer able to live independently but may not need or want the full time care of a nursing home, or for those seniors unable to afford assisted living arrangements. Counseling, training and respite care will be available to family caregivers. These services will also be made available to grandparents who are caregivers to children.

I deeply believe that seniors in this country should continue to have access to the quality services they have received in the past from the Older Americans Act. This reauthorization not only accomplishes that goal but includes needed improvements. My only regret is that I was unable to be here in person to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased today to support passage of the Older Americans Act (OAA) Reauthorization. This Act has been providing a wide range of services, such as a community service employment program, nutrition services, and research, training, and demonstration activities since 1965 for older persons, especially those at risk of losing their independence.

One such service is the Act's nutrition program, which provides millions of meals to older persons in congregate settings, such as senior centers, and to frail older persons in the comfort of their homes. The nutrition program is the Act's largest program providing meals to people who are generally older, poor, and living alone. Most significantly, this program is often the most important source of a balanced, nutritious meal for its elderly participants. While these seniors need some assistance securing adequate meals for themselves, through OAA they don't have to give up living on their own to ensure they have proper nutrition.

In an effort to expand other home-based services, this bill authorizes \$125 million in appropriations for a National Family Caregiver Support Program. The new caregiver program which will provide grants to support families and other providers of in-home and community care to older individuals, to develop innovative approaches to caregiving, and to link family support programs with programs for persons with mental retardation or related developmental disabilities and their families. This provision will help not only our seniors, but their families who are struggling to care for them in a home environment rather than a nursing home.

Another example of how OAA helps seniors keep their independence is through the senior community service employment program, which provides opportunities for part-time employment in community service activities for unemployed, low-income older persons. One goal of this program is to increase the income of these persons, however the broader goal is to assist them obtain jobs and become more self-sufficient. While the program supports over 61,500 jobs for elderly Americans, we all benefit from its efforts. Its participants are enthusiastic additions to our labor force, eagerly taking on jobs in community service that might otherwise go unattended. The participants are eager to enter the workforce and are often hired into other jobs outside of the program because of their strong work ethic.

In my home state of Tennessee, 1,224 positions have been established for the senior community service employment program through 1999. During that same year, 547 older Tennesseans were placed into the workforce outside those positions, which means that Tennessee has a rate of 45 percent for transitioning these subsidized part-time jobs into employment outside the program. Of the four senior community service employment program grantees operating in Tennessee, Green Thumb is the oldest and largest, serving 744 elderly Tennesseans during 2000. Green Thumb is currently transitioning 65 percent of elderly Tennesseans from their training program into the workforce, or in other words, at a much higher rate than the national average.

In Tennessee, the seniors served by the senior community service employment program are typically destitute women, with little to no job experience and the inability to pay for food and other basic needs. I recently heard the story of 83 year old Nell Taylor of Trenton, Tennessee. Ms. Taylor has worked at the Department of Human Services in Trenton since 1987 after starting with Green Thumb in 1985. As a result of her experience in the program, she wrote, "I am so thankful to know I have a job in DHS for it makes me feel like I am wanted and I am important."

Other stories illustrating the success of this program are those of Elizabeth

Powell and Marion Perry. Elizabeth Powell is a teacher's assistant, who also tutors individuals in the "English as a Second Language class," at the Rhea County Adult Education program in Dayton, Tennessee. At 69 years of age, Ms. Powell inspires students having received her own GED at age 58 and knowing personally how the lack of a diploma or GED hinders job opportunities. Marion Perry of Etowah, Tennessee, is a 57-year-old, part-time school bus driver who needed a second job to support his family, which includes several adopted and foster children of various nationalities. Within a couple of weeks, Green Thumb assisted Perry in securing a job as a security guard with a local company.

These few programs I've mentioned today, together with the many other services and activities established by OAA, are providing our elderly Americans with needed services, helping them maintain their independence, and affirming the valuable role they play in our community. I would like to thank Senator JEFFORDS and Senator DEWINE for their leadership on this issue. I would also like to thank Senator KENNEDY for his work and dedication to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, in half an hour we are going to have the opportunity to cast two votes. The first vote will be on the Gregg amendment. The second vote will be on the Older Americans Act. We have the opportunity to do something that Congress has not done for 8 years; that is, to reauthorize and change and improve the Older Americans Act. For 5 years this bill has not been reauthorized. It is time we do it.

Let me be very candid and very blunt about the amendment of my colleague from New Hampshire. I understand his concerns. He has expressed them very well. The reality is we have taken his concerns into consideration, and we have done more than that, we have incorporated them into this bill. So the bill we will ultimately pass today, I certainly hope without the Gregg amendment, will reflect what my colleague from New Hampshire has already contributed. That has already been done. He should be very proud of that because he has been the voice talking about accountability.

The bill that is in front of us is a bill that needs to pass. Lest anyone make a mistake about what is at stake on this first vote on the Gregg amendment, if the Gregg amendment is agreed to, the Older Americans Act reauthorization will die. It is as simple as that. We have taken a long time to get to this point. We are in the last few days of this Congress.

The House of Representatives, that has been working with us so very close-

ly, passed this identical bill yesterday by an overwhelming vote, with only two votes against it. The idea we would be able to add the Gregg amendment, which makes changes in the bill, and get the bill ultimately passed is absurd. Make no mistake about it; the key vote today is on the Gregg amendment. Anyone who is for the Older Americans Act needs to vote against the Gregg amendment.

Let me talk about the accountability we have been able to put into this bill. The accountability takes care of those issues about which Senator Gregg was concerned. We do it, basically, in two separate ways. We do it by requiring, for the first time, the Department of Labor to have very specific standards and very specific criteria. We enumerate that in the section I have in front of me called "Responsibility Tests." We outline what the Department of Labor will take into consideration when they decide whether or not this contract will be let to an organization. It says:

Before final selection of a grantee, the Secretary shall conduct a review of available records to assess the applicant agency or State's overall responsibility to administer Federal funds.

As part of the review described in [this paragraph] the Secretary may consider any information, including the organization's history with regard to the management of other grants.

It goes on and on, page after page, to describe what is in there that they will have to look at.

The second way this bill brings about accountability is after the fact, if a grantee is awarded a contract. It provides for a process of review, to make a determination whether or not the grantee has met the national performance standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allocated have expired.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am sorry, but I am just about out.

Mr. President, how many minutes do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, earlier I recognized the many contributions made by Senator GREGG to the provisions contained in our bill. We were glad to add those provisions. I regret that my colleague does not find them sufficient. But I must say that his amendment goes too far, and if adopted it will kill any chance of reauthorizing the Older Americans Act this year. I urge all of the Senators to vote against the amendment.

On its face, this proposal may look reasonable, but it is not.

It sets standards that would penalize all grantees and would preclude them providing these valuable services without the opportunity to have what are book keeping disputes adjudicated.

Moreover, the bill expressly requires each grantee to comply with OMB circulars and rules and requires the grantees to maintain records sufficient to permit tracing of funds to ensure that funds have not been spent unlawfully.

The bill institutes and requires performance outcome measures, annual grantee evaluations, grantee accountability and it creates a new grant competition for those not meeting performance measures.

It provides Governors and States greater resources and influence over job slot allocations, but also requires broad stakeholder participation in a State Senior Employment Services Plan coordinated through Governor's offices.

Our bill introduces performance measures and competition into the senior employment program for the first time. The bill would establish a 'three strikes and you're out' policy to ensure performance goals are met.

Failure to pass these reforms this year will maintain the status quo. It will only continue a system that does not serve the job placement needs of seniors in many states, and will not correct the deficiencies in the administration and planning of the program. The only way these improvements will be realized is to pass the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000, a bipartisan, bicameral initiative.

This amendment is not opposed by just the aging organizations like AARP. It is also opposed by the Southern Governors Association. Yesterday, Governor Bush of Florida urged us to pass this bill and send it the President for his signature. Governor Huckabee of Arkansas said.

The Senate must move expeditiously to pass this bill without any amendments.

I urge all the Senators to vote against the Gregg amendment.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Today, the Senate is about to approve a reauthorization of the Older Americans Act which keeps faith with the nation's senior citizens. These programs provide vital links between senior citizens and their communities.

For seniors who are healthy and active, the act offers community service employment opportunities, preventive health services, and transportation services. It also supports a range of social activities, including congregate meals. The act supports more than 6,400 multi-purpose senior citizen centers across the country. For those frail seniors who lack mobility, it helps to maintain a lifeline to the outside world. It provides daily home-delivered meals, in-home care services, home-maker services, and transportation to doctors and other caregivers, and it supports programs to protect vulnerable seniors from abuse and exploitation.

This legislation reaffirms our commitment to ensuring that older Ameri-

cans continue to receive the services which are so essential to their quality of life. This reauthorization should mean increased Federal financial support for these very worthwhile programs.

As part of this legislation, we have also created a National Family Caregiver Support Program to help families who care for ill or disabled parents or elderly relatives at home. We know how difficult it can become for a family when an elderly person needs a high degree of continuous care. We know the importance of keeping a frail senior at home in a loving environment whenever it is medically possible. This new program will provide essential support services to help these seniors remain with their loved ones. These families deserve our assistance, and this new program will ensure that they receive it.

Family caregivers will be able to obtain a broad range of support services, including respite care, in-home assistance, training in caregiver skills, and family counseling, all of which will make a major difference for these vulnerable seniors and their families. We have authorized \$125 million for the first year of this new effort, and we anticipate the program will grow in succeeding years. Massachusetts families will receive over \$3 million dollars to help them care for their elderly loved ones.

The Senior Community Service Employment Program, authorized by title V of the act, is the nation's only employment and training program aimed exclusively at low-income older persons—and it will have an increasingly important role as the Baby Boom generation ages.

Title V serves over 90,000 low-income elderly persons every year. The jobs obtained through this program provide these men and women with needed economic support. But it does much more than that. It keeps them active and involved in their communities, not isolated at home. It provides opportunities to make important contributions to their communities and to learn new skills—and it enhances their sense of dignity and self-esteem. In this legislation, we have significantly strengthened the Community Service Employment Program and provided for its much-needed expansion.

The legislation already addresses the financial accountability of title V program operators. It establishes strong new performance measures which program operators must meet each year, and provides for removal of operators who consistently fail to meet performance standards. It sets strict limits on the purposes for which program funds can be used, and established a 14-point financial responsibility test which every program operator must pass. The Department will have ample authority to disqualify those program operators whom it deems either untrustworthy or unreliable. The procedures we have established are tough and fair. The Gregg amendment is not needed.

Reauthorization of the Older Americans Act has been co-sponsored by over 70 Senators. It is supported by the National Governors' Association and by more than forty citizens organizations. It was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives yesterday on a vote of 405-2. It is the product of a delicate bipartisan and bicameral consensus. Any change in the bill at this late date would have the effect of killing the reauthorization of the OAA for this session. That would be a serious loss for the millions of seniors who depend on this program, and are counting on us to reauthorize it. Please oppose the Gregg amendment so that we can finally enact this important bill this year.

I think the real test of a civilization is how it honors its elderly people, its senior citizens. I think that is a very fair criterion and it is one we ought to be reminded about. After all, these are the men and women who fought the wars, brought the country out of the Depression, and continued to make sacrifices for their children. We have enacted legislation historically, with Social Security, to try to keep these individuals out of poverty and also a Medicare program to address their needs.

This Older Americans Act is of great importance to millions of our senior citizens, to make sure they can live a quality life. It is not a prescription drug program. No, it is not, but it does provide vital services: Nutrition programs, preventive health care programs, transportation programs, feeding programs, in-home delivered meals programs. It is something that is really a lifeline for millions of our senior citizens. It is an employment program for many of our elderly people who want to provide services in local communities in nonprofit organizations.

The amendment before us, the amendment that has been put forward by Senator GREGG, brought a matter to the committee that the committee considered. I just hope our colleagues listen to the excellent presentations of the Senators from Ohio and Vermont, that would indicate that on these issues, this legislation responds to those questions and does it well.

This is an opportunity, with the defeat of the Gregg amendment, to pass this legislation and be on the road to provide meaningful services to our senior citizens. I hope the Gregg amendment will be defeated and we will have an overwhelming vote in support of the legislation.

I yield.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes remaining. The Senator from New Hampshire has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield 5 minutes to the good Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Senate passage of the bipartisan Older Americans Act—OAA Amendments of 2000—H.R.

782. This bill passed the House yesterday with the overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 405-2. The Senate companion bill S. 1536 has 72 cosponsors. H.R. 782 is a bipartisan, bicameral agreement to reauthorize the OAA. It is built on the strong foundation of S. 1536 and the bipartisan compromises reached by the HELP Committee in that bill. It also has the overwhelming support of the aging community. H.R. 782 is well worthy of your support.

This bill long overdue. It keeps our promise to older Americans to retain and strengthen current OAA programs, but is also provides new innovations and accountability to further improve the Act. It will ensure that the Older Americans Act continues to meet the day-to-day needs of our country's older Americans and the long range needs of our aging population.

The highlight of this bill is the creation of the national Family Caregiver Support Program. This program will provide respite care, training, counseling, support services, information and assistance to some of the millions of Americans who care for older individuals and adult children with disabilities. It also will help grandparents who care for grandchildren. This program has strong bipartisan support, will get behind our nation's families, and give help to those who practice self-helped.

Today our families are the backbone of the long term care system in this country. Currently about 12.8 million adults need assistance from others to carry out activities of daily living, such as bathing and feeding. By 2030 there will be about 21 million people over the age of 70 needing care. More than half of the elderly that do not currently receive help do not expect to have help in the future.

One in four adults currently provides care for an adult with a chronic health condition. The economic impact of caregiving is staggering. A recent study found that on average, workers who take care of older relatives lose \$659,139 in wages, pension benefits, and Social Security over a lifetime. Further, it is estimated that the national economic value of informal caregiving was \$196 billion in 1997.

Many of us have personally cared for sick or aging parents or other relatives and understand firsthand the strains and stresses facing caregivers. We know that adult children are most often the providers of care for seniors. This is the sandwich generation with moms and dads caring for their own children and their own parents. They have full-time jobs at the office and then they come home to full time jobs of caring for other family members.

My sisters and I cared for my mother when she was ill. We were fortunate. We all lived relatively close to my mother and could share caregiving responsibilities. But many families may be scattered across the country and find it more difficult to ensure that older members of their family are

cared for properly. In addition, as our population ages, many people are living longer. We now see 80-year-old spouses caring for each other. We can see 70-year-old daughter caring for her 90-year-old mother.

The National Family Caregiver Support Program will help caregivers across the country care for their older relatives, grandparents care for grandchildren, and older individuals care for adult children with disabilities. It is a vital new innovation in this bill. It will meet the day-to-day needs of countless families across the country. We must pass this bill to create this program to help families.

When many Americans think of how the Federal Government helps our country's older Americans, they think of Social Security and Medicare. But what many Americans do not realize is the vital role that the Older Americans Act plays in meeting the day-to-day needs of seniors in this country. In this bill we maintain core programs in this Act that help our seniors.

Some of the most well known OAA programs are congregate and home-delivered meals. OAA provides about 240 million meals to over 3 million older persons. About half of these meals are provided in congregate settings and the other half are provided to frail older persons in their homes. These meal programs are vital to seniors.

A national evaluation of the nutrition program shows that, compared to the total elderly population, nutrition program participants are older and more likely to be poor, to live alone, and to be members of minority groups. The report found that the program plays an important role in the participants' overall nutrition and that these meals are the primary source of daily nutrients for these seniors. For every Federal dollar spent, the program leverages on average \$1.70 for congregate meals, and \$3.35 for home-delivered meals. A hot lunch at a senior center could be the only hot meal some seniors get each day.

Congregate meals also provide an opportunity for seniors to get out of their homes and socialize with other older persons in their community. After a meal, seniors may stay on for other activities. A meal can lead to a spirited game of bingo, ping-pong, pool, a dance class, or an exercise class. These kinds of activities keep older Americans more active and engaged which can help them live longer and live better. Home-delivered meals allow the frail elderly to enjoy a nutritious hot meal in the comfort of their own home. It can help keep seniors in their own home rather than having to live in an institution.

We also maintain important protective services for seniors such as legal assistance, the long-term care ombudsman, and elder abuse prevention activities. Legal assistance helps seniors with everything from writing a will to guardianship issues to assistance with housing to accessing Social Security benefits.

The long-term care ombudsman is the only OAA program that focuses solely on the needs of institutionalized persons. A senior in a nursing home or that senior's family can contact a local long-term care ombudsman if they are concerned about the quality of care their family member is receiving in a nursing home. The ombudsman is a neutral third party that investigates and helps resolve complaints about quality of care. This is an invaluable resource for seniors to help ensure that they get the best care possible.

The Act also provides for elder abuse prevention programs. OAA helps coordinate elder abuse prevention programs and combat crimes against seniors. It helps train professionals who serve seniors to help them better recognize signs of abuse and help seniors who are victims of abuse. OAA helps increase public awareness about elder abuse both among seniors and in the community at large.

We keep innovation and new ideas flowing by maintaining a separate and distinct Title IV for Research and Demonstration Projects, which is where innovative programs like the eldercare locator got started. We recognize the importance of the White House Conference on Aging to the aging community, and require the President to call such a conference before the end of 2005. Past White House conferences have brought forth innovative new ideas and created new programs to better serve seniors.

We maintain strong support for transportation services, which are critically important to seniors in our rural areas. I know this can be especially important in areas like Western Maryland and the Eastern Shore where seniors may have to travel further to the grocery store or a doctor's appointment or to their nearest senior center. And we retain core provisions of the law, like minority targeting language. That language ensures that OAA services are directed to those who need them the most. However, we acknowledge that unmet need can exist in rural areas, so we have included provisions to help improve the delivery of services to older individuals in rural areas.

At the same time, we recognize the need to strengthen certain programs in the Act and increase accountability. We have focused efforts on strengthening accountability and improving the Senior Community Service Employment Program or title V.

This program provides part-time community service jobs to low-income seniors. It gives them a steady source of income that they need for rent, groceries, medical care, and utilities. Most of the seniors participating in the program are older women whose work histories include working in the home, domestic work, caring for their children and grandchildren, or part-time unskilled employment. Many have not finished high school. Few have pensions, and Social Security or supplemental security income may be the

only source of income for the majority of participants. They count on their check from this program to pay their bills.

Seniors also receive valuable training and skills that enable them to get unsubsidized jobs in the public and private sectors. This is especially important in today's tight labor market. Increasingly, employers are looking to older workers to fill jobs traditionally not held by older Americans.

Title V also gives something back to communities. Seniors in this program serve meals in senior centers and drive the vans to help seniors get to their local senior center for a hot lunch. They work in schools and hospitals and day care centers. They make a difference in their communities and their work does not go unnoticed.

We have taken a number of steps to increase accountability. We establish performance measures. If an organization or a state fails to meet these standards and improve its performance, other entities will get the opportunity to competitively bid for a portion or all of the original organization or entity's grant. We establish a minimum amount that must be spent on enrollee wages and fringe benefits. We clarify the way organizations must define and report their costs so that there is no room for ambiguity. We codify responsibility tests and new criteria for grantee eligibility. We require a broad and open planning process so that areas of greatest need within a State are served as efficiently as possible.

While I believe that overall the current grantees are performing very well, these provisions will help ensure that seniors get the high quality services they deserve. They also strengthen the entire SCSEP program and do not target one particular grantee.

This bill strikes a good balance between recognizing the need for additional resources to support OAA programs and protecting the most vulnerable seniors and their access to services. It specifically authorizes seniors to make voluntary contributions—donations—for all OAA services. The bill also allows states to require cost-sharing for a limited number of services such as transportation, respite care, and personal care. A long list of services is exempt from cost sharing, such as the meals program, information and assistance, and ombudsman. It also provides guidance to states and protections to help ensure that seniors are not discouraged from seeking services because of cost-sharing.

I also want to note the strong need for increased funding for Older Americans Act programs. Very few OAA programs have seen increased funding in recent years, yet there is a growing need for services. I strongly support full funding of the new National Family Caregiver Support Program, but other OAA programs must also receive needed increases in funding. I strongly urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate

leadership to do as much as possible to increase funding for these valuable programs in the final days of this Congress and in the future. I look forward to working with you to do that.

I want to thank Senator DEWINE, Chairman of the Aging Subcommittee, for his sincere dedication to reauthorizing the OAA and willingness to work in a bipartisan manner to accomplish this. Thank you to Senator JEFFORDS for his strong leadership in moving this bill through the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and all the way through until enactment. Senator KENNEDY also deserves credit for this bill—he continues to be a tireless advocate for the OAA and the people it serves. I want to thank the Senate staff that have worked so hard on this legislation: Sean Donohue, Hollis Turnham, Karla Carpenter, Jeff Teitz, Abby Brandel, and Rhonda Richards. I can not think of any better way to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the OAA in 2000 than by enacting this long-awaited bipartisan reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the bill and defeat of the Gregg amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized 2¾ minutes.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I think it has pretty much been said. I ask my colleagues to defeat the Gregg amendment and to pass the Older Americans Act. This is a bill that needs to pass. It is a bill that is sponsored by 73 Members of this body. It is a bill that is supported by the National Governors' Association which urges us to pass the bill. I have a letter from the Southern Governors' Association, signed by all the Southern Governors, including Governor Bush from Texas, as well as Governor Bush from Florida.

Governor Bush from Florida has been very instrumental in working with us on this bill and is a very strong proponent and advocate of the bill because he understands what a difference it will make.

I reiterate, the concerns my colleague from New Hampshire has raised, and I know he will speak in a moment, are valid concerns. We have taken them into consideration. We have incorporated them into this bill. We congratulate him on the work he has done. This bill is a better bill because of what JUDD GREGG has done.

We are now, though, at the point where we have incorporated those reforms. This is a reform-minded bill. This is a bill that will make a difference. This is a bill that will change the status quo. We are now faced with the prospect of either passing this good bill and sending it on to the President of the United States or, if we adopt the

Gregg amendment, killing the bill and seeing the status quo remain because that is what will happen.

None of the reforms my colleague wants to see take place will take place if we kill this bill. It will not be one of them. We will continue to muck along. We will continue to move along as we have year after year with the status quo and with no reforms at all. If you are for reforms, you have to vote against the Gregg amendment and then vote for final passage.

I thank the Chair and thank my colleagues.

AMENDMENT NO. 4343

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 15 minutes remaining. All time controlled by Senator JEFFORDS has expired. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, first, I appreciate the kind words that have been expressed relative to my efforts on this bill. They are minor compared to the efforts of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Maryland who have worked very hard.

The underlying bill is a strong bill. Remember, we are talking about a 5-year authorization. We are not talking about 1 day, 2 days, 1 year, or 2 years. We are talking about 5 years. We are talking about continuing the status quo for another 5 years on this piece of legislation.

This amendment is about good government. The amendment is: Are you for language which says that a grantee that misuses the funds can be disciplined by the Department of Labor? It is that simple. It is generic. If the Department of Labor determines that a grantee misuses funds, this gives the Department of Labor the capacity to do something about that.

As I talked about earlier today, we have an example of one of the grantees, the National Council of Senior Citizens, which has grossly misused funds, which set up a slush fund of \$6 million, which spent over \$10 million basically to pay for expenses for insurance, which were insurance organizations operated by the same people who ran the National Council of Senior Citizens, which has had an audit in the years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, all of which audits have shown it has misused funds.

If we do not adopt this amendment, that organization will continue to get \$64 million a year, will continue to misuse those funds, and the Department of Labor will not have the authority to act against that organization in anything that is even conceivably a reasonable timeframe. Under this bill, as it is presently structured, the fastest timeframe in which the Department of Labor can act against an organization which has acted in the manner in which this organization has acted is 3 years. Even then it is not an issue because there is no language for activity for misuse of funds. They would have to raise it to a level of

criminal or fraudulent activity, which is a standard that is very hard to prove.

It is very obvious that American tax dollars are not being used for the purposes of employing senior citizens, which should be our goal. I am asking for some extremely reasonable good government language to be inserted into this bill. The only argument I have heard today against this language is essentially that, if this little amendment goes in, this bill dies.

I say to my colleagues, that is absurd on its face. We are not leaving here very soon. Regrettably, I wish we were leaving here today. A lot of us wish we were leaving here today, but we are not. I happen to know of three major pieces of legislation which are not going to be completed today. They probably are not going to be completed tomorrow. It is a fairly safe bet that we are going to be back next week. In fact, I can almost guarantee it. I can say that with some authority because I happen to chair one of the committees which has jurisdiction over one of these pieces of legislation, the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill. That bill is not going to be completed today, and it is probably not going to be completed this week, and probably we will be back next week.

The same is true of the Labor-HHS bill, and the same is true of the tax bill. We know we are going to be able to take this amendment, send it back to the House, have it passed, and come back here and pass the whole bill.

If that is the reason this language is being opposed, it is inaccurate. This language can be inserted, this bill can be reformed and it can be corrected, and the bill can be brought back to us and passed.

The House of Representatives passed this bill overwhelmingly. This language is not debilitating to the bill. It is an attempt to make the bill function as it should.

What should it do? It should make sure that when we give \$350 million a year to agencies without requiring them to bid on the programs, when we give them an entitlement that says, you get this money; you just walk up to the window and we give it to you, at least those agencies should be required not to misuse the money; that those agencies should be required to spend the money for the purposes of employing senior citizens, not for the purpose of creating a slush fund, not for the purpose of financing a Teamsters Union election, not for the purpose of financing a campaign against a Senator, not for the purpose of creating an insurance vehicle which benefits the underlying agency. It should be that those moneys should be used for the senior citizens, to be employed under the bill under title V.

That is all this language does. It is benign language. Without this language, we will essentially continue a process that allows these agencies to come to the window, take the money,

and run, without adequate accountability. Even more importantly, there will be no competition and no performance standards.

So the language is reasonable. It needs to be included in the bill. The timing of this bill is not such that this language is going to kill the bill. The momentum for this bill is immense. There is no way that this bill will not pass with this language in it if this amendment is agreed to. The bill will pass. The bill will be conferenced. The bill will be back here. The bill will be voted on before we adjourn as a Senate or a Congress. So that debate is inaccurate.

So I hope that this language, which is a very reasonable attempt to address what is regrettably a glaring problem in the delivery of these services, will be accepted. I hope people would not vote against something so simple as a statement that we should allow the Department of Labor to discipline people who misuse tax dollars. To vote against that is really to take a position which I think is very hard to defend.

We are going to vote on this amendment. I would certainly appreciate my colleagues not being swayed by the argument that a vote for my amendment will bring the bill down because that argument is a red herring, in my opinion, because we are going to be here next week and we can certainly pass this bill next week. It will pass on a voice vote once this amendment is taken. In fact, it will pass by unanimous agreement.

But, rather, I hope my colleagues will be swayed by the fact that if we fail to include this amendment, we will continue to have the issue of whether or not the dollars we are spending to employ seniors, to make their lives better, are, instead, going to be able to be spent to benefit some agency in some way that has no relationship to seniors and their needs. A good government requires that this type of language be put in the bill. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. President, I understand that all time on the other side has been used; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GREGG. I yield back the remainder of my time and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Gregg amendment No. 4343. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 69, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 284 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Brownback	Hutchison	Shelby
Bunning	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Kyl	Thompson
Craig	Lott	Warner
Enzi	Mack	
Fitzgerald	McConnell	

NAYS—69

Abraham	Durbin	McCain
Akaka	Edwards	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Miller
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Bennett	Grassley	Murray
Biden	Hagel	Reed
Bingaman	Harkin	Reid
Boxer	Hatch	Robb
Breaux	Hollings	Roberts
Bryan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Burns	Inouye	Roth
Byrd	Jeffords	Santorum
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kennedy	Schumer
Cochran	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Crapo	Landrieu	Thomas
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lincoln	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lugar	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Feinstein	Grams	Lieberman
Gorton	Helms	Specter

The amendment (No. 4343) was rejected.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from

Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 285 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Abraham	Enzi	McConnell
Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Allard	Fitzgerald	Miller
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Bayh	Gramm	Murray
Bennett	Grassley	Nickles
Biden	Gregg	Reed
Bingaman	Hagel	Reid
Bond	Harkin	Robb
Boxer	Hatch	Roberts
Breaux	Hollings	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hutchinson	Roth
Bryan	Hutchison	Santorum
Bunning	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Burns	Inouye	Schumer
Byrd	Jeffords	Sessions
Campbell	Johnson	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Kerrey	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kerry	Snowe
Collins	Kohl	Stevens
Conrad	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Thompson
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Voivovich
Dodd	Lincoln	Warner
Domenici	Lott	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lugar	Wyden
Durbin	Mack	
Edwards	McCain	

NOT VOTING—6

Feinstein	Grams	Lieberman
Gorton	Helms	Specter

The bill (H.R. 782) was passed.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SANTORUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I withdraw my pending motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure that the Senate has passed the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000. This year is the 35th anniversary of the Older Americans Program. Since 1965, the Act has provided a range of needed social services to our Nation's senior citizens. It is the major vehicle for the organization and delivery of supportive and nutrition services to older persons, and it has grown and changed to meet our citizens' needs. In 1972, we created the national nutrition program; in 1978, we established a separate title for Native Americans; and in 1987, we authorized programs to prevent elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation. The Act has been reauthorized 12 times, most recently in 1992. Reauthorization legislation was considered in the 104th and

105th Congresses but did not pass due to controversy about a number of proposals. But those controversies were addressed and the Senate has voted unanimously to pass this Act and provide our elderly with desperately needed help.

The Older Americans Act programs play a vital role in all our communities. Because of the Older Americans Act, millions of nutritious meals are delivered each year to the generation that served our country in World War II. It funds the operations of senior centers and other supportive services to enhance the dignity and independence of the Nation's elders; and it provides part-time employment opportunities to tens of thousands of senior citizens. Indeed, virtually all of our Nation's elderly are benefitting from the Act. However, more could be done to help our senior citizens and their families. This is why we are here to pass the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000.

I want to commend all of the members of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions for their work and contributions in this effort. Senator DEWINE and Senator MIKULSKI led the way on this reauthorization effort early in this Congress. Beginning on March 3, 1999, the Subcommittee on Aging held a series of hearings, receiving testimony from over 30 witnesses. The first hearing presented Subcommittee members with an overview of the various Older Americans Act programs. Subsequent Subcommittee hearings covered other important issues, including elder abuse, supportive services, State and local views, longevity in the workplace, and long-term family caregiver programs. In March, 1999, we were very fortunate to hear testimony from Ms. Reeve Lindbergh of St. Johnsbury, Vermont. She spoke to our Committee about the unacceptable problem of elder abuse which confronts some of our most fragile elders. Then, in April, we heard from another Vermonter, Mr. John Barbour, who serves as the Director of the Champlain Valley Agency on Aging, in Winooski, Vermont. He alerted the Committee to changes needed in the nutritional programs outlined in Title III of the Act.

This bill improves the Older Americans Act in several key areas. For example, Title I sets out broad policy objectives related to income, health, housing, long-term care, employment, retirement, and community services that will improve the lives of all older Americans. Modifications under this title establish a Federal definition of "in-home services" and give both State units and area agencies on aging the ability to include locally significant in-home services in their service definition.

Title II identifies the Administration on Aging as the chief Federal agency advocate for older persons and also establishes the Eldercare Locator Service and Pension Rights and Counseling as ongoing programs.

Significant modifications have been made to Title III, grants for State and community programs. One of the most important aspects of this Act is the establishment of the Grassley-Breaux National Family Caregiver Support Program. According to the 1994 National Long Term Care Survey, there are more than 7 million informal caregivers—including spouses, adult children, other relatives, and friends who provide day-to-day care for most of our Nation's elders. The National Family Caregiver Program authorizes \$125 million in Federal assistance to help families care for their elderly by providing a multifaceted system of supportive services, including information, assistance, counseling, and respite services. Moreover, it will help older individuals who are caring for relative children, such as their grandchildren. According to the United States Census Bureau, in 1997, almost 4 million children were living in homes maintained by their grandparents. This program will also extend to older folks who are caring for their adult children with mental retardation and developmental disabilities.

Other changes to this title clarify the role of area agencies on aging with respect to case management, information and referral services, and also strengthen their obligations to coordinate volunteer programs and efforts with other community organizations providing similar services. In addition, the interstate formula allotments are updated, with appropriations being tied to minimum-growth hold harmless amounts, so that no State receives less than it did in FY 2000.

Title V authorizes community service employment for older Americans to provide part-time community service jobs for unemployed, low-income persons 55 years old and over. There will be 1.4 million more low-income persons over the age of 55 in the year 2005 than there were a decade earlier, and many of them will continue working. Employment obtained through this program provides these workers with needed economic support. It keeps them active and involved in their communities, and it provides them with the opportunity to make important contributions to their communities, learn new skills, and enhance their sense of dignity and self-esteem.

The changes made in Title V by this bill are a critical part of this legislation, because they strengthen and modernize the Senior Employment Program. To begin, the purpose statement is amended to stress economic self-sufficiency and to increase the number of placements in public- and private-sector unsubsidized employment. The employment program is integrated with the Workforce Investment Act, including one-stop delivery systems and participant assessments and services, while the program itself and the administrative costs are codified. Also, under this title, the State Senior Employment Services Plan is established which provides Governors with greater

influence and responsibility concerning the allocation of job slots. The newly established State Plan ensures for the first time a planning process with broad participation by representatives from State and area agencies on aging; State and local workforce investment boards; public and private non-profit providers of employment services; businesses and labor organizations; and other aging network stakeholders.

The remaining sections have also been modified. Title IV, training, research, and discretionary projects and programs, authorizes the Assistant Secretary for Aging to award funds for training, research, and demonstration projects in the field of aging. This Act consolidates the demonstration programs from 18 to 10 categories, including sections on violence against older Americans, rural health, computer training, and transportation. Title VI, grants to Native Americans, authorizes funds for social and nutrition services to older Indians and Native Hawaiians. The modifications by this Act authorize the Family Caregiver Support Program for tribal organizations. Then, a provision is added under Title VII, vulnerable elder rights protection activities, which authorizes funds for activities that protect the rights of the vulnerable elderly. The new provision requires that ombudsman programs coordinate with "law enforcement" agencies.

I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the many other individuals and organizations that have contributed to this effort. In addition to leadership Senator DEWINE and Senator MIKULSKI, Senator KENNEDY contributed his long experience to this effort. He helped us find the middle ground and solutions to many thorny issues. Senator GREGG was instrumental in focusing the Committee's attention on the much-needed reforms in the employment services program, and the program is much strengthened by his work. Senator HUTCHINSON was especially active on these efforts to address the employment and services needs of the rural elderly.

Among the groups in the network of aging organizations, special recognition must go to the National Council of Older Americans and the National Association of State Units on Aging for their insight in proposing a compromise to the employment services program. AARP, with the leadership of Horace Deets, undertook the difficult task of seeking consensus among the many aging organizations. Green Thumb tirelessly educated members of Congress about the importance of these aging populations, especially those members representing rural constituencies. The Leadership Council of Aging Organizations, currently being chaired by the Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, provided a continuous forum for many issues to be addressed. Others contributing to this effort include the National Caucus on Black Aging, the National Associa-

tion of Area Agencies on Aging, and Meals on Wheels. Finally, the Administration on Aging, headed by Jeanette Takamura, provided ongoing leadership and continuous expert support in strengthening these programs.

Many of our staff deserve considerable recognition for their dedicated work. Daphne Edwards in the Office of the Legislative Counsel worked tirelessly on countless drafts of this legislation. Carol O'Shaughnessy of the Congressional Research Service lent her counsel, as well as her years of experience with aging programs, to this bill. Abby Brandel and Rhonda Richards of Senator MIKULSKI's office, and Jeffrey Teitz of Senator KENNEDY's staff, worked diligently to reach accords on many of these difficult issues. Alan Gilbert with Senator GREGG provided invaluable guidance on the employment services program. Kate Hull, of Senator HUTCHINSON's staff, also dedicated many hours of effort to the final product. Recognition is deserved especially by Karla Carpenter, the staff director of the Aging Subcommittee, who with Senator DEWINE developed the framework for this modernization bill and who stuck with the effort to see it finished. Finally, on my own staff, I want to acknowledge and commend the efforts of Hollis Turnham and Sean Donohue. Hollis came to my office as the Senator John Heinz Fellow on Aging, and her extensive experience with these programs was invaluable to the completion of the bill. Hollis brought with her years of experience in serving our Nation's elders and a full knowledge of just how the Older Americans Act affects our older Americans. After several years of trying, this effort to reauthorize the Older Americans Act could have gone astray at countless points over these past two years. Therefore, much credit must go to Sean Donohue, whose focus, experience, and sheer tenacity guided this successful effort.

In summary, our bill goes a long way to improving supportive, employment, and nutritional services for the elderly. This legislation updates the Older Americans Act, making it more relevant and useful to our country's senior citizens. All of these individuals have worked hard to develop innovative strategies to strengthen and modernize the Older Americans Act, and I know that through these efforts our Nation's elders will be better served by this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act which just received the Senate's unanimous approval is the product of a two-year bipartisan effort. Earlier today, I said Senators JEFFORDS, DEWINE, MIKULSKI, and I share a common commitment to preserving and strengthening these programs, which have done so much to improve the lives of millions of senior citizens. I commend my three colleagues for their tremendous leadership in fashioning this legislation.

Now, I would like to recognize the members of our staffs who did the work that made this bill possible: Rhonda Richards and Abby Brandel from Senator MIKULSKI's office, Karla Carpenter from Senator DEWINE's office, Sean Donohue, Hollis Turnham and Mark Powden from Senator Jefford's office, and Jeffrey Teitz, Michael Myers, and Jerry Wesevich from my office. We assigned them an extremely difficult task. Efforts to reauthorize the Older Americans Act had failed in the last two Congresses. This year, at each point when the differences appeared too wide, these individuals found a creative way to bridge the divide. They managed to build the consensus which has enabled this legislation to pass both the House and Senate so overwhelmingly.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS, HEALTH, TAX, AND MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to the conference report accompanying H.R. 2614, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 286 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Frist	Nickles
Allard	Grassley	Robb
Ashcroft	Gregg	Roberts
Bennett	Hagel	Roth
Bingaman	Hatch	Santorum
Bond	Hutchinson	Sessions
Brownback	Hutchison	Shelby
Bunning	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Burns	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Kohl	Snowe
Chafee, L.	Kyl	Specter
Cochran	Lott	Stevens
Collins	Lugar	Thomas
Craig	Mack	Thompson
Crapo	McCain	Thurmond
DeWine	McConnell	Voinovich
Domenici	Miller	Warner
Enzi	Moynihan	
Fitzgerald	Murkowski	

NAYS—40

Akaka	Boxer	Cleland
Baucus	Breaux	Conrad
Bayh	Bryan	Daschle
Biden	Byrd	Dodd