

to do something with that. Could we finish it? No, we sure couldn't. Sure, there is a little different view. We wanted to let the local people have more flexibility. Our friends over there wanted the rules to come from here. OK, we have a difference. We have a difference in philosophy. I don't argue with that. We have an honest difference. Let's vote. But, no, that is not what happened. What we did was have introduced all kinds of irrelevant, non-germane amendments. I don't know how long we can do that.

The marriage penalty—I have already mentioned it. That is something that certainly ought to be done. As far as I know, it is agreed to by nearly everyone, including the President. It is a fairness issue. We ought to be doing it.

Agriculture, crop insurance, that is one of the things we need to strengthen, since we are moving away from the old farm program. Agriculture is out there; farmers are running some risks and crop insurance is part of it. We were not able to do that. Things that were not pertinent were there.

The juvenile justice bill, we passed juvenile justice. It is still in the committee. We are trying to get some agreement. It is being held up by non-germane kinds of things.

I respect fully the difference of view. I respect fully the differences in philosophy. That is why we are here. That is what elections are about. I understand that. But we simply have to find a way to put aside this business of stalling, just put aside this business of delay, put aside this business of constantly seeking to bring to the floor issues that are totally political and have nothing to do with the topic we are on and talk about them at the time to talk about them. But talk about them once. Don't talk about them every other day. That is what we do. That is wrong. We ought to change it.

We have a chance to take a look at where we are and where we want to go. I have thought more recently, I don't know quite why, about the concept that each of us has goals for ourselves, whether they be personal goals, whether they be professional goals, whether they be spiritual goals, whether they be family goals, and seek to identify those and then decide what our goal is and what we have to do to reach it.

Frankly, I wish it applied a little more to Government. As we enter into these, we ought to not only be looking at the daily issues with which we deal, but we should also be looking at, having set goals and identified where we want to be, whether what we are doing now is contributing to the attainment of those goals.

It is my view we have not done enough of that. If we have a goal of accomplishment in the Senate, a goal of doing the things the people sent us here to do, and then find ourselves caught up in business which does not move toward the attainment of that goal, it is frustrating.

I hope we can move forward. I believe we will. I appreciate the Presiding Offi-

cer's efforts. I look forward to next week to accomplish more than we did this week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROCEEDING TO DEBATE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I just finished presiding, and the last 15 minutes I presided was a quorum call. It occurred to me there are probably people watching the quorum call who wonder why there was a quorum call. Since I had to listen to some of the previous discussion that I don't think gave a full explanation of why there is a quorum call, or why we are not proceeding on the business of this country, I feel compelled to give a brief explanation.

In the Senate, we have to get permission to proceed to debate a bill. That is where we are right now. We are trying to get permission to proceed to debate an appropriations bill. It is a foreign operations appropriations bill. The Democrats have decided, because of a procedural motion on which they lost yesterday, which will have an effect on the debate of the Senate for years to come perhaps, that we are not going to debate anything for a while.

Let me explain a little more about what that is. What we are having is a filibuster. It is being done rather silently, and sometimes in a whining way. We are having a filibuster over whether we are going to debate any of the appropriations bills. What you heard earlier was them saying that if we can't debate extraneous, non-germane items on any one of the appropriations bills, we are going to see that the business of this country does not go forward. I want to tell you, I think that is wrong and I think the American people need to know about it.

We can do a lot of finger-pointing over why things aren't happening around here, and that isn't going to get anything done except allow the voters in November to make a decision. But the voters need to know what it is that is happening. We are talking about whether a Senator ought to be able to run down here to the floor on any measure that comes up under appropriations—we have 13 appropriations bills to pass, and it usually takes a week to pass each one, and we have about 13 weeks left of the session this year. We are debating now whether or not you can come down here and just stick in any amendment you want, on any issue you want, and call it "deliberative debate."

You can't have an appropriations amendment that legislates. Nobody

questions that. That has been determined. We have a Senate rule that says you can't legislate on an appropriations bill. But there is a loophole there. It isn't clear whether you can pontificate on an appropriations bill, whether you can't stick in something that is your pet project and talk ad infinitum on it. That is what this is about. That is what the silence is about. That is what the inability to go forward is about. It is about whether we ought to be able to pontificate on anything we want to, whether or not it is relevant to the item that is up.

Why is that important? I guess it is because this Chamber has television in it now and what we say can be carried to people all across this country. It is cheaper than buying a campaign ad. But it doesn't make it right.

You can't legislate on an appropriations bill, so should you be able to do a sense of the Senate? I say you should not be able to. We should be at the business of taking the appropriations bills we have and deciding on each and every issue that is in that appropriations bill to see if it is the right thing to do. If it is some other issue we want to debate, we should not get to do it then. When we finish up the 13 appropriations bills, we can go back to the regular legislation of this body. On those, there is no requirement on what can be added to them. You can debate and put in an amendment whether it has anything to do with the bill or not. My personal opinion is that you should not be able to do that either. We would get more business done. But there isn't a rule that keeps you from doing non-germane amendments on the regular legislative business; it is only on the appropriations.

Why would we do that? Why would there be requirements on what can be debated when we are talking about appropriations? Well, the bill on which we are trying to get permission to debate right now is one of the smaller ones. A lot of people probably don't think it is very important to this country. In fact, if this bill didn't pass, a lot of people in Wyoming would probably be overjoyed. But it is our business to make sure we deliberate and pass this bill before October 1. What bill is it? The permission that has been requested is to debate the foreign operations appropriations bill.

Earlier, a couple of my colleagues mentioned that if people come to see them in their office and they want to talk about the dairy business, they expect them to be able to come over here to the floor and solve their problem. Well, I want to tell you, that isn't how it happens. You can't talk to somebody in your office, leave your office, come over here, and solve their problem. There are days I wish it were that easy and that fast. But it is designed not to be that easy and that fast. You really have to be able to put it with something that will convince enough Senators it is a good idea that you can do it.

If we happen to be debating a bill that has that dairy problem in it and the funding allocated for it, you can make a difference at that point in time. That is what we are talking about—how to spend the money of this country. As I said, this is a very small bill. This is a \$13 billion bill—\$13 billion that we are going to spend partly in the United States and partly around the world. It has some interesting provisions in it that are probably worthy of debate—funds for university development assistance programs across the United States. On page 23, they go into a whole bunch of countries that we help. In the report on the bill on page 34, we talk about physician exchanges, so we can have better health around the world. We have vitamins for at-risk women. On page 35, we have violence against women. One of the items that will undoubtedly be debated at some length in this bill is whether there ought to be some bilateral economic assistance to Colombia for narcotics control and law enforcement. But we are not going to get to debate those because perhaps we ought to be able to debate a sense of the Senate on this bill that has nothing to do with it. Patients' Bill of Rights is very important.

I am one of the people on the Senate team negotiating between the Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate for a Patients' Bill of Rights. We passed that bill. It is an important bill. We are trying to get resolution on that bill.

As a Senator, if we don't have the rule about how peripheral and how nongermane you can get, I could offer an amendment that says I have this sense of the Senate that everyone will agree with me on, and I would like that Patients' Bill of Rights finished by next week. It isn't going to happen because there are too many details that need to be worked out.

I would have had the right day before yesterday to do that. That is what we are talking about. I could have demanded debate time.

It is very difficult to bring debate to a close in this body. As you saw with the gun amendment which was a sense of the Senate, it was a nonbinding sort of thing that said they wanted the juvenile justice bill resolved between the House and the Senate, and they wanted it done by May 24, sometime next week. And it had to be done.

Well, it isn't going to be done. It can't be done. They demanded 12 hours of debate on that issue—12 hours of debate holding up the Senate. That issue is important to a lot of Members. We already debated it and sent it to the conference committee. It is being resolved in the conference committee.

Does it deserve another 12 hours of debate when we are on appropriations? The appropriations bill that we are trying to get done now is on foreign ops. The one we finished when that came up was military construction, building the things that our military needs at home and abroad to do the right job for our national security.

Deliberation is different than publicizing.

These desks down here on the floor were built two per State as the States came into the Nation. They are the same desks that all of the Senators have used through the years. If you have an opportunity to be on the floor, you can take out the bottom drawer of these desks. Senators, as they were leaving this deliberative body, carved their names in that drawer as a tradition. Those are now preserved in Plexiglass. That is taken out, and Members can add their names as they leave.

There is a list in each desk that shows each and every Senator who sat at that desk in the history of the United States. It is fascinating to come down here at night and sit at these desks, look at those lists, and see the names of Senator after Senator whom you have read about in your history book who has been here and debated. You can read about some of the great debates they gave.

For a long time there was not even a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. We didn't have this pontificating, saying I really think we will feel better if we debate and do a sense of the Senate on this nongermane issue. But if you sit here at night and read those names, it is like a walk through history. It is also an opportunity for you to get the feeling that they are still in this Chamber debating whether we are doing the job that we ought to be doing.

In my opinion, the job that we ought to be doing is getting the appropriations bills of this country done as fast as we possibly can, as deliberately as we possibly can, as carefully as we possibly can but getting it done and sticking to the issue of what is in that appropriations bill, or what we think ought to be in that appropriations bill, or what we think ought to be disappearing from that appropriations bill.

Those are the amendments that we ought to be debating, turning in, and turning over. Those are the ones that we ought to be giving grand consideration to in the style that used to in this Chamber—not bringing in peripheral amendments and saying I think I can delay this whole bill so that the President can negotiate it when the new year begins.

It is even possible to delay the whole thing by doing genuine amendments to a genuine bill. It is important for Senators to be able to express themselves on all issues. I daresay if you watch television evenings and weekends you can see Senators debating absolutely every issue. You can't see them making progress on every issue. That is a very prized thing and very difficult to do around here.

I have to tell you that a sense-of-the-Senate amendment doesn't do that. A sense of the Senate delays the actual amendments that change appropriations.

I suspect that if we don't get some agreement to proceed on this bill, we

will check and see if there are other appropriations bills they believe are maybe important enough that we ought to be getting on with the business of and debating. We have 13 of them.

I think another one that has now cleared the committee is agriculture. I have to tell you that I think the farmers across this country are going to be pretty livid if this appropriations bill is being held up because somebody has a sense of the Senate where they kind of want to see if all of the Senators kind of feel good about something that doesn't have to do with agriculture. They ought to be livid about it.

I know when I go home, they say: How come you guys put other non-related stuff in bills you are talking about? How come some of those get in there? They really want the stuff to be germane to the bill that we are working on and they want it debated. They want it debated in a timely fashion. They think we ought to be getting on with the business.

We can finish appropriations. We can talk about other bills. We talked about a lot of them. They just need to be resolved. But we can talk about those other bills. On the other bills of the Senate, you can still add anything you want, including a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, or including a motion, or legislation that has nothing to do with anything.

The debate should be moving on. The debate should not be held up over whether we can do feel-good motions on appropriations. The debate should center around whether an appropriations bill is justified or not justified, whether we ought to spend the money or we ought not to spend the money, whether the program is good or whether the program is bad.

That is the appropriations process. We have plenty of it to do as we spend close to \$2 trillion in this United States.

For those of you who have family budgets and scrimp and save and worry and force that into your capability to buy things, you can recognize how important it would be for us even on something as small as \$13 billion to get started on the debate, to look at the items that are included to decide whether or not they are justified and make a decision and move forward so that we can get to the bigger bills that amount to billions more dollars than this one. This should be a bill that is done in about 1 day. But it isn't going to be 1 day. It isn't even going to be started in 1 day. I suspect we may not be started on it next weekend, unless the American people get upset with the way their Government is being run. I am sure they will express their opinion that we ought to be debating every dollar that is involved, and when the debate on the dollars is over, get to the other business of passing laws in this country.

I thank the President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN HAITI

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, as we prepare to begin the debate concerning the provisions within the fiscal year 2001 foreign ops appropriations bill, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an event scheduled to take place this Sunday, May 21, referring to the parliamentary elections of Haiti.

The openness, the fairness, the transparency of these elections that will be held on Sunday are critical to Haiti, and really place the country and its people at a crossroads. These are the elections that have been postponed, postponed, postponed, and postponed. Finally, it appears as if they will actually take place this Sunday.

The world is watching to see how Haiti conducts these elections. The international community and the United States will be judging Haiti based on these elections. I think it is a fair statement to say that future assistance, future aid from the international community, from the private sector, private organizations, as well as governments, as well as the United States, will depend certainly to some extent on how these elections are conducted. Not how they turn out but how they are conducted. The world will be looking on Sunday to see the amount of violence connected with these elections; to see whether or not the elections are fair, transparent, and open; to see what kind of participation takes place among Haitian people.

We have every right to be concerned about these elections. We have a right to be concerned because of the investment the United States has made in Haiti, which I will discuss in a moment. We have a right to be concerned because these elections have been postponed, postponed, and postponed. We have a right to be concerned because we want to see whether or not this fledgling democracy is, in fact, making progress.

So, yes, the world will be watching. We are concerned, quite candidly, about these elections because of the action and because of the inaction of Haiti's political elite, its upper class, what they have not done and what they have done during the past 5 years.

We all had high expectations for Haiti when the United States sent 20,000 U.S. troops to that island in 1995 to restore President Aristide to power. At that time, we understood it would take time for Haiti to become politically stable. We understood it would take time to establish a free and open market system in that country. We understood it would take time to invoke the rule of law and privatization of government-run-and-owned industries. And we understood it would take a while to establish a fair and impartial and functioning judicial system.

Quite tragically, time has passed and very little, if anything, has changed.

The phrase "Haitian Government" is an oxymoron, given President Preval has been ruling by decree without a democratically elected Parliament since January 1999. Political intimidation is rampant, with violence and killings increasing as the elections approach. Furthermore, the Haitian economy is, at best, stagnant. Haiti remains the poorest nation by far in our entire hemisphere, with a per capita income estimated at \$330 per year per person, where 70 percent of the people are either without jobs or certainly underemployed.

When we deal with Haiti, the statistics don't matter. We are not even sure how reliable they are. Anyone who has visited Haiti—and I have had occasion to visit Haiti nine different times in the last 5½ years—sees where that economy is and sees the years of wrenching, unbelievable poverty in Haiti, a country that is just a short trip from Miami.

Absent a stable and democratic government, Haiti has no hope of achieving real and lasting economic nor political nor judicial reforms. That is why Haiti is finding itself stuck in a vicious cycle of despair. It is a cycle in which political stalemate threatens the government and judicial reforms, which, in turn, discourages investment and privatization.

Caught in this cycle, the economy stands to shrink further and further until there is no economic investment to speak of at all. With no viable law enforcement institutions in place, and given the island's weak political and economic situation, drug traffickers operate with impunity.

I have talked about this on this floor on several different occasions in the last few years. I predicted several years ago that we would see the amount of drug transportation in Haiti, the amount of drugs flowing through that country, go up and up and our own Government has estimated today that prediction has, tragically, come true. Our Government estimates Haiti accounts for 14 percent of all cocaine entering the United States today. Haiti is now the major drug transshipment country in the entire Caribbean. We estimate 75 tons of cocaine moved through Haiti in 1999. That represents a 24-percent increase over the previous year.

Quite frankly, Haiti has become a great human tragedy. While the decade of the 1980s witnessed unbelievable changes in Central America, with countries moving from totalitarian regimes to democracies, that was the great success story of the 1980s. Many of us hoped in the 1990s, and into the next century, we would see that same progress made in Haiti. Tragically, that has not taken place. Haiti now stands as a missed opportunity for reform, a missed opportunity for progress, for growth, and for development. The true casualties, the real victims of all the turmoil and instability are the children. They are the victims

because the small band of political elite in Haiti has not moved forward and taken seriously the need for reform. They have missed their opportunity.

The economy is worse, human rights are being violated, and there is very little optimism today in Haiti. These dire conditions are every day killing children. Haiti's infant mortality rate is approximately 15 times that of the United States. Because Haiti lacks the means to produce enough food to feed its population, the children who are born suffer from malnutrition, malnourishment. They rely heavily on humanitarian food aid. Additionally, because of the lack of clean water and sanitation, only 39 percent of the population has access to clean water. It is estimated only 26 percent have access to sanitation. Diseases such as measles and tuberculosis are epidemic.

Given this human tragedy, we can't turn our backs on these children as mad as we may get at the political leaders of that country, as frustrated as we may become with the political leaders of that country. Haiti is part of our hemisphere, and what happens in our hemisphere, what happens in our own backyard, is very much our concern. If we ignore the situation, we risk another massive refugee exodus for our shores, and drug trafficking through Haiti will continue to increase and increase and increase.

We must seek ways to foster democracy building in Haiti and promote free markets in the rule of law. We also must fight drug trafficking through Haiti and expand agricultural assistance through nongovernmental organizations. Let me say there are good nongovernment organizations that are in Haiti working to make a difference in spite of the Haitian Government. I must also say I have personally seen and visited a number of Americans in church groups who are down in Haiti risking their lives, making a difference every day to save the lives of children.

Finally, most important, I believe we must ensure that humanitarian and food assistance continues to reach the Haitian people, especially the children. We cannot just sit back and let the political elite in Haiti starve these orphan children as well as the elderly and the destitute.

Ultimately, though, Haiti will not really progress until its political leaders and the elite of the country take responsibility for the situation and commit to turning things around. The tragedy of the last 5 years is that the elite in Haiti has not made a decision that it is in their interests and in the interests of their country to change things. Until the elite of Haiti decides to make these changes, it is going to be very difficult, no matter what we do, to have any significant progress made in that very poor country.

Haiti can succeed as a democracy if, and only if, the elite has the resolve to hold open elections, create free markets, reduce corruption, improve its judicial system, respect human rights,