

you are likely to live to 80 or 85 years of age. You have one choice—a Washington HMO; one chance when you are 64½ and no turning back.

I make it very clear to our seniors what we are talking about when we talk about the prescription drug plan proposed by Vice President GORE.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues today in celebrating the passage of Children's Health Act, which Senators FRIST, KENNEDY, myself, and many others introduced earlier this year. The Children's Health Act passed the Senate on September 22, the House on September 27, and is now one step closer to becoming law.

The Children's Health Act will significantly improve the well-being of children in this nation. This bill authorizes prevention and educational programs, clinical research, and direct clinical care services for child specific health issues.

President Clinton needs to sign this legislation into law now. Our nation's medical research and treatment systems must be encouraged to recognize that children have unique needs. Without the initiative of the Children's Health Act, research into many of the diseases and disorders that effect children will be overlooked and neglected.

I am also excited that the Children's Health Act includes legislation that the Senate passed last year to reauthorize the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). The Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act is critically important for strengthening community-based mental health and substance-abuse prevention and treatment services.

We introduced SAMHSA reauthorization with strong bipartisan cosponsorship of many members of the HELP Committee. The service and grant programs administered by SAMHSA have gone far too long without being reauthorized. We will now be able to improve access and reduce barriers to high quality, effective services for individuals who suffer from, or are at risk for, substance abuse or mental illness, as well as for their families and communities.

This legislation includes the formula compromise for the Substance Abuse Treatment Block Grant that was originally included in the 1998 omnibus appropriations bill. This is an issue of paramount importance to small and rural states, and I am pleased that this legislation ratifies and continues the agreement reached in 1998.

The Children's Health Act and the Youth Drug and Mental Health Services Act are both the product of many months of work and collaboration among its many stakeholders. We have come this far because of the bipartisan dedication of members of HELP Committee and especially the leadership of Senator FRIST and Senator KENNEDY. I commend them both for their considerable efforts to help so many children and American families.

I also want to thank my colleagues in the House for their strong cooperation and support. I am so proud of being involved in this effort and I think the entire House of Representatives and Senate should be very proud of approving the Children's Health Act.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 110

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate convenes tomorrow morning, the time prior to 10 a.m. be equally divided in the usual form and the previously ordered vote on H.J. Res. 110 now occur at 10 a.m.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FRIST. I ask consent that the Senate now resume consideration of the Interior conference report and Senator FITZGERALD be recognized.

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

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, Senator WYDEN has requested to speak for 5 to 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent he be allowed to do that, then I be able to go back and speak as though it were a continuation of the speech I have had ongoing since early this morning.

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

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to discuss the possibility that there will be an effort very shortly to override Oregon's assisted suicide law as part of a package that includes legislation that is extremely important to the country, such as legislation that would protect women from domestic violence, such as legislation that would also deal with sex trafficking—an extraordinary scourge that victimizes women and children. I think it would be extremely unfortunate to victimize the victims in that way. It is clearly not in the public interest.

Oregon's assisted suicide law involves a very controversial matter. I happen to be against assisted suicide, against the Oregon law, but the bill that cleared the Judiciary Committee on a 10-8 vote, a very narrow vote, is strongly opposed by the American Cancer Society. The American Cancer Society believes that legislation will harm those in pain. I am very hopeful that rather than tie this assisted suicide legislation to vitally needed legislation that would protect the victims of domestic violence and women and children from sex trafficking, the Senate

would adhere to the agreement that was entered into in August.

In August, on a bipartisan basis, the Senate made it very clear, and I specifically addressed this on the floor of the Senate, that I was open to a fair fight, to an open debate on the assisted suicide question. In fact, I made it very clear that while I intend to use every opportunity to speak on the floor of the Senate and make sure the Members understand, for example, that the American Cancer Society believes this legislation will harm those in pain, I was willing to accept the will of the Senate on any cloture vote that might be scheduled. That was the agreement entered into in August. It provided for a fair fight on this issue.

Tonight we are told that there may be the possibility, as I have touched on, of an effort to override Oregon's assisted suicide law. By the way, Oregon is the only State in the country that has such legislation. It would be linked to the other desperately needed measures, such as the legislation to protect women victimized by domestic violence. I hope that will not be the case. I would have to oppose very strongly that kind of effort. It seems to me it is not in the public interest, and it is particularly regrettable since it runs contrary to the spirit of what was agreed to in August: That there would be an opportunity for both sides on the floor of the Senate to have this debate about assisted suicide; I would have a chance to address the issue in some detail, but if there were an effort to file cloture, I would accept the will of the Senate on that measure.

In addition, we just learned in the last few minutes there is a possibility schoolchildren in 700 rural school districts around the country could also be held hostage because, again, there may be an objection to the county payments bill legislation authored by Senator CRAIG of Idaho and myself—again, bipartisan. There may be an objection to that bill, again, on the grounds that somehow it should be examined some more and possibly linked again to the assisted suicide question.

I think, again, these issues ought to be considered on the merits. The county payments legislation passed this body by unanimous consent; 100 Senators agreed to make sure that these schoolchildren in 700 rural school districts got a fair shake. We have been working with the House. We have now come up with an agreement among the House, the Senate, and the White House. I think we can pass it 100-0 in the Senate. But we are told someone is going to object to the county payments legislation for the unrelated reason that they are not able to work out an arrangement that allows them to throw the Oregon assisted suicide law in the trash can on an arbitrary basis.

What the Senate worked out in August was fair to all sides. It ensured that we have a chance to discuss the matter of assisted suicide. It is a controversial question. I personally am

against assisted suicide. I voted against the Oregon law twice. I voted against Federal funding for assisted suicide. But I oppose the legislation being advanced here to overturn Oregon's law for the same reasons that the American Cancer Society does. It will hurt patients in pain.

I felt compelled to come to the floor of the Senate and express my concern. I think it is not in the public interest to link desperately needed legislation such as the bill to protect the victims of domestic violence to the assisted suicide law. It is not appropriate to hold hostage the victims of sex trafficking to the Oregon assisted suicide law. I hope we will not see what has been raised as a possibility in the last few minutes, and that is to hold up the county payments legislation—which has been agreed to by the House and the Senate negotiators and those at the White House—that would provide a lifeline to 700 rural school districts all across the country.

I hope that bill and the other vitally needed legislation will not be held up because a Senator decides he or she wants to throw the assisted suicide override into unrelated legislation that this country needs so greatly. I made it clear last August I was open to being fair to both sides. That is why we entered into an agreement for a fair fight. I said I would respect the will of the Senate on a cloture vote if it came to that. I think we ought to adhere to that August agreement and not link this matter of throwing Oregon's law into the trash can by tucking it into unrelated legislation.

Frankly, those who are trying to tuck this override of Oregon's assisted suicide law into other legislation—such as the bill that would protect the victims of domestic violence—are doing a tremendous disservice to the women victimized by domestic violence, to the victims of sex trafficking, to the schoolchildren who desperately need that county payments legislation. These bills ought to be considered on their merits. That was agreed to back in August with respect to the assisted suicide legislation. I will do everything in my power to insist the Senate adhere to what was agreed on last August.

I thank my colleague and friend from Illinois for his thoughtfulness.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of the affected Members of the Senate, I would like to state for the record that if a Member who is precluded from travel by the provisions of rule 39 is appointed as a delegate to an official conference to be attended by Members of the Senate, then the appointment of that individual constitutes an authorization by the Senate and the Member will not be deemed in violation of rule 39.

FINAL PASSAGE OF S. 1198, THE TRUTH IN REGULATING ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the efforts of everyone who worked to pass S. 1198, the Truth in Regulating Act. Last evening, the House passed this important legislation, following the Senate's passage of the bill on May 9th of this year. I was pleased to learn of the final passage of this bill in the House, as this event marks the culmination of the hard work of many Senators, Representatives, and members of their staffs in achieving another milestone in our journey towards comprehensive regulatory reform.

This legislation establishes a process for Congress to obtain reviews of economically significant rules. These reviews, to be performed by the General Accounting Office, will help Congress to better assess the impact of federal agency regulations. I am confident that the information which will be provided in these reports will enable Congress and the public to have a better understanding of the potential costs and benefits of these regulations, and I believe that these independent analyses will help federal agencies to develop the most efficient and beneficial regulations for all concerned.

Mr. President, passage of this legislation would not have been possible without the hard work of several Senators on both sides of the aisle. Both Senator SHELBY and Senator THOMPSON have been active in addressing this issue for quite some time, and the efforts of Senator BOND and the input of Senator LEVIN were also helpful to the process. Similarly, I know that Representatives KELLY and MCINTOSH worked hard on the House side to get the Truth in Regulating Act passed. The details of this legislation were worked out by countless hours of work by a number of staff members, both former and current, for these Senate and House members. In addition to members of my staff, these staff members include Paul Noe, Mark Oesterle, Suey Howe, Linda Gustitus, Meredith Matty, Barry Pineles, Larry McCredy, Barbara Kahlow, and Marlo Lewis.

Mr. President, I look forward to the President signing this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased that last night the House passed on suspension the "Truth in Regulating Act," S. 1198, and that this legislation will now be sent to the President. S. 1198 will support Congressional oversight to ensure that important regulatory decisions are cost-effective, well-reasoned, and fair.

The foundation of the "Truth in Regulating Act" is the right of Congress and the people we serve to know about important regulatory decisions. Through the General Accounting Office, which serves as Congress' eyes and ears, this legislation will help us get access to the cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, federalism assessment, and other key information underlying any important regulatory proposal. So, in a

real sense, this legislation not only gives people the right to know; it gives them the right to see—to see how the government works, or doesn't. GAO will be responsible for providing an evaluation of the analysis underlying a proposed regulation, which will enable us to communicate better with the agency up-front. It will help us to ensure that the proposed regulation is sensible and consistent with Congress' intent before the horse gets out of the barn. It will help improve the quality of important regulations. This will contribute to the success of programs that the public values and improve public confidence in the Federal Government, which is a real concern today.

Under the 3-year pilot project established by this legislation, a chairman or ranking member of a committee with legislative or general oversight jurisdiction, such as Governmental Affairs, may request the GAO to review a proposed economically significant rule and provide an independent evaluation of the agency regulatory analysis underlying the rule. The Comptroller General shall submit a report no later than 180 days after a committee request is received. A requester may ask for the report sooner when needed, as may be the case where there is a short comment period or hearing schedule. The Comptroller General's report shall include an evaluation of the benefits of the rule, the costs of the rule, alternative regulatory approaches, and any cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, and federalism assessment, as well as a summary of the results of the evaluation and the implications of those results for the rulemaking.

It is my hope that the "Truth in Regulating Act" will encourage Federal agencies to make better use of modern decisionmaking tools, such as cost-benefit analysis and risk assessment. Currently, these important tools often are viewed simply as options—options that aren't used as much or as well as they should be. Over the years, the Governmental Affairs Committee has reviewed and developed a voluminous record showing that our regulatory process is not working as well as intended and is missing important opportunities to achieve more cost-effective regulation. In April 1999, I chaired a hearing in which we heard testimony on the need for this proposal. The General Accounting Office has done important studies for Governmental Affairs and other committees showing that agency practices—in cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, federalism assessments, and in meeting transparency and disclosure requirements of laws and executive orders—need significant improvement. Many other authorities support these findings. All of us benefit when government performs well and meets the needs of the people it serves.

A lot of effort and collaboration went into this legislation, which I think is why the Senate and now the House could approve it with broad bipartisan