

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

support. The Truth in Regulating Act is based on two initiatives—a bill originally sponsored by Senator RICHARD SHELBY with Senators LOTT and BOND, as well as a similar measure that I sponsored with Senators LINCOLN, VOINOVICH, KERREY, BREAU, LANDRIEU, INHOFE, STEVENS, BENNETT, ROBB, HAGEL, and ROTH. I particularly appreciate that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle worked with me to pass this legislation. From the beginning, Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN made this a bipartisan initiative by joining me as cosponsor. Later, Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, the Ranking Member of the Governmental Affairs Committee, worked with me to resolve his concerns before the Committee markup. This led the way for passage of this legislation through the Governmental Affairs Committee by voice vote and through the Senate by unanimous consent.

Congresswoman SUE KELLY first proposed a bill for the congressional review of regulations in the 105th Congress. After the Senate passed S. 1198 by unanimous consent in May of this year, Chairman DAN BURTON of the Government Reform Committee advanced the bill through the House. I want to thank Chairman BURTON for his leadership as well as SUE KELLY for her hard work that led to the final passage of the Truth in Regulating Act in the House.

I congratulate my colleagues in the House and Senate for pulling together to get the job done.

ON DELAYS IN SENATE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5107

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, all Democrats have cleared for final passage H.R. 5107, the Work for Hire and Copyright Corrections Act of 2000. I hope that the Senate will take up H.R. 5107 without further unnecessary delay. Representatives BERMAN and COBLE deserve credit, along with the interested parties, for working out a consensus solution in their work for hire copyright legislation. I do not know why the Senate has not confirmed their work and accorded their bill consent for final passage. Why the Republican majority has not taken up this measure since the middle of last week is another unexplained mystery.

As has been true with our bipartisan bill to provide bulletproof vest grants to law enforcement, S. 2014, and its House-passed counterpart, H.R. 4033, all Democrats have cleared these matters for Senate action. As has been true for some time with the Violence Against Women Act of 2000, S. 2787, all Democrats have cleared these matters for Senate action. There are so many bills cleared by the Senate Democrats being held hostage without explanation by the Republican majority, it is hard to

know where to begin and where to end. Here is this last week of the session the Senate could be making progress on a number of items but we remained stymied.

I regret that Congress did not complete its necessary work on the required appropriations bills before the beginning of the new fiscal year. We are again requiring the Government to exist from continuing resolution to continuing resolution. Along with the American people, I hope that we will complete our work before too much longer.

NBC AND FOX AND THE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I also wish to say a word today about NBC and Fox, the two television networks that have decided they would not broadcast the Presidential debates live. I think it is deplorable, really, that networks, that use the public airwaves, and have some responsibility here with respect to the public good and public interest, have decided that Presidential debates are not important enough to preempt other programming.

I notice that NBC said its local affiliates could make their own judgment. It is not as if NBC, according to Mr. Kennard, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, has not interrupted regular programming previously. In fact, they have interrupted sports programming previously. NBC, last evening, said: We have a contract to show a New York Yankees-Oakland Athletics playoff game. So they did not really want to, on a national basis, show the Presidential debate live. They did allow their affiliates to make that decision.

Mr. Kennard points out in an op-ed piece in the New York Times that in 1994 NBC was showing the NBA finals, the basketball finals, but they cut away from the basketball finals to follow that white Bronco that was meandering around the highways of Los Angeles with O.J. Simpson in the backseat. So they were able to cut away from the NBA finals to deal with the O.J. Simpson saga in that white Bronco, we remember so well, but they could not cut away from a playoff game—not the World Series; a playoff game—in baseball to televise the Presidential debate.

Fox News is another story. They did not give their affiliates any choice. From their standpoint, "Dark Angel" was important last night, entertainment programming. Apparently Fox News' entertainment programming is more important than televising the Presidential debates for the American people.

I agree with Bill Kennard, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. He wrote a piece that says: "Fox and NBC Renege on a Debt." It seems to me, in this country we ought to take this system of ours seriously. Presidential debates are very

important. They have a wonderful and hallowed tradition in this country. It seems to me that television networks have a responsibility to the American people to provide live coverage of those debates.

I regret that NBC did not. And I would say to the NBC affiliate in Washington, DC, they decided to carry the debate. Thank you for doing that. Good for them. But Fox News did not give any of their affiliates that choice. I think they have made the wrong choice.

VISIT BY FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I join with my colleague Senator ROBERTS to draw attention to a most interesting report on our country's policy toward Cuba. Some of my colleagues may know that a bipartisan group of former Members of Congress traveled to Cuba in September on a fact-finding mission for the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. These four former members, John Brademas, Larry LaRocco, Fred Grandy, and Jack Buechner, did not travel as a group officially invited by the Cuban Government, but rather traveled on tourist visas, a distinction that allowed the delegation more flexibility to meet with representatives of a wide cross section of Cuban society, including religious and cultural leaders, as well as ordinary Cuban citizens.

Upon returning to the United States, the delegation wrote a detailed report concerning their visit to Cuba, and their recommendations on U.S.-Cuban policy. Remarkably, the recommendations contained in the report were unanimous, and were markedly similar to the recommendations made by two previous delegations in 1996, and 1999.

The report, which was released on September 5, states that "United States policy toward Cuba should be addressed on the basis first, of what is best for U.S. national interests, and second, what is best for Cuba and the Cuban people." It goes on to observe that, as a policy aimed at bringing about political change in Cuba, the regimen of comprehensive sanctions and the embargo have become increasingly anachronistic. It calls upon Congress and the Administration to begin a phased reduction of sanctions against Cuba, and a first step, recommends that current legislation on Capitol Hill to remove all restrictions on the sales or gifts of food and medicines be enacted. The report concludes with the observation that the delegation found "solid support among key independents" in Cuba for this action.

Among other recommendations, the delegation suggested that the United States establish a bank in Havana to authorize the sale of food and medicine, that additional direct flights between the U.S. and Cuba be facilitated, and steps taken to improve Internet communication between the two countries.