want to provide for your families and for your constituents?

The first one is to protect all patients with private insurance. This is the difference. Under the Democratic proposal, there are 161 million Americans who are covered. Under the Senate Republican program, there are only 48 million. Under the bipartisan House of Representatives program, it is 161 million. We ought to be able to decide that pretty easily. Do we want to cover everyone, which is 161 million, or are we going to cover only 48 million? If you put people together in a room, they have to be able to come out with some number. The Republican bill leaves out millions of Americans. I find it absolutely extraordinary to think that we wouldn't provide protections for all Americans.

Do we want to leave out the 23 to 25 million State and local employees—teachers, firefighters, police officers, public health nurses, doctors, garbage collectors, et cetera? Do we want to leave them out? They were left out of the Senate bill sponsored by the Republicans. We included them.

Do you want to leave out those who are the self-employed—farmers, child care providers, cab drivers, people who work for companies that don't provide insurance, contract workers, workers who are between jobs and unemployed? We cover them, 12 to 15 million people. The Republican bill does not cover them.

The bipartisan legislation that we support and which we voted on in the Senate on June 8 covers everyone. But the Senate Republican leadership says ''no'' to farmers, truck drivers, police officers, teachers, home day care providers, fire fighters, and countless others who buy insurance on their own or work for state or local governments. Republican conferees steadfastly refuse to cover all Americans. Their flawed approach leaves out two-thirds of those with private health insurance—more than 120 million Americans.

The protections in the House-passed bill are urgently needed by patients across the country. Yet, the Republican leadership is adopting the practice of delay and denial that HMOs so often use themselves to delay and deny patients the care they need. It's just as wrong for Congress to delay and deny these needed reforms, as it is for HMOs to delay and deny needed care.

We have listened to statements on the other side that, ''This is all politics. This is all politics.'' We are asking: What is politics, to try to include everyone? What is politics is not including them and being in the debt of the HMOs and the industry. That is the politics.

So we ask, what is it that we don't want to provide—which one of over twenty different protections? Are we going to deny access to specialists? Are we not going to permit clinical trials? Are we going to refuse women access to OB/GYNs? What about prescription drugs that doctors give; are we not going to guarantee that? Or are we going to prohibit the gag rule so doctors can give the most accurate information on various treatments? I hope. Are we going to ensure external and internal appeals as well as accountability? Are we going to ensure emergency room access? I would think so. Which of these protections do the Republicans not want to guarantee to the American people? That is the question we are asking. The American people are entitled to an answer. Three hundred organizations that represent the American people say they are entitled to it. We ought to be doing something about it.

Every day, we find out that Americans are being harmed. We were able to get bipartisan legislation through the House of Representatives. At the dead end of our conference, the courageous Congressmen, Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. GANSKE, came over and indicated that they believe we are not making progress. They support our efforts in the Senate. Two prominent doctors who happen to be Republicans strongly support our effort in the Senate to get action.

We reject the concept that this is just a political ploy. It is interesting to me, having been here for some time, that whenever you agree with the other side, it is wonderful and you are a statesman. If you differ, you are a politician; it is done for political purposes. We have listened to that all the time. We heard it last night on prescription drugs. We heard it on hate crimes. We heard it with regard to the Patients' Bill of Rights.

The American people understand the importance of this legislation. We want to give assurances to the American people, we are not letting up on this issue. We are going to press this issue on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We are going to press it, and press it, and press it until we get the job done.

We are going to do the same with prescription drugs, so our friends on the other side ought to get familiar with it. Just as we are going to come back to the issue of minimum wage, we are going to come back to it, and back to it, and back to it, if you want to dust off your speeches already and say that that is politics.

The idea of guaranteeing someone who works 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, that they are not going to live in poverty is a fairness issue which the American people understand. We ought to guarantee that minimum wage for work in America. You can name it or call it anything you want, as long as we vote on it and get it and make sure they get the fair increase they deserve.

I thought we would have the chance to get into the debate and discussion on a number of these issues, but we are not having that opportunity today. I look forward to debating the issues the first of the week.

Mr. President, Congress can pass bipartisan legislation that provides meaningful protections for all patients and guarantees accountability when health plan abuse results in injury or death. The question is ''will we''?

The American people are waiting for an answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Georgia is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

June 23, 1999:

Abdalla Al-Khadra, 23, Salt Lake City, UT;

Khari Bartigan, 18, Boston, MA;

Joseph Coats, 26, Chicago, IL;

Wendell Gray, 22, Chicago, IL;

Derwin K. Harding, 21, Oklahoma City, OK;

Hosey Hemingway, 27, Miami-Dade County, FL;

Teresa Hemingway, 30, Miami-Dade County, FL;

Steven Henderson, 17, Baltimore, MD;

Jim Johnson, 31, Dallas, TX;

Monique Trotty, 22, Detroit, MI;

Nichole Vargas, 18, Chicago, IL;

Unidentified male, San Francisco, CA.

These names come from a report prepared by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The report includes data from 100 U.S. cities between April 20, 1999, and March 20, 2000. The 100 cities covered range in size from Chicago, IL, which has a population of more than 2.7 million, to Bedford Heights, OH, with a population of about 11,800.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL KIDNAPPING AND GERMANY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I am troubled—deeply troubled. I am troubled by a report in the Washington Post that—yet again—illustrates Germany's reluctance to return American

children who have been kidnapped by a parent and taken to Germany. The Post article details the latest event in the continuing international struggle that American Joseph Cooke has endured as he seeks the return of his children. As my colleagues may recall, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder recently promised President Clinton during the President's visit to Europe that Germany would help Mr. Cooke and grant him and his family visitation rights. Well, despite this promise at the highest levels government, the Kostanz Special Service for Foster Children now is limiting the access that Joseph Cooke's mother has to visiting her grandchildren—apparently as a punishment for all the recent media attention the case has received. This is outrageous, Mr. President. And it simply cannot be tolerated.

Let me take a moment to review the events that have led to where we are today on this issue. At the recent European conference on ''Modern Governance in the 21st Century,'' President Clinton met with Chancellor Schroeder to discuss several pressing international concerns. One issue, in particular—one I had urged President Clinton to raise with the Chancellor—was the tragic situation of U.S. children being abducted by a parent and taken to Germany.

It was necessary to raise this issue with Chancellor Schroeder because parents—and not just American parents, either—have had a very difficult time getting their children back when they have been abducted and taken to Germany. Although Germany has signed the Hague Convention, our ally—yes, our ally—has not taken their obligations under the Convention seriously. In fact, from 1990 to 1998, only 22 percent of American children for whom Hague applications were filed were returned to the United States from Germany—and that percentage includes those who were voluntarily returned by the abducting parent.

Last month, I spoke on the floor about the Joseph Cooke case—a case that illustrates perfectly Germany's reluctance to return kidnapped children. In Mr. Cooke's case, his wife took their two children to Germany, and without his knowledge, turned them over to the German Youth Authority. Despite Mr. Cooke's desperate attempts to get his children back, a German court decided that they were better off with a German foster family than with their American father. Only after President Clinton's meeting with Chancellor Schroeder and only after Mr. Cooke's case received considerable publicity and media attention, did Germany agree to help Joseph Cooke.

The Germans promised to allow Mr. Cooke and his family visitation with his children. The Germans also promised to form a working group with the United States to examine pending abduction cases. Chancellor Schroeder agreed to ''think about organizational and institutional consequences to be taken'' to speed up the German court process and make changes in German law to allow visitation rights for those parents previously prevented from seeing their children at all. Although the Chancellor acknowledged that it would be difficult to reverse German custody decisions, he assured President Clinton that this soon-to-be-created commission would work on providing the so-called left-behind parents access to their children.

But now, as the Washington Post reports, Germany is restricting visitation of the Cooke children's American grandmother from open, six-hour visits to supervised, two-hour visits in a psychologist's office. We must take a very tough stance against this, Mr. President. We must judge Germany by its recent actions—not its recent words—recent, empty words. We must hold Germany to its promises and see to it their government matches words with deeds and returns every single American child.

Given Germany's reversal on the visitation agreement, I am even more skeptical now about the sincerity of Germany's commitment to return kidnapped children. I say that partly because German officials have repeatedly blamed their non-compliance on the independence of their judiciary system. They say that they are reluctant to challenge court rulings because the courts are separate and independent from the parliament. Chancellor Schroeder even likened such interference to the days of Nazi Germany, when he told a German newspaper that: ''We have always fought for the well-being of the children to be at the core of divorce and custody cases. That is the only standard. The times in which Germany would routinely change the decisions of the courts [during the Nazi era] are over, thank God'' (Reuters, 6/1/00).

I find that argument very interesting since the United States has a very independent judiciary branch, yet we return children in 90% of all international abduction cases. And, our return rate of German children, specifically, is equally high. Even according to the German Justice Ministry's own figures, from 1995 to 1999, there were 116 cases of German parents demanding children back from the United States. Of those cases, the U.S. courts refused to return the children in only four cases. During those same five-years, there were 165 known cases in which a parent living in the United States wanted his or her children returned from Germany. Yet, in 33 of those cases, German courts declined to return the children (AP Worldstream, 6/2/00).

Mr. President, I am also concerned about Germany's offer to create a ''working group'' with the United States given the result of a similar promise Germany made to France. French President Jacques Chirac, who has characterized Germany as applying ''the law of the jungle'' in abduction cases (The London Evening Standard, 6/1/00), repeatedly asked Germany to address the difficulty his country is having in getting French children returned. In response, Chancellor Schroeder agreed to create a ''working group'' between the two nations to reach some resolution. While this working group was created a year ago, results have yet to come in on its effectiveness. Given France's experience, it is crucial that we hold Chancellor Schroeder to his word and see to it that his words are not just empty promises made in an attempt to improve a tarnished image in the international community.

Assistant Secretary of State for consular affairs, Mary Ryan will be in Germany this weekend where, according to the Washington Post, ''she will be raising this specific issue with every person she meets in the German government.'' I am encouraged to see that our State Department has indicated that it is outraged by Germany's action—perhaps now, they will take these kinds of cases seriously and take some type of significant action against Germany. Never-the-less, I urge her and our State Department and President Clinton to not take Germany's broken promises lightly. We must insist that the Germans reverse these restrictions on visitation, otherwise there is absolutely no reason to set up the commission.

Mr. President, we cannot tolerate lip service from our allies. We must hold the German government's feet to the fire. No excuses should be accepted by the parents of these children, nor by this Senate, nor by this Congress, nor by the American people. This must be a priority.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AMENDMENT OF SENATOR ROBB

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my disappointment with the outcome of the vote that occurred last evening here in the Senate. I am referring to the vote on Senator ROBB's amendment concerning a Medicare benefit for prescription drugs.

Last night, we had an opportunity to give millions of elderly and disabled Americans something they desperately require, a universal prescription drug benefit. Yet, this measure was defeated, mostly along party lines, by a vote of 44–53. Our nation's seniors deserve better.

The need for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare has grown each and every year. Advances in medical science have revolutionized the practice of medicine. And the proliferation of pharmaceuticals has radically altered the way acute illness and chronic disease are treated and managed.

These remarkable advances, however, have not come without a cost. Since 1980, prescription drug expenditures have grown at double digit rates and prescription drugs constitute the largest out-of-pocket cost for seniors. For millions of seniors, many of whom are living on a fixed income and do not