

who keep our shelves full at home and in our grocery stores, but those who are victimized in the most inhumane way because we have an unworkable law.

I heard all kinds of opinions about my bill. I granted to them that it probably wasn't a perfect bill, but at least I was trying—one of the few who are—to resolve this situation. I thank Senator GRAHAM of Florida for his willingness to step into this issue. One gets lots of arrows in the back when they try to tackle an immigration issue.

What motivates me to do this is almost weekly reports of migrant workers dying in the American deserts of the Southwest, trying to make their way to jobs. These are people who are victimized by human coyotes. They are raped. They are robbed. They are bribed. They are pillaged in ways that are unthinkable, and ought to be unthinkable, in this country. It happens because they have no safe and legal way to come here and to go home, to work a job, to earn their way, and to share the American dream, which is really just a human dream. That was the motive upon which I tackled this issue.

The law we have regarding our guest worker system doesn't work. There are estimates of 2 million illegal aliens in this country working in agriculture. There are estimates of 6 million illegal aliens in the United States. I was trying to focus on agriculture. Let me tell you why this system doesn't work.

First of all, it is economically beyond the pale of most of those in the farm communities who would like to hire them. This is the application. There are hundreds of pages a farmer has to comply with to hire one worker. Conversely, I applied for a job in the Senate, I had to fill out a two-page document. This is what a farmer has to fill out just to get a worker in a system that is untimely as the crops go unharvested.

We have a broken system. I believe it is estimated about 30,000 in total in this country use this system out of probably 2 million illegal aliens in agriculture. I think it is a given, a manifest failure. We need to make our guest worker law workable. That is a long-term solution. I think we need to do this.

What made my meetings, frankly, more productive and very helpful was a press release from the AFL-CIO, in which they called not for help to farmers and farm workers alone, they called for a general amnesty of all illegal aliens in this country. A general amnesty is something we have done in this country periodically; every few decades we seem to do this. The question now is whether it is appropriate to do that now.

There have been lots of editorial comments about this recently in the Washington Post. There was a very in-

teresting article on this whole issue of farm labor and illegality. The Post said:

Congress has responded sympathetically to the pleas of the high-tech industry to hire more skilled workers from abroad, but it has yet to do anything for employers of those at the bottom end of the labor market—the end where U.S. citizens don't want to work. Now, with a record number of illegal immigrants living in the United States, an estimated 6 million, with most of them working, some even paying taxes and joining unions, it is time to bring our immigration policies in line with what is actually happening in the labor market. It is time to recognize that we need the immigrants as much as they need us.

See, I know in Congress there are a lot of people who make an academic argument that we don't want to reward illegal behavior with a legal document. I understand that, but it doesn't fix the problem. It doesn't deal with reality. These people aren't coming; they are here and they live among us. They live in our shadows and they are victimized on a daily basis in a whole range of ways—bureaucratically, even criminally. It is a shame upon this country that we don't resolve this—short-term and long-term.

I was pleased that in the recent testimony of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan he gave support to what I am talking about. Said the Chairman:

It is clear that under existing circumstances, not only in the high-tech and in the farm area, but indeed throughout the country, aggregate demand is putting very significant pressures on an ever-decreasing available supply of unemployed labor. The one obvious means that one can use to offset that is expanding the number of people we allow in, either generally or in specifically focused areas. And I do not think that an appraisal of our immigration policies in this regard is really clearly on the table.

I think we need to put it clearly on the table as a priority of this Congress to do something about it. It need not be partisan. Regarding the position the AFL-CIO has just taken, I hope they will let me help them. I would like to help them to get a general amnesty. But I think that we also need to fix our broken farm labor system.

For those who say we should not do anything, I don't know what their motive is. I fear too often, though, that it is just anti-immigrant. We rightfully criticize, for example, Joerg Haider, of Austria for his anti-immigrant statement, which recalls a bygone era and a great tragedy. But what is the difference when we have politicians among us who make comments not unlike that about even legal immigration? They don't want anymore of it.

We have the Chairman of the Federal Reserve saying we need workers because we have good employment, but it is predicated on an illegal system. We need these jobs to be filled and we need crops harvested. Right now, we are victimizing farm workers and farmers be-

cause farm workers have to live like fugitives among us, and farmers are made out to be felons. We owe the United States something better. But, more, we owe the people at the bottom rung something better. They contribute to our society and they are victimized too often by our society when they make a significant contribution to the abundance that we enjoy as Americans.

So I call on our congressional leadership to bring us together, to fix our H-2A program, but also to pursue the amnesty that has been suggested by the AFL-CIO in this two-pronged approach. We can find a solution and we can treat these people more fairly, like human beings, with the dignity of law and the protection of law and a process that is safe and humane.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me inquire of the parliamentary situation. Are we in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are until 12:30.

DEFENSE HEALTH CARE BILL

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise in support this morning of S. 2087, the Military Health Care Improvement Act of 2000. This is bipartisan legislation. It will begin to fulfill a promise of lifetime health care for our military men and women who sacrifice so much for our freedom.

This bill begins a multiyear process to identify and correct the broken promise of lifetime health care to our military retirees and veterans. I want to emphasize that this is a reasonable and a prudent first step. It is not the end by any means. It is only the beginning of an effort to rejuvenate our defense health care system.

I met an hour or so ago with the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He confirmed that this is an important part of the triad of things that we must do to reinstate the morale and recruitment and retention that we need for our military.

Last year, with S. 4, we addressed two components of that triad: Pay and pension benefits. But this year defense health care is critical. The chiefs have stepped up to this issue and included in the budget what was submitted by the President significant improvements, particularly for health care for our active-duty personnel. But more needs to be done, both for the active-duty personnel, but especially for our retired military personnel.

I am pleased that the Commandant and the chiefs are trying to help us in this effort, and it is going to be one of the most important things we can do this year for the military.

It helps the men and women currently serving in the Armed Forces while also keeping promises to the heroes of America's storied yesterdays without which our prosperous and promising future would have never been possible.

Last year, I was proud to see our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol join in significantly improving two-thirds of the triad that I referred to. I was honored to join my distinguished colleagues on the defense authorization committee in passing the largest pay hike for our uniformed military personnel since 1981.

I remember very well in 1981 when President Reagan came in and said it is unconscionable that we are not paying our military personnel enough to live on. We had that period where they were having to go on food stamps and become qualified for welfare. The significant pay increase they received affected morale and helped us get our military into the position of great strength throughout the rest of the 1980s. But we have lost ground since then.

With the 4.8-percent raise for our men and women in uniform last year, we narrowed the pay differential between military and the private sector, making our All Voluntary Force more attractive to America's best young people and a more viable option for quality men and women who wish to remain in uniform.

Occasionally, I run across people who say, well, how is our All Volunteer Force working? Are they really able to do the jobs? We are getting the best? Sometimes I wonder. And then I have an occasion to go to a military installation to see men and women on Air Force bases—the Little Rock Air Force Base or Keesler Air Force Base, or Meridian Naval Air Station, or other military installations from South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, and all across this country—to California.

I am invariably impressed with the caliber of young men and women I see, the knowledge they have, the sophistication of what they have to deal with in aircraft, ships, and in weapons systems. We are doing well, but morale has suffered because of the pay and retention problem, and now health care needs that they depend on for their families. They have this additional problem now of long assignments in areas such as Haiti, Kosovo, Bosnia, South Korea, and around the world. They are away from their families.

We run the risk of seeing our military begin to erode internally by losing these young men and women because of family needs and because of health

care needs. We run the risk of not being able to retain our pilots and keep our chiefs, master sergeants, and the sergeant majors. Yes, these generals are fantastic, but who runs the Marine Corps? The sergeant major is the guy who does the work, or the woman who does the work that allows the Marines to do what they need to do.

This legislation is so important. It would substantially improve the health care benefits of our service personnel.

The military medical and dental care systems still do not provide benefits to all that have earned them. And it is possibly the single most important remaining item that addresses and affects the quality of life of our service members, their families, and our retirees.

Today there are the same number of potential beneficiaries, approximately 8 million, as when we began the downsizing almost 10 years ago. However, the resources allocated to military health care have decreased dramatically. We can no longer squeeze blood from this stone. It is empty. Our service men and women, their families, and our retirees deserve better.

The Military Health Care Improvement Act will complete the pay, benefits, and medical triad. The bill is composed of five primary components:

First, it extends existing demonstration programs for the over-65 retirees until the year 2005, including programs such as the Medicare Subvention and Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan.

It also expands the Defense Department's national mail order pharmacy program to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries, with \$150 deductible.

It requires the expansion of the TriCare Remote program in the continental United States for active-duty family members in the Prime Remote program and eliminates copays for TriCare Prime for active-duty family members. It also improves the business practices used in administering the TriCare program.

Fourth, it expands the Department of Defense and Veterans' Administration cooperative programs, directing DOD and the VA to develop a common set of patient safety indicators for centralized tracking, and it will improve pharmaceutical safety.

Finally, it will initiate two studies to access the feasibility and desirability of financing the military health care program for retirees on an accrual basis.

This bill is only a start, but it is a very sure start. As with last year's efforts to improve the pay and retirement part of the quality of life triad for our military personnel, I am pleased this measure has such a broad bipartisan base of support in the Senate, particularly from my distinguished colleagues on the Senate's defense committees.

Unlike several other bills that are being touted on the Hill, this bill will be fully funded in the Senate's budget resolution of fiscal year 2001. Every year, thousands of bills that would spend millions, even billions, of dollars are introduced in the Congress—and for good purpose, I am sure, almost all of them. However, at the end of the year, few of the new massive programs are passed in view of all the other needs for defense, Medicare, Social Security, education, and transportation.

The key to success is ensuring that funding is included in the budget for the desired program. That is how the pay and retirement provisions of S. 4 were ultimately signed into law. That is how I hope to have the provisions of this bill signed into law. When S. 4 came up at the beginning of last year, some said: This costs too much; we will never get it done. But it was not a massive jump, it was achievable. Moving S. 4 aggressively with the authorization early in the year led to it ultimately being funded.

While I support the ultimate goal of the other bills, I don't know what their final cost may be. We have had estimate ranges of \$8 billion to \$20 billion per year. I believe our Nation should keep its promise of lifetime health care for our military personnel. But I also believe we owe it to all America's taxpayers to ensure we know how we can best meet this commitment, and if we can. As I said earlier, this process will take a year or two or more.

Many in Congress are committed to finding a way to fulfill our Nation's promise to our military members, their families, our military retirees, and veterans. What our military community doesn't need is more empty promises and unrealistic expectations; we need results. That is what this bill, S. 2087, is designed to do. It will give tangible and measurable results.

The broken promise of lifetime health care for our veterans has been a haunting specter in the Halls of Congress for a number of years, and rightly so. I have been hearing concerns about this throughout my career in Congress, both the House and Senate. Of course, the problem goes back to the 1950s when changes were made that led to the problem we have now. It is time we keep that promise. This calls for concrete, bipartisan legislation that takes a discernible step forward. Our Nation's veterans deserve nothing less. They deserve health care, especially as so many World War II, Korea, and Vietnam era veterans depend on the promise of the Government of the people that they fought so hard to protect.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at this legislation. I thank Senator WARNER for the work he and his staff have done on this bill, as well as my staff who have worked on the Military Health Care Improvement Act of 2000.

I am thankful we have a bipartisan group of Senators who have cosponsored it. I think this is achievable legislation this year. It is the beginning of keeping our promise.

I commend this legislation to my colleagues.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, since the next order of business is the education savings account bill and those Members are currently involved in a very important Finance Committee hearing with regard to China trade, I ask that the morning business period be extended until 2 p.m. today under the same terms as previously ordered.

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

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

Mr. LOTT. I inform our colleagues that the managers on this legislation, the chairman of the Finance Committee and the ranking member, Senator MOYNIHAN, will be available at 2 o'clock and we will begin the process to consider the education savings account bill. I certainly support this legislation. It has broad support across the country. We did pass it a couple of years ago. It was vetoed by the President. But it is a bill whose time has come.

People should be able to save for the education of their children, for their needs in education—whether kindergarten, 4th grade, 10th grade, or 12th grade. We need to allow parents who can and want to, to save for their needs, whether it is a computer for their child, whether tutoring, remedial assistance in reading, or whatever it may be. It is unconscionable that we can do that for a child's higher education but not for their education needs in the fourth grade.

Some say it will benefit middle-income people and upper-income people who can afford to save for their children's needs. That is fine. The important thing is to help our children, all of our children, at the lowest economic level, but also to encourage savings across the board for education in general.

I am glad we will have this full debate. I commend Senator COVERDELL for his pertinacious support for this legislation. He is dogged. He will not

quit. I predict this bill will become law.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INTERNET PRIVACY

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, if Americans knew that every time they walked through their local shopping mall or wandered through the shopping district of their hometown their movements were being tracked, every purchase was being recorded, and every conversation was being monitored, they would be outraged. Americans would consider this level of surveillance a violation of their most basic constitutional right. Yet that very expectation of privacy we expect in our traditional shopping in the local mall, or our visiting with friends, or searching for information in our hometown is exactly what is not happening in the shopping center of the 21st century in cyberspace.

Whenever a citizen ventures online to pay a bill, seeks medical advice, purchases a product, checks the latest news, or engages in a conversation on the Internet, there is a chance that someone is gathering information about us, recording their information, and then selling it, or giving it to others. It is a very disturbing new look at a very exciting new technology.

Indeed, there are companies now being formed for the specific purpose of monitoring our travels through cyberspace and recording this very information.

The situation, while unsettling, does not need to necessarily be menacing. Marketing both online and offline is very common in our daily lives. By collecting some of this information, businesses, indeed, can benefit, if they know the kind of products we want, what our tastes might be, our sizes, and our preferences in what we want to read and want to purchase. The question is whether consumers can control that information because, indeed, companies having access to this information can be more efficient and allow our time to be used more efficiently. I may want a retailer of clothing to know the kind of clothes I want to buy so that I receive the proper advertising. I may want a book company to know the things that I like to read and my areas of study so I can receive products more properly.

That is having information used at its best. One can only imagine how it can be used at its worst.

This information about what I want to read in the wrong hands can reveal my most private political thoughts that I would rather have others not know. It could reveal sexual orientation or party affiliation. Indeed, if I seek medical advice online for psychiatric care or for a disease for myself or a child or a mate, it very well probably would be information I wouldn't want generally available to other people for commercial purposes, political purposes, or worse.

Too often web sites underinform or misinform the public about how they intend to use this information or have presented work to be used improperly or where it can be misused. The fact is that over 90 percent of our most popular web sites do not reveal that they gather and share consumer information with other businesses. And if the public knew that 90 percent of these sites were sharing this information, we as consumers and citizens would be more careful about what we reveal or what we purchase.

A 1999 Georgetown survey also concluded that only 36 percent of leading web sites that admit to gathering information fully explain how they intend to utilize it. So the consumer, the citizens, are not able to make an informed decision about what information they are providing and what risks they might be taking.

Many consumers are now being informed through the popular media that without our consent or knowledge, programs known as "cookies" monitor and collect information regarding our web site browsing habits.

Personal data is also routinely extracted directly by web sites whenever we transmit the information required to purchase a product or surf the net for a specific topic.

In both cases, our actions are monitored and our information will be shared unless we specifically request that a company do not do so, a process known as opting out.

Opting out requires that a user directly contact a site to decline disclosure. The problem with opting out is that the location on web sites where one clicks to opt out, to take your information out of circulation, is often not prominently displayed and therefore is not known by the consumer.

One leading marketing company that tracks 80 million online consumer profiles has revealed it receives an average of only 12 opt out requests per day; 80 million customers, 12 opt out per day.

It is unlikely that only 12 people are concerned about privacy of their purchases or other vital personal information. I suggest to the Senate it is much more likely that the opt out location on the web page is obscured or in some form inadequate.

Privacy policies meant to inform users of both the scope and scale of this information are very often inaccessible. A recent California Healthcare