of scope, to the issue of exhaustion of remedies, to the issue of clinical trials, to the issue of the NIH, to the issue of the sunset, etc., in which we have worked with Senators Bayh and Carper to make sure we have a consensus on what is covered, giving proper deference to the contract and the contractual language but making sure the independent review process that we have the ability to make sure that if particular treatments are needed, they can be provided.

So we started 2 weeks ago with a series of obstacles in front of us, starting with scope and running throughout the legislation. What has happened during the course of this debate, and the work that has been done, is that one by one those obstacles, those barriers, have fallen, and we have been able to reach consensus agreement.

There is great momentum to do something that really matters to the American people. The winners in this debate are not politicians. The winners of this debate are not the people within this Chamber. The winners are the American people and the families all over this country.

We have in this body an opportunity to do an extraordinary thing, which is to give people more control over their lives and more control, specifically, over their health care decisions, the things that affect their families and members of their families.

All Republicans and Democrats—to try to get to the place where we have consensus on this legislation, and one by one to see the barriers to passing real patient protection have fallen to the floor.

We have more work to do. We will have issues of liability that remain to be resolved. But the reality is, we are at a long way down the road. We have tremendous momentum for doing what there is a consensus in this country to do. Not just in the Senate, not just in the House of Representatives, but all across America, all of us who have spent time in our States have heard over and over that the American people expect us to do something about this issue.

The time has come. It is time to quit talking about it. It is time for the political debate to stop. It is time to do something that can really affect people's lives. We have an extraordinary opportunity to do something important. We have made extraordinary progress toward that goal, but we are not quite there. We need to keep our nose to the grindstone, keep working, keep finishing this legislation, get it through the House, and get it on the President's desk, with great hope and optimism that the President, when confronted with legislation that during his campaign he vowed to support, will stand by his vow and do what he has told us he would do. We are optimistic about that. We believe the President will do what is right for the American people.

So I thank my colleagues for all their work on this issue.

I ask my colleagues to vote, tomorrow morning, against the Collins amendment and for the Breaux amendment, which is a bipartisan consensus that has been reached. And we will continue our work toward providing the American people the protection they need and they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I regret I was not present to cast my vote on the motion to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON). I wish the RECORD to reflect that had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Major Appropriations DASCHLE was asked earlier today, on several occasions by Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, if he would bring to the floor a unanimous consent request that there be a time set on the supplemental appropriations bill that is now with the Appropriations Committee that would set a time certain for filing of amendments on this most important legislation.

Such a request has been cleared by Senator DASCHLE and the majority, but objection has been raised by the minority. So the request by Senators BYRD and STEVENS cannot be met tonight. Hopefully, this request will be cleared by the minority tomorrow so that there can be a time certain set for the amendments on this, as I said, most important piece of legislation, the supplemental appropriations bill.

I suggest the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

OFFSHORE OIL

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to take a moment while the leadership of the Senate is, at this very moment, deciding which course the rest of the day will take with regard to this important legislation, the Patients' Bill of Rights. While we have a moment in which we might reflect on other items, I want to draw to the attention of the Senate the considerable concern of 16 million Floridians that the Bush administration is trying to drill for oil and gas off the shores of the State of Florida.

It is most instructive, if one looks at a map of the Gulf of Mexico, where colored in on the gulf waters are the active drilling leases. What is strikingly clear is that, from the central Gulf of Mexico all the way to the western Gulf of Mexico, almost all of the waters of the gulf are shaded in, indicating active oil and gas drilling leases. Indeed, there is a reason for that. It is because the reserves were there, the oil and gas deposits are there, the future reserves are expected to be there. As a matter of fact, I believe it is 80 percent of all economically recoverable reserves on the Outer Continental Shelf—which not only includes the gulf but also the Atlantic and Pacific—80 percent of the Nation's known, recoverable gas reserves in the central and western Gulf of Mexico and 60 percent of the future recoverable oil reserves are in that area too. They are no in the area off the State of Florida.

The State of Florida has consistently taken the position that we should not have oil and gas drilling because of the high cost and potential damage to our environment and to our economy. One of our primary industries is the tourism industry, which so often is dependent upon those pure, sugary white beaches being unspoiled whereas millions of visitors who come to Florida to enjoy the sunshine and the waters and the beaches can do so without having to worry about having oil spread across these beaches.

I can tell you that 16 million Floridians, in unison, do not want oil lapping up on our beaches. The cost to our environment and the cost to our economy would be simply too high.

Why, you would ask, other than that the oil and gas reserves are in the central and western Gulf of Mexico, is there not any drilling off the coast of Florida? It goes back to the early 1980s, under the Reagan administration and a Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, who offered tracts for lease from as far north as Cape Hatteras, NC, in the Atlantic, south all the way as far as Fort Pierce, FL.

I had the privilege of being a Member of the House of Representatives at the time. So I went to work, knowing the people of my congressional district, in the early 1980s, didn't want oil lapping up onto their beaches. We were able to persuade the appropriations subcommittee on the Department of the Interior appropriations bill to insert language that said no money appropriated under this act shall be used for
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offering for lease tracts such and such, and then listed the tracts all the way from North Carolina south to Fort Pierce, FL. And we prevailed in the appropriations.

The administration left Floridians alone on offshore oil drilling for a couple of years but came back under a new Secretaries of the Interior and tried again. This time it was harder to stop. This time it escalated all the way to the full House Appropriations Committee. But we finally prevailed, interestingly, not on the threat to the economy or to the environment of Florida, and indeed the United States eastern coastline, but prevailed by getting NASA and the Defense Department to own up to the fact that you cannot have oil rigs down there in the footprint of where you are dropping solid rocket boosters into the space shuttle and where you are dropping first stages of the expendable booster rockets that are being launched out of the Cape Canaveral Air Force station. And we have not been bothered since the early 1980s, in Florida, about offshore oil drilling—until now.

The bush administration is pressing a 6-million-acre lease off the northwest coast of Florida in a strange configuration called lease-sale 181, of which the bulk of the 6 million acres is 100 miles offshore but a stovepipe runs northward to within about 20 miles of the Alabama coastline, which is about 20 miles, then, from the white sands of Perdido Key, State of Florida.

In a meeting of the Vice President with a Florida congressional members delegation, the Vice President suggested a compromise, which was to knock off that stovepipe coming off the bulk of the 6 million acres. That is no compromise, it is unacceptable, it is a cause that is still oil drilling off the State of Florida where the future reserves are shown to be not as abundant. The tradeoff to 16 million Floridians is simply not worth what potentially could be discovered in oil and gas—the despoiling of our environment and the killing of our economy.

Thus, it was such welcome news when we learned last week that the other side of the Capitol, the House of Representatives, added to the Interior appropriations bill an amendment that would prohibit such drilling. The vehicle was the Interior appropriations bill. It prohibits it for only 6 months. It will be my intention, and certainly the intention of my wonderful colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM, that we in the future will offer amendments either to the Interior appropriations bill, to bring it in conformity with the House-passed bill, or more likely amendments that would cause a prohibition of lease-sale 181 as well as offering similar amendments to the authorizing bill that will come out of Chairman BINGAMAN’s committee.

I want our colleagues to be clear. This is an issue of enormous magnitude to 16 million Floridians. It happens to be one of New Jersey, the State of the Senator who sits as Presiding Officer, as well as all the States in New England which value so much the pristine waters and the waters particularly as you get on north of New Hampshire and Maine—those waters that produce such delicacies as the Maine lobsters. This is a matter of grave concern to many of us.

It is time to draw the line in the sand—hopefully, not a line that will be washed over by oil on our beaches’ sand but, rather, a line that will indicate the unanimity of 16 million Floridians, joined by their sister States along the eastern seaboard, of opposition to offshore oil drilling.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred April 15, 1998 in Boise, Idaho. Mark Bangerter was brutally beaten because of his perceived sexual orientation. As a result of this attack, Mr. Bangerter was left with severe facial injuries and blindness in one eye.

I believe that government’s first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 would be a symbol that can become substance in our society.

I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

HUNGER AND POVERTY IN AFRICA

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join with Senators LEAHY and HAGEL in submitting S. Con Res. 53, which encourages the development of strategies to reduce hunger and poverty in sub-Saharan Africa.

In the year 2000, almost 200 million Africans, fully a third of the total population, went to sleep hungry and 31 million African children under the age of five were malnourished. One child out of seven dies before the age of five, and one-half of these deaths are due to malnutrition. Nearly half of sub-Saharan Africa’s population, some 291 million people, live on less than $1 a day, and almost 85 percent of the world’s 41 million children who do not have access to primary education are present in sub-Saharan Africa.

These problems are compounded by epidemics of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, cholera, and other diseases now ravaging the continent. The human costs are staggering. Almost 4 million people are infected with AIDS every year, adding to the over 25 million already infected. Over 75 percent of the people worldwide who have died of AIDS lived in Africa. One million people each year, mostly children, die from malaria.

Hunger only adds to the spread of disease, rendering the poor and malnourished too weak to defend against AIDS and other infectious diseases. Even if treatment clinics are available, those suffering from hunger are unable to afford fees for care or medicine to aid them with their battle against the illness.

Despite funding shortfalls, the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, and other U.S. government agencies and organizations, non-governmental organizations, NGOs, and private sector companies are presently implementing many innovative programs directed toward alleviating hunger and poverty in Africa. Unfortunately, these actions are not enough to keep poverty and hunger from growing in many African countries. Many of our experts have concluded that the United States is not tapping into the full range of interest, ability, experience and capacity available to address this problem. The introduction of our Resolution, which addresses these issues, coincides with the conference of The Partnership to Cut Hunger in Africa, an independent effort formed by U.S. and African public and private sector institutions, international humanitarian organizations and higher educational institutions. Michigan State University continues to play a strong leadership role in this effort. The President, Mr. Peter McPherson, serves as one of the Partnership’s co-chairs and was instrumental in arranging conference-discussion activities in the Senate this week.

The goal of the Partnership is to formulate a vision, strategy, and action plan for renewed U.S. efforts to help African partners cut hunger dramatically by 2015. For three days this week, the Partnership’s 22 distinguished policy experts and practitioners from the U.S. and 8 African countries will share their views on hunger in Africa and will open a dialogue on the role the U.S. might play in diminishing hunger and poverty in Africa. On Thursday, June 28, 2001, Partnership experts will culminate their 3-day conference with a roundtable discussion on Capitol Hill, during which time they will share their findings and action plan to effectively combat hunger and poverty in Africa. I also have the opportunity to join in hosting this event.

I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Partnership to Cut Hunger in Africa and the Partnership’s