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