

water for irrigation, at the expense of power production. Or vice versa.

Or to set more space aside for flood control. Each year, the planning process starts by measuring the snowpack and predicting the runoff.

In a particularly wet year, like 1997, operational changes may be needed to prevent downstream flooding, by setting aside more storage space in upstream reservoirs.

In a particularly dry year, operational changes may need to be made to allocate scarce water among competing uses.

In many of these cases, under the rider, the agencies could only act if they received specific Congressional approval.

Mr. President, we all know how hard it is to get anything passed around here. Any change that is at all controversial can be at least delayed, and maybe stopped completely.

Do we really want decisions like this, that may need to be made quickly in response to constantly changing circumstances, to require specific Congressional approval?

To sum it all up, this is no way to run one of the world's largest and most complex river systems. That's why we have expert federal and state agencies, like the Northwest Power Planning Council and BPA.

Congress should set clear legal standards. When necessary, we must improve those standards. That's why I support S. 1180, a bill to improve the Endangered Species Act.

Congress also should conduct careful oversight.

But we should not require Congressional approval of the complex decisions that managers must make so that the river system functions smoothly.

By requiring Congressional approval of any changes that diminish the use of the system below "present operational plans," the rider goes too far.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ON THE DEATH OF TOM BRADLEY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, for me, this is a sad day. Someone in politics whom I have very much respected passed away this morning, and that was Tom Bradley, former mayor of Los Angeles. Tom was one of America's finest mayors, a tireless advocate on behalf of the cities of America. I had an opportunity to work closely with him during the 1980s when we were both mayors.

I saw firsthand how he would go about solving a problem. He was kind and gentle, but he was tenacious about promoting the city of Los Angeles that he so deeply loved.

He leaves a rich legacy for Los Angeles and for the entire State of California. No Californian—and particularly no Los Angeleno—will ever forget the pride of hosting the 1984 Olympics. Tom Bradley showed that an American city could host a profitable and spirited Olympic ceremony.

His other accomplishments are many: Bringing public rail transportation to his city; building an international airport—Tom Bradley Airport—and a port that generated hundreds of thousands of jobs for the region; opening the doors of city government so that city workers reflected the rich cultural diversity of Los Angeles.

One particular vision I have of Tom Bradley which I will never forget is when we met, of all places, on the Great Wall of China as mayors in June of 1979. I was there to secure a sister city relationship between San Francisco and the city of Shanghai. While San Francisco got that relationship, Tom Bradley went right out and secured a similar relationship between Los Angeles and Guangzhou.

Tom knew the importance that the Pacific Rim would play in his city's future and he would literally travel anywhere in the world to help promote the city. He was a forceful and successful advocate for the cities of America every time cities needed a strong voice. His presence was matched by a wonderful and soft gentleness that I, personally, will never forget.

My deepest sorrow goes to his family and to his many friends. Mr. President, I know we all will do our part to see that Tom Bradley's vision for Los Angeles lives on and on for generations to come.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will report the motion to proceed to S. 442.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 442, a bill to establish national policy against State and local government interference with interstate commerce on the Internet or interactive computer services, and to exercise Congressional jurisdiction over interstate commerce by establishing a moratorium on the imposition of exaction that would interfere with the free flow of commerce via the Internet, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the motion.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I was under the impression that we had time to speak in the time allocated under the cloture motion; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Time allocated under cloture has begun. The Senator has one hour to speak.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I had voted in favor of moving ahead with the legislation itself because it is important. However, I daresay that I want to take a few moments of the Senate's time here to review the bidding about where we are on legislation and where we are not on legislation.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. I want to address the Senate this afternoon because of my continued concern that we are not addressing one of the most important areas of concern for American families, and that is the legislation which is known as the Patients' Bill of Rights. I and a number of our colleagues have cosponsored Senator DASCHLE's legislation. I had hoped that we could debate and reach conclusion on this legislation. I believe the overwhelming majority of our colleagues on this side of the aisle are in support of this legislation and, if we had an opportunity to debate this issue, I think we would have support as well from Members on the other side.

Basically, it is a fundamental issue that I think all Americans can understand. This issue centers around whether doctors are going to make decisions with regard to the treatment of patients in our country, or whether we are going to have those decisions made by accountants—whose primary interest is enhancing the profits of the HMOs rather than the health of its patients. That is really at the heart of the Patients' Bill of Rights. There are other important protections, but that is at the heart of it.

This issue affects about 160 million American policy holders. Our legislation is supported by more than 180 leading health care organizations—virtually all of the major doctors' organizations, nursing organizations, and consumer organizations.

I have read the comments of some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They distort the provisions of this legislation and talk about it as legislation which is unnecessary and legislation that will complicate the current practice of medicine. But, listen to the doctors. They say it will simplify the practice of medicine.

It does seem to me valuable to consider what the doctors say about this, what the nurses say about this, and what the overwhelming, virtually unanimous sense of the health professionals is about it, and they say that they strongly support our legislation. They are opposed to the Republican legislation. But all of them are asking when will the Republican leadership yield and permit us—permit us meaning the Senate—to take up this legislation and debate it and reach a resolution on these various issues. That is the matter I am addressing here this afternoon.

Over the period of the last 2 weeks in the Senate we have had votes on the salting legislation. I bet if we asked the Americans who are listening or watching this afternoon what the salting legislation is really all about and where it fits on their list of priorities, many of them would not know what it is all about. It is basically a technique which is used—and used effectively and legitimately according to the Supreme Court with its unanimous vote—to permit the organization of workers in