fourths of the minority seniors currently without coverage would gain immediate coverage. And the most frail of our seniors, those over 80 years old, would improve their access under the Bush plan.

Another important part of the Bush proposal is that States will not be restricted from offering low-income subsidies above 175 percent of poverty. Under the Gore plan, there is no option for States to pool funds and ease the expense of drug coverage for even more seniors.

Why is this chart important? This chart was done by the Washington Post. People who understand newspapers in this country understand what the Washington Post does will not be favorable to Governor Bush. They have a tendency to be favorable to the other side. So when they do a chart, a person ought to pay a little bit of attention to it. This is from the article that came with the chart:

Bush details Medicare plan, September 5: Texas Governor George Bush today proposed spending $198 billion to enhance Medicare over the next 10 years, including covering the full cost of prescription drugs for seniors with low incomes.

Bush's plan was modeled on a bipartisan proposal by Senator John Breaux, Democrat from Louisiana, and Senator Bill Frist, Republican from Tennessee.

This is the commission I was talking about.

Bush's plan proposes ''fully subsidizing people with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty level and creating a sliding scale for people with slightly more money. But Gore would stop the sliding scale at 150 percent of the poverty level, while Bush would extend it to 175 percent.

As I mentioned, a lot of States like that flexibility. A newspaper that normally would not give good reviews, gives a good review. One problem is the cost over the next 10 years would be $198 billion. The chart they did comparing the two shows $158 billion. They were charging him with $40 billion more in costs than what their chart actually shows.

I hope people will pay some attention to the comparisons. I ask unanimous consent that the chart be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 2000]

Bush	Gore
PREMIUMS	
25 percent of health plans' monthly charge.	$25 per month starting in 2002, increasing to $44 by 2008.
COPAYMENT FOR EACH PRESCRIPTION	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual plan.	Government would pay 50 percent up to maximum of $2,000 when the program starts, increasing to $5,000 by 2008.
COVERAGE FOR CATASTROPHIC EXPENSES	
Government pays all costs above $6,000 per year.	Government pays all costs above $4,000 per year.
DEDUCTIBLE	
Not spelled out. Would be determined by individual health plan.	None.
HELP FOR LOW-INCOME ELDERLY	
Pays premiums and all other costs for individuals with incomes less than 135 percent of the poverty line—that is, $11,300 or couples with incomes less than $15,200. Partial subsidies for people with incomes up to 175 percent of the poverty level.	Same, but partial subsidies available for people with incomes up to 150 percent of the poverty level.
WHEN BENEFITS WOULD START	
Help for low-income people and catastrophic coverage would be administered by states, starting next year. Premium subsidies for other people and broader Medicare reforms to make the program rely more heavily on private HMOs would start in 2004.	2002.
COST	
$158 billion by 2010	$253 billion by 2010.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the comparison shows pretty conclusively that you get more benefits under the $158 billion plan than you do under the $253 billion plan. The $158 billion plan goes into effect right away. The other one does not go into effect until 2002, and people have to pay, under the Democrat plan, $600 whether they get any benefits or not. It is my understanding the $600 has been subtracted from the $253 billion to make that cost a little bit lower. So it is a another tax for a proposal that provides for Federal control as opposed to your control.

HCFA versus your decisions: Talk to your doctors about HCFA and how it participates and interacts with them. Talk to them about the crisis that HCFA has already caused in this Nation in medical care and ask yourself: Do I want to give them the added burden of a prescription drug plan and only give myself one option? That is what we are looking at here.

I hope you will do some comparisons and see the difference and concentrate on this bipartisan solution to providing prescription drugs. The one thing about the Governor from Texas with which I have really been impressed has been his ability and effort to work with both sides in the Texas Legislature. I used to be in the Wyoming Legislature. I know how important it is for people to work together. It is a little different atmosphere than we have in Washington.

How did Governor Bush do that when he moved in and had a Democrat legislature? He sat down with them one on one, face to face, and talked to them about his priorities and their priorities, and they worked together. What excites me is following the history of Presidents, they tend to repeat what they have done successfully before, and I am really excited about that because I see a Governor coming to Washington and sitting down with both sides, one on one, face to face—a long process; there are 535 of us, but it is doable. That is what is needed in Washington: more effort across the aisle, effort like the Medicare Commission that has provided a solution for prescription drugs that can be done. I thank the Chair and yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining under morning business on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to use those 6 minutes to sum up.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when I finished speaking, the Senator from Arizona came to the floor and said it is unseemly that we would be discussing the Presidential race. The race has been discussed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, as it should be. There is no more important decision to be made by the American people than the choice of the President of the United States, and that choice will determine what this body considers for the next 4 years.

Frankly, we ought to reflect on what has happened with this Republican-led Congress. If you take a look at the fact that we are approaching the Halloween holiday, in that spirit we might consider the fact that Congress has become ''Sleepy Hollow,'' the final resting place for priorities of American families.

Take a look at the list of things that have been offered by the Democratic side but have not been acted upon by the Republican side: A real Patients' Bill of Rights. When you go to a doctor, who should make the decision; a doctor or insurance company clerk? That is an easy choice for me. I want the doctor to make the call. When we tried to pass that bill in the Senate, the Republicans defeated us.

Prescription drug coverage under Medicare: Not one of these convoluted schemes we just heard described that would somehow give prescription drugs to the States for 4 years, take it back, give it to the insurance companies—we know how it should work. Medicare has been on the books for 35 years. It is proven. It is universal.

Frankly, we think all seniors and disabled in that category should be able to make the choice themselves, voluntarily, whether or not they want the benefit under Medicare. The Republicans do not care for Medicare. They called it socialized medicine when the Democrats proposed it and, frankly, they are still criticizing it, doing little to help that system.

Most Americans know how valuable Medicare has been to their families. We think a prescription drug benefit under Medicare should be the law. The Republicans and pharmaceutical interests have stopped us.

We also believe in an increase in the minimum wage. Ten million Americans went to work this morning for $5.15 an hour, and they are not just kids in their first jobs. Over half of them are women and many of them are raising children and trying to eke out a living at $5.15 an hour. We used to give them a periodic increase in the minimum

wage without even debate, but the Republicans now think this is unacceptable; that we cannot give a minimum wage increase without lording billions of dollars in tax breaks on businesses. For goodness' sake, give these people—400,000 of them in Illinois—an increase in the minimum wage of at least 50 cents an hour for the next 2 years. That bill has not passed, and the Republican Congress has had ample opportunity to address it.

We believe on the Democratic side we need tax cuts; use the surplus for tax cuts for families for the deductibility of college education expenses. That is a concern I hear from families as soon as the baby is born. How are we going to pay for this kid's education? When you see the cost of education going up over a 20-year period of time, from the time that child was born until they will be in school—it goes up 200 percent, 400 percent—people ask: How can we possibly do this?

On the Democratic side, we want to give the families deductibility of tuition and fees to help them pay for college. The Republicans oppose it. We support it. That is the difference. When we offered it, they stopped us.

Also, we are talking about education funds to improve our Nation's schools, to reduce class size. This does not take a Ph.D. in education to understand. If you were a teacher, would you rather walk in on the first day and see a classroom with 30 kids or 15 kids? Are you more likely able to help a struggling student if there are 15 children in the classroom or 30? It is not rocket science. It does not take a Ph.D.

We on the Democratic side believe reducing class size is the first step to helping kids from falling behind and helping those better students get a little more attention.

We also believe we ought to be supporting afterschool programs for students. Letting kids go now at 3 o'clock is just a gamble because very few of them have parents at home. They do not have Ozzie and Harriet waiting with cookies and milk anymore. They are by themselves.

Some do pretty well, but a lot of them do not. We think afterschool programs, supervised, so kids have a chance to maybe catch up on their school subjects, maybe appreciate the arts a little more, maybe become better on a computer, or even just play some basketball, makes some sense as long as there is supervision. We support afterschool programs and fought the Republicans every step of the way trying to put this valuable money back into education.

We also believe in commonsense gun safety legislation. The No. 1 story in 1999 in the news was the Columbine tragedy. What has America done to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals? Congress has done nothing. Nothing.

The National Rifle Association and its leader, ''Mr. Moses,'' have decided we are not going to do anything to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals, and that is criminal. The Republican-led Congress should be held accountable for that.

If you have an aging parent or grandparent, the Democrats believe you should have a tax break to help pay for their care.

How many folks and families do you know worried about that aging parent and how their last years are going to be? They need a helping hand. We support it, as we support increased targeted tax cuts to help people pay for day care, so kids can be left in a healthy, safe environment and families can afford to pay for it. Stay-at-home moms, who sacrifice for their kids, should get a tax break, too. They are making a sacrifice that will enhance that child's future. We should invest in them as well.

When it comes to these myriad issues I have just given you, these are the issues with which working families, middle-income families, and single people as well can identify. Yet we have had no help whatsoever on the Republican side of the aisle. The Republican Congress has failed to address the basic issues of education and health care, taxes that are reduced and targeted tax cuts and credits for families who really need them, prescription drug coverage under Medicare, and a Patients' Bill of Rights.

We came to this Congress with all kinds of lofty goals. We are leaving now, unfortunately, with appropriations bills as large as the Washington, DC, telephone book, scarcely read, that serve too many special interests and too few families across this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:13 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALLARD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

PRIVACY LEGISLATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we live in a period of unprecedented prosperity and opportunity.

We can go more places than ever before. We are living longer and healthier lives than ever before. We are employed in jobs today that were unthinkable just a few years ago.

Our lives have changed dramatically because of computers, the Internet and technology.

But with all the good that comes with technology, there are elements that cause us concern. One such concern that has captured our attention is the issue of privacy.

As more of us use the Internet to shop and conduct business, more of our personal information is being spread throughout the web. That information, in many instances, is used properly and in a way that is good for consumers. But as in any field, there are those who abuse the public trust by using this personal information in unethical ways.

Because of concerns about consumer privacy, the Senate has considered how we might do better at protecting consumers while not unwittingly turning off the Internet engine that is such a key part of the economic prosperity we currently enjoy.

The Senate Commerce Committee recently held its third hearing this year on the privacy of information gathered from consumers who use the Internet. Since the Federal Trade Commission recommended legislation in this area earlier this session, I, and I believe a substantial number of my colleagues, have come to agree that we must act on this issue in the not-too-distant-future.

I have come to believe that Federal legislation is needed to protect consumers. I don't think that the current voluntary privacy policies are sufficient. Consumers who use the Internet should be given more information about what data is being gathered about them, and they should be given greater control over how this data is used.

I have also come to believe that Federal legislation is needed to protect and improve Internet commerce which, of course, benefits consumers and businesses alike. Not only will the assurance of adequate, enforceable privacy standards increase consumers' comfort with on-line transactions, but the possibility of States acting to protect consumers in the absence of a Federal law threatens to create a patchwork of conflicting privacy mandates that could be hard to apply to a medium that does not recognize State borders.

Though I know that I support Federal legislation regarding the on-line collection and use of consumer information, I confess to not knowing at this time exactly what should be legislated. At the last hearing in the Senate Commerce Committee we considered three different bills, and additional, and more varied, bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives. I don't know which of these approaches or combination of approaches will best protect consumers without making on-