

per 10,000 women ages 40–49 who are regularly screened. About 2,500 women should be screened regularly in order to extend one life." These two statements leave a great deal of room for interpretation by women, their physicians and their families.

The report concludes, "up to 25 percent of all breast cancer is not detected by mammogram in women ages 40–49." One could therefore logically conclude that 75 percent of all breast cancer is detected by mammography performed on women in this age group. To me, the fact that 75 percent of breast cancers will be detected through mammography is very significant. In addition, this conclusion also makes a compelling case for additional research to develop more sophisticated equipment which can detect breast cancer earlier than today's mammography technology can.

The report also concludes that use of mammography has contributed to a growing trend that breast cancer tumors are being detected when they are small, and at an early stage. The report states that, "the presence of smaller or earlier stage breast tumors can give a patient more choice in selecting among various treatment options." Research has shown that lumpectomy, combined with radiation therapy, is as effective as mastectomy when the tumor is detected early.

One area all parties involved in this issue can agree upon is the need for additional research. I have introduced Senate Resolution 15, to express the sense of the Senate that funding for biomedical research activities of the National Institutes of Health should be doubled over the next 5 fiscal years. It is only through research that definitive answers to these very important research questions can be obtained.

While I respect the conclusions of the consensus panel, I believe the message being sent to younger women throughout America is wrong. They are being told, in essence, that early detection of breast cancer may not be all that important. I believe most women reject that conclusion.

On numerous occasions, I have spoken about how my own family has been affected by cancer. My wife and my mother are both survivors of breast cancer because it was detected at an early stage. It haunts me to think what might have happened if they had received the message that women are currently receiving with this report.

I support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I believe it is important that the Senate send the message that more research is needed to further determine the benefits of mammography screening in younger women, that the National Cancer Institute should reconsider its mammography screening guidelines, and to encourage the public to consider cancer screening guidelines issued by other organizations.

Ms. MIKULSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to conclude the debate on this side by reaffirming that this resolution does not meddle with the National Institutes of Health. It does not meddle with science. It essentially says let us have more research on the subject of breast cancer in terms of its cause, in terms of its prevention, and in terms of its cures.

It also calls for the women of America and their physicians to follow those guidelines that are recommended by every physician group as well as the American Cancer Society on urging women in the age 40 to 49 group to have either an annual or biannual mammogram.

Third, it asks the National Cancer Institute to repromulgate its own guidelines urging the same.

I would like to comment that this advisory panel that made this report in January is not made up of NIH scientists. This is an outside advisory group to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. President, I have the honor of representing the National Institutes of Health because it is in my State. How wonderful to be able to represent a Government organization devoted to saving lives by finding cures and causes for the diseases that threaten Americans and others around the world.

The National Cancer Institute has taken specific steps to be far more sensitive and to have a budget priority looking at those gender-specific diseases, particularly breast cancer and ovarian cancer. And we are pleased also with the work that is now being done in the area of prostate cancer as well.

I believe that the National Cancer Institute is on the right track. We want to be sure that they continue their scientific research, and if there is a gray area about when you should have a mammogram always go to the side of safety. Always go to the side of caution. One of the things we know is that when you are treated by a physician more information is often better information.

So, Mr. President, I urge unanimous adoption of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Knowing no other Democrats who wish to comment on this issue, I yield the remainder of my time and look forward to the vote at 5 p.m.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, in conclusion I would like to make several final points.

First of all, I would like to commend Senator SPECTER for his commitment and devotion for years on this issue, and in particular tomorrow for holding a hearing as the chairman of the Labor-HHS Committee on Appropriations which I think will be very significant in highlighting and profiling the importance of this issue.

Finally, I also would like to say that I think it is critical that he send a very

strong message to the Cancer Institute advisory panel that will be meeting later this month to revisit this issue, and, if they see that we have a very strong vote here in the U.S. Senate from all Senators across the political aisle, clearly I think they will rescind the statement that they made last month in not making any recommendation for women in their forties. I think it is an abdication of their responsibility, and an abdication of their knowledge of medical science in terms of what is best for women.

I am very pleased as well that all nine women here in the U.S. Senate—all Republican and all Democratic women—are cosponsors of this resolution.

I do hope that we can get unanimous support of this issue so that we can correct what I think has been a wrong decision on the behalf of women in America and does nothing to advance women's health.

That is why this resolution becomes a critically important statement to the lives, health, and safety of women in America.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the vote on this resolution will occur at the hour of 5 p.m.

In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Idaho, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, while I and a number of my colleagues will come to the floor in the days ahead to introduce specific proposals affecting our Nation's parks and public lands, I would like to talk very generally about the environmental and natural resources agenda of the 105th Congress. My hope is that we have learned from the lessons of the last Congress and will not once again attempt to undo the most effective and progressive network of environmental laws in the world.

Over 25 years ago, with overwhelming bipartisan support, the National Forest Management Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Water Act were enacted into law.

Today, as a result of those and other laws passed with strong support from

both sides of the aisle, people are more actively involved in management of their public lands, more people are using public lands for recreation than ever before, our air and waters are cleaner, hunting and fishing is better, our Government is more open about the effects of its actions on the health and safety of families and local communities, and rare species such as the bald eagle and grizzly bear are thriving.

By protecting our natural resource heritage, we have become a wiser, stronger, and healthier Nation.

At times we have a tendency to overlook the value—our moral and ethical obligation—to pass on healthy lands and waters to our children's children. How else can we explain efforts in the last Congress—and proposals by some of my colleagues today—to rewrite, overturn, or significantly weaken the protections afforded all Americans by these laws?

In this regard, I was encouraged by the recent words of Mike Dombeck, the new Chief of the Forest Service. His first day on the job, Chief Dombeck said:

More and more, people are realizing that their jobs and professions, the quality of the water they drink and the air they breathe—the very fabric of their lives—are dependent on the land that sustains them.

Dombeck told his employees that this Nation's environmental laws:

... represent the conservation values of mainstream America. Do not be disturbed by the debate surrounding their execution. This is background noise to a complex society and healthy, properly functioning democracy. There is an ongoing debate in this Nation over how national forests and rangelands should be managed. That's just fine. In fact, it is healthy. Debate and information are the essence of democracy. The people we serve, all of the American people, are now more fully engaged in defining how their public land legacy should be managed.

The new Chief succinctly stated what we inside the beltway sometimes forget, "We cannot meet the needs of the people if we do not first conserve and restore the health of the land." This Nation is blessed by a public land legacy that is the envy of the world. Our taxpayer-owned lands are the refuge of last resort for vanishing species. Moreover, these lands enable our children to experience the solitude of wilderness, pristine clear lakes, and a hunting and fishing experience unexcelled in pure delight anywhere else.

Last year many Members of Congress were shocked by the outrage of our citizenry over the efforts to dramatically cut the EPA budget. In 1960, 65 percent of our lakes and streams were neither swimmable nor fishable. Today 65 percent of our lakes and streams are swimmable and are fishable, and I can tell you, our people want that progress to continue until we reach 100 percent. I applaud Chief Dombeck's views and encourage my colleagues to allow him the time and resources to make the policy and personnel changes needed to achieve his critically important vision.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX CUT AND MEDICARE CUT PROPOSALS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, tonight the President will address the Nation on the State of the Union. I do not know precisely what the President is going to say, particularly about the economy and about the budget, tax cuts, the deficit, crime, education, the environment, and so on. I am sure he will address each one of those things and more.

But I would be less than candid with my colleagues and my constituents—and I would be less than honest with myself—if I did not voice some concerns about what I have been reading about what the Republicans want in the way of tax cuts and what the President wants in the way of tax cuts, what the President wants in the way of Medicare cuts, and what the Republicans want in Medicare cuts, what kind of incentives we want for our children to attend college, what kind of a tax cut we want for so-called middle class people.

So let me address those issues seriatim and say, first of all, it is my understanding that the proposal which has been in the public domain for some time now to cut Medicare by \$138 billion over the next 6 years will probably be fairly well applauded. Nobody is going to object to any proposal that makes the Medicare system sounder and gives our elderly Medicare recipients a better sense of security. Anything we can do to cause the American elderly population to sleep better at night because they know the Medicare system is sound and will be sound for the foreseeable future is a highly desirable goal.

Now, having said that, I think the Republicans will want to cut Medicare more than \$138 billion. And I am not saying they are right or wrong. I do not know what the figure ought to be. I might support additional proposals to do anything to make the Medicare system sounder than \$138 billion will make it.

But having said that, I am puzzled by how you achieve a balanced budget while you are cutting \$138 billion in Medicare, which alone would go right on the budget deficit over the next 6 years, I believe it is.

But we do not stop with that. The Republicans do not stop with it and the Democrats do not stop with it.

The Republicans have a proposal of a tax cut which they call the middle class tax cut. It is designed to provide a \$500 tax credit for each child in the family, but it is not refundable.

That means that if you are making \$30,000 a year, and you pay \$1,500 in taxes, you would get \$1,500 back if you have three children—\$500 for each child.

But if you happen to have a \$30,000 income, and six children, and you do not pay any tax, you get nothing.

So the simple question must be asked, who needs a tax cut more, the parents with three children or the parents with six children?

Move on down the ladder to \$25,000, move on down the ladder to \$20,000, a single mother with one child who is working as a waitress in a Senate cafeteria. Her tax bill is \$1,000, we will say. She would get \$500. But if she had three children and was still paying \$1,000, she would get \$1,000, but nothing for the third child.

The third scenario: If she has children and is paying no tax, she gets nothing. And on top of that, as the Presiding Officer will tell you, and recall, we cut the earned income tax credit last year, which is so beneficial to the mother who is a waitress in a Senate cafeteria that I just described because she is entitled to an earned income tax credit by staying on the job and off of welfare.

No less a person than Ronald Reagan said it was the greatest incentive for staying off welfare he could think of. Every President since that thing first came into effect has said that this is one of the best incentives to keep people off of welfare we have. That is to say, "If you stay on the job all year long, don't get on welfare, and if you make less than \$28,000 a year, we'll give you a sum of money at the end of the year, as high as \$2,000."

So what are we doing here? What kind of social policy is it? Forget economics. What kind of social policy is it when we give money to people who have one or two children and pay income tax, give no money to people who work and pay no income tax because they have enough dependents to keep them from paying taxes and maybe whose income was cut this year because we cut the earned income tax credit? What kind of fairness is that?

So, Mr. President, I am troubled about the so-called \$500 tax rebate for all your children. It is not refundable. Only if you pay taxes do you get it. Obviously, the people who are hurting most are not paying taxes because they do not make enough money.

Then we have this proposed capital gains tax cut. As I read the Republican proposal, CBO scores it to cost \$33 billion over the next 5 years and \$111 billion over the next 10 years. And who do you think gets the majority of the benefit? Why, it is the people who own stock in Microsoft and Intel and IBM. It is the people who are big investors in the stock market.

The rate of 28 percent on capital gains may be a tad high. There is probably nobody in this room who would quarrel with that. But if you are trying to balance the budget, which we have