

and the United States. They were resolved, and they are resolved, to keep American forces in that area to maintain the peace and security of the region, along with our allies.

I might add, parenthetically, that we make up only, roughly, 7,000 of the nearly 41,000 troops that are in Kosovo, and that, in fact, we are doing the Lord's work there. It is kind of interesting that, in the six or seven trips I have made to the region—the last one being a trip to Kosovo—after I came back I remember having discussions here on the floor, and I would hear about how down the morale was of the American forces and how circumspect they were about whether we should be involved.

That is not what I found, whether it was at Camp McGovern in Bosnia several years ago or at Camp Bondsteel in Kosovo last year. What I found was that these young women and men knew exactly why they were there. They knew why they were there. They did not have to be told. And they felt good about it. They knew they were doing the Lord's work. They understood. They understood there was a purpose and meaning for being there. All they had to do was ride through the streets and they understood it. It is interesting that the retention rate and reenlistment rate is higher for those who have been in Kosovo or Bosnia than for any other segment of the military.

So I would argue that what is happening in Yugoslavia now is making a lie of some of the assertions that were taken for granted around this place by a majority of the people on the floor, as well as a majority of the press, as well as a majority of the people who are so-called pundits.

This is the point I want to make.

We should not now, at this moment, change policy. Slobodan Milosevic is a war criminal. We should not, as former Secretary Eagleburger—a man for whom I have great respect—said yesterday on television, accommodate his departure from Serbia by winking and nodding and essentially letting him off the hook on the War Crimes Tribunal. We should not do that.

The newly elected President of Serbia, Vojislav Kostunica, is a lot of things that are good. But his record shows that he is also a fierce nationalist.

We should lift sanctions, but only when Milosevic goes. But again, just a word of caution, we should not lift all sanctions until we are clear that the new leadership in Serbia, in Belgrade, will honor the Dayton accords and will not use force in Kosovo. This is no time to relent. None—none—of us should relent now.

We have been right so far. A steady course, firm hand, U.S. power, U.S. leadership, and U.S. resolve have brought us this far. Without it, none of what has happened would be, in fact, what the history books will write about 2, 5, 10, and 20 years from now. History will record that what we did

was the right thing to do from a moral standpoint, and, even more importantly, in a Machiavellian sense, right for the national interests of the United States, and essential for any prospect of long-term peace and security in Europe.

I said a week ago that Milosevic could not be sustained, no matter what he did from this point on. The tides of history have moved. We saw it some years ago in Bulgaria. We saw it in Romania. We saw it occur again in Croatia. We saw it again in Bosnia. And we now see it in Serbia. For the first time in modern European history, there is a prospect—a serious prospect—that the Balkans will be integrated into Europe as a whole.

I can think of no more significant foreign policy initiative that this Government has taken since the Berlin Wall came down that has been so clearly vindicated—so clearly vindicated. So now is not the time to take an easy road out. Lift sanctions partially, make it clear to the Serbian people that we love them—our fight was never with them; they are a noble people—but I think we should have a steady hand. We are prevailing. The West is prevailing. Yugoslavia, in particular—most people refer to it as Serbia—is about to come into the light of day. We must not now send the wrong signal and let people in Serbia conclude that there is not a price to pay for those who violate, in a massive way, the human rights of their fellow citizens and that we expect the new government to behave in a way consistent with international norms.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 3059

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, set a time and date for consideration of S. 3059, and that only relevant amendments to the bill be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have been involved in other meetings this morning, and I have not heard the discussion. I have not had an opportunity to see the level of disagreement on this. Let me just say to Senator McCain—and we just talked about it—I don't have a personal problem with this. But give me a little time to make sure that all of our people know to what we are about to agree. Hopefully, within the next few minutes he can offer that again. I will object at this point, but if he will withhold, because I understand there may be more objections, I will check that out.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous consent request. I also assure the majority leader that if it appears as if there is going to be an avalanche of relevant amendments to

which we cannot get time agreements, then I am not interested in tying up the entire Senate on that legislation. But I do believe that it is important that we take it up, obviously. I am grateful the other side doesn't object to the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, when the conference report arrives, I will terminate my comments.

THE SAFETY AND HEALTH OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN

Mr. FRIST. Amidst all of the proposals and discussions and objections and debate that has gone on here on the floor, I rise to talk about a bill that has been very positive, which demonstrates the best of what this body is all about—a pulling together and working together across the aisle in a bipartisan way, all with the goal of making others' lives more fulfilling, both in the current generation and in future generations. This week, the U.S. Congress has sent to the President of the United States for his signing a comprehensive bill that very much forms the backbone of efforts to improve the safety and health of America's children.

This bill that has been sent to the President focuses on our children's health, the Children's Health Act of 2000. It was more than a year ago that Senator Jim JEFFORDS and I reached out across the Capitol to Chairman BILEY and Representative BILIRAKIS to work together in a coordinated way on a whole variety of issues and bills that are critical to children's health and safety. These included such issues as maternal and infant health, day-care safety, pediatric research, pediatric health promotion, and efforts to fight drug abuse and provide mental health services for young people today. I am delighted that both the House and the Senate have passed this bill, that it has been sent to the President, and that we were successful in achieving our goal.

The bill addresses a range of issues. Just to give some flavor of this bill and what it can achieve, what it will achieve, what it does achieve in its language, let me comment on a few.

Day-care safety. Currently, there are more than 13 million children 6 years of age and less who are enrolled in day-care centers. Almost a quarter of a million are in Tennessee. One provision in this bill, the Day-Care Safety Act, recognizes the need to make these settings safer, improving the health and public welfare of children in day care. Parents should simply not be afraid to leave their children in the morning when they drop them off in these day-care settings, fearing that a licensed

day-care facility is not safe over the course of that day. This bill helps ensure that our childcare centers will be safer.

Secondly, children's health. Provisions included in this bill, the Children's Public Health Act of 2000, some of which were introduced July 13 of this past year—that I introduced with Senators JEFFORDS and KENNEDY—address a number of children's health issues, including maternal and pediatric health promotion and research.

Thirdly, traumatic brain injury. Traumatic injuries are the leading cause of death for every age group between 1 and 19 years of age. This bill strengthens the traumatic brain injury programs at the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the Health Resources and Services Administration.

Fourth, birth defects: Birth defects are the leading cause of infant mortality and are responsible for about 30 percent of all pediatric admissions.

This bill focuses on maternal and infant health. The legislation establishes a national center for birth defects and developmental disabilities at the CDC, the purpose of which is to collect and analyze and distribute data on birth defects.

Fifth, asthma. The bill combats some of the most common challenges, problems, and public health issues in children today. In terms of asthma, it provides comprehensive asthma services and coordinates a wide range of asthma prevention programs in the Federal Government to address this most common chronic childhood disease.

Mr. President, I am delighted that this bill has passed both of these bodies with this body working together in a bipartisan way.

I understand that we are about ready to begin on the conference report. Therefore, I will terminate my comments at this point, and later in the day, during morning business, will extend my comments on this very important bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will continue to work on this with Senator MCCAIN. I understand other Senators are coming to the floor to discuss the issues with him.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill H.R. 4475 making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk reads as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H.R. 4475, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the Senate agree to the same, signed by all of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The report was printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of October 5, 2000.)

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, what is the pending business? Is there a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report on Transportation is the pending business.

Mr. SHELBY. I urge adoption of the conference report and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following the completion of the vote, Senator HARKIN be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate will have the opportunity to consider the conference agreement for the fiscal year 2001 Transportation appropriations bill.

I believe that this bill strikes a funding balance between the modes of transportation, funds critical safety initiatives, reflects the priorities of the overwhelming majorities of both the House and the Senate, and provides adequate flexibility and direction for the Department as it transitions into the next administration.

Mr. President, allow me to take just a few minutes to summarize and highlight a few of the provisions of the conference report that is now before the Senate.

Of the three issues that the administration indicated were critical to it in the safety arena, I'm pleased to report that we're three for three. And, so is the administration. These issues have been negotiated in a fashion and with a spirit of accommodating the interests of the House, the Senate, and the administration. Through some creativity and with an awareness of the specific concerns of all the parties, we have been able to meet everyone more than halfway.

The compromise language on the hours of service regulations in this conference report allows the Department to move forward with the analysis of the docket, issue a supplemental NPRM, and do everything short of issuing the final rule. I think that is a reasonable compromise and one that should provide the incentive for the administration to fully listen and solicit views on all sides of this issue.

As many of you know, I have a concern that NHTSA has ignored calls from consumer groups and critics of the proposes static stability factor rating system in its rush to publish a roll-over rating as part of the NCAP program. Notwithstanding that concern, I have been convinced by the distinguished House Chairman, Mr. WOLF, that he believes that NHTSA, in light of our attention to the issue, will now act responsibly in this area.

Accordingly, the conference agreement maintains the Senate requirement to conduct a 9-month study at the National Academy of Sciences. The Academy is directed to investigate the usefulness of the information that NHTSA proposes to provide, the scientific underpinnings of the NHTSA approach, and consideration of whether dynamic testing is preferable to the static stability factor calculation—while simultaneously allowing NHTSA to move forward with its proposal.

This issue deserves all our attention as it evolved because rollovers are among the most deadly of accident types and providing bad information to consumers could well mean more highway fatalities. People have a right to expect that the information that the Federal Government provides is accurate, unbiased, and based on sound testing methodologies. I am pleased that in the conference agreement NHTSA will have to meet that standard, if not in the short term, at least in the long term.

The funding levels keep faith with the recently enacted AIR-21 capital and airport authorizations, and come very close to the President's budget request for FAA operations.

The Highway and Transit accounts are funded at the TEA-21 authorized levels; the Coast Guard, adjusted for some of the capital projects funded in the supplemental, is above the President's requested level for fiscal year 2001; NHTSA is above the President's request once it is adjusted downward for the RABA shift that was a non-starter with both the House and the Senate.