

has an opportunity to take a look at it. If indeed it doesn't reflect the intent, Congress should have a chance to change it.

Those are some of the things that I think would help implement the things we are doing. It would help to have a smaller and more efficient Government. It would help us, Mr. President, as you pointed out, to set aside some of the dollars that ought to be used to pay down the debt and go back to the taxpayers. I think we have a great opportunity to do that. I hope we focus on that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I rise to remind Senators that there is an order that requires amendments to this bill be filed by 3 p.m. We have been notified there are about 41 amendments that may be offered. Senator INOUE and I are prepared to deal with these.

If Members have amendments and desire to have a vote sometime tomorrow, please take time this afternoon to initiate that debate. There is no time limit on amendments yet, but we do intend to reach a time limit agreement on amendments later this afternoon. If Members have amendments and desire to have a considerable amount of time to present to the Senate, this is a great time to do that.

We will be working up a managers' package of amendments that we believe we can take to conference and work out. Senators may want to identify those amendments and present them. We would be pleased to consider them now and determine if we will put them in the managers' package so we can move the bill forward.

It is our hope we will finish this bill tomorrow afternoon. That is complicated a little bit by the fact we have a full Appropriations Committee meeting tomorrow afternoon to report out the Transportation appropriations bill. That may not take very long. It is our intention to keep working on the Defense bill, notwithstanding the fact we will be in committee on the Transpor-

tation bill. I urge Senators to introduce and possibly present amendments to the Senate so we can determine whether they should be included in our managers' package, which will be accepted by unanimous consent.

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.

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

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

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 3308

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for the preventative application of dangerous pesticides in areas owned or managed by the Department of Defense that may be used by children)

Mrs. BOXER. I send an amendment to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself and Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 3308.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 109 of the substituted original text, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 8. **PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTATIVE APPLICATION OF PESTICIDES IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AREAS THAT MAY BE USED BY CHILDREN.**

(a) DEFINITION OF PESTICIDE.—In this section, the term 'pesticide' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136).

(b) PROHIBITION USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventative application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen or a category I or II acute nerve toxin, or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class, in any area owned or managed by the Department of Defense that may be used by children, including a park, base housing, a recreation center, a playground, or a daycare facility.

Mrs. BOXER. I will do my best to describe my amendment in about 10 minutes, if I might.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mrs. BOXER. I say to the Senator from Alaska, I am asking for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. I will agree to that.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if I may be recognized, I ask that it be scheduled for sometime tomorrow at a time to be agreed upon between the Senator from Hawaii and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's unanimous consent request?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to clarify with my friend from Alaska and my friend from Hawaii that we will have an up-or-down vote on this amendment and not a second degree? We can have a vote up or down.

Mr. STEVENS. We have no problem with agreeing that the amendment not be subject to a second-degree amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend from Alaska and my friend from Hawaii for agreeing to my request. I hope we will not have much opposition because I believe that this amendment is, in fact, consistent with the stated policy of the Department of Defense. I will explain what my amendment does.

My amendment would prohibit the routine use of particularly harmful pesticides on Department of Defense property or grounds where children may be present.

I was stunned to learn, about a year after I got to the Senate—so it must have been about 1984—that the way the laws were written and the way they applied across the Government was that our environmental laws were set to protect essentially 155-pound men.

Now, that is fine, if you are in that category, but what we find out is that people of a lesser weight, a different gender, pregnant women, the elderly, people who are ill, and little children, react very differently to that amount of pollution or pesticide, as the case may be. So I wrote a bill called the Children's Environmental Protection Act. I am very much hopeful that we can get it passed as sort of an omnibus bill that takes care of all of our laws in every Department to make sure that children, in particular, are protected.

So far we have not had much luck moving that bigger package, so what I have done is, on every bill that has come before this body, I have offered an amendment that would lower the risk for our children. In this particular case, we are saying to the Department of Defense: You have been good about putting the policy forward; we want to codify it and make sure that you do not use a pesticide containing a probable carcinogen or a known carcinogen, an acute nerve toxin or other toxins that would in fact harm our children.

Why is it important to limit the use of these pesticides around children? Clearly, by definition, pesticides are meant to kill living things. Exposure to pesticides has been linked to cancer,

neurological disorders, and learning disabilities. For example, common insecticides that schools spray on baseboards and floors to kill cockroaches and ants include an active ingredient—chlorpyrifos—that is classified by the EPA as a nerve toxin. And I compliment Carol Browner over at the EPA because she just held a press conference announcing that this particular ingredient will be banned. However, it is important to note it is going to take at least 6 months for that ban, and we do not want that kind of toxin being sprayed around children. That is why it is important to include it in this amendment.

We know that potential chronic effects from exposure to these kinds of harmful toxins, we know we see a decrease in neurological performance.

Are these risks any different for children in relation to adults? The answer is yes. I would like to refer you to the 1993 National Academy of Sciences report, "Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children." We know that children are at greater risk to experience the harmful effects of pesticides exposure than adults. In other words, children are not just little adults. They are changing; they are growing. I often say that I am a little adult but I am not a child; I have grown to my maximum potential. But the fact is, kids at a certain age, before they reach maturity, are very susceptible to having adverse reactions to the chemicals that I would not have, nor Senator INOUE, nor Senator STEVENS, nor our Presiding Officer, Senator ROBERTS; we are stronger, although I would say they are much stronger than I am because they are being protected because of a rule that says if you are a 155-pound male, you will be OK.

So it is important to bring this issue to the Senate as often as I can, and I am very pleased with the response I have gotten from colleagues thus far because we have been able to change the rules as they apply to safe drinking water; we recently had some luck on an education bill; and we have had some luck with the Superfund in committee. We make sure that when the Superfund sites are cleaned up—these are the terrible dumps that include so many harmful toxins—they are cleaned up to protect children, not just the 155-pound adults.

We know that pound for pound of body weight, children eat more food; they drink more water; and they breathe more air than adults so they are vulnerable. They are rapidly growing; their developing systems are vulnerable.

I want to show you this picture in case you are wondering what all this means because I think it is extremely interesting and it is also extremely disturbing.

This picture is from a study, "Showing the Effects of Pesticide Exposure on Young children." One group of children in this study was from a region where pesticide use was high, both in

the home and outdoors. The other group in the study was the same as the first group: same age, same ethnicity, except the second group of children was from regions where pesticides were not used—the same group of children, except for pesticide exposure. The two groups of children were asked to draw a person to test their cognitive ability, their ability to learn and understand. These are the results, results which show an unsettling picture.

These are the pictures that were drawn by the kids who were exposed to pesticides. You can see you don't even see a resemblance of a person. And clearly where there was very little exposure, you are getting a much more appropriate type of drawing. This isn't something that we are making up. We are seeing this response.

The kids who grew up without exposure to pesticide use in significant proportions did far better. They had better hand-eye coordination, and you could see it so clearly; they had better memory and their brain skills were so much sharper.

The study's authors also observed that children from the area with little pesticide use—and again that is clearly this group shown here—engaged in more group play; they were more creative with their activities; they were less aggressive than the children from the area with the high pesticide use. This is a study that is considered one of the first in this particular area.

This was done by Professor Elizabeth Guillet who is affiliated with the University of Arizona. This study clearly shows what many of us have suspected for a long time. It is a fact in evidence that our kids are damaged when they are exposed to dangerous pesticides and toxins.

The point I want to make about the amendment is that while we prohibit the routine use of these dangerous pesticides, we certainly do not prohibit the Department of Defense from using common and less toxic pesticides.

Under the amendment, DOD could still use synthetic pyrethroid insecticides to control insects. These insecticides are among the most common used today.

And, DOD could still use copper sulfate, a very common pesticide used today.

DOD also could still use "biopesticides"—there are some 50 of these type pesticides in use today.

DOD could also use pheromone traps and baits—which are used heavily today to control termites and carpenter ants.

Finally, DOD could still use insect growth regulators, which help control insects.

I was asked when putting this amendment together: Suppose there is an absolute emergency and we have an encephalitis epidemic break out on a military base. We make an exception for that in this amendment. We agree, if we have to go to these harsher toxins to fight a health hazard. Of course. We

have an exception in this amendment. By the way, that exception is part of the DOD guidelines.

We are only banning as a routine method the known carcinogens, the probable carcinogens, the nerve toxins from regular use.

This is a very disturbing study that was done by someone who is considered a leader in this field of understanding children and their brain development at the University of Arizona. We know for a fact that kids are adversely impacted by these toxins. I would be very pleased to see the Senate act to put on the record and put into law the official banning of these very harmful pesticides.

I again thank my colleague, the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUE, for his help on this. I ask unanimous consent that HARRY REID be added as a cosponsor to this amendment.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I particularly thank Senator STEVENS for his graciousness in not only allowing me to go forward with this amendment today but agreeing to have a vote directly on the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the author of the measure?

Mrs. BOXER. Certainly.

Mr. INOUE. Is the Senator satisfied that her amendment does not violate provisions of rule XVI?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, we have been told it is drawn in such a fashion that it simply says no funds may be used for these pesticides and toxins on a regular basis.

Mr. INOUE. It is limited only to the Department of Defense.

Mrs. BOXER. That is correct. I would love to do much more, I say to my friend, but we are following rule XVI.

Mr. INOUE. I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3317 THROUGH 3320, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have four amendments at the desk; three are technical in nature and one is substantive. I ask unanimous consent they be presented at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes amendments numbered 3317 through 3320, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3317

(Purpose: To provide research and development funds for the Information Technology project)

In the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. . In addition to funds made available in Title IV of this Act under the heading "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", \$20,000,000 is hereby appropriated for Information Technology Center.

AMENDMENT NO. 3318

(Purpose: To make a technical correction to Sec. 8083 of the bill)

On page 83, line 26 of the bill after the comma strike the following text: "1999 (Public Law 105-262)", and insert the following text: "2000 (Public Law 106-79)".

AMENDMENT NO. 3319

(Purpose: To make a technical correction on Section 8014)

On page 47, at line 21, strike the words "Native American ownership" and insert in lieu thereof "ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in 25 U.S.C. 450b(e), or a Native Hawaiian organization, as defined in 15 U.S.C. 637(a)(15)".

AMENDMENT NO. 3320

(Purpose: To make a technical correction on Section 8073)

On page 79, insert the words "Increase Use/ Reserve support to the Operational Commander-in-Chiefs and with" after the words "to be used in support of such personnel in connection with".

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would have been pleased to have had the amendments read, but they are technical. They have been cleared by my good friend from Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent the amendments be adopted en bloc.

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

The amendments (Nos. 3317 through 3320), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a series of amendments. Normally, it would be shown that I have offered them for these Senators. I ask unanimous consent they be shown to have been submitted by the Senators whose names have been shown as sponsors.

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

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and I have just discussed an amendment he has filed. He is prepared

to modify that amendment but wishes a little bit more time. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that has been filed by Senator BYRD be subject to his modification notwithstanding the present order.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3328

(Purpose: To adjust the cash balances available under the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" account)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 3328.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 90, line 14, strike Section 8091 and insert the following new section:

SEC. 8091. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by \$789,700,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations, and stabilization of the balance available within the "Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense", account.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this amendment changes one figure in the bill. It is cleared by Senator INOUE.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3328) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am filing an amendment for myself and

Senators ROTH and BIDEN. In their absence, I am submitting this amendment probably as an alternative to an amendment they have filed. I want it on the record just to avoid any problems in the future. I ask that it be filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be filed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am also filing an amendment for myself and Senator MCCAIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be filed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another amendment for Senator MCCAIN be printed in the RECORD.

There is one other.

These may have been already filed. If so, I ask that they just be withdrawn as a redundancy. But we are not certain they have been filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be filed.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, has time passed for the filing of amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Boxer amendment occur at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow with 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, can we withhold that just for a moment?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have sought recognition at this time to address some remarks to the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

I commend the managers of the bill, Chairman STEVENS and Senator INOUE, for their work on this measure. These two Senators have a vast knowledge, and it goes all across the areas of the Defense Department. They have been at this work a long time. Their hearts are in it, and they are highly dedicated to it. Their combined efforts are always evident in the annual DOD appropriations bill. This year's bill is

no exception—it is a well-balanced and comprehensive measure.

In recent years, the committee has had to provide for ever-increasing demands on our military—primarily in peacekeeping activities around the world. Our military personnel are scattered around the world—they are skilled and dedicated men and women, ever vigilant in their duty—charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of our country and its citizens. But they have in more recent times also been charged with the responsibility of acting as peacekeepers in many troubled areas around the globe.

Under these circumstances, it is very difficult to craft Defense appropriations bills. It has been nearly impossible to determine just how long and to what extent our military personnel might be needed in some of these peacekeeping operations, and what the estimated costs thereof might be. That situation exists today, for example, in Bosnia. It exists in southwest Asia, in Kosovo, and even in Haiti.

So I take my hat off to our managers for their dedication, not only this year but for many previous years, in working through these challenges to provide the funding necessary to carry out these efforts.

The bill before us today clearly addresses the most critical needs of our military personnel and their families. The 3.7-percent pay raise recommended by the Senate Armed Services Committee is fully funded in this bill. Sufficient resources are also included to improve the health care benefits of our military retirees. And more than \$96.7 billion is provided for the readiness of our military forces.

It is imperative that Congress provide funding for these important programs to demonstrate to the men and women in uniform who are serving our country throughout the world our strong and unwavering support for them.

Furthermore, this bill does not neglect our necessary defense modernization requirements. It provides funding for all of the highest priority programs identified by our military leaders and requested by the administration.

So I congratulate Senator STEVENS, chairman of the appropriations subcommittee—he is also chairman, of course, of the full Appropriations Committee—and Senator INOUE for their dedication and hard work, and I know that my colleagues will support passage of the bill.

I also take this opportunity to recognize in a very special way our ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator DANIEL INOUE, who will be honored next week, at which time he will receive the Nation's highest military award for valor—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

How proud it makes all of us feel that we have someone like DANIEL INOUE here as a Senator in our midst

as we think of the sacrifices that he made.

Senator INOUE was first elected to the Senate in 1963 from our 50th State.

Mr. President, I am proud to say that I am one who voted for Statehood on behalf of both Alaska and Hawaii. I believe that I am the only Senator left remaining here who voted for statehood for both of these States. I am proud of having done that.

He was first elected, as I say, to the Senate in 1963 from Hawaii, the 50th State. I think I am correct in saying that I am only one of three Members of today's Senate who were also here when he joined this body.

When I first came to the Senate, there were 96 Members of the Senate. Upon my being sworn in, the two new Senators from the new State of Alaska were sworn in with me, making a total of 98 Senators. Later in the year, Hawaii, the new State, the 50th State, sent two Senators, two new Senators to the Senate, making a total of 100 Senators to comprise this body.

I have had the pleasure of working with DANNY INOUE on many occasions over the years. I have found him to be a man of the utmost integrity, who has worked tirelessly in the Senate on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of the Nation.

He was a Senator who was extremely supportive of me when I was the majority leader of this body. He was supportive of me when I was minority leader. He was very supportive of me when I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He is certainly a Senator on whom one can rely for truth, for integrity, for steadfastness, for forthrightness, and as one who is extremely and highly dedicated to his work.

Like many others in this body, I view Senator INOUE as a national hero. I know of his wartime heroics in France and in Italy. I read about how he fought to protect the troops with whom he served without regard for his own life. He doesn't talk much about it, but we know about it. He was gravely wounded in serving his country, yet he continued to fight. I am immensely proud of this outstanding American in our midst.

For many in Congress, in our hearts we have felt that DANNY INOUE richly deserves the special recognition he earned in those bloody battles some 55 years ago. We are deeply moved and so proud that he is now to receive the highest military honor that can be bestowed upon any American citizen, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

It isn't enough to say in our hearts
That we like a man for his ways;
It isn't enough that we fill our minds
With psalms of silent praise;
Nor is it enough that we honor a man
As our confidence upward mounts;
It's going right up to the man himself
And telling him so that counts.

If a man does a work that you really admire,
Don't leave a kind word unsaid.
In fear to do so might make him vain
And cause him to lose his head.

But reach out your hand and tell him, "Well done."

And see how his gratitude swells.
It isn't the flowers we strew on the grave,
It's the word to the living that tells.

Well done, our friend, our colleague, our hero.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, at this moment I find that mere words are inadequate to express my deep gratitude. Aloha to the senior Senator from West Virginia. May I just simply say I thank him very much.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I share the feelings of the Senator from Virginia concerning the statement of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Those are wonderful words to say about our colleague, and every one of them was well deserved.

I ask unanimous consent that the Parliamentarian review the amendments filed on this bill prior to 3 o'clock and inform the minority and majority managers of the bill whether any of those amendments are subject to rule XVI.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that second-degree amendments be in order to the filed amendments, and that they be relevant to the first-degree amendments.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the managers of the bill may, with the consent of the sponsor, modify amendments so they could be included in the managers' package.

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

HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished managers of the bill in a brief colloquy on the issue of the health care management demonstration program recommended by the Armed Services Committee in S. 2549, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

Section 740 of S. 2549 would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a test of two models to improve health care delivery in the Defense Health Program: one model would study alternative delivery policies, processes, organization and technologies; the second would study long term disease management. This section would also

authorize \$6 million within the total of \$11.4 billion authorized for the Defense Health Program in FY2001 to carry out these demonstration programs. The Armed Services Committee believes that these two models have the potential to improve significantly the delivery of health care in the military medical system.

I would like to ask the distinguished managers of the bill if the FY2001 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill currently before the Senate includes the resources in the Defense Health Program to conduct the health care management demonstration program directed by section 740 of S. 2549?

Mr. STEVENS. I support the health care demonstration program directed by section 740 of S. 2549, and I assure my good friend from Michigan that the FY2001 Department of Defense appropriations bill before the Senate includes sufficient funding in the Defense Health Program to carry out this important effort.

Mr. INOUE. I agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I thank the Senator from Michigan for bringing this matter to our attention.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN AND SHARON ROESSER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor John and Sharon Roesser of Encino, California who celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary on Saturday, June 20, 2000.

After serving in the First Marine Division in the Pacific and near the China/Manchuria border during and immediately after World War II, John attended Loyola University in Los Angeles. John met Sharon, who was attending Immaculate Heart College, at a dance in the fall of 1948.

A year and a half later on a blistering hot day, June 10, 1950, John and Sharon were married in the original Saint Mary's Church in El Centro, California by the Most Reverend Charles S. Buddy who was the first Bishop of the San Diego Diocese. Sharon's maid of honor was her sister Patricia, and John's best man was Paul Connor. After their honeymoon at the Hotel Del Coronado, John and Sharon lived in Santa Monica and then settled in Encino, California where they raised their six children: Regina, John Jr., Allison, Paul, Mary Carol, and Tom. At last count, John and Sharon have 16 grandchildren.

Today, I honor John and Sharon's 50 years of marriage and their commit-

ment to raising their children in a loving and caring household. Since their marriage, they have always been there for each other and for each of their children through the best of times and the most difficult of times. They are an example of all that is good in America, and I wish them all the best in the years to come.

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, breast cancer is second only to lung cancer as a cause of cancer-related deaths among American women. This year, an estimated 182,800 new cases of breast cancer will be diagnosed and 40,800 women will die of this terrible disease. In addition, an estimated 12,800 new cases of cervical cancer will be diagnosed this year, and 4,600 American women will die of this disease. Many of these deaths could be avoided by making sure that cancer detection and treatment services are readily available to all women at risk.

Early detection is currently the best way to combat breast and cervical cancer. If women age 50 and over obtain regular screening for breast cancer, up to 30 percent of breast cancer deaths could be prevented. Moreover, virtually all cervical cancer deaths could be prevented through regular screening.

In recognition of the value of screening and early detection, Congress passed the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention Act of 1990, which established the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC's) National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. This important program has provided over two million screening tests to low-income and underserved women in all 50 States since its inception, and over 6,000 cases of breast cancer and over 500 cases of invasive cervical cancer have been diagnosed. In Maine, more than 8,300 women have been screened and 28 cases of breast cancer and 12 cases of cervical cancer have been detected through this program.

As one Maine woman observed:

This screening program was an answered prayer. I had been concerned about having to skip checkups lately, but there was no way to come up with the money anytime soon. I will gladly tell all of my friends about this and will gladly return for follow-up.

The National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program has provided cancer screening services to more than one million low-income American women who, like the woman from Maine, otherwise might not have been able to have these critically important tests. Unfortunately, however, the program does not currently pay for treatment services for women with abnormal screening results. Since the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program is targeted to low-income women, many do not have health insurance and many more are underinsured. While States partici-

pating in the program have been diligent and creative in finding treatment services for these women, a study done for CDC found that, while treatment was eventually found for almost all of the women screened, some women did not get treated at all, some refused treatment, and some experienced delay.

Screening must be coupled with treatment if it is to save lives. As we approach the 10th anniversary of the enactment of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Act, it is time for Congress to complete what it started by enacting legislation to ensure that women diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the screening program will have coverage for their treatment. That is why I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 662, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act, which would give States the option of providing Medicaid coverage for the duration of breast and cervical cancer treatment to eligible women who were screened and diagnosed through the CDC program. This legislation is not a mandate for States. It simply lets States know that, if they do decide to provide treatment services for these women, the Federal Government will be there to help with an enhanced Federal Medicaid match for these services.

Mr. President, S. 662 has strong bipartisan support with 66 Senate cosponsors. Moreover, last month the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed similar legislation. I want to commend the Senate Finance Committee chairman and the Senate majority leader for making a commitment to move this legislation this year, and I urge them to schedule committee action and Senate floor time soon so that S. 662 can be signed into law this summer. There would be no better way to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program in August than by enacting this important bill to provide the treatment necessary to save the lives of the women who are screened and diagnosed with cancer through this program.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, June 9, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,645,113,216,631.00 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-five billion, one hundred thirteen million, two hundred sixteen thousand, six hundred and thirty-one dollars).

One year ago, June 9, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,604,849,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred four billion, eight hundred forty-nine million).

Five years ago, June 9, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,899,367,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred ninety-nine billion, three hundred sixty-seven million).

Twenty-five years ago, June 9, 1975, the Federal debt stood at \$526,170,000,000 (Five hundred twenty-