

If nominees were only considered in the order they were nominated, the process would, of course, grind to a halt. We have heard some comments about that. Some people have argued this is a queuing up process; we just queue up whoever is next in line; they should go next on the Senate floor. But we know that cannot happen. If nominees were only considered in the order they were nominated, the process would grind to a halt as more qualified nominees would back up behind questionable nominees.

I believe, if it were not for ORRIN HATCH's efforts, there would have been far fewer judges confirmed during this session of the Congress. But I am also sure that if ORRIN HATCH had not been chairman, other questionable nominations would have been made. Because of this man's integrity, because of this man's honesty, because of this man's proven track record, and because he takes his job so seriously, I am convinced that certain nominations this White House might have considered making simply were never made and were never submitted.

I commend Senator HATCH for his efforts in moving the nominees along, but also for his efforts in doing a thorough and complete job. I am very proud to have ORRIN HATCH as chairman of this committee. We are very honored to have him serve in that capacity.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIDEN. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed as in morning business for up to 7 minutes to discuss digital mammography.

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

NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we are now in the midst of National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and the air has been filled with new and sometimes confusing statistics, new treatment, new research advances, and ever-present warnings about the seriousness of this dreaded disease.

One aspect of this issue that is close to my heart is National Mammography Day—a day to increase awareness of how routine periodic mammography and early diagnosis of breast cancer are responsible for huge increases in the numbers of long-term survivors of this disease.

I note parenthetically that my wife started an organization in my State to increase awareness—it is named after her, not me—called the BIDEN Breast Health Initiative, where she and her

group of advisers bring oncology nurses and oncologists into the local high schools throughout the State to make young women in high school aware of breast health examinations and self-examination because the key to survival is early detection.

Breast cancer is now an illness not to be feared as a death sentence but to be conquered commonly and routinely. This year, National Mammography Day, which I sponsored years ago, will occur on Friday, October 20. As in previous years, the Senate has adopted a resolution that I introduced affirming this designation.

This year's National Mammography Day will see the beginning of a tremendous new advance in early detection of breast cancer—digital mammography. This new technique offers many advantages over standard film-based mammography. From the patient's point of view, the usual 40-minute examination time can be cut in half, and the exposure to radiation can be reduced in almost all instances.

For many women, the mammogram images with digital technology are considerably more precise. The digital technology makes it possible for the radiologist to manipulate the images and to zoom in on questionable areas, thus providing more accurate diagnosis in reducing the need for repeat examinations.

The digital technology does away with the cost and the disposal problems as well of x-ray film.

In addition, the retrieval of prior film for comparison with current images no longer require the time-consuming manual search through an x-ray room.

Finally, by switching to the digital approach, this new technique allows all future advances in digital computer technology to be applied directly to saving women from breast cancer.

It is impossible, in my view, to overstate the importance of this digital technique's adaptability to new technological advances. Those of us old enough to remember how the first personal computers were a huge advance over the slide rule are also aware of how the incredible subsequent advances in computer technology meant that those first PCs were now useful only as doorstops. I look forward to a similarly rapid advance in the new digital technology as it moves into the field of breast cancer diagnosis.

Digital mammography is a revolutionary technology that must be offered to seniors and disabled who obtain their medical care through Medicare. And it should be done as soon as possible. I strongly encourage the Health Care Financing Administration to evaluate this product expeditiously and to set appropriate payment rates under the Medicare program.

What I don't want to see happen—I realize this may seem somewhat premature—is that digital mammography is only available for those who are able to pay, while all those on Medicare or

Medicaid, because the reimbursement cost is not sufficient to cover a digital mammography, will have to settle for what will prove to be an inferior test. The lives of many women who have yet to discover they have breast cancer may hang in the balance.

Therefore, I look forward to HCFA establishing a reasonable price at which reimbursement can be made under Medicare for those women on Medicare or Medicaid who seek a breast examination by use of digital mammography, the new emerging science, rather than one that is film based.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

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

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the conference report to accompany the Interior appropriations bill, and the conference report be considered as having been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read 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. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 29, 2000.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I say to those who are interested, we are going to the report, but there is no time agreement to run off. Nobody has given up their rights in that regard, but we are now going to be able to proceed to the conference report, and we will continue to work on the issues that are of interest to Senators.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the next 2 hours be under the control of Senators ROBERTS and CLELAND. I will be anxious to hear that presentation.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the leader, we are at a point now where people have spent literally months on the bill. It is good we are here. Senator LANDRIEU still has concerns. She wants to make sure everyone understands she may want to speak at least 2 hours and do some things with the legislation generally because of her unhappiness.

Mr. GORTON. Reserving the right to object, I ask the leader, does this mean we will start the actual debate on the Interior bill later today or will it be tomorrow?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there is no time agreement, so we will not be running off agreed-to time. If Senators want to speak on the bill itself, he or she can. Since we do have 2 hours set aside now for Senator ROBERTS and Senator CLELAND, which will take us to 8 o'clock, I presume the decision will be that we will begin on the Interior bill first thing in the morning.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I also say to the leader, we will all want to be getting our slippers on and pajamas ready for the big debate tonight.

Mr. LOTT. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. REID. By 8 o'clock.

Mr. LOTT. Did we get a clearance? Are the reservations withdrawn?

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

UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to draw attention to a group of federal officers who carry out a vital mission and provide critical services, but are largely unknown to people not in the law enforcement community. I am referring to the men and women of the United States Park Police.

An agency within the Department of Interior, the United States Park Police traces its lineage back to 1791 when then President George Washington established a force of "Park Watchmen". In subsequent years, the authority of what has become the Park Police has been expanded so that today, that department is responsible for providing comprehensive police services in the National Capital Region. Furthermore, they have jurisdiction in all National Park Service Areas, as well as other designated Federal/State lands.

While you will find their officers in New York City and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco, the bulk of the officers and duties of the United States Park Police are right here in the National Capital Region. Park Police officers provide a multitude of services ranging from patrol to criminal investigation and from counter-terrorism to helping to protect the President. They are responsible for patrolling and providing police services in 22% of the geographic area of the

District of Columbia, which includes all the national monuments; as well as, Rock Creek Park, National Parklands in the Capital Region, and 300 miles of parkways in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

The United States Park Police is a tremendous asset, but I am deeply concerned that due to a lack of adequate funding, it is an asset that is losing its edge. Make no mistake, I question not the leadership of the Park Police nor the brave men and women who serve selflessly as officers and support personnel in that agency. Chief Langston and his officers will do yeoman's work no matter how well or how poorly funded their agency is, they are professionals and committed to protecting the public. I am worried that the Department of Interior lacks a commitment to providing sufficient funds to the law enforcement operations that fall under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior. The Park Police is now 179 officers below its authorized strength of 806 officers. Furthermore, it is an agency that loses approximately 50 officers a year either through retirement or lateral transfers. It is understandable that it is difficult for some Park Police Officers to resist the higher pay of other agencies, especially when you consider that over a 30-year period, a United States Park Police Officer makes approximately \$135,429 less than what the average salary is for officers at other agencies in this area. In addition to being short-handed, equipment, from the officers' sidearms to the agency's radio equipment is antiquated and in need of replacement. The Park Police needs our help.

It is truly a shame that the Park Police is facing the challenges it is today and we are in a position to do something about it. The men and women who serve as Park Police Officers have not had a raise since 1990, and we should support legislation that will give them a much needed pay boost. In an era when it is harder and harder to attract qualified individuals into public service, let alone a life threatening profession such as law enforcement, it is vital we do something to reward those who already serve, as well as, to attract new officers to an agency that provides services that keep the Capital Region safe.

It might sound cliché, but the United States Park Police is there when they are needed. They are there when someone suffers an emergency in the waters around Great Falls, they are on the parkways when someone is in need of assistance, and they are on the Mall keeping visitors to Washington safe. They were there when the tragic shooting took place in this building, and they landed their helicopter on the plaza outside the Capitol in a valiant attempt to get a wounded United States Capitol Police Officer transported to a local trauma center as quickly as possible. Giving the officers of the United States Park Police a

raise is not going to solve all of that agency's needs, but it will help recruit and retain personnel. More importantly, it is the right thing to do.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL

SECTION 303

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, section 303 of S. 2507, the Intelligence Authorization bill, as amended by the managers' amendment, establishes a new criminal offense for the unauthorized disclosure of properly classified information. Existing criminal statutes generally require an intent to benefit a foreign power or are limited to disclosures of only some types of classified information. Administrative sanctions have constituted the penalty for most other leaks.

While I support the basic objective of this provision, we must ensure that it will not be used in a capricious manner or in a manner that harms our democratic institutions.

I see two respects in which some caution is merited. First, it could be applied to trivial cases. I believe that former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger once said that he told everything to his wife. If his discussions with his wife included classified information, he surely would have violated the letter of this bill. But so-called "pillow talk" to one's spouse is common, and I don't think we mean to throw people in jail for incidental talk to a person who has no intent either to use the classified information, to pass it on to others, or to publish it.

Mr. SHELBY. The Senator from Delaware is correct. The Committee expects that the Justice Department will use its prosecutorial discretion wisely. In some cases, administrative remedies are clearly more appropriate. In each case however—as under all criminal laws—prosecutors will need to judge whether criminal charges are warranted.

Mr. BIDEN. My second concern is that section 303 not be used as a justification for investigations of journalists. Our republic depends upon a free press to inform the American people of significant issues, including issues relating to foreign policy and the national security. If a leak statute were to become a back door for bringing the investigate apparatus of the federal government to bear on the press, we would be sacrificing our democratic institutions for the sake of protecting a few secrets. Much as we are dedicated to the protection of classified information, that would be a terribly bad bargain.

Mr. SHELBY. I agree with the Senator from Delaware 100 percent, and I can assure this body that in passing section 303, no member of the Select Committee on Intelligence intended that it be used as an excuse for investigating the press. That is why the scope of this provision is limited to persons who disclose, or attempt to disclose, classified information acquired