

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits.

S. 548

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 548, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide enhanced reimbursement for, and expanded capacity to, mammography services under the medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 584

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 584, a bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall States Courthouse".

S. 615

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage bond financing, and for other purposes.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel exercise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish headstones or markers for marked graves of, or to otherwise commemorate, certain individuals.

S. 686

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for energy efficient appliances.

S. 760

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage and accelerate the nationwide production, retail sale, and consumer use of new motor vehicles that are powered by fuel cell technology, hybrid technology, battery electric technology, alternative fuels, or other ad-

vanced motor vehicle technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 804

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require phased increases in the fuel efficiency standards applicable to light trucks; to required fuel economy standards for automobiles up to 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight; to raise the fuel economy of the Federal fleet of vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety and efficacy of pharmaceuticals for children.

S. 913

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 913, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of all oral anticancer drugs.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to establish the conservation security program.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 989, a bill to prohibit racial profiling.

S. 999

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 999, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a Korea Defense Service Medal to be issued to members of the Armed Forces who participated in operations in Korea after the end of the Korean War.

S. 1075

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1075, a bill to extend and modify the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, to authorize a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute, and for other purposes.

S. 1078

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1078, a bill to promote brownfields redevelopment in urban and rural areas and spur community revitalization in low-income and moderate-income neighborhoods.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide assistance to communities for the redevelopment of brownfield sites.

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1125, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to facilitate the deployment of broadband telecommunications services, and for other purposes.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 1204, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide adequate coverage for immunosuppressive drugs furnished to beneficiaries under the medicare program that have received an organ transplant.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include swine and bovine waste nutrients as a renewable energy resource for the renewable electricity production credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for years I have worked to decrease our reliance on foreign sources of energy and accelerate and diversify domestic energy production. I believe public policy ought to promote renewable domestic production that burns clean energy. For this reason, I will be introducing the Providing Opportunities With Effluent Renewables, or POWER Act today which cultivates another home-grown resource: swine and bovine waste nutrients.

Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code provides a production tax credit for electricity produced from renewable sources. Currently, the production tax credit is available for wind, closed-loop biomass, and poultry waste. The

POWER Act will modify Section 45 to include swine and bovine waste nutrient as a renewable energy source.

The benefits of swine and bovine waste nutrient as a renewable resource are enormous. Right now, there are at least 20 dairy and hog farms in the United States that use an anaerobic digester or similar systems to convert manure into electricity. These facilities include swine and/or dairy operations in California, Wisconsin, New York, Connecticut, Vermont, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Colorado, Minnesota, and my home State of Iowa.

By using animal waste as an energy source, a livestock producer can reduce or eliminate monthly energy purchases from electric and gas suppliers. In fact, a dairy operation in Minnesota that uses this technology generates enough electricity to run the entire dairy operation, saving close to \$700 a week in electricity costs. This dairy farm also sells the excess power to their electrical provider, furnishing enough electricity to power 78 homes each month, year round.

The benefits of using an anaerobic digester do not end at electricity production. Using this technology can reduce and sometimes nearly eliminate offensive odors from the animal waste. In addition, the process of anaerobic digestion results in a higher quality fertilizer. The dairy farm I referenced earlier estimates that the fertilizing value of the animal waste is increased by 50 percent. Additional environmental benefits include mitigating animal waste's contribution to air, surface, and groundwater pollution.

With all the problems that this type of opportunity remedies, I'm sure there will be a number of folks wondering why we haven't tried this before. The reason is, even if we had provided swine and bovine producers with tax incentives to produce renewable energy, they probably wouldn't have had access to the capital necessary for infrastructure development.

In fact, there was a segment on National Public Radio last week addressing the topic of anaerobic digester energy production. A professor from Cal State University who is an expert on anaerobic digesters was interviewed. The professor explained that the main reason farmers have not pursued this type of opportunity is cost.

For that reason, in addition to the tax credit opportunity I'm providing under section 45, I'm also going to guarantee within the POWER Act that funds be made available under the Environmental Quality Incentives Program for the development of anaerobic digesters.

Currently, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program provides funding for technical, educational, and financial assistance to farmers and ranchers for soil, water, and related natural resource concerns on their land. A component of the program allows for improvements to farm manure

management systems. The POWER Act will guarantee that payments, up to two years worth of funding which currently amount to \$100,000, would be made available to producers for "cost sharing" opportunities related to anaerobic digester implementation.

Using swine and bovine waste nutrient as an energy source can cultivate profitability while improving environmental quality. Maximizing farm resources in such a manner may prove essential to remain competitive and environmentally sustainable in today's livestock market.

In addition, more widespread use of this technology will create jobs related to the design, operation, and manufacture of energy recovery systems. The development of renewable energy opportunities will help us diminish our foreign energy dependence while promoting "green energy" production. This tax/farmbill proposal is real "win-win" situation for America and for our livestock producers.

Using swine and bovine waste nutrient is a perfect example of how the agriculture and energy industries can come together to develop an environmentally friendly renewable resource. My legislation will foster increased investment and development in waste to energy technology thereby improving farmer profitability, environmental quality, and energy productivity and reliability.

Why should we promote swine and bovine waste nutrient as an energy source? Consider the recent electricity shortage in California, the sky-high prices at the pump throughout last year and the soaring cost of home heating fuel and natural gas this winter. We have an obligation to consumers across the country to accelerate the nation's production of homegrown, clean-burning, renewable sources of energy.

The POWER Act is good for agriculture, good for the environment, good for energy consumers, and promotes a good, make that great, renewable resource that will reduce our energy dependence on foreign fuels. It is my hope that all of my colleagues join with me to advance this important piece of legislation.

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program for the rehabilitation, preservation or improvement of railroad track; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, today my colleague Senator SMITH of Oregon and I have introduced the Railroad Track Modernization Act. As chairman and ranking member of the Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, the needs of the Nation's small railroads have been brought to

our attention by railroad experts during hearings concerning the state of the railroad industry. Our colleagues Senators SCHUMER, DURBIN, and SPECTER join us in introducing this legislation.

Short line railroads have saved tens of thousands of miles of light density rail line from abandonment. In 1980, there were 220 short line railroads in the U.S. Today there are over 500 short line railroads, due in part to the mergers and streamlining of Class I operations which encouraged the larger companies to sell off their little-used or abandoned branch lines. Short line and regional railroads are an important and growing component of the railroad industry. Today they operate and maintain 20 percent of the American railroad industry's route mileage and account for 9 percent of the rail industry's freight revenue and 11 percent of railroad employment.

These line railroads employ approximately 25,000 individuals, serve thousands of local and rural shippers and are often the only connection these shippers have to the national rail network. To survive, this infrastructure needs to be upgraded in order to move the heavier cars that are currently being moved by the Class I railroads. The revenues of the smaller railroads are not sufficient to get the job done.

Since 1982, the short lines and regional have maintained the track in rural areas where rail service would have been abandoned by the Class I railroad. Because of their relatively low traffic levels, the Class I railroads could not afford to invest in this infrastructure and, as a result, allowed these lines to slowly deteriorate. With a lower cost structure and more flexible service, short line companies that both the track have been able to keep them going. However, the revenue is still not high enough to make up for past years of neglect.

Today, two factors have combined to bring this situation to a head. First, the advent of the heavier 286,000-pound cars that are becoming the standard of the Class I industry puts a greater premium on speed and precisely scheduled operations, the short line railroads must meet these higher standards or be cut off from the national system.

This legislation does not create a long term program to fix this problem, but instead it creates a one time fix for this problem. While these small railroads have enough traffic to operate profitably on an ongoing basis, they do not earn enough to make the large capital investment required by the advent of the 286,000-pound cars or the need to significantly increase speed. This legislation would authorize a program which could provide grants to the nation's smaller railroads to help them make the improvements needed to stay in business and continue to serve small shippers.

This legislation is of vital importance to the economy of Louisiana and the Nation. Louisiana is home to ten

small freight railroads that maintain rail service on over 500 miles of track. Without these small railroads, dozens of Louisiana communities and hundreds of employees would be cut off from our national rail network.

In addition, small railroads are vital to the safety of our highways. Every loaded rail car keeps as many as four trucks off to our nation's roads. At a time when we face record congestion and unprecedented delays we can ill afford the influx of trucks caused by the failure of the small freight railroad system. Millions of additional trucks per year is not only bad for our interstate highways, but also for the state rural roads in Louisiana. These roads will bear the brunt of damage caused by the trucks, while dramatically increasing our highway costs.

The Timber Rock Railroad, TIBR, serves Beauregard Parish and handles 15,000 carloads of freight per year, of which lumber and coal are the major commodities. Without the existence of TIBR, many major employers in western Louisiana such as Boise Cascade, Louisiana Pacific and Energy Gulf States would be without any rail service at all. The New Orleans and Gulf Coast Railway runs for 24 miles from Goulsboro Yard in New Orleans through Orleans, Jefferson, and Plaquemine Parishes to Myrtle Grove. New Orleans and Gulf Coast, NOGC, serves shippers such as Chevron Chemical's Oak Point Plant, Harvest States' Myrtle Grove Grain Export Terminal, and TOSCO Petroleum's refinery at Alliance. Rail is the safest mode of transportation for hazardous materials, and by transporting hazardous materials by rail NOGC keeps hundreds of truckloads of dangerous cargoes off of Highway 23 and the streets of New Orleans. The Louisiana & Delta Railroad, L&D, is headquartered in New Iberia, LA and operates 114 miles of track carrying 12,000 carloads of carbon black, sugar, molasses, pipe, rice and paper products. The railroad serves dozens of customers in Lafayette, St. Martin, Vermilion, Iberia, St. Mary, Assumption, and Lafourche Parishes. In order to upgrade the infrastructure of Louisiana's short lines and those around the nation who provide the same kind of local service as the TIBR, NOGC, and L&D, the Railroad Track Modernization Act should be passed.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1220

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Railroad Track Modernization Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. CAPITAL GRANTS FOR RAILROAD TRACK.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 223 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 223—CAPITAL GRANTS FOR RAILROAD TRACK

“Sec.

“22301. Capital grants for railroad track.

“§ 22301. Capital grants for railroad track

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a program of capital grants for the rehabilitation, preservation, or improvement of railroad track (including roadbed, bridges, and related track structures) of class II and class III railroads. Such grants shall be for rehabilitating, preserving, or improving track used primarily for freight transportation to a standard ensuring that the track can be operated safely and efficiently, including grants for rehabilitating, preserving, or improving track to handle 286,000 pound rail cars. Grants may be provided under this chapter—

“(A) directly to the class II or class III railroad; or

“(B) with the concurrence of the class II or class III railroad, to a State or local government.

“(2) STATE COOPERATION.—Class II and class III railroad applicants for a grant under this chapter are encouraged to utilize the expertise and assistance of State transportation agencies in applying for and administering such grants. State transportation agencies are encouraged to provide such expertise and assistance to such railroads.

“(3) INTERIM REGULATIONS.—Not later than December 31, 2001, the Secretary shall issue temporary regulations to implement the program under this section. Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 does not apply to a temporary regulation issued under this paragraph or to an amendment to such a temporary regulation.

“(4) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than October 1, 2002, the Secretary shall issue final regulations to implement the program under this section.

“(b) MAXIMUM FEDERAL SHARE.—The maximum Federal share for carrying out a project under this section shall be 80 percent of the project cost. The non-Federal share may be provided by any non-Federal source in cash, equipment, or supplies. Other in-kind contributions may be approved by the Secretary on a case by case basis consistent with this chapter.

“(c) PROJECT ELIGIBILITY.—For a project to be eligible for assistance under this section the track must have been operated or owned by a class II or class III railroad as of the date of the enactment of the Railroad Track Modernization Act of 2001.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants provided under this section shall be used to implement track capital projects as soon as possible. In no event shall grant funds be contractually obligated for a project later than the end of the third Federal fiscal year following the year in which the grant was awarded. Any funds not so obligated by the end of such fiscal year shall be returned to the Secretary for reallocation.

“(e) ADDITIONAL PURPOSE.—In addition to making grants for projects as provided in subsection (a), the Secretary may also make grants to supplement direct loans or loan guarantees made under title V of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 822(d)), for projects described in the last sentence of section 502(d) of such title. Grants made under this subsection may be used, in whole or in part, for paying credit risk premiums, lowering rates of interest, or providing for a holiday on principal payments.

“(f) EMPLOYEE PROTECTION.—The Secretary shall require as a condition of any grant made under this section that the recipient railroad provide a fair arrangement at least

as protective of the interests of employees who are affected by the project to be funded with the grant as the terms imposed under section 11326(a), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Railroad Track Modernization Act of 2001.

“(g) LABOR STANDARDS.—

“(1) PREVAILING WAGES.—The Secretary shall ensure that laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors in construction work financed by a grant made under this section will be paid wages not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act; 40 U.S.C. 276a et seq.). The Secretary shall make a grant under this section only after being assured that required labor standards will be maintained on the construction work.

“(2) WAGE RATES.—Wage rates in a collective bargaining agreement negotiated under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) are deemed for purposes of this subsection to comply with the Act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act; 40 U.S.C. 276a et seq.).

“(h) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the projects carried out with grant assistance under this section to determine the public interest benefits associated with the light density railroad networks in the States and their contribution to a multimodal transportation system. Not later than March 31, 2003, the Secretary shall report to Congress any recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate regarding the eligibility of light density rail networks for Federal infrastructure financing.

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation \$350,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2004 for carrying out this section.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to chapter 223 in the table of chapters of subtitle V of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“223. CAPITAL GRANTS FOR RAILROAD TRACK 22301”.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1221. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an additional basis for establishing the inability of veterans to defray expenses of necessary medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have sought recognition at this time to comment briefly on legislation that I have introduced today to address an injustice now contained in statutory formulas which define which veterans will, and will not, be allowed priority access to free Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, health care services. To simplify, VA currently provides access to health care under the following priority scheme: veterans who have suffered service-connected disabilities have first opportunity to enroll for VA care; then, veterans who are former prisoners of war, those who are catastrophically disabled, and those who have no where else to turn for health care because of financial constraints may enroll for VA care; and, finally, veterans who simply choose to seek VA care even though they can afford care elsewhere, and, in testimony to the quality of care VA provides, many do, are invited to enroll. Currently, VA

welcomes all veterans to enroll for care, and VA generally turns away no veteran who seeks hospital or clinical care. But lower priority patients are required to make copayments for the care and the medications they receive from VA.

As I have noted, poor veterans, technically, those who are classified as being "unable to defray the expenses of necessary care," have priority over veterans who have nonservice-connected illnesses or disabilities. In order to determine who is, in fact, "unable to defray," VA uses a single, national "means test." In effect, a veteran without dependents who has an annual income of less than \$23,688 has priority access to VA care at no charge; a veteran with a higher annual income who does not otherwise qualify for priority status is required to make a copayment to receive the same care. In addition, that patient is placed in the pool of "discretionary" patients who face the risk of disenrollment should VA budget shortfalls ever require limiting enrollment.

A single, national "means test" applies irrespective of cost-of-living variations among geographic localities. In many other Federal pay and benefits systems, by contrast, geographic cost-of-living variations are taken into consideration. For example, the housing allowance paid to active duty service members is based on the average housing costs in the area they are assigned; salary and wage payments to Federal employees, while utilizing national pay scales, also contain locality adjustments; and, benefits afforded to low income families by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD, are based on median family income in the area in which the applicant resides. VA's "means test" should also take such local cost-of-living variations into account. Today, I introduce legislation which would require VA to do so.

My legislation would adjust VA's current "means test" to allow veterans who live in high-cost areas, such as Philadelphia, to qualify for priority status in VA hospitals even if their incomes are slightly higher than VA's single, national threshold amount. My bill would provide for an additional formula to measure a veteran's "unable to defray" status, the "Low Income index" established by HUD under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937. That index defines "low income" by reference to the median family income in the Metropolitan Statistical Area in which the applicant lives. Clearly, a formula which takes into account local variations in income, and, thus, the local cost of living, more fairly measures a veteran's actual ability to assist in defraying the cost of his or her medical care. I note, however, that the current VA formula would also be retained lest veteran-patients who live in relatively low cost areas lose priority status they might currently have under that formula. It is not my intention to shrink the pool of priority patients; it is my

intention to expand it by allowing more low income persons, particularly the urban poor, to qualify.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in improving VA's medical care priority "means test" so that it more accurately accomplishes its true purpose of measuring whether a veteran can, or cannot, be expected to assist in defraying the cost of his or her necessary medical care. Such a test, clearly, must take into account variations in the cost-of-living in the locality in which the veteran resides.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1221

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL BASIS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF INABILITY TO DEFRAY EXPENSES OF NECESSARY CARE.

(a) ADDITIONAL BASIS.—Section 1722(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "or" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) the veteran (including any applicable part of the veteran's family) is eligible for treatment as a low-income family under section 3 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a) for the area in which the veteran resides."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2002, and shall apply with respect to years beginning after December 31, 2001.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 138—NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAYH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REID, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. KERRY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAYTON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. REED, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. STEVENS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 138

Whereas over 1,000,000 American families live with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 American man in 6 will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in his lifetime;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed nonskin cancer and the second most common cancer killer of American men;

Whereas 198,100 American men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer and 31,500 American men will die of prostate cancer in 2001, according to American Cancer Society estimates;

Whereas fully ¼ of new cases of prostate cancer occur in men during their prime working years;

Whereas African Americans have the highest incidence and mortality rates of prostate cancer in the world;

Whereas screening by both digit rectal examination and prostate specific antigen blood test (PSA) can diagnose the disease in earlier and more treatable stages and have reduced prostate cancer mortality;

Whereas the research pipeline promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatments; and

Whereas educating Americans, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving men's lives and preserving and protecting our families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of September as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month";

(2) declares that the Federal Government has a responsibility—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods and treatment of prostate cancer;

(B) to increase research funding that is commensurate with the burden of the disease so that the causes of, and improved screening, treatments, and a cure for, prostate cancer may be discovered; and

(C) to continue to consider ways for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, interested groups, and affected persons to promote awareness of prostate cancer, to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, their families, and the economy and to observe the month of September with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today prostate cancer remains the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer in America. According to estimates by the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute, NCI, more than 198,000 American men will learn that they have the disease within the year. Nearly 32,000 American men will lose their lives to prostate cancer this year, making it the second most common cause of cancer death among men. Those statistics translate into devastating realities for men and families across this country.

This disease will affect one in six men in the United States during his lifetime. More than 25 percent of those battling this disease are under the age of 65, prime years of productivity for families and for this Nation. The number of Americans impacted by cancer, and prostate cancer, is expected to grow. If unchecked during the next decade, cancer incidence and mortality rates could increase by 25-30 percent.