

S. 2051

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2051, a bill to remove a condition preventing authority for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation from taking affect, and for other purposes.

S. 2119

At the request of Mr. DODD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2119, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of inverted corporate entities and of transactions with such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 2189

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2189, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to remedy certain effects of injurious steel imports by protecting benefits of steel industry retirees and encouraging the strengthening of the American steel industry.

S. 2200

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2200, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that the parsonage allowance exclusion is limited to the fair rental value of the property.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. MILLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to amend the Act establishing the Department of Commerce to protect manufacturers and sellers in the firearms and ammunition industry from restrictions on interstate or foreign commerce.

S. 2454

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2454, a bill to eliminate the deadlines for spectrum auctions of spectrum previously allocated to television broadcasting.

S. 2465

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2465, a bill to extend and strengthen procedures to maintain fiscal accountability and responsibility.

S. 2480

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2480, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from state laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

ness Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 94

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 94, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that public awareness and education about the importance of health care coverage is of the utmost priority and that a National Importance of Health Care Coverage Month should be established to promote that awareness and education.

AMENDMENT NO. 3396

At the request of Mr. DAYTON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3396 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3009, a bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3403

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3403 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3009, a bill to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BURNS:

S. 2510. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept the donation of certain lands previously disposed of from the public domain, together with certain mineral rights on federal land, in the Mineral Hill-Crevice Mountain Mining District in the State of Montana, to be returned to the United States for management as part of the national public lands and forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce the introduction of the Mineral Hill Historic Mining District Preservation Act of 2002. The purpose of this act is for the Forest Service to accept a donation from TVX Mineral Hill, Inc., an inholding of approximately 570 acres of private land in the Gallatin National Forest. This inholding overlooks the northern entrance of Yellowstone National Park and is within well-known elk habitat. The donation also includes 194 acres of mineral rights underlying Federal lands.

This bill provides a win-win situation with benefits for the community, for wildlife, for the company, and for the environment. After a rich and storied history, the Mineral Hill Mine is played out and the opportunity to extract minerals has passed. The prop-

erty is in very good condition and is being reclaimed in accordance with a reclamation plan approved by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality. The Forest Service has been closely involved during the reclamation planning and implementation processes to make certain that the property will remain in the excellent environmental state it is in today. As an added guarantee, the United States will also be the beneficiary of a \$10 million insurance policy provided by TVX to clean up the site in the unlikely event that hazardous materials are discovered in the future.

The Mineral Hill Mine is located in the historic Jardine Mining District which was established during the 1860s. Many of the buildings at the site go back to that time period. Some of the buildings will be preserved for interpretation purposes and will be available to the public. In addition, the site will be used in cooperation with Montana Tech of the University of Montana for mining and geologic education. The Mineral Hill property is being donated by TVX to the Government without the necessity of a payment. There will be ongoing permits issued by the State of Montana and by EPA for monitoring of water discharge. This bill allows for those permits to be upheld and for the water processes to be maintained. In a letter to my office dated June 25, 2001, the Greater Yellowstone Coalition observed that "we believe that there would be no adverse impact to the agency and indeed would be a benefit to the public that this donated land is conveyed with the obligation to maintain the NPDES permit already in force." This is exactly what the bill provides in section 11.

I am pleased to say that this is a bill with the support of all key parties. The Forest Service has agreed to the transfer and management of the land and has been actively involved in this process. The Gardiner Chamber of Commerce supports the project, as do the Commissioners of Park County. The Greater Yellowstone Coalition also supports the donation. Simply put, this legislation is in the public interest. On behalf of the people of Montana, I look forward to its passage.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON)

S. 2513. A bill to assess the extent of the backlog in DNA analysis of rape kit samples, and to improve investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases with DNA evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2002, a bill that guarantees prompt justice to victims of sexual assault crimes through DNA technology. 99.9 percent, that is how accurate DNA evidence is. 1 in 30 billion, those are the odds someone else committed a crime if a suspect's DNA matches evidence at the crime scene. 20 or 30 years, that is how long DNA evidence from a crime scene lasts.

Just 10 years ago DNA analysis of evidence could have cost thousands of dollars and taken months, now testing one sample costs \$40 and can take days. Ten years ago forensic scientists needed blood the size of a bottle cap, now DNA testing can be done on a sample the size of a pinhead. The changes in DNA technology are remarkable, and mark a sea change in how we can fight crime, particularly sexual assault crimes. The FBI tells us that since 1998 the national DNA database has helped put away violent criminals in 4,179 investigations in 32 states. How? By matching the DNA crime evidence to the DNA profiles of offenders. Individual success stories of DNA "cold hits" in sexual assault cases makes these numbers all too real.

For instance, in Florida, Kellie Green was brutally attacked and raped in the laundry room of her apartment complex. Because of lack of funds, her rape kit sat on the shelf for three years until a persistent detective had it analyzed. The evidence matched the profile of a man already incarcerated for beating and raping a woman 6 weeks before Kellie. Or take for example a 1996 case in St. Louis where two young girls were abducted from bus stops and raped at opposite ends of the city. The police were unable to identify a suspect. In 1999, the police decided to re-run the DNA testing to develop new leads. In January 2000, the DNA database matched the 1996 case to a 1999 rape case, and police were able to identify the perpetrator.

Just days ago, the New York Police Department arrested a man linked to the rape of a woman four years ago. In 1997, a woman was horribly beaten, robbed and raped, there were no suspects. Several months ago, the perpetrator submitted a DNA sample as a condition of probation after serving time for burglary. That DNA sample matched the DNA from the 1997 rape. Crime solved, streets safer.

Undoubtedly, DNA matching by comparing evidence gathered at the crime scene with offender samples entered on the national DNA database has proven to be the deciding factor in solving stranger sexual assault cases, it has revolutionized the criminal justice system, and brought closure and justice for victims.

In light of the past successes and the future potential of DNA evidence, the reports about the backlog of untested rape kits and other crime scene waiting in police warehouses are simply shocking.

Today I am introducing legislation, "The DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2002", to strengthen the existing Federal DNA regime as an effective crime fighting tool. My bill addresses five, pressing issues.

First, exactly how bad is the backlog of untested rape kits nationwide? A 1999 government report found over 180,000 rape kits were sitting, untested,

on the storage shelves of police department and laboratories all across the country. While recent press reports estimate that the number today is approaching 500,000 untested rape kits, I am told that there is no current, accurate numbers of the backlog. Behind every single one of those rape kits is a victim who deserves recognition and justice. Accordingly, my legislation would require the Attorney General to survey every single law enforcement agency in the country to assess the extent of the backlog of rape kits waiting to undergo DNA testing. To combat the problem of rape kit backlogs, it is imperative to know the real numbers, and how best to utilize federal resources.

Second, how can existing Federal law be strengthened to make sure that State crime labs have the funds for the critical DNA analysis needed to solve sex assault cases? To fight crime most effectively, we must both test rape kits and enter convicted offender DNA samples into the DNA database. There has been explosive growth in the use of forensic sciences by law enforcement. A government survey found that in 2000 alone, crime labs received 31,000 cases, a 47 percent increase from almost 21,000 cases in 1999. In addition, the labs received 177,000 convicted offender DNA samples, an almost 77 percent increase from 100,242 samples in 1999.

All across the country, laboratories report personnel shortages in the face of this overwhelming work. According to this same government survey, on average, there are 6 employees in a state crime lab—a lab that must not only do test DNA for hundreds of cases, but also run forensic tests on blood, footprints or ballistic evidence. The bill I'm introducing would: 1. increase current funding levels to both test rape kits and to process and upload offender samples; and 2. allow local governments to apply directly to the Justice Department for these grants. I thank my colleagues, Senators KOHL and DEWINE, who began this effort with the DNA Backlog Elimination Act of 2000.

Third, what assistance does the FBI need to keep up with the crushing number of DNA samples which need to be tested or stored in the national database? I am told that the current national DNA database, known as the Combined DNA Index, or "CODIS", is nearing capacity of convicted offender DNA samples. My bill would provide funds to the FBI to 1. Upgrade the national DNA computer database to handle the huge projections of samples; and 2. process and upload Federal convicted offender DNA samples into the database. Efforts to include more Federal and State convicted offenders in our database just makes plain sense to fight crime. We know that sexual assault is a crime with one of the highest rates of recidivism, and that many sexual assault crimes are committed by those with past convictions for other kinds of crime. Their DNA samples

from prior convictions help law enforcement efforts enormously.

Fourth, what additional tools are needed to help treat victims of sexual assault? One group that understands the importance of gathering credible DNA evidence are forensic sexual assault nurse examiners, who are sensitive to the trauma of this horrible crime and make sure that patients are not revictimized in the aftermath. These programs should be in each and every emergency room and play an integral role in police departments, bridging the gap between the law and the medicine.

Likewise, tapping the power of DNA requires well-trained law enforcement who know how to collect and preserve DNA evidence from the crime scene. Training should be a matter of course for all law enforcement. No rape kit evidence will lead to the perpetrator if the DNA evidence is collected improperly. The DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act would create a new grant program to carry out sexual assault examiner programs and training. And it would train law enforcement personnel in the handling of sexual assault cases, including drug-facilitated assaults, and the collection and use of DNA samples for use as forensic evidence.

Fifth, what can be done to ensure that sexual assault offenders who cannot be identified by their victim are nevertheless brought to justice? Profound injustice is done to rape victims when delayed DNA testing leads to a "cold hit" after the statute of limitations has expired. For example, Jeri Elster was brutally raped in her California home, and for years the police were unable to solve the crime. Seven years later, DNA from the rape matched a man in jail for an unrelated crime. Yet the rapist was never charged, convicted, or sentenced because California's statute of limitations had expired the previous year.

The DNA Sexual Assault Justice Act of 2000 would change current law to authorize Federal "John Doe/DNA indictments" that will permit Federal prosecutors to issue an indictment identifying an unknown defendant by his DNA profile within the 5-year statute of limitations. Once outstanding, the DNA indictment would permit prosecution at anytime once there was a DNA "cold hit" through the national DNA database system.

John De/DNA indictments strike the right balance between encouraging swift and efficient investigations, recognizing the durability and credibility of DNA evidence and preventing an injustice if a cold hit happens years after the crime. The law must catch up with the technology. I started looking at this issue almost two decades ago when I began drafting the Violence Against Women Act. In fact, it is the Violence Against Women Act that provided the first funding to sexual assault nurse examiner programs. The DNA Sexual

Justice Act of 2000 is the next step, a way to connect the dots between the extraordinary strides in DNA technology and my commitment to ending violence against women. We must ensure that justice delayed is not justice denied.

By Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services within the Department of Health and Human Services relating to modification of the medicaid upper payment limit for non-State government owned or operated hospitals published in the Federal Register on January 18, 2002, and submitted to the Senate on March 15, 2002; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a Resolution of Disapproval to reverse a rule submitted by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS. The rule, which takes effect today, lowers the Medicaid Upper Payment Limit for non-State government owned or operated hospitals. It reduces the Federal Medicaid match, or Medicaid Upper Payment Limit, from 150 percent of the Medicare rate to 100 percent. According to the administration's budget, the rule will cut \$9 billion over 5 years, money currently targeted to public hospitals and other "safety net" health programs, the most vulnerable sector of our health care system. At a time when Medicaid programs in the States are struggling, we simply can't afford to take this amount from our health care safety net. Too many people will be hurt.

The regulation will mean a loss of about \$30 million for Minnesota's public health care system this year, potentially more in future years. Hennepin County Medical Center alone stands to lose about \$10 million this year. This is a hospital that provides essential health care for thousands of Minnesotans. For many, it is the only place they can go. Other hospitals and clinics around Minnesota will also be deprived of needed funding. At a time when our health care system, and particularly our public hospitals are struggling just to survive, we ought not to be taking resources away from them like this.

CMS Director Scully has attempted to justify this damaging reduction by pointing to instances in the past when States did not use the program's money for health care purposes. Director Scully is certainly correct. The program should be used for health care, not for anything else. But slashing the Upper Payment Limit means that none of this money goes to health care. That doesn't make any sense. The loopholes that existed in the program have already been closed. The rule is a \$9 bil-

lion transfer away from those who desperately need health care, purportedly in order to solve a problem, but the problem has already been fixed. The rule is not needed and will cause great harm. I urge colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

#### STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 267—EX- PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE POL- ICY OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 54TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING COMMISSION

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REED, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FITZGERALD, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

#### S. RES. 267

Whereas whales have very low reproductive rates, making whale populations extremely vulnerable to pressure from commercial whaling;

Whereas whales migrate throughout the world's oceans and international cooperation is required to successfully conserve and protect whale stocks;

Whereas in 1946 the nations of the world adopted the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, which established the International Whaling Commission to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks;

Whereas the Commission adopted a moratorium on commercial whaling in 1982 in order to conserve and promote the recovery of whale stocks;

Whereas the Commission has designated the Indian Ocean and the ocean waters around Antarctica as whale sanctuaries to further enhance the recovery of whale stocks;

Whereas many nations of the world have designated waters under their jurisdiction as whale sanctuaries where commercial whaling is prohibited, and additional regional whale sanctuaries have been proposed by nations that are members of the Commission;

Whereas two member nations currently have reservations to the Commission's moratorium on commercial whaling and 1 member nation is currently conducting commercial whaling operations in spite of the moratorium and the protests of other nations;

Whereas a nonmember nation that opposes the moratorium against commercial whaling is seeking to join the Convention, on the condition that it be exempt from the moratorium;

Whereas the Commission has adopted several resolutions at recent meetings asking member nations to halt commercial whaling activities conducted under reservation to the moratorium and to refrain from issuing special permits for research involving the killing of whales and other cetaceans;

Whereas 1 member nation of the Commission has taken a reservation to the Commission's Southern Ocean Sanctuary and also continues to conduct unnecessary lethal scientific whaling in the Southern Ocean and in the North Pacific Ocean;

Whereas the Commission's Scientific Committee has repeatedly expressed serious concerns about the scientific need for such lethal research;

Whereas one member nation in the past unsuccessfully sought an exemption allowing commercial whaling of up to 50 minke whales, in order to provide economic assistance to specific vessels, now seeks a scientific permit for these same vessels to take 50 minke whales;

Whereas the lethal take of whales under scientific permits has increased both in quantity and species, with species now including minke, Bryde's, and sperm whales, and new proposals have been offered to include sei whales for the first time;

Whereas there continue to be indications that whale meat is being traded on the international market despite a ban on such trade under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, and that meat may be originating in one of the member nations of the Commission; and

Whereas engaging in commercial whaling under reservation and lethal scientific whaling undermines the conservation program of the Commission. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) at the 54th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission the United States should—

(A) remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling;

(B) initiate and support efforts to ensure that all activities conducted under reservations to the Commission's moratorium or sanctuaries are ceased;

(C) oppose the proposal to allow a nonmember country to join the convention with a reservation that exempts it from the moratorium against commercial whaling;

(D) oppose the lethal taking of whales for scientific purposes unless such lethal taking is specifically authorized by the Scientific Committee of the Commission;

(E) seek the Commission's support for specific efforts by member nations to end illegal trade in whale meat; and

(F) support the permanent protection of whale populations through the establishment of whale sanctuaries in which commercial whaling is prohibited;

(2) at the 12th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, the United States should oppose all efforts to reopen international trade in whale meat or downlist any whale population;

(3) the United States should make full use of all appropriate diplomatic mechanisms, relevant international laws and agreements, and other appropriate mechanisms to implement the goals set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2); and

(4) if the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the President, under section 8(a)(2) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978(a)(2)), that nationals of a foreign country are engaging in trade or a taking which diminishes the effectiveness of the Convention, then the United States should take appropriate steps at its disposal pursuant to Federal law to convince such foreign country to cease such trade or taking.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Oceans, Atmosphere and Fisheries Subcommittee, I rise today to submit a resolution regarding the policy of the United States at the upcoming 54th Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, IWC. I wish to thank the Ranking

Member of the Subcommittee, Ms. SNOWE, for co-sponsoring this resolution. I wish to also thank my colleagues Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REED, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. BOXER and Mr. KENNEDY for co-sponsoring as well.

The IWC will meet in Japan from May 20 to 24, 2002. Despite an IWC moratorium on commercial whaling since 1985, Japan and Norway have harvested over 1000 minke whales since the moratorium was put in place. Whales are already under enormous pressure worldwide from collisions with ships, entanglement in fishing gear, coastal pollution, noise emanating from surface vessels and other sources. The need to conserve and protect these magnificent mammals is clear.

The IWC was formed in 1946 under the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, Convention, in recognition of the fact that whales are highly migratory and that they do not belong to any one Nation. In 1982, the IWC agreed on an indefinite moratorium on all commercial whaling beginning in 1985. Unfortunately, Japan has been using a loophole that allows countries to issue themselves special permits for whaling under scientific purposes. The IWC Scientific Committee has not requested any of the information obtained by killing these whales and has stated that Japan's scientific whaling data is not required for management. At this meeting, Japan intends to propose to add an additional 100 whales to the whales it kills for scientific purposes. Japan's claim that it needs these whales for scientific purposes is ever more tenuous: last year, Japan unsuccessfully sought to obtain an exemption allowing 50 whales to be commercially hunted to provide economic assistance to specific vessels. This year, Japan is seeking to use these same vessels to kill the same number of whales, in the name of "science." The additional 50 whales include new species, sei whales. Norway, on the other hand, objects to the moratorium on whaling and openly pursues a commercial fishery for whales. Iceland, currently a nonparty, is proposing to join the Convention, but only if it is granted a reservation that exempts it from the ban on commercial whaling.

This resolution calls for the U.S. delegation to the IWC to remain firmly opposed to commercial whaling. In addition, this resolution calls for the U.S. to oppose the lethal taking of whales for scientific purposes unless such lethal taking is specifically authorized by the Scientific Committee of the Commission. The resolution calls for the U.S. to oppose the proposal to allow a non-member country to join the Convention with a reservation that would allow it to commercially whale. The resolution calls for the U.S. delegation to support an end to the illegal trade of whale meat and to support the

permanent protection of whale populations through the establishment of whale sanctuaries in which commercial whaling is prohibited.

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—EX-  
PRESSING SUPPORT FOR LEGIS-  
LATION TO STRENGTHEN AND  
IMPROVE MEDICARE IN ORDER  
TO ENSURE COMPREHENSIVE  
BENEFITS FOR CURRENT AND  
FUTURE RETIREES, INCLUDING  
ACCESS TO A MEDICARE PRE-  
SCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 269

Whereas our nation's senior citizens and the disabled need and deserve the highest quality health care available;

Whereas the Medicare program has not fundamentally changed since its creation over 35 years ago and has not kept pace with recent improvements in health care delivery;

Whereas the Medicare Trustees report that the current system is not sustainable;

Whereas Medicare only provides limited access to many lifesaving and health enhancing pharmaceutical and biological medicines;

Whereas America's seniors need a comprehensive, voluntary outpatient prescription drug program under Medicare; and

Whereas Medicare prescription drug coverage can best be provided through comprehensive steps to modernize and strengthen the Medicare program: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) by September 30, 2002, the Senate should consider legislation to comprehensively modernize the Medicare program under which beneficiaries will be offered more choices, including outpatient prescription drug coverage;

(2) this legislation should ensure that the Medicare program's financial solvency is preserved and protected;

(3) this legislation should permit beneficiaries to choose from a variety of coverage options, including an option to continue benefits under the current plan as well as an option to choose from benefits offered by multiple competing, private insurance plans that rely on competition to control costs and improve quality; and

(4) this legislation should provide at least one option providing comprehensive outpatient prescription drug coverage to Medicare beneficiaries, including those having high prescription drug costs.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a Sense of the Senate Resolution expressing support for Medicare Reform and the addition of a prescription drug benefit. I am pleased that Senator THAD COCHRAN and Senator JAMES INHOFE are joining with me in this effort today.

The Medicare program is of vital importance to our Nation's seniors and has been providing them dependable, affordable and high quality health care for over 35 years. Despite this, I think we would all agree that the system has not kept pace with modern medicine or coverage available to those covered by private insurance. The practice of medicine has changed dramatically since

the inception of the Medicare program. The many new technologies and drugs that are available to our seniors today weren't even an option 35 years ago.

No senior should have to worry about whether he or she can afford the medicine they need to stay healthy. I am well aware that the rising cost of prescription medicine and prescription drug coverage is a great concern for today's seniors and tomorrow's retirees. Indeed, in some cases, prescription drugs are as important as a doctor's care. It is this reality that makes it so critical we focus our efforts on finding a solution.

As discussion continues, it is crucial we develop effective options for simultaneously modernizing and securing Medicare. We can not afford to add an expensive new comprehensive benefit without real reform to the program and we need to focus our attention on the necessary steps to ensure Medicare remains dependable and up to date.

This is why I am choosing to submit this Sense of the Senate Resolution expressing support for a prescription drug benefit and Medicare modernization. I am calling on the Senate to work to pass legislation on this issue before September 30, 2002 and to give current and future seniors the benefits they deserve. Included in this resolution are principles that I believe should be included in any Medicare or prescription drug legislation that passes this year. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these principles and working towards the goal of passing substantial Medicare reform.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND  
PROPOSED

SA 3408. Mr. DAYTON (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes.

SA 3409. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3408 proposed by Mr. DAYTON (for himself and Mr. DORGAN) to the amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra.

SA 3410. Mr. THOMPSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3411. Mr. KENNEDY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra.

SA 3412. Mr. BAYH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3009, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3413. Mrs. LINCOLN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3009, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3414. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3401 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) to the bill (H.R. 3009) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.