

in areas of critical national security, and to assist government agencies in addressing deficiencies in personnel possessing specialized skills important to national security and incorporating the goals and strategies for recruitment and retention for such skilled personnel into the strategic and performance management systems of Federal agencies.

S. 1897

At the request of Mrs. CARNAHAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1897, a bill to require disclosure of the sale of securities by an affiliate of the issuer of the securities to be made available to the Commission and to the public in electronic form, and for other purposes.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. EDWARDS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to protect against cyberterrorism and cybercrime, and for other purposes.

S. 1912

At the request of Mr. SMITH of Oregon, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1912, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce to give greater weights to scientific or commercial data that is empirical or has been field-tested or peer-reviewed, and for other purposes.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to provide for highway infrastructure investment at the guaranteed funding level contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

S. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 109, a resolution designating the second Sunday in the month of December as "National Children's Memorial Day" and the last Friday in the month of April as "Children's Memorial Flag Day."

AMENDMENT NO. 2837

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2837.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. 1928. A bill to amend section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934 to re-

quire affirmative written consent by a customer to the release of customer proprietary network information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to require telecommunications firms to receive explicit written consent from consumers prior to sharing their customer proprietary network information, or CPNI, with other entities. This is a simple bill that will provide consumers with the privacy protection that they deserve to have and that I believe should already be required under the 1996 Telecommunications Act.

The 1996 Communications Act established as law that CPNI is confidential personal information, requiring customer approval before its release or being shared with others. Congress and the American people count on the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, to carry out that mandate and to protect the privacy of American consumers who use the country's telecommunications system. Therefore, I believe it shouldn't really even be necessary to introduce this legislation, clarifying that approval should mean "express written consent" or, in other words, an "opt-in" approach to protecting privacy. But I share the concern of consumer advocates and 39 State attorneys general that the FCC, which is currently taking comment on the matter, could otherwise adopt an "opt-out" approach to privacy as it relates to CPNI. In my view, and in the view of the consumer advocates and the state attorneys general, an opt-out approach cannot adequately protect consumers' privacy and would not meet Congress's intent in passing the 1996 Communications Act.

An opt-out approach would put the unfair burden on consumers to protect their own confidential personal information that is in the possession of large telecommunications companies, protect it from being shared by those companies with other entities. This can be information of the most sensitive kind, including lists of phone numbers dialed and the duration and timing of calls. An opt-out approach presumes consumer consent that such information could be shared unless the customer goes through an unduly burdensome and uncertain process to request that the provider not share it.

In recent months in Minnesota, for example, Qwest notified customers that the company would begin to share customer information unless the customers notified Qwest that they did not want it shared. The company notice was often overlooked by customers, and it was difficult to understand for many customers who did try to read it. Furthermore, numerous customers reported problems getting through to the company's 800 number, or in navigating the options for opting out of the information sharing scheme. Due to customer complaints, and to

the company's credit, Qwest recently reversed its position and will not share any customer information until the FCC issues a final CPNI rule. Meanwhile, however, Qwest and other telecommunications carriers have been advocating heavily for adoption by the FCC of an "opt-out" approach.

I am not telling anyone whether they should want their CPNI shared and made available to marketers. That is up to consumers themselves. I do want to leave that choice to consumers. I believe that means that they must have the opportunity to give their express consent on what personal information and to whom it will be shared before such information is shared.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1929. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security to permit Kentucky to operate a separate retirement system for certain public employees; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to add Kentucky to the list of States that are permitted to offer "divided retirement" plans under the Social Security Act.

Three weeks ago, I was contacted by Brian James, president of the Louisville Fraternal Order of Police, FOP, and Tony Cobaugh, president of the Jefferson County FOP. These two law enforcement leaders called my attention to a problem that could jeopardize the retirement security of many of our community's police, fire, and emergency personnel.

In November of 2000, the citizens of Jefferson County and the City of Louisville, KY voted to merge their communities and respective governments into a single entity, which will be known as Greater Louisville. As one might expect, combining two large metropolitan governments in such a short time frame cannot be done without encountering a few difficulties along the way. Jefferson County and the City of Louisville currently operate two very different retirement programs for their police officers. When these two governments merge on January 6, 2003, current Federal law will require the new government to offer a single retirement plan that could dramatically increase the cost of retirement for both our dedicated public safety officers and the new Greater Louisville government.

Thankfully, when the FOP's leaders called this problem to my attention, they also suggested a simple solution, let the police officers and firefighters choose for themselves the retirement system which best meets their needs.

I rise today to offer legislation that will provide retirement stability to our public safety officers by allowing Kentucky to operate what is known as a "divided retirement system." I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Congressman RON LEWIS and Congresswoman ANNE NORTHUP who will soon introduce similar legislation in the House of Representatives.

With passage of my legislation and similar legislation by the Kentucky General Assembly, Louisville's and Jefferson County's police officers would decide whether or not they want to participate in Social Security or remain in their traditional retirement plan. While future employees will be automatically enrolled in Social Security, no current officers would be forced into a new retirement system as a result of the merger without their approval.

Current Federal law allows twenty-one states the option of offering divided retirement systems. Unfortunately, Kentucky is not one of these twenty-one States. The legislation I am offering today would change that by adding Kentucky to list of states designated in the Social Security Act.

It is critical that the Senate provide this retirement stability to the brave men and women who protect the citizens of Louisville and Jefferson County everyday. There is extensive precedent for granting Kentucky this authority, and my legislation enjoys the broad, bi-partisan support of policemen, firefighters, local and state officials. I look forward to working with this coalition, as well as my colleagues in the Senate, to see that this urgently needed legislation is enacted into law this year.

I ask unanimous consent that letters of support from the Louisville FOP, Jefferson County FOP, Louisville Firefighters Union, and State Finance and Administration Cabinet, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
LOUISVILLE LODGE 6,
Louisville, KY, January 7, 2002.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Louisville, KY.

DEAR MR. MCCONNELL: Following a referendum held approximately one year ago the voters in our community approved a government merger of the City of Louisville and Jefferson County Kentucky. Currently officers employed by the City of Louisville working for the Louisville Division of Police do not pay into Social Security, due to having been exempted from making such payments by a previous law. On January 06, 2003 when our new government become effective the Louisville Police Officers who I am elected to represent will no longer be excused from Social Security participation.

I would like to see our new government offer a "Divided Referendum" vote that would allow each individual officer the opportunity to choose his or her own preference in participating in Social Security. This would make for a smoother transition as it relates to our members and the new government. For this to be possible there has to be federal legislation sanctioning Kentucky as a "Name State". There are currently twenty-one states that have such designation. Also there has to be changes in the Kentucky Revised Statutes to allow for the "Divided Referendum" vote.

It is my hope that you would assist our organization in making the necessary changes at both the federal and state levels during this years Congressional Session as well as Kentucky's Legislative Session.

If you have any questions regarding this issue please do not hesitate to call me. Thank you in advance for any consideration you can give this matter. I am looking forward to seeing you in 2002.

Respectfully,

DAVID JAMES,
President.

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE,
JEFFERSON COUNTY LODGE No. 14,
Louisville, KY, January 15, 2002.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Louisville, KY.

DEAR MR. MCCONNELL: The voters of Louisville and Jefferson County approved the referendum for a consolidated government over one year ago. Now the monumental task of organizing that future government is quickly upon us. As the leader of this labor organization, I must focus on those labor-related issues that affect my membership.

The biggest issue raised to this point is the area of social security. Louisville police officers do not participate in Social Security. However, Jefferson County police officers do participate. Both FOP lodges are working closely on the very probable police merger that will most likely follow the government merger.

Both FOP lodges believe that the members should have the opportunity to decide their futures in reference to Social Security through a "divided referendum". It is our understanding that a change must occur on the state and federal level. Will you help us by changing Kentucky to a "Name State"? Hopefully, we can count on your support for enabling changes at the state or federal level during the 2002 United States Congress or at the Kentucky General Assembly.

Respectfully,

ANTHONY J. COBAUGH,
President.

LOUISVILLE PROFESSIONAL FIRE
FIGHTERS UNION LOCAL 345,
Louisville, January 28, 2002.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Louisville KY.

DEAR MR. MCCONNELL: Following a referendum held approximately one year ago, the voters in our community approved a government merger of the city of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky. An issue has come up concerning Social Security, involving police and fire fighters. Due to a previous law exempting fire fighters, we do not pay into social security. On January 6, 2003 when our new government becomes effective, the members of the Louisville Professional Fire Fighters, Local #345 will no longer be excused from Social Security participation.

I would like to see our newly formed metro government offer a "Divided Referendum" vote that would allow each individual the opportunity to choose his or her own preference in participating in Social Security. For this to be possible there has to be federal legislation sanctioning Kentucky as a "Name State". There are currently twenty-one states that have such legislation. In addition, there has to be changes in the Kentucky Revised Statutes to allow for the "Divided Referendum" vote. If "Name State" status is not obtained, the new government will be forced to match the Social Security, contribution made by more than 1,300 of its employees, including the fire fighters, who currently do not pay into the Social Security, System.

It is my hope that you would assist the Louisville Professional Fire Fighters in making the necessary changes at both the federal and state levels during this years US Congressional Session as well as Kentucky's Legislative Session.

If you have any questions concerning this issue; please do not hesitate to call me.

Thank you in advance for any consideration you can give this matter.

Respectfully,

MICHAEL J. "HOWDY" KURTSINGER,
President.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER,
Frankfort, KY, February 6, 2002.

Hon. A.M. "MITCH" MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: The Kentucky Division of Social Security is responsible for administering the social security and Medicare program for all public employees in the Commonwealth. This includes not only state employees, but also the employees of all political subdivisions such as school boards, counties, cities, libraries, water districts, etc.

Those public employees who are participating in an employer provided retirement system and not covered for social security and Medicare may join the program via an employee referendum. There are several steps that must be taken during this process, but, under current federal and state statutes, it boils down to a simple majority of the eligible employees approving coverage for all employees of a coverage group.

There is, however, a second mechanism available to certain states that are specifically named in the federal Social Security Act. A referendum of the employees is also conducted, but the outcome of the election differs in that those employees voting for coverage become eligible for participation in the social security and/or Medicare program. Those employees voting against social security coverage are exempt. This is referred as "divided coverage".

Last November, the voters of Jefferson County voted to merge the governments of the City of Louisville and Jefferson County, effective January 6, 2003. The success of the merger efforts, however, also present a problem that must be resolved, that is, the social security and Medicare coverage of several groups of public servants.

Some of the City of Louisville Police and firefighters contribute only the Medicare program, not social security. Other city police and firefighters contribute to neither. The Jefferson County Police and corrections employees contribute to both social security and Medicare. When the merger become effective next year all these coverage groups will be considered as a single group for social security coverage purposes.

The new government, under the current legal situation, will face the dilemma of adversely affecting the employee benefits (eliminating social security coverage) of some of these public servants or bring an additional financial burden on the second group (forcing them to contribute to social security) as well as on the new government (additional employer contributions to social security).

The preferred remedy to this situation is to utilize divided coverage. This would allow each employee to decide for his or herself whether to pay into social security. All new employees hired after a divided referendum is conducted would automatically be enrolled in social security.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky is not included as a "named" state in the Social Security Act and, therefore, its public employers cannot utilize the divided coverage option. We requesting support for federal legislation amended 42 U.S.C. 418 to include Kentucky as a "named" state and enable Greater Louisville and their employees to take advantage of the divided coverage concept. This would add Kentucky to a list of 21

states included in section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Social Security Act that are currently permitted to conduct divided referendums. The Kentucky General Assembly is proceeding with amendments to the Kentucky Revised Statutes to authorize a divided referendum, contingent upon federal legislative changes.

If should also be noted that providing the Commonwealth with the ability to conduct divided coverage would in no way effect the members of the Kentucky Teachers Retirement System. State statutes prohibit social security coverage under the Commonwealth Section 218 agreement with the Social Security Administration to any individual covered by KTRS.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky and the citizens of Jefferson County need your support for designating Kentucky as a "Named State" by the Congress. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

PATRICK L. DOYLE,
Director, Kentucky Division of Social Security.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Frankfort, KY, February 6, 2002.

Senator MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate, Senate Russell Office Bldg., Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: Last November, the voters of Jefferson County voted to merge the governments of the City of Louisville and Jefferson County, effective January 6, 2003. The success of the merger efforts, however, requires that certain issues involving the social security and Medicare coverage of several groups of public servants be resolved.

Some of the City of Louisville Police and firefighters contribute only to the Medicare program, not social security. Other city police and firefighters contribute to neither. The Jefferson County Police and corrections employees contribute to both social security and Medicare. When the merger becomes effective next year all these coverage groups will be considered as a single group for social security purposes.

The preferred remedy to this situation is to utilize what is termed a "divided referendum". This would allow each employee to decide for his or herself whether to pay into social security. All new employees hired after a divided referendum is conducted would automatically be enrolled in social security.

Before the new government can conduct a divided referendum, the federal Social Security Act must be amended to designate Kentucky a "Named State". This would add Kentucky to a list of 21 states included in section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Social Security Act that are currently permitted to conduct divided referendums. The Greater Louisville Merger Transition Office has recommended this option and is pursuing legislation with the Kentucky General Assembly to authorize divided referendums, contingent on Federal legislative changes.

We support the Greater Louisville Merger Transition Office recommendation and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the citizens of Jefferson County need your support for designating Kentucky as a "Named State" by the Congress. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

T. KEVIN FLANERY,
Secretary.

By Mr. CONRAD:

S. 1930. A bill to promote the production of energy from wind; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation to promote the development of wind energy production across our Nation. My "Wind Energy Promotion Act of 2002" would provide incentives and clear regulatory hurdles to allow this economically feasible and environmentally friendly electricity source to help meet our National energy needs.

As the Senate begins work to enact a comprehensive National energy policy, we must take advantage of the enormous potential that wind energy offers. Wind is an abundant and inexhaustible renewable resource across our country. North Dakota alone has the potential to produce more than 460,000 megawatts of electricity from wind annually, the highest potential in the Nation.

Wind production costs have fallen dramatically over the last two decades, making production affordable, investment logical, and electricity consumption from wind economical for our Nation. Production costs have declined more than 80 percent since the 1980s, from an average of 38 cents per kilowatt-hour to an average of 3-6 cents per kilowatt-hour today. These costs are predicted to fall even lower in the near future. In addition, wind energy produces no pollution, providing a clean, environmentally friendly power option for the Nation.

However, wind energy development faces a number of obstacles, which my legislation is designed to overcome. First, my bill will extend the valuable wind energy tax credit for five years. The credit expired at the end of last year, and renewal is simply crucial to the industry. Hundreds of millions of dollars of investment in wind energy in my State of North Dakota are on hold because the Senate has not yet acted to extend this credit. It is time to extend the credit now, for a full five years, in order to ensure substantial investment in the industry across the Nation.

Further, my legislation makes it easier for farmers and ranchers to develop wind energy resources. It provides grants and loans to farmers and ranchers and allows producers to put wind turbines on CRP lands. And, because better technology will make investing in both large and small wind harnessing operations more attractive, my bill authorizes more than \$500 million over the next four years for wind energy research. My bill also calls for breaking down federal regulatory barriers to wind energy development. The Federal Government should help, not hinder the development of the Nation's wind potential. Because North Dakota and other western States contain large tracts of public lands that contain great wind energy potential, my bill would allow for the development of facilities on public lands. Finally, my legislation would authorize studies on several aspects of developing the Nation's wind energy potential, including one to determine the best possible way

to overcome the barriers to adequate transmission of power generated from wind.

My bill is not only a key component to providing energy security for the country; it would provide a much-needed economic stimulus to rural America.

According to the American Wind Energy Association, every 100 megawatts of wind energy development will produce 500 job years of employment. In addition, payments to farmers and ranchers could equal \$4 million for every 2,000 megawatts of wind energy production, money our Nation's producers would get simply for allowing wind development on their land. This would be a critical boost to our Nation's rural economy.

Wind energy development would also play a key role in the economy of North Dakota. Extending the production tax credit alone will mean more than \$100 million in sales for DMI Industries, LM Glasfiber, and other industry participants in my state in the next year. Using only conservative estimates, the wind industry has the potential to add a half billion dollars to North Dakota's economy in 2002, but only if the Senate acts soon to extend the wind energy production tax credit, the most important component of the legislation I am introducing today.

The Senate will be taking up energy legislation this week. As this debate begins, I will be working to include the provisions of my wind energy legislation in a comprehensive energy policy that our Nation seriously needs. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the development of wind energy in the United States through the provisions of my Wind Energy Promotion Act.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1931. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve patient access to, and utilization of, the colorectal cancer screening benefit under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "Colon Cancer Screen for Life Act of 2002." I am pleased that my colleagues Senators COLLINS, TORRICELLI, SNOWE and COCHRAN have joined me in introducing this very important bill.

As many of my colleagues know from personal experience, colon cancer is a devastating disease. Nearly 57,000 people die each year from colon cancer. It is the third most commonly diagnosed cancer in both men and women and the second most common cause of cancer-related death in America.

But colon cancer can be combated, controlled and potentially conquered if it's caught in the earliest stages. In fact, colon cancer is a rare form of cancer in that it can even be prevented through screening, if pre-cancerous polyps are quickly identified and removed.

The survival rate when colon cancer is detected at an early, localized stage is 90 percent. But only 37 percent of such cancers are discovered at that stage. The later the disease is caught, the lower the survival rate.

That's why in 1997, Congress led the fight against colon cancer by making screening for the disease a covered benefit for every Medicare recipient. That is especially significant because the risk of colon cancer rises with age.

Heightened awareness and greater access to treatment are working. Over the last 15 years, we've seen steady, if slow, annual declines in both incidence rates and mortality rates tied to colon cancer.

But we can do more, because barriers to screening still exist. Modern technology has blessed us with extremely accurate screening tools, in particular the colonoscopy, which results in higher colon cancer identification rates and better long-term survival rates due to early detection. A consultation with a doctor before a colonoscopy is required to ensure that patients are properly prepared before they undergo the procedure.

Unfortunately, Medicare does not pay for that consultation before a screening, creating an obvious obstacle to preventive treatment for many men and women. The Colon Cancer "Screen for Life" Act would cover these medical visits so that more Medicare beneficiaries will have easy access to screening.

Further, with this legislation, just as Congress has done for screening mammography, screening colonoscopy will not count toward a senior's Medicare deductible. This will remove additional financial disincentives to screening.

Finally, with this bill, we're breaking through another big barrier to early detection and treatment.

The medical reality is that colonoscopy procedures are invasive and require sedation to perform, making it safer for them to be conducted in the hospital or an outpatient setting, where safety standards and emergency procedures are in place, rather than in a private doctor's office. But when doctors perform colonoscopies for Medicare patients in an outpatient setting, they take a hit on cost, because reimbursement for the procedure performed there has decreased by nearly 36 percent since 1997, while reimbursement for the procedure performed in a doctor's private office has increased by 52 percent.

As a result, to balance their budgets, doctors and hospitals are typically forced to space out their Medicare patients, creating long waits for and limited access to these vital screenings. That financial incentive structure is indefensible.

The job of medical services should be cutting cancer, not cutting costs. Unfortunately, today something as critical as colon cancer screening is moderated not by the real needs of patients and their medical doctors, but by market incentives.

To address the problem, the "Screen for Life" Act would increase the payment rates for colonoscopies performed in hospitals and outpatient facilities by 30 percent. The result will be more access to early detection and treatment and thousands of lives saved.

Colon cancer is a formidable foe, but we can make a difference in the fight against it. Early detection and treatment is our first line of defense.

With the help of the Colon Cancer "Screen for Life" Act, I hope that in a decade we'll have fewer cancer cases to contend with and more survivors to celebrate the simple fact that screening saves lives.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators LIEBERMAN, TORRICELLI, SNOWE, and COCHRAN in introducing the Colon Cancer Screen for Life Act of 2002 to improve patients' access to the colorectal cancer screening benefit under Medicare.

Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths in the United States for both men and women: more than 57,000 Americans will die from this disease this year, yet it is a disease that many of us feel uncomfortable discussing.

The sad irony is that cancer of the colon is probably the most treatable and survivable of all cancers, but only if it is caught early. If detected and treated early, colon cancer is curable in more than 90 percent of diagnosed cases. Conversely, if the cancer is detected in an advanced stage, death rates are high. As many as 92 percent of these patients will die within five years.

Despite the fact that we have extremely effective screening tests for colon cancer, our screening rates for colon cancer, even among those Americans who are most at risk, are woefully low. Moreover, even the addition in 1998 of a new Medicare benefit covering these services has not improved the situation.

In 2000, the General Accounting Office, GAO, conducted a review of claims data to determine the extent to which this new preventive health service has been used. According to the GAO, only 3.8 percent of Medicare patients received either a screening or diagnostic colonoscopy in 1999, far below the recommended use rates and just a one percent increase over the rate in 1995.

Clearly we must find ways to heighten public awareness about the importance of colon cancer screening and remove any remaining barriers that may be preventing Medicare beneficiaries from receiving these critically important services. While the GAO identified a lack of patient awareness, understanding and inclination as the most significant factors inhibiting the use of colorectal cancer screening services, it also found that physician practices affect rates of screening. One factor is the inadequate Medicare reimbursement rates to cover the costs involved.

Medicare reimbursement rates for this procedure have declined in recent

years and are almost universally lower than reimbursements under private insurance. Moreover, in many States, the Medicare rates are lower than Medicaid rates. Our legislation will therefore increase the Medicare payment rates for colonoscopies performed both in hospitals and outpatient settings. Specifically, the payment rates in hospitals and outpatient facilities would be increased by 30 percent, while payment for procedures done in physicians' offices would be increased by 10 percent.

Our legislation will also require Medicare to provide reimbursements for pre-procedure consultations to ensure that beneficiaries are properly prepared and educated before they undergo a screening colonoscopy. Medicare currently only pays for the pre-procedure appointment prior to a diagnostic colonoscopy. This pre-procedure visit is no less necessary in the case of a screening colonoscopy and should be covered.

Finally, under our legislation, the normal Part B deductible will not apply for screening colonoscopy, just as it does not apply for screening mammography. This will remove a financial disincentive for seniors to seek screening and increase the likelihood that they will undergo screening colonoscopy.

The Colon Cancer Screen for Your Life Act of 2002 will not only help to ensure the safety of colorectal cancer screenings, but it will also increase Medicare patients' access to this life-saving procedure, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2843. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes.

SA 2844. Mr. DAYTON (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2843. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2471 submitted by Mr. DASCHLE and intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1731) to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 126, before line 1, insert the following: