

(Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 298, a resolution designating May 2004 as “National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month”.

S. RES. 311

At the request of Mr. BROWNBAC, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 311, a resolution calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Father Thadeus Nguyen Van Ly, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 313

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 313, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate encouraging the active engagement of Americans in world affairs and urging the Secretary of State to coordinate with implementing partners in creating an online database of international exchange programs and related opportunities.

S. RES. 317

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 317, a resolution recognizing the importance of increasing awareness of autism spectrum disorders, supporting programs for increased research and improved treatment of autism, and improving training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism.

AMENDMENT NO. 2889

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2889 intended to be proposed to S. 1637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to comply with the World Trade Organization rulings on the FSC/ETI benefit in a manner that preserves jobs and production activities in the United States, to reform and simplify the international taxation rules of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2943

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2943 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2945

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2945 proposed to H.R. 4, a bill to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, improve access to quality child care, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2945 proposed to H.R. 4, supra.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 2262. A bill to provide for the establishment of campaign medals to be awarded to members of the Armed Forces who participate in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues, Senators INHOFE, LANDRIEU, LUGAR, and LOTT, to introduce a bill to honor our service men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan who have served and continue to serve their country by working for a free, independent, and stable Iraq and a new Afghanistan. These missions have been difficult and the cost has been high; nearly 600 Americans have been killed and almost 3,000 Americans have been injured in Iraq, while more than 500 Americans have been injured and more than 100 U.S. service men and women have been lost in Afghanistan.

More than a year after the initial invasion, nearly 110,000 troops are still stationed in Iraq, working to build a new, stable beacon of freedom in the region. My fellow Senators, the liberation of Iraq is turning out to be the most significant military occupation and reconstruction effort since the end of World War II. We cannot understate the importance of the work being done there today.

The administration's focus on Iraq leaves the mission in Afghanistan incomplete. Despite constant progress there, the fighting is still not over. Recent assassinations of government officials, car bombings, and the lingering presence of terrorist forces and former Taliban fighters force thousands of our troops to stay in-country.

For these courageous efforts, the Department of Defense has decided to award our brave young men and women with the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, GWOT, and no other medal. This is despite the fact the GWOT medal is meant for any individual who has served overseas during the war on terror and may have come within a few hundred miles of a combat zone. The dangers of serving in Iraq and Afghanistan are greater; therefore, along with my colleagues, Senators LOTT, LANDRIEU, INHOFE, and LUGAR, I propose to correct this mistake by passing legislation authorizing the Iraq and Afghanistan Liberation Medals in addition to the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

While some of us in this body have not shared the administration's view on this war, we are united when it comes to supporting our troops. These young men and women from Active

Duty, National Guard, and Reserves are all volunteers and exemplify the very essence of what it means to be a patriot. We believe that what they are doing in Iraq and Afghanistan today differs from military expeditionary activities such as peacekeeping operations or no-fly-zone enforcement.

They continue to serve, even though they do not know when they will return home to family and friends. They continue to serve despite the constant threat to their lives and the tremendous hardships they face.

There is a difference between an expeditionary medal and a campaign medal. We only need to look at an excerpt from U.S. Army Qualifications for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal and Kosovo Campaign Medal. In order to receive the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, you don't need to go to war. You only need to be “placed in such a position that in the opinion of the Joint Chief of Staff, hostile action by foreign armed forces was imminent even though it does not materialize.”

To earn the Kosovo Campaign Medal, the standard is higher. A military member must:

Be engaged in actual combat, or duty that is equally hazardous as combat duty, during the Operation with armed opposition regardless of time in the Area of Engagement. Or while participating in the Operation, regardless of time, [the service member] is wounded or injured and required medical evacuation from the Area of Engagement.

Many within the military agree that there is a difference. According to the Army Times, “Campaign medals help establish an immediate rapport with individuals checking into a unit.” An expeditionary medal like the GWOT does not necessarily denote combat. A campaign medal is designed to recognize military personnel who have risked their lives in combat.

Campaign medals matter. “When a Marine shows up at a new duty station, commanders look first at his decorations and his physical fitness score—the first to see where he's been, the second to see if he can hang. They show what you've done and how serious you are,” said GySgt James Cuneo. “If you're a good Marine, people are going to award you when it comes time. . . .”

My fellow colleagues, it is time. We must recognize the sacrifice of our young men and women who liberated Iraq, including great Americans like Army SPC Joseph Hudson from Alamogordo, NM, who was held as a prisoner of war. The Nation was captivated as we watched Specialist Hudson being interrogated by the enemy. Asked to divulge his military occupation, Specialist Hudson stared defiantly into the camera and said, “I follow orders.” Those of us with sons and daughters were united in worry with Specialist Hudson's family. The entire Nation rejoiced when he was liberated.

We have also asked much from our Reserve and National Guard Forces.

The reconstruction of Iraq would not be possible without the commitment and sacrifice of the 170,000 guardsmen and reservists currently on active duty.

My colleagues, Senators LOTT, LANDRIEU, INHOFE, LUGAR, and I are committed to honoring our over 200,000 heroes who liberated Iraq and Afghanistan. We believe that current administration policy does a disservice to our fighting men and women. Therefore we propose, in addition to the GWOT medal, new decorations that characterize the real missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, two that are distinctive and honor their sacrifice, the Iraq and Afghanistan Liberation Medals.

What we do today is not without precedent; Congress has been responsible for recognizing the sacrifice and courage of our military forces throughout history. Congress has had a significant and historically central role in authorizing military decoration. Our Nation's highest military decorations were authorized by Congress, including: the Medal of Honor, the Air Force Cross, the Navy Cross, the Army's Distinctive Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

We have also authorized campaign and liberation medals similar to what we hope to accomplish with this legislation. A partial list includes the Spanish War Service Medal, the Army Occupation of Germany Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Berlin Airlift Medal, the Korean Service Medal, and the Prisoner of War Medal.

The list goes on and on. The great men and women of our military forces are doing their jobs every day in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is time to do our job and honor them with an award that truly stands for their heroic service, the Iraq and Afghanistan Liberation Medals.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Army Times and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Army Times, Mar. 15, 2004]  
HILL SET TO CHALLENGE PENTAGON ON  
TERROR-WAR MEDAL  
(By Rick Maze)

The Pentagon's determination to award a single campaign medal for the entire global war on terrorism will come under fire Wednesday when the House Armed Services Committee is expected to pass a bill ordering creation of separate campaign medals for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is a bipartisan bill, first introduced in September, with 84 cosponsors. It is expected to pass the committee Wednesday with little or no discussion, but the next step is unclear, House aides said. The Defense Department has stood firm in the face of complaints about having a single Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal instead of separate campaign medals, and is likely to lean on House Republican leaders to prevent passage of the bill, aides said. "Passing the committee isn't a problem. Getting the bill scheduled for a vote in the House of Representatives could be a lot tougher," said

one Republican aide. Exactly who would get the campaign medals would be left to the Pentagon to determine. The bill, HR 3104, only orders the medals to be established and leaves eligibility rules to the military. Passage by the full House still wouldn't ensure the separate medals would ever be issued. The Senate debated the issue last year and by a 48-47 vote ended up siding with the Pentagon. Defense officials have argued that a single medal treats all deployments for the war on terrorism equally, whether the operations are in Iraq, Afghanistan, Africa, Colombia or the Philippines. The chief cosponsors of the House bill are all Vietnam veterans who serve on the armed services committee: Vic Snyder, D-Ark., a former Marine, and Army veterans Rob Simmons, R-Conn., and Silvestre Reyes, D-Texas. Snyder, the chief sponsor, said his combat experience is part of the reason why he is pushing for separate campaign medals. "I know the incredible pride and sense of accomplishment our military personnel feel about how well they have done in our most recent wars," he said. "In past wars, millions of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines have received combat medals that have held intense meaning for them," Reyes added. "Soldiers who fought and are fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan deserve a medal of equal significance." "As a Vietnam veteran and reservist, I am proud of the sacrifices made by our military men and women," said Simmons, who remained in the Army Reserve after his combat experience and retired from the military in 2000. "Whatever one thinks about the war on terror, our service men and women did what their country asked of them and did it very well. Congress should recognize these accomplishments." In addition to the campaign medal bill, the House Armed Services Committee is scheduled to take up three other measures on Wednesday. One bill would order the reimbursement of travel expenses for service members who used the Central Command's rest and recuperative leave program in its early stages last fall, a measure passed by the Senate last week. Also planned are votes on a bill attempting to expand access for military recruiters to college campuses and a non-binding resolution asking the Defense Department, banks and credit unions and the Federal Trade Commission to all work to reduce the financial hardships of mobilized reservists. The planned markup is unusual because the House Armed Services Committee normally would wrap such bills into the larger defense authorization bill it approves each year. Aides who spoke on the condition of not being identified said there are two reasons for breaking with tradition to pass separate bills. One is that lawmakers want to move quickly on some issues, like R&R travel reimbursement, which have already been completed. The second reason is that House Republican leaders have been pleading with committees to have some bills ready for debate and passage on the House floor. The legislative calendar already is light because of the upcoming elections, aides said. Delays in House floor debate on the 2005 budget resolution, due to problems getting a consensus among Republicans about budget priorities, has left a big hole in the legislative schedule that House leaders would like to fill, aides said.

S. 2262

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

**SECTION 1. MILITARY CAMPAIGN MEDALS TO RECOGNIZE SERVICE IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM AND OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.**

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The President shall establish a campaign medal specifically to rec-

ognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and a separate campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the President, eligibility for a campaign medal established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be set forth in uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments and approved by the Secretary of Defense or in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 2264. A bill to require a report on the conflict in Uganda, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague, Senator ALEXANDER, in introducing legislation to draw attention to the horrifying situation in northern and eastern Uganda.

When most of my colleagues think of Uganda, they probably think, quite rightly, of Uganda's inspiring example of how a concerted effort on the part of government and civil society can save lives in the fight against HIV/AIDS. Or perhaps they recall the brutal history of the Amin era, and reflect on the extraordinary progress that the Ugandan people have made in closing that chapter of their history and rebuilding their country. Today, so much of Uganda is vibrant and exciting. A lively debate about the pace and depth of democratization has been underway for years. Ugandan leaders, including civil society leaders, work to fight against the insidious influence of corruption, just as leaders here in our country do. Ugandan officials devote time and energy to fostering a climate that encourages enterprise and increased trade and investment so that the next generation of Ugandans might know even more progress. And importantly Uganda is a strong partner in cooperating with the United States and with the rest of the vast global coalition committed to fighting international terrorist networks.

It is in part because there is so much that is positive and promising about Uganda and about our relationship with Uganda that the situation in northern and eastern Uganda is so very shocking. For more than 17 years, a conflict has raged between the Lord's Resistance Army and the Government of Uganda. All conflict comes with costs, but this one has been particularly atrocious. The LRA's campaign has been characterized by the forced abduction of thousands of Ugandan children—possibly over 25,000 children. These children have been terrorized, tortured, forced to participate in extraordinarily brutal acts, pressed into service as soldiers and used as cannon fodder, and forced into sexual servitude. Throughout the region, about 1.4 million people are displaced, often

forced into camps by the government. They cannot plant their crops, they cannot support themselves, and insecurity makes it difficult to get humanitarian assistance to these populations. Acute malnutrition is widespread, sanitary conditions often do not meet even minimal standards.

Worse, often these camps have insufficient protection, and the LRA has targeted these civilian communities of the displaced. Just last month, a displaced persons camp was attacked by the LRA, and in a 3-hour period, some 200 unarmed civilians were hacked, shot, and burned to death. Many fear that targeting of civilians will only increase with the government's efforts to arm and train local defense forces, and local leaders warn of the potential for these forces to take the form of ethnic militias, harkening back to some of the worst days of Uganda's history.

Reputable human rights organizations have reported disturbing abuses committed by Ugandan security forces in the region, and an absence of reliable mechanisms for holding those responsible to account. The recent history of Ugandan military adventures in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, particularly in Ituri, does not inspire confidence. Thankfully, Uganda has withdrawn from the DRC. But lingering questions about the military's commitment to basic human rights standards remain. I believe that the Ugandan military and the Ugandan government want to answer those questions definitively, and to reaffirm their commitment to developing professional and responsible forces. But pretending that these questions and concerns do not exist is not in the interest of Ugandans, it is not in the interest of Americans, and it is not in the interest of the kind of solid, frank, genuine partnership that I believe we all wish to cultivate with Uganda.

The Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children reports that at least 50,000 people—the majority of them children and adolescents—flee their homes nightly in search of secure places to stay until dawn. Dusk brings seemingly endless lines of children walking into town centers from homes that are often miles away, sleeping en masse in makeshift shelters if they are very lucky, sleeping on the streets where they are extremely vulnerable to exploitation if they are not. This is not something that happens occasionally. This has become a nightly ritual, a way of life, for the civilians caught up in this nightmare. Children, some of whom have been abducted and have escaped only to be abducted again, know much about fear. But they know little about school. They know little about safety. They know very little about the promise of a better future. And the entire structure of their community has been shattered.

The human tragedy is devastating and the implications are quite serious. If Sudan is continuing to support the LRA, I am concerned about what this

tells us about the nature of the Sudanese regime. I am troubled by the prospect that some will, for their own purposes, cast the conflict in northern and eastern Uganda in purely ethnic terms, lumping civilians who have been victimized in with the LRA forces responsible for their suffering. I worry about the potential for regional fractures when one part of the country lives in such a different world from the rest, enjoying none of the stability and development that we all so admire. I want Uganda to succeed. I want the volume of positive news to increase. And that means that we must address this serious issue frankly today.

This legislation asks the administration to report to Congress on a number of issues relating to the situation in northern and eastern Uganda. I ask for these reports because I certainly do not have all of the answers. But I know enough about the problem to know that these reports will help the Congress to make informed decisions about how to proceed in our relationship with Sudan and about how to most effectively help the people of northern and eastern Uganda.

Once again, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for joining me in this effort. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2265. A bill to require group and individual health plans to provide coverage for colorectal cancer screenings; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following bill, the Eliminate Colorectal Cancer Act, be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2265

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Eliminate Colorectal Cancer Act of 2004".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in the United States for men and women combined.

(2) It is estimated that in 2004, 146,940 new cases of colorectal cancer will be diagnosed in men and women in the United States.

(3) Colorectal cancer is expected to kill 56,730 individuals in the United States in 2004.

(4) When colorectal cancer is diagnosed early, at a localized stage, more than 90 percent of patients survive for 5 years or more. Once the disease has metastasized, 92 percent of patients die within 5 years. Yet, only 37 percent of colorectal cancer cases are diagnosed while the disease is still in the localized stage.

(5) If all men and women age 50 and over practiced regular colorectal cancer screening, without any new scientific discoveries, the United States could see up to a 50 to 90 percent reduction in deaths from this disease.

(6) Currently, many private insurance health plans are not providing coverage for the full range of colorectal cancer screening tests. Lack of insurance coverage can act as a barrier to care.

(7) Assuring coverage for the full range of colorectal cancer tests is an important step in increasing screening rates for these life saving tests.

**SEC. 2. COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.**

(a) **GROUP HEALTH PLANS.**—

(1) **PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS.**—The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"TITLE XXIX—MISCELLANEOUS HEALTH COVERAGE**

**"SEC. 2901. COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.**

“(a) **COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage, shall provide coverage for colorectal cancer screening consistent with this subsection to—

“(A) any participant or beneficiary age 50 or over; and

“(B) any participant or beneficiary under the age of 50 who is at a high risk for colorectal cancer.

“(2) **DEFINITION OF HIGH RISK.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(B), the term ‘high risk for colorectal cancer’ has the meaning given such term in section 1861(pp)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(pp)(2)).

“(3) **REQUIREMENT FOR SCREENING.**—The group health plan or health insurance issuer shall cover methods of colorectal cancer screening that—

“(A) are deemed appropriate by a physician (as defined in section 1861(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(r))) treating the participant or beneficiary, in consultation with the participant or beneficiary;

“(B) are—

“(i) described in section 1861(pp)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(pp)(1)) or section 410.37 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(ii) specified by the Secretary, based upon the recommendations of appropriate organizations with special expertise in the field of colorectal cancer; and

“(C) are performed at a frequency not greater than that—

“(i) described for such method in section 1834(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(d)) or section 410.37 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(ii) specified by the Secretary for such method, if the Secretary finds, based upon new scientific knowledge and consistent with the recommendations of appropriate organizations with special expertise in the field of colorectal cancer, that a different frequency would not adversely affect the effectiveness of such screening.

“(b) **NOTICE.**—A group health plan under this section shall comply with the notice requirement under section 714(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the requirements of this section as if such section applied to such plan.

“(c) **NON-PREEMPTION OF MORE PROTECTIVE STATE LAW WITH RESPECT TO HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUERS.**—This section shall not be construed to supersede any provision of State law which establishes, implements, or continues in effect any standard or requirement solely relating to health insurance issuers in connection with group health insurance coverage that provides greater protections to participants and beneficiaries than the protections provided under this section.

“(d) DEFINITIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.—The definitions and enforcement provisions of title XXVII shall apply for purposes of this section.”.

(2) ERISA AMENDMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1185 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 714. COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.

“(a) COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage, shall provide coverage for colorectal cancer screening consistent with this subsection to—

“(A) any participant or beneficiary age 50 or over; and

“(B) any participant or beneficiary under the age of 50 who is at a high risk for colorectal cancer.

“(2) DEFINITION OF HIGH RISK.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1)(B), the term ‘high risk for colorectal cancer’ has the meaning given such term in section 1861(pp)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(pp)(2)).

“(3) REQUIREMENT FOR SCREENING.—The group health plan or health insurance issuer shall cover methods of colorectal cancer screening that—

“(A) are deemed appropriate by a physician (as defined in section 1861(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(r))) treating the participant or beneficiary, in consultation with the participant or beneficiary;

“(B) are—

“(i) described in section 1861(pp)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(pp)(1)) or section 410.37 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(ii) specified by the Secretary, based upon the recommendations of appropriate organizations with special expertise in the field of colorectal cancer; and

“(C) are performed at a frequency not greater than that—

“(i) described for such method in section 1834(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m(d)) or section 410.37 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(ii) specified by the Secretary for such method, if the Secretary finds, based upon new scientific knowledge and consistent with the recommendations of appropriate organizations with special expertise in the field of colorectal cancer, that a different frequency would not adversely affect the effectiveness of such screening.

“(b) NOTICE UNDER GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The imposition of the requirements of this section shall be treated as a material modification in the terms of the plan described in section 102(a), for purposes of assuring notice of such requirements under the plan; except that the summary description required to be provided under the third to last sentence of section 104(b)(1) with respect to such modification shall be provided by not later than 60 days after the first day of the first plan year in which such requirements apply.”.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 731(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191(c)) is amended by striking “section 711” and inserting “sections 711 and 714”.

(ii) Section 732(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191a(a)) is amended by striking “section 711” and inserting “sections 711 and 714”.

(iii) The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713 the following new item:

“Sec. 714. Coverage for colorectal cancer screening.”.

(b) INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part B of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–41 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2752 the following new section:

“SEC. 2753. COVERAGE FOR COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of section 2901(a) shall apply to health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in the individual market in the same manner as it applies to health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in connection with a group health plan in the small or large group market.

“(b) NOTICE.—A health insurance issuer under this part shall comply with the notice requirement under section 714(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 with respect to the requirements referred to in subsection (a) as if such section applied to such issuer and such issuer were a group health plan.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 2762(b)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–62(b)(2)) is amended by striking “section 2751” and inserting “sections 2751 and 2753”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) GROUP HEALTH PLANS.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to group health plans for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2005.

(2) INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to health insurance coverage offered, sold, issued, renewed, in effect, or operated in the individual market on or after January 1, 2005.

(d) COORDINATED REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure, through the execution of an interagency memorandum of understanding among such Secretaries, that—

(1) regulations, rulings, and interpretations issued by such Secretaries relating to the same matter over which both Secretaries have responsibility under the provisions of this section (and the amendments made thereby) are administered so as to have the same effect at all times; and

(2) coordination of policies relating to enforcing the same requirements through such Secretaries in order to have a coordinated enforcement strategy that avoids duplication of enforcement efforts and assigns priorities in enforcement.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in introducing the Eliminate Colorectal Cancer Act of 2004. I especially commend Senator ROBERTS for his leadership, assistance, and support on this important legislation. This bipartisan bill is being introduced on the final day of National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, as a sign of our intention to do all we can to see that more effective action is taken as soon as possible to combat this deadly disease. Our goal in this is to give every American with health insurance the right to access a full range of screening tests for colorectal cancer.

The statistics are staggering. Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among men and women in America. Last year, 148,000 people were diagnosed with colorectal cancer, and 56,000 mothers, fathers, daughters, and sons died from the dis-

ease. Tragically these deaths are taking place despite the fact that this form of cancer is curable 90 percent of the time if detected early.

We know that screening can discover this cancer early, in fact, so early that growths can be identified and removed before they become cancerous. For no other disease are the guidelines for screening better defined and nationally recognized as the best way to prevent deaths from this cancer.

Screening for colorectal cancer will save lives, and it will also avoid thousands of dollars in later treatment costs for each patient. The Institute of Medicine estimated that such screenings cost less than 1 percent of later treatment for this cancer. Screening for colorectal cancer is obviously the right thing to do, and it is also the cost-effective thing to do.

The real tragedy is that fewer than half of those who fit the guidelines for screening are actually screened within the right timeframes, if at all. As a result, only 37 percent of colorectal cancers are diagnosed at the early, most curable stages.

Many citizens are aware, at least vaguely, that they should probably be screened, but they can't afford it, because it is not covered by their health insurance. In our view, no American should be denied access to these life-saving screening procedures simply because their health insurance company will not pay for it.

Every American with insurance should have access to screening procedures that will prevent cancer. By requiring insurers to cover colorectal cancer screening, we will save thousands of lives each year, and save money too.

Some argue that it is wrong to require insurers to cover a test for a specific disease. Yet the evidence is clear that screening makes colorectal cancer preventable, treatable, and beatable.

National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month has brought new attention to the fact we can eliminate a disease that causes immeasurable suffering and sadness in the lives of millions of Americans. With this legislation, we can save hundreds of thousands of lives over the next 5 years.

The need is clear and so is the solution. As National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month comes to a close, let us do the right thing and work together to approve the Eliminate Colorectal Cancer Act of 2004.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for Mr. KERRY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BAYH, Mr. PRYOR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. LEVIN)):

S. 2266. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide adequate funding for Women's Business Centers; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today as ranking member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I offer the Women's Business Center Safeguard Act, legislation to fix a funding gap that exists for the most experienced meritorious women's business centers.

I would first like to express my sincere disappointment that the Republican majority refused to include the bipartisan women's business center compromise that was agreed to by Chair SNOWE and the bipartisan leadership of the House Small Business Committee, and, in the best interest of women business owners across the country, I urge them to reconsider.

I also want to comment on the Bush administration's proposals to eliminate experienced, efficient, and effective women's business centers in favor of new, untested, and inexperienced centers. Moving forward with the administration's proposal and failing to correct this funding gap immediately would jeopardize women's business centers in 39 States and eliminate assistance for thousands of women in business. While, as my bill demonstrates, I support opening new centers to help women entrepreneurs who do not currently have access to this important assistance, this should only occur when the existing centers, whether in their initial or a later funding period, are fully funded. The administration's policy to sacrifice successful, experienced centers in the interest of opening new centers is unwarranted and unwise. Women entrepreneurs and their businesses are critically important to our economy and to U.S. job creation, and women's business centers help them succeed. I intend to continue to advocate on their behalf.

This legislation contains a small adjustment to the Women's Business Center program that updates an outdated funding formula, without added cost to the Treasury. The adjustment changes the portion of funding allowed for women's business centers in the sustainability part of the program to keep up with the increasing number of centers that will need funding this fiscal year. In short, this change directs the SBA to reserve 54 percent of the appropriated funds for the sustainability centers, instead of 30 percent, which will allow for full funding of the most experienced centers, while still allowing for new centers and protecting existing ones.

Currently there are 88 women's business centers. Of these, 35 are in the initial grant program and 53 will have graduated to the sustainability part of the program in this funding cycle. These sustainability centers make up more than half of the total women's business centers, but under the current funding formula are only allotted 30 percent of the funds. Without the change to 54 percent, all grants to sustainability centers could be cut in half—or worse, 23 experienced centers could lose funding completely. Cutting

funding for these, our most efficient and successful centers, would not only be detrimental to the centers themselves, but also to the women they serve, to their local communities, to their States, and to the national economy.

As the author of the Women's Business Centers Sustainability Act of 1999, I can tell you that when the bill was signed into law, it was Congress's intent to protect the established and successful infrastructure of worthy, performing centers. The law was designed to allow all graduating Women's Business Centers that meet certain performance standards to receive continued funding under sustainability grants. This approach allows for new centers to be established—but not by penalizing those that have already demonstrated their worth. It was our intention to continue helping the most productive and well-equipped women's business centers, knowing that demand for such services was rapidly growing.

Today, with women-owned businesses opening at one-and-a-half times the rate of all privately held firms, the demand and need for women's business centers is even greater. Until Congress makes permanent the Women's Business Center Sustainability Pilot Program, as intended in Senate-passed legislation, an extension of authority and increase in sustainability funds is vital—not only to the centers themselves, but to the women's business community and to the millions of workers employed by women-owned businesses around the country.

This bill is necessary to continue the good work of SBA's Women's Business Center network, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it and its inclusion as part of any extension of SBA programs. I ask that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD. •

The bill follows.

S. 2266

*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 "Women's Business Center Safeguard Act".

**SEC. 2. WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FUNDING PRIORITY.—Subject to available funds, and reservation of funds, the Administration shall, for each fiscal year, allocate—

“(i) \$150,000 for each women's business center established under subsection (b), except for any center that requests a lesser amount;

“(ii) from the remaining funds, not more than \$125,000, in equal amounts, to each women's business center established under subsection (1), to the extent such funds are reserved under subsection (k)(4)(A), except for any center that requests a lesser amount; and

“(iii) any funds remaining after allocations are made under clauses (i) and (ii) to new eligible women's business centers and eligible women's business centers that did not receive funding in the prior fiscal year under subsection (b).”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by adding at the end the following:

“(v) For fiscal year 2004, 54 percent.”.

(b) SUNSET DATE.—The amendments made by this section are repealed on October 1, 2004.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. CHAFEE):

S. 2267. A bill to amend section 29(k) of the Small Business Act to establish funding priorities for women's business centers; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2267

*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 "Women's Sustainability Recovery Act of 2004".

**SEC. 2. WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FUNDING PRIORITY.—Subject to available funds, and reservation of funds, the Administration shall, for fiscal year 2004, allocate—

“(i) \$150,000 for each eligible women's business center established under subsection (b), except for centers that request a lesser amount;

“(ii) from the funds reserved under subsection (k)(4)(A), not more than \$125,000, in equal amounts, to each eligible women's business center established under subsection (1), except for centers that request a lesser amount; and

“(iii) any funds remaining after allocations are made under clauses (i) and (ii) to new eligible women's business centers and eligible women's business centers that did not receive funding in the prior fiscal year under subsection (b).”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(A), by adding at the end the following:

“(v) For fiscal year 2004, 48 percent.”.

(b) SUNSET DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) are repealed on October 1, 2004.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 326—CONDEMNING ETHNIC VIOLENCE IN KOSOVO

Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 326

Whereas ethnic violence erupted in Kosovo on March 17, 2004, claiming the lives of 20 individuals, including 8 Kosovo Serbs, 8 Kosovo Albanians, and 4 unidentified victims, injuring more than 600 others, and displacing more than 4,000 Kosovo Serbs and other minorities;