from coverage under the medicare skilled nursing facility prospective payment system.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELSTON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1084, a bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of diamonds unless the countries exporting the diamonds have in place a system of controls on rough diamonds, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. S SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to prohibit the trafficking, distribution, and abuse of Ecstasy (and other club drugs) in the United States.

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 1408. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to standardize the income threshold for copayment for outpatient medications with the income threshold for inability to defray necessary expense of care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today legislation that would exempt certain veterans from copayments for needed prescription drugs.

Currently, veterans with incomes of less than $24,000 a year are exempt from copayments for most VA health care services. However, when it comes to prescription drugs, the income threshold for exemption is just $9,000 a year. Veterans earning over $9,000, well below the poverty threshold established by the Census Bureau, are required to make copayments. These copayments place an undue burden on our poorest veterans. To compound the problem, the Department of Veterans Affairs recently proposed increasing the copayment for prescription drugs from $2 to $7 per 30-day prescription.

I have serious concerns about what this copayment increase will mean for veterans. Indeed, I have already heard from a number of veterans whose incomes hover just above the $9,000 threshold, who must make the required copayments for their pharmaceuticals. Many of them are on several different medications for multiple medical conditions, each requiring their own copay. There are many veterans like Steven Smith, formerly of Greenwood, WV, who has no health insurance except Medicare and depends upon the VA for his medications. With the lack of a Medicare drug benefit, he, and many veterans like him, are faced with a 350 percent increase in what they must pay for life-sustaining medications. I am not alone in my concerns about the increase will have on veterans. In commenting on the proposed regulations, the VFW recently cited an example of a veteran who has an annual income of $10,500, just above the current exemption limit set by VA. The increase in the prescription copayment rate would force that veteran to allocate over 8 percent of his annual income just to prescription drugs. There is a grave danger that, faced with this situation, many veterans will stop seeking necessary medical care because they are priced out of the system. At a glance, the increase to $7 per prescription may seem reasonable enough and in keeping with industry standards. However, consider a veteran with an income of about $9,000 a year who currently pays $2 per prescription for 10 medications a month. He presently incurs out-of-pocket costs of $240 a year. Under the new regulations, his costs would go up to $840 per year, an increase of $600. For someone living barely over the $9,000 annual income threshold, this is a substantial sum.

I am also concerned about disparities in how VA defines who is “poor” for the purpose of exemption from health care copayments. For prescription drugs, veterans with annual incomes of up to $30,000 or more must make copayments, but for outpatient care, hospitalization, and extended care, the income threshold for copayments is $24,000 per year. My proposed legislation would raise the exemption level for prescription copays to make them the same as all other VA health care copays. It will be less confusing to veterans, easier to administer, and quite simply, it’s the right thing to do.

As part of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, Congress gave VA authority to adjust drug copayments more rationally. Currently, veterans must make a copayment of over $50 for outpatient care services. There is no doubt that $50 for a routine outpatient visit is unreasonable at best, and at worst, discourages veterans from seeking the care they need. By delaying the increase in the medication copayment until VA implements its adjusted outpatient copayment, we will reduce the negative financial impact on our Nation’s veterans. It is my hope that VA will study this issue closely and will expeditiously set the outpatient copayment to be more in line with managed care plans.

I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in seeking to provide affordable health care for our sick and disabled veterans. They have sacrificed for all of us, and deserve every effort we can
Given the ongoing and relentless bloodshed in the Middle East, the time has come for finger pointing. Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) terrorists he allows free reign in the West Bank and Gaza—guilty of waging a guerrilla war against America’s most important and reliable ally in that region. Scores of innocent Israeli men, women, and children have been killed by bombs, bullets, knives, and stones. In acts of cowardice, Palestinian suicide bombers have caused death and destruction in discos, pizza parlors, cafes, and on the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

There appears no end to this madness. On Monday of this week, four bombs exploded in the Jerusalem neighborhood of French Hill. On Tuesday, a Palestinian suicide bomber disguised as an orthodox Jew killed him-

self and injured others on Jerusalem's street close to two international schools. One wonders how much more of this terror the people of Israel can—or should—endure.

Mr. Arafat and his minions are enlisting Palestinians of all ages to their misguided cause of mutually assured destruction. One Palestinian children's television show reportedly broadcast a song: "When I wander into Jerusalem, I will become a suicide bomber." Mr. President, Israel is well aware of the presence of the people in Mr. Arafat's Neighborhood, and they are not ones they, or any peaceful loving people, would choose to associate with.

The legislation we are introducing will make clear the intentions of Mr. Arafat and the PLO. In a report to Congress, the Administration is required to determine whether or not the PLO has lived up to its 1993 commitments under the Oslo Accords to renounce violence against Israel, and what steps have been taken by the PLO and the Palestinian Authority to investigate and prosecute those responsible for killing American and Israeli citizens. Should the Administration determine that the PLO's actions run contrary to their word, the President is required to immediately suspend all assistance to the West Bank and Gaza, except humanitarian aid. He is also required to initiate additional sanctions against the PLO, which may include denying visas to senior officials and downgrading their representative office in the United States.

I intend to offer this legislation, along with Senator Feinstein, as an amendment to the Operations Appropriations bill, which may be considered by the full Senate in the near future.

While I will have much more to say on the situation in the Middle East at a later date, I want a question of my colleagues: If the daily terrorists attacks taking place against Israelis were occurring on American soil against U.S. citizens, what would our response be? A democracy in a region of dictatorships and kingdoms, Israel has the right and responsibility to protect and defend its citizens against terrorism. The United States should be clear in its support of Israel exercising this right, in whatever manner the people of Israel, through their elected leaders, deem appropriate. To date, Israel has shown remarkable restraint.

Mr. McConnell. With great thanks to my colleague from California in collaborating with me on this effort, and looking forward to further efforts on behalf of this proposal, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized. Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky for his leadership. We have consulted together on this bill, and I am very proud to join him as the lead Democratic co-sponsor.

I ask unanimous consent to put the following Members from this side of the aisle on the bill: Senators DASCHLE, SCHUMER, MIKULSKI, CLINTON, CARNANAH, BOXER, TORRICELLI, EDWARDS, AND CLELAND.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky and I joined together in this legislation because we believe that if the violence between the Palestinians and Israel is to end and the peace process is to gain any momentum, the Palestinian leadership must show it can muster the political will that is necessary to meet the commitments they made in the Oslo Accords.

Most people, I think, don't know what the Oslo accords were. In fact, the Oslo accords were letters that were sent between the Palestinian and Israeli leadership in 1993. Those letters became the Oslo accords.

I want to indicate what the Palestinians, over the signature of their chairman, Mr. Arafat, said they would do on September 9, 1993:

The PLO recognizes the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security.


The PLO commits to the Middle East peace process, and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.

These are not my words, these are the words of Chairman Arafat. It goes on:

The PLO considers that the signing of the Declaration of Principles constitutes a historic event, inaugurating a new epoch of peaceful coexistence, free from violence and all other acts which endanger peace and stability. Accordingly, the PLO renounces the use of terrorism and other acts of violence and will assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel in order to assure their compliance, prevent violence, and discipline violators.
In view of the promise of a new era and the signing of the Declaration of Principles, and based on the PLO’s acceptance of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, the PLO affirms its recognition of the Palestinian people’s right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. Mr. President, the letter that became the foundation of PLO recognition, and the Declaration of Principles constitutes a historic event, inaugurating a new epoch of peaceful coexistence, free from violence and acts which endanger peace and stability. Accordingly, the PLO renounces the use of terrorism and other acts of violence and will assume responsibility over all PLO elements and personnel to assure their compliance, prevent violence and discipline violators.

SEC. 3. REPORTS.

(a) In General.—The President shall, at the times specified in subsection (b), transmit to Congress a report—

(1) detailing and assessing the steps that the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has taken to substantially comply with its 1993 commitments, as specified in section 2(1) of this Act;

(2) describing the steps taken by the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, to investigate and prosecute those responsible for violence against American and Irali citizens;

(3) making a determination as to whether the PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has substantially complied with its 1993 commitments during the period since the submission of the preceding report, or, in the case of the initial report, during the preceding 6-month period; and

(4) detailing progress made in determining the designation of the PLO, or one or more of its constituent groups (including Fatah and Tanzim) or groups operating as arms of the Palestinian Authority (including PLO or the Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has substantially complied with its 1993 commitments during the period since the submission of the preceding report, or, in the case of the initial report, during the preceding 6-month period; and

SEC. 4. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) In General.—If, in any report transmitted pursuant to section 3, the President determines that the PLO or Palestinian Authority, as appropriate, has not substantially complied with the commitments specified in section 2(1), the following sanctions shall apply:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Middle East Peace Compliance Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 9, 1993, Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasser Arafat made the following commitments in an exchange of letters with Prime Minister of Israel Yitzhak Rabin:

(A) “The PLO recognizes the right of the State of Israel to exist in peace and security.”

(B) “The PLO accepts United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338” pertaining to the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

(C) “The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process, and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.”

(2) The Palestinian Authority, the governing body of autonomous Palestinian territories, was created as a result of the agreement of September 9, 1993, which the President is next required to submit a report under the PLO Commitment Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII of Public Law 101–246) and may be combined with such report as a foreign terrorist organization, in accordance with section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(b) TRANSMISSION.—The initial report required under subsection (a) shall be transmitted not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Each subsequent report shall be submitted on the date on which the President is next required to submit a report under the PLO Commitment Compliance Act of 1989 (title VIII of Public Law 101–246) and may be combined with such report.
(1) SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE.—The President shall suspend all United States assistance to the Occupied Territories of the West Bank and Gaza except for humanitarian assistance.

(2) ADDITIONAL SANCTION OR SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) DENIAL OF VISA TO PLO AND PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY FIGURES.—The President shall prohibit the Secretary of State from issuing any visa for any member of the PLO or any other official of the Palestinian Authority.

(B) DOWNGRADING IN STATUS OF PLO OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall withdraw or terminate any waiver by the President of the requirements of section 1003 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1988 and 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5202) (prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a Palestinian information office in the United States), and such sanction shall apply so as to prohibit the operation of a PLO or Palestinian Authority office in the United States from carrying out any function other than those that are carried out by the Palestinian information office in existence prior to September 13, 1995.

(b) DURATION OF SANCTIONS.—The period of time remaining after the date the report pursuant to section 3 was transmitted and ending on the later of—

(1) the date that is 6 months after such date;

(2) the date that is 6 months after the date the next report under section 3 is required to be transmitted; or

(3) the date at which the President determines and informs Congress that the conditions that were the basis for imposing the sanctions are no longer valid.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive any or all of the sanctions imposed under this Act if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States, and reports such a determination to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; TERMINATION DATE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—This Act shall cease to be effective 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CAMPELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 1411. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Denver Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. CAMPELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to facilitate the transfer of the Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center, DVAMC, from its current site in Denver to the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Aurora, CO. I am happy to be joined in this effort by my friend and colleague Senator ALLARD as an original cosponsor. The bill would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accomplish the transfer in a timely manner. It would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the Veterans Affairs Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives. This report would detail the costs of the transfer and would be submitted 60 days prior to awarding a contract for the move.

The relocation of the DVAMC to the former Fitzsimons site offers a unique opportunity to deliver the highest-quality medical care for our veterans. The University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, UCHSC, is moving its facilities from its overcrowded location near downtown Denver to the Fitzsimons site, a decommissioned Army installation. The DVAMC has long operated on adjacent campuses and have shared faculty, medical residents, and access to equipment. A DVAMC move to the new location would allow such cost-effective cooperation to continue, for the benefit of our veterans and all taxpayers.

The need to move is pressing. A recent VA study concludes that the Colorado State veterans’ population will experience one of the highest percent increases nationally in veterans 65 and over between 1990 and 2020. The present VA hospital was built in the 1950’s. While still able to provide service, the core facilities are approaching the end of their useful lives and many of the patient care units have fallen horribly out of date. Studies indicate that co-location with the University on a state-of-the-art medical campus would be a cost-effective way to give veterans in the region the highest quality of care. The move would also provide a tremendous opportunity to showcase a nationwide model of cooperation between the University and the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA. These cooperative initiatives have proven time and again their effectiveness.

Timing is also very important. The VA needs to move quickly to realize the financial advantages of this unique opportunity. In order to make the move fiscally effective, the VA needs to make a decision not later than 2004. Additionally, our veterans are aging and their needs are increasing. Assisting our veterans with their medical needs is a promise we, as a country, made long ago.

The savings we can realize by approving the timely transfer of our veterans’ medical treatment facilities in the Denver region compels me to urge my colleagues to act quickly on this bill. We must not miss out on this opportunity to serve America’s veterans and their families by ensuring that they receive the excellent medical care they deserve.

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

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

"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 "Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center Transfer to Fitzsimons Act of 2001."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 1527. Mr. THOMPSON proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes.

SA 1528. Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 149, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1529. Mr. KYL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, supra.

SA 1530. Mr. SARBANEBS (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 149, supra.

SA 1531. Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2500, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1532. Mr. REID (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1885, to expand the class of beneficiaries who may apply for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.