

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLON CANCER SCREEN FOR LIFE ACT OF 2002

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 2002

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Colon Cancer Screen for Life Act of 2002. Colorectal cancer is the number two cancer killer in the United States. This year, an estimated 135,400 new cases will be diagnosed and 56,700 Americans will die from the disease. My home state of Maryland ranks 7th in the nation in the number of new cases and in the number of deaths. Our nation's capital, Washington, D.C., ranks first in the nation.

Colorectal cancer disproportionately impacts the elderly. The risk of colorectal cancer begins to increase after the age of 40 and rises sharply at the ages of 50 to 55, when the risk doubles with each succeeding decade. Despite advances in surgical techniques and adjuvant therapy, there has been only a modest improvement in survival for patients who present with advanced cancers.

The good news is that colorectal cancer can be prevented, and is highly treatable when discovered early. Most cases of the disease begin as non-cancerous polyps which can be detected and removed during routine screenings—preventing the development of colorectal cancer. Screening tests also save lives even when they detect polyps that have become cancerous by catching the disease in its earliest, most curable stages. The cure rate is up to 93 percent when colorectal cancer is discovered early.

Recognizing the importance of early detection in preventing colorectal cancer deaths, Congress in 1997 enacted a Medicare colorectal cancer screening benefit. Medicare currently covers either a screening colonoscopy every ten years or a flexible sigmoidoscopy every four years for average-risk individuals. Beneficiaries identified as high risk are entitled to a colonoscopy every two years.

Despite the availability of this benefit, very few seniors are actually being screened for colorectal cancer. Since its implementation in 1998, the percentage of Medicare beneficiaries receiving either a screening or diagnostic colonoscopy has increased by only one percent.

Why aren't more seniors being screened? I believe the problem is due, in part, to rapidly declining colorectal screening reimbursement levels. By 2002, Medicare reimbursement for diagnostic colonoscopies performed in an outpatient setting will have declined 36% from initial 1998 levels. For flexible sigmoidoscopies, payment in 2002 will be 54% less. Colorectal cancer screening will not be effective if it is a "loss leader" for doctors.

While reimbursement has dropped across the board, cuts have been particularly harsh for screenings provided in hospital outpatient departments (HOPDs) and ambulatory surgery

centers (ASCs). In 1997, a colonoscopy performed in one of these settings was reimbursed at approximately \$301. Now in 2002, the rate has fallen to about \$213.

The facility-specific cuts provide incentives for physicians to perform screenings in their offices, where reimbursement rates have remained between 68% and 108% higher. As you know, Medicare has established its own criteria for both ASCs and HOPDs to ensure high quality of care and patient safety. While there are office facilities where endoscopy is safely performed, physicians' offices are, for the most part, unregulated environments. The site-of-service differential could interfere with the clinical decision-making process, at the expense of patient safety.

In addition, Medicare currently pays for a consultation prior to a diagnostic colonoscopy, but not for a screening colonoscopy. Since colonoscopy involves conscious sedation, physicians generally do not perform them without a pre-procedure office visit to ascertain a patient's medical history and to educate patients as to the required preparatory steps. In fact, several states now require physicians to consult with patients prior to procedures involving conscious sedation. Because Medicare will not pay for pre-screening consultations, many physicians must provide them for free.

And, unlike screening mammography, colorectal cancer screening tests are subject to the Medicare Part B deductible, which discourages beneficiaries from seeking screening.

My colleague, Representative PHIL ENGLISH, joins me today to introduce this important legislation. This bill is supported by the American College of Gastroenterology, the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, and the American Gastroenterological Association. It would improve beneficiary utilization and help ensure the safety of colorectal cancer screening by doing three things.

First, it would increase reimbursement for colorectal cancer related procedures to ensure that physicians are able to cover the costs of providing these valuable services.

Second, our bill will provide Medicare coverage for a pre-screening office visit. If Medicare will pay for a consultation prior to diagnostic colonoscopy, it also should pay for a consultation before a screening colonoscopy.

Third, the bill would exempt colorectal cancer screening procedures from the customary Medicare deductible requirement. By reducing the financial requirements on the beneficiary, this law will encourage increased access to colorectal screening services.

The preventive benefits we authorized in 1997 were an important step toward fighting this deadly disease. But the colorectal cancer screening program is in danger of failing without our intervention. I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 2002

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 2002, I was unavoidably detained and missed Rollcall vote No. 5. Rollcall vote 5 was on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to a resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 5.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE THAT SCHEDULED TAX RELIEF SHOULD NOT BE SUSPENDED OR REPEALED

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 2002

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution on the floor this morning. H. Con. Res. 312 instructs the Congress to push for more tax cuts, thereby eliminating necessary funds to help senior citizens, families, and laid-off workers.

My colleagues that stand on the other side of this have always emphasized that this Congress must put forth every effort to work together in a bipartisan way. We have worked together to pass such legislation as airline security, and H.R. 1, the "Leave No Child Behind Act of 2001." But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution only separates this body along party lines. It disregards the future of our country.

We all received a copy of the President's budget on Monday. It, among other things, envisions an \$80 billion deficit even while proposing an actual decline in spending for domestic programs not related to defense or homeland security. How will it be possible to adhere to President Bush's budget? The only way is by invading Social Security and Medicare and cutting program funding in such important areas as education and agriculture.

I did not support the President's tax cut last year because such a plan would have forced him to break his promise to not invade Social Security. Over the next 10 years, the President's budget would invade Social Security surpluses by approximately \$1.4 trillion and invade Medicare surpluses by approximately \$550 billion. Again, Mr. Speaker, this resolution disregards the future of our country. The President says that our current war on terrorism has cost \$1 billion per month and is the primary reason for the deficit. We, as a nation, have experienced tremendous pain as a result of September 11. But our pain pales to the loss experienced by families of the victims. During this healing period, a time when they rely on our leadership to provide medical care,

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.