

we have seen an explosion in advertising. Unfortunately, what has happened is we have seen that explosion in advertising causing an explosion in our costs of 18 percent to 20 percent a year.

Something is wrong when there are almost twice as many people involved in promoting a drug and advertising a drug as there are people researching new medications. There is also something wrong when we can go across the bridge or through the tunnel to Canada—Mr. President, that is 5 minutes in Michigan. We can go across the bridge and we can cut our costs in half for American-made, FDA-approved medications.

I have twice taken a group of seniors across the border, going through the Canadian medical society, and then going into the Canadian pharmacies. We have seen dramatic results. I will just share a couple.

In Michigan, Zocor, a drug to reduce cholesterol, costs \$109.73 for 50 5-milligram tablets. In Canada, the exact same prescription costs \$46.17—\$109.73 and \$46.17. Since we as taxpayers in the United States have helped to subsidize the research—which I support doing—I also want to see us get a price break for the tax dollars that are helping to do this.

I also know that tamoxifen, a breast-cancer-treating drug, is available for about \$136 in Michigan. When we went to Canada, with breast cancer patients, they got it for \$15. There is something wrong with the laws that say our people cannot freely go back and forth—our hospitals, our businesses—and get those lower costs.

There is something wrong with a system where small businesses are seeing 25, 30, 35 percent or more increases in their health care premiums. I have had small business people come to me saying they will have to drop their insurance because they cannot afford the premium increases. The majority of that is the cost of prescription drugs.

We have a lot of work to do. There is something wrong in a country as blessed and as wealthy as the United States when there are seniors who got up this morning, sat at the kitchen table, and said: Do I eat today or do I take my medicine? Do I pay the electric bill or do I take my medicine?

We can do better than that. We have an obligation to do better than that. I believe one piece of that is Medicare coverage and updating our Medicare system to cover prescription drugs. But I believe it is also much more than that. I believe it is making generics available once the patent has run its course and finding ways to make sure those laws are enforced and not undermined. It is making sure that research is done, and we reward and help fund that, and invest in that more than we are investing in advertising. It is making sure our business community can afford premiums, that we have competition across the border, making sure we are able to provide prescriptions at the lowest possible cost while still al-

lowing important research to happen and our pharmaceutical industry to thrive.

I believe we can do all of that if we have a focus on the right values and priorities when it comes to this debate.

I simply say it is now time for a sense of urgency. If a child in our family is sick or if we have a parent who needs lifesaving medication and can't afford it, if we have someone in our family who needs an operation, we feel a sense of urgency. We feel a sense of urgency if someone needs nursing home care or if someone needs some other kind of health care.

We need that same kind of sense of urgency when it comes to public policy on health care.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us in the coming weeks to lower the fastest growing part of that health care dollar; that is, the cost of prescription drugs and lifesaving medication.

We can do better than we are doing for our seniors and our families. We can do better than we are doing for the business community. We can do better than we are doing for everybody in our country if we are willing to get to work. I hope we are going to do that.

I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Missouri completes her statement, Senator MURKOWSKI be recognized to offer his Iraqi oil import amendment; that there be 60 minutes for debate prior to the vote in relation to the amendment with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that there be no intervening amendment in order prior to the vote in relationship to the Murkowski amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of the time without further intervening action or debate the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendment.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

LEAVE NO CHILD BEHIND ACT

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, last year, Democrats and Republicans joined together with President Bush to enact a monumental and far-reaching education bill.

This new law, the Leave No Child Behind Act, will bring new resources and meaningful reform to our Nation's schools.

It establishes new academic standards for students, increases teacher training, and demands new levels of accountability, while increasing flexibility with Federal funds at the State and local level.

I am hopeful that this law will help close the achievement gaps that separate many poor and minority students from their peers.

Indeed, I am optimistic that it will improve education for all students.

But Congress has, as Harry Truman once said, some "unfinished business" when it comes to our schools.

We have left out a critical component when it comes to ensuring that our schools and our teachers and, most importantly, our students will succeed.

Today, one in five schools fails to meet building or safety codes or needs extensive repairs, renovations, and maintenance.

Across the country, run-down, overcrowded, dilapidated schools jeopardize the health and safety of our students.

Across the country, deteriorating schools inhibit the ability of our children to learn.

And yet, with the exception of the Impact Aid program, which I strongly support, the new education reform law did not include funds for school renovation and repair.

Nor were any funds for renovation and repair made available through the appropriations process.

The administration's most recent budget even eliminates the Emergency School Repair Program.

And yet, data from the National Center for Education Statistics tells us that nearly \$127 billion in renovations and repairs are needed to upgrade existing schools to good physical condition.

Furthermore, this figure does not include the funding needed for construction to accommodate increasing enrollments in districts across the country.

We have these pressing needs at a time when resources are scarce. Our States and local governments are still feeling the effects of the recession.

And for too many years, Congress has failed to provide States and localities the funding it promised long ago to share the cost of special education.

The Federal Government cannot ask States and localities to shoulder the burden of school renovation and repair costs alone.

If the Federal Government stands on the sidelines, it will be at the expense of our children.

But neither should Washington attempt to single-handedly solve this problem. Congress should not be in the business of giving direct grants to communities to build schools.

I strongly believe that education is a national priority but a local responsibility.

The legislation being introduced today, the "Investing for Tomorrow's

Schools Act," answers this call for partnership.

Our bill provides initial funding for the creation of State and regional infrastructure banks. These banks will make loans to districts for school construction or modernization needs.

This mechanism helps to alleviate the financial burden for States and localities but provides sufficient flexibility to meet local needs.

The structure of the bill ensures that states and localities have the requisite flexibility to tailor programs to meet their unique needs.

The bill requires a 25 percent State match, which ensures the commitment of State government to the program while allowing States to leverage their dollars four-to-one.

It is a voluntary program—only for those states who choose to participate.

To those who have argued that the Federal Government should have no role in school facilities, and likewise to those who call for overly intrusive Federal programs, this bill offers a common-sense compromise.

I remember visiting a school in Nixa, MO, where every fourth-grader in the district attends class in trailers behind the school.

I have subsequently learned from teachers and administrators in other districts that the kids in trailers often have the best deal because conditions in the actual school buildings are often far worse than they are in the trailers.

Every State in this country has districts in need, in both urban and rural and suburban communities. The needs span the social economic strata of our Nation.

Disadvantaged and minority students are most likely to attend school in decrepit and obsolete buildings.

I would imagine that we have all seen schools that are either freezing cold or unbearably hot, that have poor lighting or inadequate bathroom facilities.

But students in more affluent suburbs—where there is often explosive growth in the community—also suffer from overcrowding.

Most parents would agree that they would like their children to attend schools where the student to teacher ratio is low, where class size is small.

Yet, without enough space, small class size is an impossibility.

And despite these conditions, we are asking our children for more than ever before.

A fellow Missourian, Mark Twain, once told the following story:

When I was a boy on the Mississippi River there was a proposition in a township there to discontinue public schools because they were too expensive. An old farmer spoke up and said, "If they stopped building the schools they would not save anything, because every time a school was closed a jail had to be built."

I have great faith in America's children. The time to invest in them is now. The investments we make in them will be returned to us many times over.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for the interest of Senators, I have been in consultation with the distinguished Republican leader throughout the day. We are momentarily going to propound a unanimous consent request which would do several things.

First of all, it would accommodate Senator MURKOWSKI and his desire to bring up an amendment on the energy bill relating to Iraq.

We would then move to complete our work on the border security bill. There would be a number of amendments offered by Senator BYRD. Once those amendments have been disposed of, it would be our intention to then go to final passage. Then, prior to the end of the day, we would also take up a judicial nomination that has been on the calendar.

We would, throughout this period, have further discussions about our schedule for the remainder of the week—tomorrow—and early next week, as we attempt to bring some final closure to the energy bill.

So that is the current schedule. It is my expectation we will get this request which would allow us to complete our work on border security today. Senators should be forewarned there will be additional votes, probably several additional votes, yet today on the border security bill, I assume on the Murkowski amendment, as well as on the judicial nomination.

So that is the current plan. Just as soon as we have cleared it a final time with our Republican colleagues, I will propound this unanimous consent request. Until that time, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3525

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Murkowski amendment relating to Iraqi oil, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3525, the border security bill, and that it be considered under the following limitations: that there be 30 minutes of debate on the bill, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators KENNEDY, BROWNBAC, FEINSTEIN, and KYL, or their designees; that the amendments listed in this agreement be the only amendments in order; that any debate time be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on final passage of the bill, without further intervening action or de-

bate: Kennedy-Brownback-Feinstein-Kyl managers' amendment, 20 minutes for debate; that debate on the following Byrd relevant amendments be limited to 20 minutes each: Byrd amendment regarding review of educational institutions' compliance provisions, Byrd amendment regarding penalty increase for manifest noncompliance, Byrd amendment with regard to change of deadlines for implementation of biometrics, and Byrd amendment regarding tightening requirements for participation in the visa waiver program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

Under this order, the Murkowski amendment relating to Iraqi oil is now the pending order of business. I encourage Senators, if they want to be heard on the amendment, to come to the Chamber.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 3159 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2917

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 3159 to amendment No. 2917.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To make the United States' energy policy toward Iraq consistent with the national security policies of the United States)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE—IRAQ OIL IMPORT RESTRICTION SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND FINDINGS.

(a) This Title can be cited as the 'Iraq Petroleum Import Restriction Act of 2001.'

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the government of the Republic of Iraq:

(A) has failed to comply with the terms of United Nations Security Council Resolution 686 regarding unconditional Iraqi acceptance of the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless, under international supervision, of all nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research,