

the President's desk after a conference with the House so that the American people know that it is law, know that there are penalties for the bad actors and the criminal activity that has occurred in certain instances at the corporate level.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
H.R. 5011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I indicated this morning, we are tremendously anxious to move to our first appropriations bill. I repeat, the President has been pushing us on these bills. We marked up in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee today the largest Defense appropriations bill in the history of the country.

We have already reported out of the subcommittee and the full committee the military construction appropriations bill, and we have not been able to get it to the floor. There has been an objection on the other side to moving forward.

Mr. President, some have suggested we just bring it to the floor. We cannot just bring it to the floor because then we get into the cloture process and that takes many days. We are now trying to go forward on the prescription drug bill, and we are in a cloture situation there, having filed cloture on the motion to proceed, and we are going to vote on that tomorrow unless something comes in the meantime.

I am basically going to propound the same unanimous consent request I did before. The majority leader was on the floor. The Republican leader has been on the floor. The Republican leader, to his credit, has said he thinks we should move forward with this. Today, I spent some time with him and indicated what we can do to move this forward. He had just finished a meeting with the President.

We want to move forward with this bill. We are doing everything we can to move forward. We were told the last time the reason we are not moving forward—and I spoke with the junior Senator from Arizona, and I know how strongly he believes we have to do something about the firefighting problems. I am from the West. We have two big fires burning in Nevada right now. I am concerned about them, but the firefighting problems of our country have never been funded in the military construction appropriations bill.

We are going to have the ability in the supplemental where it should be done. It is an emergency. We have been blocked from doing that by the administration, but it will be done, as it has always been done during my tenure, if not in a supplemental, in the Interior appropriations bill, chaired by Senator BYRD, the President pro tempore of the Senate. I hope they will allow to us move forward on this.

There are military projects that will have to wait until we pass this bill. So

here I go: I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 486, H.R. 5011, the military construction appropriations bill, and that it be considered under the following limitations:

That immediately after the bill is reported, all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of Calendar No. 479, S. 2709, the Senate committee-reported bill be inserted in lieu thereof; that debate time on the bill and substitute amendment be limited to a total of 45 minutes, with an additional 20 minutes under the control of Senator MCCAIN; that the only other amendment in order be an amendment offered by Senators FEINSTEIN and HUTCHISON of Texas, which is at the desk; with debate limited to 10 minutes on the Feinstein-Hutchison amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of time on the amendment, without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the amendment; that all debate time not already identified in this agreement be equally divided and controlled between the chair and ranking member of the subcommittee or their designee; that upon disposition of the Feinstein-Hutchison amendment, and the use or yielding back of all time, the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read three times; that section 303 of the Congressional Budget Act be waived; and the Senate then proceed to a vote on passage of the bill; that upon passage of the bill, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Reluctantly, I must object at this time on behalf of a group of other Senators and myself, not to the terms of the unanimous consent agreement as has been outlined by the Senator from Nevada, but rather to bringing up the bill until there has been an agreement reached on how to deal with the supplemental funding for dealing with these wildfires.

I think the Senator from Nevada is absolutely correct that that funding should be on the supplemental appropriations bill. Unfortunately, it has not been put on that bill so far. There are a lot of different reasons alleged to exist for that. It seems everybody is willing to do it but somehow or another they cannot all get together to make it happen, and if it does not happen on that bill, the only other alternative is to try to do it on the military construction bill.

The Interior Department appropriations bill is not likely to be able to

come before us in a timely fashion so the money that is needed for replenishing these Forest Service accounts can be replenished before the end of the fiscal year, and that is the reason we have to retain this option.

I hope that within the next several hours an agreement can be reached and these funds will be put on the supplemental appropriations bill, as the Senator from Nevada suggests, and then we can move on with this important legislation. Until then, we do need this as a possible way to move forward with the funding that it seems everybody is for but they just cannot find a way to make happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think this is too bad, for lack of a better way to describe things. This bill is not the proper place for this type of funding. With all due respect to my friend from Arizona, this does not create any pressure, holding up the Military Construction Subcommittee bill.

We have to understand that if we are going to take care of the men and women who are defending our country, we need to take care of the bills that fund them.

I have indicated I am concerned about firefighting in Nevada. We have fires burning as I speak, but never in the history of this country, that I am aware, have we funded firefighting through the military construction bill, and we are not going to do it in the future. Holding up this bill creates a false illusion that we are accomplishing something regarding firefighting in this country.

I hope that in the next couple of hours, as my friend from Arizona said, more deliberation can come and that we can move forward on this bill.

I am terribly disappointed we do not have more things declared emergencies. It is hard to believe, but the terrible disaster that occurred in Oklahoma where a barge ran into part of our interstate freeway system, dumped more than a score of cars in the river, killed at last count about 14 people, that is not deemed an emergency to fix that road. Now if that is not an emergency, I do not know what is. I do not know what we are trying to accomplish with the numbers game, but that is an emergency, if anything ever was an emergency.

Those fires that are burning, those are emergencies. They are not in the next fiscal year, they are in this fiscal year. The fires are burning right now. The fires in Arizona are not even out yet. They have them under control, but they will be burning for weeks into the future. They have large crews making sure they do not blow up again. I think books will probably be written about that fire in Arizona, if not articles. They were blowing out fireballs for miles, not a few hundred feet or a thousand feet but, by some accounts, up to 3 miles. They were blowing out big

bombs of fire and starting fires up to 3 miles away.

I do not know what is happening down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, but they have to come to their senses and realize that some things are emergencies. The big fire in Colorado was started by somebody who worked for the Forest Service. The big fire in Arizona, from the information we have now, a firefighter started that fire. It is too bad, but they were started. They are emergencies no matter how they were started. It is like the fire burning some 30 miles from Las Vegas, it was started by lightning, but they are emergencies, and they should be declared emergencies, and they should be placed on the supplemental. It does not count against any of the numbers we have. They are truly emergencies.

We are going to offer this again before the day is out. We want to go forward with that bill. The managers of that bill, the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas, have done a remarkably good job. This is a fine bill. I think it is remarkable they have been able to do the job they have done. They have both tremendous interest in the military, and they have both been speaking about the needs they have in their respective States and the country.

The military construction bill goes beyond what we do in this country. We have military construction we pay for that is outside this country. So I hope my friend from Arizona will do what he can. He has tremendous sway with the White House, and that is where the bottleneck is, and it should stop.

In the meantime, let us move forward. We are only asking for a little over an hour on this bill to complete it.

The only other thing, before my friend from Florida begins, is we are expecting a very important unanimous consent agreement on antiterrorism, and when that comes, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt, we will make sure his remarks do not appear interrupted in the RECORD.

GREATER ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE PHARMACEUTICALS ACT OF 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is the parliamentary position of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering a motion to proceed on S. 812.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am going to talk about one of the issues which will be a central part of the next several days' debate on American health care. The specific bill before us upon which we are seeking permission to proceed relates to generic drugs and eliminating some of the legalisms which have grown up around our generic drug law and have made it difficult for competitive products to come to market, even after the brand name

drug has run the full course of its patent. That will be a debate for another day, hopefully as early as today.

I am going to talk about an issue that will come up somewhat later in this debate and that is adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare.

Some would say: Look, this issue has been around for a long time. Why should we continue to spend time debating a matter which has thus far been unable to find enough support in the Congress to become law? Why is this issue important enough for us to spend time on it?

The answer is: Freda Moss. That is why this is an important issue.

In Tampa, FL, Freda Moss, an 80-year-old American, along with her 84-year-old husband Coleman, is watching this, and so are thousands like Freda and Coleman. They are also watching us.

Freda is watching and waiting to see if we can improve her life and the lives of 39 million Americans by adding a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare Program. The story of Freda and Coleman is typical of many older Americans. They live on Social Security with an income of \$1,038 a month. They are both eligible for Medicare. They have no prescription drug coverage.

While Coleman has remained healthy and has relatively low prescription drug costs, unfortunately, Freda suffers from diabetes, heart disease, and hypertension. Freda is on a list of prescription drugs that include Plavix, Mavik, Amaryl, and Zocor. In 1 year alone, Freda's prescription drug costs were nearly \$7,800—62 percent of that couple's total income. It is for people like Freda that we need to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare.

As more and more Americans discover the effectiveness of prescription drugs in promoting longer and healthier lives, they have become an indispensable part of our health care system. In 1980, prescription drugs accounted for less than 5 percent of national spending on health care. In 1980, less than 5 percent. Twenty years later, in 2000, prescription drug costs accounted for nearly 10 percent of national spending on health care. It is estimated in the year 2010 prescription drugs will reach 14 percent of total health care costs.

Last year, 20 percent of the increase in the total cost of health care came from increases in the cost of prescription drugs. Even though they were only 10 percent of all costs, they were 20 percent of the increase in cost.

As there has been in the last few years, there will be a lot of debate over the next few days about the many measures that will be introduced to conquer the problems in the prescription drug market. While many of these proposals are important and even useful to seniors, the ultimate goal must be a prescription drug benefit for older Americans. For many years we have come to the Senate floor to talk about

how important this is. Others, beyond Freda, have been used as an example of the urgency of action, but every year we have gone home we have spoken to our constituents about how committed we were, how hard we worked to accomplish the objective of passing a prescription drug benefit but that we had failed.

Now is the time to overcome failure with victory. We can pass this year—we must pass this year—a benefit for our older citizens who are looking to us for the protection of their health care.

I appeal to all of you who have heard stories such as that of Freda Moss to join me in providing a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Why doesn't Medicare, established in 1965 and which covers 39 million people, provide a prescription drug benefit? Virtually every other health care plan, the kind of plan that the Presiding Officer, myself, and other 98 colleagues have, provides a prescription drug benefit as part of a total health care program. Why doesn't Medicare?

The answer is basically history and inertia. In 1965, when the Medicare Program was founded, prescription drugs were a very small part of health care. Few drugs were used by the very ill. Can you believe this? In the year Medicare was established, in 1965, the average spending for prescription drugs by older Americans was \$65. That is not \$65 a week or \$65 a month. That is \$65 a year was the average amount expended by older Americans on prescription drugs when Medicare was established.

What is the number today? According to the Congressional Budget Office, spending over the 37 years, from 1965 to today, has risen to an average of \$2,149. That is a 35-times increase in the cost, on an annual basis, of prescription drugs for older Americans.

If the Medicare Program were to be designed today, in 2002, there would be no question that lawmakers would include a prescription drug benefit. Why? Not only because every other health care plan, the plans that most people have gotten accustomed to during their working lives, have long included a prescription drug benefit, but also because prescription drugs today are an integral part of a modern health care program.

Medications are used not only to halt the effects of a disease, but in many cases can even reverse the negative consequences of disease. After 37 years, it is unfair to ask our Nation's older citizens, one of the most vulnerable populations in our society, to continue to go without the Medicare Program offering coverage for the necessity of modern health care, prescription drugs. Everyone in this Chamber receives this benefit as a Federal employee. We should demand nothing less for our older citizens.

How do we solve the problem? I suggest there are a set of principles that we should look to as we shape a response to this problem of the missing