

In the small print it says: "They don't do research." Of course they do not do research. They do not do research. They do not have to do research. The idea of generic drugs is to take the formulas and the patents after the research has been done, after the American people have helped to pay for that research through NIH funding, tax deductions, and supporting the companies with a 20-year patent so they do not have competition in recovering their costs.

The whole point of generics is the American public made a deal that, once the 20 years is up, once those subsidies are up, they will have that formula available so generic companies can manufacture those drugs and lower the prices.

Instead of working with us to have a system that works both for brand name companies to develop these new brand name drugs and also for the American people to get the bargain they are supposed to get, which is lower prices, the companies are putting millions of dollars into a front senior citizen group, ads on the air, getting involved in elections and running ads scaring people that somehow if we let the system work as we created it over the years in a bipartisan way, if we let the system work, this child, who is obviously seriously ill, will somehow be hurt. I find that absolutely outrageous.

I am concerned in the context of this economy and the debate and the American people trying to figure out when they sit down in the morning what they are going to pay for—are they going to be able to afford the health care premium? Is that senior going to be able to afford their medicine? Are they going to be able to pay for the clothes kids need for school? Are they going to be able to do the other things they need for their family?

Instead of working with us, the companies have chosen an outrageous PR propaganda campaign. I urge them to work with us to do the right thing. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have been listening to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying the economic problems we have are somebody else's fault. They blame the President. Unfortunately, in this instance, the President cannot pass legislation. The President was successful in working with us to pass the beginning of tax relief which took effect in 2001, and most responsible economists I know suggest that helped lessen the impact of the downturn which began in 2000, beginning as early as the first quarter of 2000 and hitting its peak the end of 2000 and the beginning of 2001.

We could do some things in this body. We could pass some laws that would make a difference and help the economy get going. Frankly, one of the great frustrations I feel is we cannot get about the business that we are supposed to do on the Senate floor. If the majority leadership had allowed the Senate Energy Committee to work its will on an energy bill, the committee would have reported out a proposal to allow drilling on 2,000 acres in the barren northlands above the Arctic Circle in Alaska. That is called ANWR.

ANWR not only has the potential to replace the oil we must now buy from the malevolent, deadly dictator Saddam Hussein, ANWR could put up to three-quarters of a million people to work throughout the country, not just in the drilling and work in ANWR, but providing the materials, making the steel and turning it into equipment, pipelines, providing the infrastructure through the private sector that we need to bring that oil down from ANWR.

I am still hoping we can get ANWR in the energy bill, a tremendous boost for the economy. Where else do we need a boost for the economy? In large construction projects. There are construction projects shut down all around the country because they cannot get insurance against terrorism.

Terrorism risk insurance was dealt with in the Banking Committee on a bipartisan basis. I understand they reported out a good bill to provide that the Federal Government would be a backstop, on a sharing basis, for the reinsurance of terrorism risk.

The majority leadership took it away. We cannot get a terrorism risk insurance bill through this body because the majority leadership has changed it into something that provides great new opportunities to sue the victims of terrorist attacks for punitive damages. Punitive damages are not a way to build the economy. Those are two pieces of legislation we could have gotten finished to help the economy get going. Making the tax cut permanent would be a third way of doing it.

I came to the floor to express what I believe is a great sense of frustration by all of us. The Senate is stuck in neutral.

I have only been in the Senate 16 years, and by some standards that is a pretty short time. We honored our distinguished senior colleague from South Carolina yesterday, and we know of the record of great service of others in this body, but in the short time I have been here I have never seen this body so dysfunctional. It is time we talked about why we are dysfunctional. What is happening? What has gone wrong? Why are we here? Quite simply, it is because some do not want to let us vote. This is the basic motivation and it is cloaked with all the talk about cloture and filibuster, but we are still on an Interior bill amendment which was offered 3 weeks ago. We are stuck because the

majority leadership does not want us to vote on that amendment.

There is plenty of time to vote, but for some reason some are apparently afraid to vote. It is no more complicated than that. If we vote, we could get to the remaining amendments, pass the bill, and move on in the next day or two. If the majority does not like it, they could move to table it and we could have a vote; might win, might lose. We could at least have a vote.

I have worked a long time on appropriations bills. I have worked very diligently with the Senator from Maryland, the excellent chairman of the VA/ HUD Committee. We have a bill we would like to present to the Senate because it deals with some very important things for veterans, for housing, for the environment, for economic development in our communities, for science, for space, for emergency management. We are ready and willing, and there are nine other bills that are ready, but when we spend more than 3 weeks on one appropriations bill, we are not going anywhere. We cannot get there until the Senate does what it is paid to do, which is to vote up or down, win or lose, and let the will of the Senate prevail.

Some are suggesting—and this, I believe, is truly outrageous—the sponsors of the amendment should pull the amendment so some do not have to cast a difficult vote. Yes, this is a political season and it is tough, but that is what we get paid to do. We have cast 223 votes this year, and I do not believe another one will make or break or overburden any of us.

The Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from West Virginia each have cast over 15,000 votes. They have shown they are not afraid to make hard decisions, and the hard decisions they have made have not taken them away. The sponsors of the Craig-Domenici amendment have had people die in their States. They have had millions of acres of trees, including old-growth trees, habitat, and wildlife, ruined by fire. Houses have burned. A sound and responsible solution has been put forward based on good science and sound forestry management. The Senate should have the courtesy, if not the common sense, to vote on it.

How poorly are we willing to treat the Senators from these Western States? I believe these Senators and their constituencies deserve a vote. If Senators want to vote against them, vote against them. They will have to explain it if they vote for them or if they vote against them.

Senator CRAIG does not have an opportunity to slip this provision into a conference report, so he is doing what the Senate should allow him to do and what we are paid to do, which is to offer amendments and have an up-or-down vote. Maybe they want a commitment to drop the amendment in a conference report. Why can't we vote?

There are a lot of reasons why appropriations bills are difficult to resolve,

but this should not be one of them. This is not a question of how much money we have available. We should have voted 3 weeks ago. We could have completed four or more bills in this time, but we are at a stalemate.

Given the choices, this should be an easy call. Should the sponsors be asked to ignore their burning States, the danger of horrific, catastrophic forest fires, and set their amendments aside, or should the people who are preventing a vote decide they should let the Senate do what we are here to do, what our constitutional responsibility is to do, which is to make decisions on hard choices and then vote?

We have been in session for over 3 weeks, since Labor Day, and we have cast a whooping 16 votes. Six of these votes were unanimous. So we have cast 10 votes on contentious issues, which is less than 1 vote per day. That is not exactly heavy lifting. This time of year, we could probably do two, three, or even four votes a day and not work up a sweat, but we are not able to do that. We cast 5 unanimous votes, and we cast a unanimous vote on procedure in 16 days, which leaves 10 votes.

Some are saying maybe we ought to come in on Saturdays. Unless we are permitted to vote, what good is that going to do? If we cannot vote on Wednesday, what makes my colleagues think we could vote on Saturday, unless the objection to voting was lifted?

I do not want to shut off any debate, but when the debate is over, we should vote. If anyone has anything to add after 3½ weeks of debate, then I think they may have missed their opportunity.

I have spoken a couple of times. Obviously I have not moved many souls or they would all be stampeding to say, let's restore sound forestry management. Maybe they were not listening, maybe I was not persuasive, but I have had my shot. I think it is time we get on with it.

I compliment the Senator from South Dakota for figuring out a way to protect his State. What he did was sound forestry management. I simply want to see other people who live around the forests have the same opportunity as the people in South Dakota, which is to be free from the danger of catastrophic forest fires.

I have farmers who want farm aid. South Dakota has an interest, I am sure. I voted on farm aid. It was not germane or relevant to the bill, but I voted for it. Why can't the Senators whose States are on fire have a vote on something that is directly relevant to the Interior bill before us? I have not heard one substantive, rational explanation as to why Senators whose States are on fire should not be entitled to vote, even a negative vote.

I say to our distinguished leadership, explain to the people of the Western States that are on fire why they do not deserve a vote. The amendment is pending. Let's vote up or down; table it or not. South Dakota got special pro-

tection. Are Colorado, California, Montana, or Utah any less important than South Dakota? I think not.

Have the national interest groups gotten so powerful—and let me say, when we are talking national interest groups, I will let everyone in on a secret. It is the Sierra Club. Have the national interest groups and the Sierra Club gotten so powerful they can prevent Senators from standing up for the safety of people in their own States?

I note that the groups that oppose this amendment are very important and powerful, but until now I did not think they were powerful enough to shut down the Senate. I understand why the authors of the amendment would not want to pull their amendment because their States are on fire and in danger of being on fire. Given all the important matters funded in Interior, given that \$5.9 billion in drought assistance for fire suppression money, I do not understand why we cannot vote. Substantively or politically, what is more important than assistance to prevent fires and assistance for drought-stricken ranchers? It is clear to those who follow the Senate, there is bad politics for some who may not want to vote.

I appreciate some activists do not want this passed—that is their right—but we are not obliged to skip votes because an outside group does not want to see a vote on it. They have their right to voice their opposition on the amendment, but they should not have the power to stop the Senate from voting. That is a shame. This matter should be resolved in the way it should be resolved, with a vote; move to table and vote up or down. I think Senator CRAIG's effort to prevent forest fires is worth the Senate's time.

We have lots of forests the size of New Jersey. Firefighters and innocent citizens in South Dakota are protected. But Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, and Missouri should be, too.

I plead with those objecting to voting to permit us to do what the people have sent us here to do.

Before I conclude, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an editorial from yesterday's Wall Street Journal. It says the Democratic leadership is:

... now blaming Republicans for stalling the appropriations bill. In fact, the bill would clear quickly if he'd just hold a vote on the Craig amendment. But the Majority Leader knows a vote would force his party either to side with Mr. Craig (thereby alienating greens), or repudiate forest cleanup (thereby alienating voters this fall). We think it was a famous Democrat, JFK, who once said that to govern is to choose.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

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

DASCHLE'S BURNING SENATORS

If you want to know why Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle can't get a spending bill for the Interior Department passed this year,

look no further than his home state's Black Hills.

Those South Dakota mountains are at the center of a growing political debate over forest fires. All summer Senator Tim Johnson, also a South Dakota Democrat, had been taking heat from the state's rural communities for allowing green groups to stymie forest cleanup, a recipe for fires. So in July, to give Mr. Johnson a boost in his tight reelection fight against Republican John Thune, Mr. Daschle slipped a rider into a bill exempting his state from the very environmental regulations he'd long championed.

It took about a nanosecond for Western Senators, their own states in flames, to seize on this flip-flop and demand equal treatment. Idaho Republican Larry Craig offered an amendment to the Interior bill that would enact much of President Bush's new fire plan, as well as a South Dakota-style legal exemption for 10 million at-risk acres of forestland. Mr. Daschle—now trying to get back in green good graces—has tried twice to close Senate debate without considering Mr. Craig's amendment, and has lost both times.

And no wonder. This year's fires, and Mr. Daschle's rider, have become an enormous political liability for Western Democrats. They've had to explain to angry constituents why Chainsaw Tom was allowed to save his state's forests, while theirs were left to burn. And, with 6.5 million acres in ashes and more than 25 people dead this year, none of them want to oppose Mr. Craig's much-needed forest cleanup plan. California's Dianne Feinstein and Oregon's Ron Wyden, both Democrats, had even been trying to work out a compromise with Mr. Craig.

Mr. Daschle is now blaming Republicans for stalling the appropriations bill. In fact, the bill would clear quickly if he'd just hold a vote on the Craig amendment. But the Majority Leader knows a vote would force his party either to side with Mr. Craig (thereby alienating greens), or repudiate forest cleanup (alienating voters this fall). We think it was a famous Democrat, JFK, who once said that to govern is to choose.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The Senator from Montana.

FIREFIGHTING FUNDS

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I rise today to address this third vote on closure on the Byrd amendment directing the replenishing of firefighting funds for the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

This vote really hinges on our desire to get drought relief to the West.

In my opinion, that is not what this debate is about. Drought relief has already been agreed to almost unanimously by this body. In other words, there were 69 votes for it. There is strong support in the Senate. I am a strong supporter for that relief.

What is happening here is the majority is saying it is our way, or the highway. America's farmers and ranchers know that is not the way we do business, or get business done. Solving problems takes compromise. I worked with the majority to get the ball rolling. I worked with the administration to get the ball rolling. We worked with the administration and the other side—not only the other side—for release last