

Nation from future attack, and support the recovery of New York.

The bill provides slightly more money than requested by the House bill, as our committee utilized the time available to conduct a series of hearings that addressed many challenges in our homeland defense efforts, and that is one of the reasons for the differences between the Senate bill and the House bill.

In addition, hearings that begin today by the Intelligence Committees may generate additional requirements for moneys in this bill to ensure the effective cooperation by our intelligence and law enforcement agencies in our homeland defense.

Most importantly, the bill provides funds vital to sustain military operations in the war against terrorism.

Our bill meets the commitment made by the President and the Congress to the victims of the September 11 attacks.

This bill enables the Transportation Safety Agency and the Coast Guard to perform and expand their mission to ensure the safety of American travelers and trade.

I endorse the increases provided in this bill for the Transportation Security Agency, the Coast Guard, FBI, INS, FEMA, and several other categories.

While these amounts exceed the level requested by the President, we believe the funds are needed by those who undertake these difficult and dangerous jobs. These are people who deserve our support.

In addition, the bill responds to the serious needs overseas as we try to support the President's efforts in the war on terrorism and to work for peace in the Middle East.

The \$250 million for the Middle East peace effort matches the House-reported level and sends a very important signal to our ally, Israel.

The \$100 million included in this bill for the fight against AIDS in Africa is very deserving. We are informed that some Members may advocate an even higher level for this item.

Finally, I personally appreciate that the full \$16 million sought by the President for Indonesia is included in this bill. Senator INOUE and I have recently returned from a trip to Indonesia, and we know firsthand the needs of that country.

For all of these reasons, as I have stated, I recommend the Senate advance this bill to a conference with the House as rapidly as possible. There are several issues I hope the Senate, in the conference with the House, will see fit to modify in the bill.

We have in the bill section 2002 that mandates that all nondefense emergencies must be so designated by the President at the same time. I don't believe that provision is necessary, but I am not going to oppose it.

Section 1102 of the bill makes the Director of the Office of Homeland Security subject to Senate confirmation. I

have joined Senator BYRD in seeking Governor Ridge's testimony before our committee. I further believe that position would be strengthened by a structure and a director with authorities defined in the law, as this amendment would provide.

Hopefully, an acceptable agreement can be reached over time between the Congress and the President on the issue of that office.

In the defense chapter, I regret that the authorities sought by the Secretary to respond to unforeseen requirements in working with our allies were not included, but the provision in the House bill, section 312, will be in conference and will be debated there quite heavily, I am sure.

The bill doesn't include the \$100 million sought by the Army and included in the House bill for a new initiative to destroy our stockpile of chemical weapons. This is another matter that we will have to address in conference. It is just a matter of how we can find the money to do all of these things at the same time.

I welcome the Senate proceeding to act on this bill today. It is my hope that we will reach an agreement on all first-degree amendments being filed today. There is no reason the Senate should not complete its work on this bill as rapidly as possible and be able to go to conference this week.

As soon as we complete this measure, we can turn to the fiscal year 2003 bills, and I remind colleagues that we have 13 separate bills to enact before the end of September. I hope Senators will assist us as members of this committee and reserve amendments that are more appropriately addressed in the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills and not raise them on this supplemental.

As of today, we have only 117 days remaining in this fiscal year. There are very few days to take the initiatives that would be required to complete the 13 bills, and there are very few initiatives that can be realistically accomplished in that time, other than proceeding with our 13 bills.

Mr. President, I commend the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor. I thank him for his cooperation and kindness to me and to our staff in the consideration of this measure. It is a bipartisan measure. I am pleased to be in the Chamber with Senator BYRD to urge the Senate to complete action on it as rapidly as possible. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have heard for weeks, if not months, how

important this legislation is. This is an emergency bill, an emergency supplemental. It deals with terrorism. The title of the bill is the supplemental appropriations act for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States.

In spite of its emergency nature, nothing is happening. There are no amendments being offered. We are doing absolutely nothing on the floor. I have spoken to the majority leader and I will confer with the two managers of the bill. At 3 this afternoon, or thereabouts, when the party conferences end, there should be Senators present, whether from the majority or the minority. We are going to move to third reading. If someone does not want us to move to third reading, they will have to object.

This is an emergency bill, the supplemental appropriations act for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States. If someone doesn't like something in this bill, try to get rid of it. I heard speeches the day we recessed that Members didn't like certain provisions in the House bill. Well, move to get rid of them. Let's not sit around in the Senate doing nothing.

I hope the White House will call those Senators with whom they have a line of communication and tell them what they don't like about the bill. The President has indicated how important this bill is. Let's move it. We are ready to move it. This afternoon we are going to move to third reading. If Members do not want to go to third reading, come and object.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I also ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in morning business.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS FOR MEDICARE

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, let me read a few recent comments from the media, always a jaded and cynical bunch, but in this case let's hope their pessimism is wrong. Our senior citizens certainly pray that it is.

From the National Journal, May 25:

It is becoming increasingly unlikely that Congress this year will approve compromise legislation providing prescription drug benefits for Medicare recipients.

The Wall Street Journal, June 3:

President Bush and Congress are unlikely to agree this year on a promised Medicare benefit for prescription drugs.

World Market's Research Centre, May 20:

Neither party wants the other to be seen by the electorate to have found the solution. Blocking the other's proposals will continue to take precedence in the run-up to November.

Cox News Service, June 3:

Slim chances for agreement on prescription drugs.

And the L.A. Times:

Few on Capitol Hill think . . . they'll produce a bill this year.

Columbus [Ohio] Dispatch:

Time is running out. . . .

The legislative year effectively ends when lawmakers leave for the August recess.

Madam President, I could go on and on. There are dozens of articles like this, but I think you get the idea. Hardly anyone thinks we are going to do anything serious about prescription drug costs and prescription drug coverage. Let us pray they are wrong—that they are not right. But if the past is prologue, that is exactly the partisan blame game that smells up this place sometimes.

I am interested in doing something now. I want results, not a campaign issue. Time is running out, and I hate to tell you but some people want it to run out. That is their game. They want to shuffle and slouch and go through the motions while the clock does run out. That is why I think I am going to bring a calendar in here, and just like we count the shopping days left until Christmas, I am going to count the days left until the August recess.

It would look just like this: 39 days left. I don't think we are going to do anything today—another day shot.

Madam President, I know some may call that undignified. I hope they do. I would like to get the meaning of dignity into this debate, into this discussion. I will tell you what is undignified—an old woman with trembling hands, trying to cut a pill in half so her medicine will last a little longer. I will tell you about losing dignity—an old man proud and self-sufficient all his life, admitting in whispered tones to his pharmacist: I didn't know it was going to cost that much and I sure don't want my check to bounce. I'll come back later.

I will tell you what undignified is—a couple who have lived together for 55 years, using coffee grounds from the day before to stretch it further because mama has to have her medicine.

So I don't want anybody talking to me about the loss of dignity, not in this debate.

By the way, there is a difference between what is undignified and what is obscene. What is obscene is making an 18.5-percent profit margin—more than four times that of all other industries—and raking in that kind of profit on the backs of our seniors.

I will tell you what is obscene—the giant pharmaceutical companies spending three times more on advertising than they do on research. Their ads are everywhere. How many times do we have to watch that woman who has—got to go, got to go, got to go?

What is obscene is having 650 lobbyists to make sure we keep shuffling and slouching—650 lobbyists. That is more than one for every Member of Congress.

There are towns in Georgia that do not have that big a population. I live in one.

I will tell you what is obscene—these lobbyists each make an average of over \$12,000 a month. That is three times more than what an average school-teacher or a registered nurse makes. We talk about predatory lending, predatory lenders—what about predatory businesses that protect their bottom lines at the expense of millions of people who cannot afford drugs they have to have?

I know we have been told we are going to take this up sometime—sometime this summer, sometime after hate crimes, sometime after this bill, sometime after another bill, sometime later. There is an old country saying. Probably nobody in this body has ever heard it, except maybe the senior Senator from West Virginia and the two Senators from South Carolina, somebody like us who has been around chickens in the yard and knows about setting hens. There is an old saying that goes like this: I hear you clucking but I can't find your nest.

It means I hear you talking, but I don't see any action.

I will tell you this, I don't want to be associated with any political party that cannot comprehend the urgency of this stark need of our seniors; that is unwilling to take some risks and that is unwilling to compromise to get some results. If we fail to get some results on this issue, we should be so ashamed that all incumbents going into November—Democrats and Republicans alike—should have to go around with a paper sack over their heads like sports fans sometimes do when they are embarrassed by their team's performance.

We have to do something and we have to do something soon, Madam President, and I know you share those desires.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3557

(Purpose: To strike section 1004 of the bill)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, Senator STEVENS and I have an amendment to strike section 1004 of the bill. This section serves to cap the amount of loan guarantees that would be available to the Nation's airlines for the duration of the current fiscal year. The section also caps the total amount of loan guarantees available through the life of the program. These loan guarantees were first authorized in Public Law 107-42, the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, which was enacted to bail out the airlines just 11 days after the tragedies of

September 11. The committee included the provision capping the volume of available loan guarantees for the sole reason of reducing the overall cost of the bill as determined by the Congressional Budget Office.

The CBO estimates that section 1004 of the bill serves to lower the total cost of the bill in fiscal year 2002 by \$393 million. A similar provision was included in the House version of the supplemental. There has been a lot of concern voiced by various Senators, to me and to Senator STEVENS and especially Senator HOLLINGS, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce.

And the concern has been that the effect of this provision would especially be heavy on US Airways and other airlines. But that particular airline is hopeful it might receive a Federal loan guarantee in the current fiscal year. There may be reason to question whether any sizable new loan guarantees will be executed by the stabilization board within the current fiscal year, but it is not the desire or intent of the committee to work a hardship on US Airways or any other airline. US Airways is the principal air carrier serving my own State.

Madam President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 3557:

Strike section 1004 of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, that should read: the amendment as proposed by Mr. BYRD, on behalf of himself and Mr. STEVENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so reflect.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I am in support of the amendment offered by Senator BYRD for himself and for me. I ask that it be adopted. I understand the Senator from Arizona would like a rollcall vote. I have no objection to that. We join him in that request.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3557.