

gentleman is always very well focused and to the point in the points he makes. I do appreciate the point the gentleman makes, and I do also look forward to what will be a good floor debate and one that I think we will all enjoy participating in.

But if I might, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to indulge me, it has been brought to my attention that the gentleman from Michigan and, very likely, the gentleman from St. Louis, Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) might find some time, and I would hope very much, to get together Monday night to enjoy the Monday night football game. I have no doubt that one or the other will enjoy it more than one or the other, but I do wish the two gentlemen from Michigan and Missouri an opportunity to watch that game, perhaps together, put down their bets, and maybe just take one evening to have a little bit of good, relaxed companionship around a good sporting event. And we will be back to work with rigorous debate soon after that, but I do not think it hurts any of us to indulge ourselves in what is America's favorite full-time pastime.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan share more in common with their respective teams than the gentleman from Missouri; I only wish we had as great a success as the Rams this year. But I appreciate the gentleman's comment and I will take him up on it.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House join me in wishing my favorite nephew, Ryan, a happy 4th birthday on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICARE DRUG DISCOUNT SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to talk about a very important issue for American seniors and that is a Medicare Drug Discount Security Act that myself and Senator CHUCK HAGEL introduced some time ago.

The President of the United States recently announced his own plan that mirrored many of the things we tried to accomplish. We are very proud of our approach to providing seniors with discounts on prescription drugs. The President announced it in a ceremony at the Rose Garden and we were quite pleased that he had taken the direction by Executive Order. As many of my colleagues know, there was a lawsuit filed by the chain discount drugstores opposing the measure, and it resides now in Federal court.

One of the interesting mythical dynamics that followed the President's announcement was groups saying that it was nothing more than window dressing. It was smoke screen. It was political posturing. It would not amount to much. It is insignificant. It is immaterial. It is not necessary, nor is it helpful. We heard that from a number of groups and a number of citizen and senior advocates. We were quite shocked because we thought, in a free society, a free market economy, when you are able to leverage the number of people participating, thereby getting them a discount on the prices they pay, that is a pretty simple and superb way in which to get seniors discounts now.

□ 1245

Others have objected to the plan saying it was not a good scheme. I questioned at the time if it is such a bad scheme, why do millions of Americans sign up to be AARP members? Usually it is because they get a discount on motel rates and other things.

It was interesting, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, September 25, there was a headline, a new Kennedy campaign on drug cause, former House Member Joseph Kennedy, a Member of this body now in Boston, Massachusetts, has been using now and creating a drug delivery system under his Citizens Energy Corporation. This allows people to join together as members of that group in order to get a discount on prescriptions.

It is interesting, when a Democrat, Mr. Kennedy, announces the plan, AARP says, it certainly is needed, says John Rother, policy director at AARP, a senior citizens advocate group advocating a prescription drug benefit for Medicare recipients. It goes on to talk about the discounts people will be able to receive. It goes on to suggest in this plan that although Citizen Help hopes to target the needy, Kennedy says the group does not have an elaborate screening process. He assumes well-to-do people will opt to stick with private insurance plans which charge on average 5 to 25 copayment for the prescription.

That therein lies the political conundrum. When we announce it as Republicans, Senator HAGEL and myself, and the President enunciates it from the White House, it is met with skepticism, scorn, and outright laughter. When a Democrat announces the plan, it becomes the focal point of how to save seniors money.

Last year during the campaign season I remember Democrats taking a bus and taking seniors up to Canada because they could buy prescription drugs cheaper. Yes, I applaud that. I think it is great when you find a discount, even if you have to cross the border, but they used that as a political campaign and tool in which to defeat senators, by saying our seniors have to go to Canada to get a discount.

Our plan, on the other hand, now mirrored by former Member Kennedy allows people to get discounts here in their own country. They do not have to get on a bus, they do not have to travel to Canada, and they can go to their local pharmacies. They can go to their local plans and get these kinds of discounts.

So I would hope in the spirit of this wonderful new bipartisanship that has emanated out of this Chamber, since September 11 we get down to the business of helping seniors, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, get prescription drug coverage and get it more affordable, without creating a government scheme that will oftentimes be more complicated and more difficult for average seniors to access.

I salute former Member Kennedy. I salute AARP for making the positive comments about our plan. I thank him for introducing it in the community where I was born in Boston, Massachusetts, and I just hope other Democrats now listening to this and reading the newspapers will finally suggest that President Bush was right in announcing from the Oval Office, or at least from the Rose Garden, that he intended to help seniors today, not next year after debate, not the following year after debate, not 5 years from now when the political process winds itself up into a lather trying to provide it, but instead, doing it through the free enterprise system which Mr. Kennedy has done here in this plan.

I urge my colleagues to look at our bill, Senator HAGEL's in the Senate and

mine in the House. It is called the Medicare RX Drug Discount and Security Act. It is worthy of your attention. It will provide discounts up to 30 to 40 percent. It is easy. It is much like Price Club and Costco that so many Members probably use here today because they can buy in volume and buy at discounts. It is why people pay a card fee, \$25 a year, to belong to that club. It lets them shop, buy by volume, by discount, and that is what we are trying to achieve here today. It works in real life.

AARP has millions of members, using discount as an enticement. It has worked in the real world. It can work in the political world if the sides will not engage in negative attacks, but rather constructive dialogue in order to see this come to a fruition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FARM SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed an important measure that was part and parcel my reason for coming to the United States Congress. Today, this Congress passed a farm bill, meeting an obligation that comes upon us in this Chamber every 5 years to pass a measure that will protect farmers while making the right investment and contribution to conservation in America.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to tell the Hoosier farmers that I serve all across eastern Indiana that the Farm Security Act and the passage of that Act in this Chamber today ought to be a source of encouragement and enormous pride to them, not because we in this Chamber wrote a farm bill, but because in every sense, farmers and ranchers across the United States of America, for perhaps the first time, truly wrote farm policy in this country.

In the past 2 years the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a proud member, held field hearings with agricultural interests across the country, 47 hearings in all, in preparation of a farm bill. Hearings were held over a 16-month period of time on H.R. 2646. There were 368 witnesses who testified before our committee during that 16-month period.

The vision of the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), to ask commodity groups and organizations and farm groups across the country to come before our committee and actually offer their own version of a farm bill was, to say the least, visionary.

From my own part, we held nearly a dozen town hall meetings across eastern Indiana in barns and in warehouses and in feed stores, asking farmers who know much better than this Hoosier what ought to have happened in this bill, and they gave us that input. So the first thing I would brag about today is the job that the American farmer and the American rancher did in the preparation of the Farm Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, let us be candid, the passage today was not altogether certain. It was not altogether ensured, with some opposition from the administration to the timing of this bill, and even some opposition from the leadership in both political parties. Those of us who worked hard on this bill knew we had our work cut out for us.

People argued that with USDA projections that net cash farm income in 2001 will achieve record levels that we did not need a farm bill now. I would argue that given the realities of the farm economy and given the circumstances on the international scene now was precisely the time for the House Committee on Agriculture and the leadership of the House of Representatives to rise to the challenge.

Even the USDA's economists agree that net farm cash income is not a good tool to base farm policies on, that livestock receipts are the driving force for the increase in net cash farm income in 2001, and that affects very few of the farmers that I serve. The increase in crop production expenses more than offsets the increase in crop cash receipts.

Without a new farm bill this year, net cash returns from major field crops would be 5.8 billion lower for 2002 crops than for 2001, and the Farm Security Act that we passed today, of course, does not happen in a vacuum.

I know that some in the national media sneered at those of us who suggested that bolstering the farm economy in America was not a matter of national security. The Wall Street Journal's left column that I usually admire suggested as much earlier this week.

Let me say as we turn our attention in the weeks ahead to Wall Street and to stimulating our economy with a much-needed economic stimulus package, I believe the House Committee on Agriculture, the Democratic and Republican leadership on that committee and the leadership that voted to pass the Farm Security Act today said, before we turn our attention to Wall Street, let us turn our attention to rural Main Street. We have sent a deafening message of strength to the farm economy in America today.

It has been a profound privilege for me as a first term Member of Congress to serve as the only member of the majority from the State of Indiana on the House Committee on Agriculture. It has been a challenging time. I commend, again, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and

the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for their outstanding leadership in forging a bipartisan bill long before bipartisanship was the theme of this Chamber, and I commend all of my colleagues today for putting the interests of farmers and ranchers ahead of the politics of the moment and saying and recognizing that a strong rural America means a strong American economy, and now is the time that all of America be strong as we face the difficult challenges of the days ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CALL-UP OF THE RHODE ISLAND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 our world changed forever. The United States suffered an attack unlike any the modern world has ever known. Thousands have been lost and will be forever missed by their friends and families. As we mourn this loss, we must find ways to strengthen our national homeland defense and to prevent terrorism both here and abroad.

Critical to meeting this goal will be the brave and dedicated members of our Armed Forces. I rise today to pay my respects to these brave men and women, in particular, the dedicated members of the 143rd Airlift Wing of the National Guard who will be deployed today.

The National Guard has tirelessly served our great Nation since the organization of its first units in 1636 in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The Guard fought in Korea, Vietnam, and the Gulf War. During the 1990s, the Guard's role dramatically increased to a total force partner at home and throughout the world. Today, we are relying on the Guard in our airports and communities throughout the country to guard us from a recurrence of what was unthinkable just a short time ago.

Mr. Speaker, we have entered into an era in which homeland defense is a crucial concern for which we rely heavily on our National Guard. These remarkable people stand out among ordinary Americans because they have chosen to give of themselves and help defend our country in times of need.

Many of our National Guard units are being called up and asked to leave their families, jobs and lives behind in order to serve and protect this Nation. From conducting intelligence work to being deployed to high risk regions of the world, these brave men and women will