

care lobbyist who asked not to be named, "Whatever that trigger is, just say it will never be met."

In other words, pretend like we are going to do something and make sure it never happens. Talking about other things we read in the newspapers, here is a quote from Mark McClellan, the head of FDA, who says, "These Members are out of touch with the realities of keeping our drug supply safe, and the clear and present dangers to America's supply of drugs that their bill would create."

Madam Speaker, let me ask Mr. McClellan a rhetorical question: How many Canadians are dying, how many Europeans are dying, and then tell me who is out of touch.

The problem is that if we do not put some real teeth into whatever we do, the drug companies will figure out how to get around it. They say later in the article that even if lawmakers turn to Canada to soothe concerns about safety, the drugs Americans want to buy may not be available. Several drug companies, and they include Eli Lilly and Co. and Wyeth, have decided to curtail sales to Canada anticipating that Congress could enact importation legislation.

Madam Speaker, that is called antitrust and that is why 22 Members of this House sent a letter last week to Attorney General Ashcroft, and I would like to read the letter. It says, "Six major pharmaceutical manufacturers have moved to restrict supply of prescription drugs to Canadian pharmacies and wholesalers. It is obvious that these actions are an attempt to prevent American consumers from accessing affordable prescription drugs. This action is putting lives at risk in the United States and Canada.

"Americans should not have to wait for States' attorneys general to enforce antitrust laws. Therefore, we request a thorough investigation by your office. If any pharmaceutical companies are found in violation of antitrust laws, the Department of Justice must take all available steps to correct this injustice.

"We must not allow pharmaceutical companies to abuse American consumers, and place lives at risk, by illegally manipulating supply."

Madam Speaker, this was signed by 22 mostly senior Members, including some of the highest ranking members of the Committee on the Judiciary. The American public now knows the dirty little secret, and that is American consumers pay the world's highest prices even though they are world's best customers for prescription drugs. If this Congress produces a bill that is filled with obfuscation, manipulation and pretending that we deal with the issue of affordability, well, as we say out in rural America, that dog will not hunt.

HONORING OUR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor the courageous men and women that have served our country. It has been over 2 years since our great Nation was attacked on September 11, 2001. That day, and every day since, we are reminded that our freedoms are protected by the men and women in the United States Armed Forces. These individuals have given their sweat, blood and sometimes their lives to protect our freedoms.

Today, American servicemen and women from the mountains of Tora Bora to the deserts of Iraq are, once again, in harm's way protecting and defending our freedoms all over the globe. I am standing before Members today with a deeply felt sense of gratitude and pride that these men and women in uniform are defending our Nation. In 2002, there were 25.6 million living veterans, and over the course of this country's history, more than 12 million servicemen have sacrificed their lives to defend our freedoms.

I want to take a moment to highlight the Latinos and other minorities that have contributed to the peace we have enjoyed for so many years in our country. According to the latest U.S. Census figures, there are 1.3 million living Latino veterans, with more than half residing in California, Texas and Puerto Rico. Many have fought and defended the United States during World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the first Gulf War, and now in Iraq. There are 41 Latinos that have received the highest Congressional Medal of Honor award, 11 were awarded for their bravery during World War II, a war in which as many as 500,000 Latino soldiers fought bravely for the U.S.

We honor our Nation's veterans, we must honor our brave men and women who are currently serving in Iraq, and as of today, 382 members of our U.S. troops have lost their lives.

In particular, two of my constituents have lost their lives. One is Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores, and I display his photo, and Private First Class Jose Casanova, Jr., and I want to tell my colleagues about these fine young men. Lance Corporal Francisco Martinez Flores was not just a brave and self-sacrificing Marine, but he was a loving son, a brother, a friend, and someone who lived in my district who was outgoing and was the eldest of his four siblings who immigrated to this country at a young age. He was not even a U.S. citizen. He was one of the first soldiers killed in Iraq. He was granted citizenship posthumously. That is great that we can do that, but we have so many other soldiers like him who are serving our country who are not being granted the opportunity to become citizens. They are not asking for U.S. citizenship when they sign up, they are asking to be there to support us and defend our country.

I am asking Members of Congress to help appeal to the Senate and to this

administration to grant the opportunity for over 37,000 U.S. soldiers just like this young man here who died and gave his life, and many others that are currently there in the line of battle protecting us, asking you to support them to have citizenship within a 2-year process. Instead of 3, 2 years, to grant them the opportunity if they have siblings or a wife or spouse, to also have an opportunity to become fully-fledged participants in our society. We do not ask our own kids to go to war, but we ask folks who represent us in our districts. We should do something for them as well, especially as Veterans Day nears, that we pay a tribute and honor to these young men and women, who all they want to do is look for a better life in our country, who look for a future, to become law enforcement officers, custodians, teachers, and government officials, but their lives are cut short defending us in the line of duty, something that they took as an oath of office to serve and defend our country. Let us remind ourselves of those many soldiers serving us now. I urge the Senate and other Members of Congress to support legislation to give citizenship to legal permanent residents.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise again this week as part of Washington Waste Watchers, a Republican effort dedicated to bringing the disinfectant of sunshine into the shadowy corners of the wasteful Washington bureaucracy. We are here to show the American people how Federal agencies need to be held accountable, for they routinely lose huge portions of taxpayer-funded budgets to waste, fraud and abuse.

This week, let us talk about the Department of Education. Today America's schools face a number of challenges. The Democrats have said time and time again that the answer is simply more Federal money, more Federal spending. Unfortunately, that is simply not true. Congress has already dramatically increased Federal spending for education. According to the Office of Management and Budget, from 1994 to 2002, funding for the Department of Education grew by a greater percentage than any other cabinet-level agency, number one. Yet test scores have either stagnated or actually declined. The problem is not how much money the government spends, the problem is how government spends the money. Unfortunately, much of the money that we spend on education is not going to the children. Enormous sums of the American people's hard-earned tax dollars intended to help teach our children are lost in waste, fraud and abuse.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, let me just give you a few examples. Over a 3-year period, just one executive director of a Head Start program received over \$814,000 in salary and bonuses. One of those years he received over \$343,000, more than the Secretary of Education, more than a four-star general, more than the Vice President of the United States. This same Head Start program leased this government employee a Mercedes-Benz SUV for \$600 a month, in part with Federal funds. And Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

This compensation is being paid with Federal funds that are intended to help 3- to 5-year-old school children. While this administrator's salary could pay for the education of 50 Head Start kids, the program he administered was over \$1 million in debt. And Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. I would just remind the gentleman from Texas that all these facts he is throwing out happened to have taken place at a time when the President of the United States and the entire United States Congress was controlled by Republicans.

Mr. HENSARLING. Reclaiming my time, actually during 1999, I believe President Clinton, a Democrat, was President of the United States. That brings up a greater problem. Frankly, there is a Federal bureaucracy that is out of control, and Republicans are trying to do something about it.

To continue, in 1999, the Department of Education made a number of improper payments, during the Clinton administration, I might add, including about \$125 million in duplicate payments to 45 different grantees, \$664,000 in duplicate payments to 51 different schools, and a \$6 million double payment to a single school. What accountability. And Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, over a 3-year period, from 1999 to 2001, during the Clinton administration, the Department of Education wasted almost one-half billion dollars, enough to pay for 194,000 extra Pell grants, increase the charter school program by 80 percent, or double the amount given to States to keep schools free and clear of drugs. \$450 million wasted. And Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few examples of the types of waste the American people are paying for. When you look at the reports, it is easy to see that many other Federal programs routinely waste 10, 20, even 30 percent of their taxpayer-funded budgets, and have for years. In the real world when people lose this much money, they are either fired or they go to jail. But in Washington, it is simply an excuse to ask for even more money next year.

If we care about our children, we will begin to measure success by focusing on the outputs of education, test scores and the realization of students' potential, and quit measuring success by merely focusing on the inputs, money thrown at the problem. There are a thousand ways that we can save money in Washington without cutting needed services and without raising taxes on hardworking families as the Democrats propose. Because when it comes to Federal spending, it is not how much money the government spends, it is how the government spends the money.

MEDICARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, people from around the world come to America for their medical care. Yet Americans are forced to go and travel around the world to get their medications. Right now the Medicare conferees are trying to devise a drug benefit for seniors and for Medicare. Just yesterday, the Newark Star-Ledger reported a \$400 billion benefit would barely make a dent in the \$2 trillion that seniors are expected to pay for prescription drugs over the next decade. Last week, Boston University came out with a study showing that, as constructed, the pharmaceutical companies would make \$139 billion in additional profit under this prescription drug bill.

I know some very smart people wonder why the public gets cynical. Why would you be cynical about the fact that you would barely get a dent in the drug benefit for senior citizens, yet the pharmaceutical companies would walk out with \$140 billion more money? I do not think the public is cynical at all. I think they are quite sophisticated. They do not think we are doing our work around here, and they have a good reason to think we are not doing our work around here. They are suffering under staggering increases in drug costs that are going up for seniors on average about 30 to 40 percent a year for the most important drugs that they need for their blood pressure, their heart, rheumatism, arthritis; yet we have a benefit that would accrue a greater benefit to the pharmaceutical companies than to the seniors.

Some are now talking about capping, cutting the cost of Medicare growth, but refuse to take on the subject of making medications more affordable. Anybody who has been around there knows that the number one issue affecting our seniors is the affordability of prescription drugs. We are talking about cutting Medicare, we are talking about increasing the profits of pharmaceutical companies, we are talking about barely making a dent in the cost to seniors; yet we will not address the issue on the table that seniors are asking us to address, which is the issue of

affordability where they one month to the next month see their drug prices go up 18, \$19 for the same medication, and nothing different has happened.

Pharmaceutical companies do a good thing. They come up with lifesaving drugs. I took some of those medications when I was in the hospital for 8 weeks. They do good work. They get rewarded handsomely. They get a tax credit on the front end for research and development. They have control over the patent laws affecting the pharmaceutical products. They have the taxpayers' funding, the National Institutes of Health, \$10 billion a year on drugs and medications. I think the taxpayers have been unbelievably generous to a good industry, and I want them to develop new medications; but I want it at competitive prices. If we are about to expand Medicare to the tune of \$400 billion, we owe the taxpayers the decency and the common courtesy to get them the best prices we can. Not the most expensive prices, the best prices.

We have a proposal, 88 Republicans, 153 Democrats joined in a bipartisan fashion. Governors of both parties, mayors of both parties are looking at it, which is to open up the market, bring competition to the pricing of medications and bring that choice and availability to consumers. People today, 2 million Americans are going over the border, grandparents and grandfathers, to get the medications they need that are lifesaving medications. The system we have here where Americans now subsidize all the research and development of these lifesaving medications, we have the distinct honor to do what? To pay the most expensive prices in the world. As my great aunt used to say, Such a deal.

We ask our elderly to pay premium prices when the poor starving French and Germans and Italians and Canadians and Dutch and British are paying 30 to 40 to 50 percent cheaper for cancer drugs, blood thinning drugs, heart drugs, rheumatism, arthritis, diabetic drugs. We funded the research to give them these lifesaving medications, and their government stood up for them and got them decent prices.

What are we asking for? We are asking that our American consumers get the same competitive prices so you do not see the disparity when it comes to a pharmaceutical product for blood pressure. Americans are paying 50 percent more than the people in France or in Germany. And it is based on the free market. I have never seen so many protectionists on the Republican side in my life who refuse to accept the notion of the free market and the principle of the free market.

In Illinois, my Governor did a study showing that of the \$340 million we spend in the State of Illinois for pharmaceutical products for employees and retirees, the State of Illinois could save the consumers and the taxpayers \$91 million. The New York Times noted of the study, not only could you save