

□ 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

\$91 million, they noted that the Canadian system is far safer than the system we have here to guarantee the safety of the products sold. The issue is safety. When somebody tells you that it is about safety, it is not about money, folks, when they tell you it ain't about money, it is usually about money. That is the case. That is what we are dealing with. We are dealing with a product about money.

The other day Eli Lilly, now that we have demystified the notion about safety, Eli Lilly's CEO said that the whole issue related to here is about having the research and development dollars. The taxpayers have been funding the research and development for the last 20 years. They have been quite generous.

I would ask my colleagues and those who are meeting now in the conference to give the taxpayers and our grandparents a break, give them the medications they can afford rather than going into hock to try to do it and become drug runners and coyotes going over the border to get the medications they need to save their lives.

GAME PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, the United States embassy in Beirut was bombed. Sixty-three were killed; 120 were wounded. In 1983, the U.S. Marine barracks were bombed in Beirut. Three hundred troops, nearly all United States troops, were killed. In 1988, Pan Am 103 was bombed; 259 were killed. In 1993, the World Trade Center was bombed. Six killed, 1,000 injured. In 1996, the Khobar Towers was bombed. Nineteen U.S. soldiers killed, 240 injured. In 1998, the U.S. embassy in Kenya was bombed; 361 were killed, 5,000 injured. And in 2000, the USS Cole was bombed in Yemen. Seventeen sailors were killed and 39 were injured.

In those seven attacks, more than 1,000 people were killed. This was double our losses in Afghanistan and Iraq at the present time which total roughly 435. Yet during those seven attacks and after those seven attacks, there was very little response from the United States. As a result of those attacks, we withdrew from Lebanon in 1983 and from Somalia in 1993. I believe that this conveyed a very clear message to those who believe in terrorism. The message was this, that when attacked consistently over time, the United States will back down, will lose its will, and, of course, these attacks then led up to 9/11.

Following the loss of more than 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001, we finally took a stand. The overwhelming majority of us in this body gave the President the authority to move aggressively against terrorism. We knew that this was hazardous. Sometimes we

get the impression that we did not really know what we were doing. Yet I for one, and I think many people here, assumed that there might be some biological and chemical attacks against our troops, that taking Iraq was going to cost at least thousands if not tens of thousands of lives. Yet the results were remarkable. We gained control of Afghanistan and Iraq in a few months, and we lost less than 500 troops. I would say that a military accomplishment of this kind is pretty much unprecedented in military annals.

We also knew that securing the peace is always difficult. After World War I, after World War II, Kosovo, it was not easy at all; and it took a long time, and there was loss of life. Yet statements emanating from the Congress that we should pull out, that we should bring the troops home, that this war was created to boost the President's numbers, reading letters from those who have suffered loss or are discouraged, stating there is no plan for reconstruction, all encourage terrorists to believe that if they persist that we will fold, that we will lack the will and the resolve to win the war.

To not see this through is to dishonor the memory of every soldier lost and to render meaningless their families' suffering. To not see this through will leave Iraq open to Saddam's return and a betrayal of Iraqis who have helped. I am sure this is one thing that they all fear. It happened after the Gulf War. Many Iraqis who extended themselves to help the United States and allied forces suffered retribution. I think in the back of their minds is the idea that maybe this will happen again. The only satisfactory solution is to win. To lose will invite ever-increasing terrorism, and I think most people in this Chamber understand that.

To achieve victory in the swiftest possible manner with the least loss of life, this country and this Congress needs to stand united. We did so for a period of time after 9/11. This was the most encouraging period of my short tenure here in Congress. Because what I saw was that party loyalties and personal ambitions were put aside. I think the overwhelming motivation for everyone in this body was to simply serve their country the best that we could. Unity of purpose and a collective will to win will prevail. Division and second-guessing and finger-pointing and politicization will only serve to prolong the struggle and cause further loss of life and suffering.

From my perspective, failure is not an option. I hope the Congress can pull together. The threat is as real today as it was on 9/11.

HONORING NOVATO FIREFIGHTERS

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor the memory of

firefighter Steve Rucker, a resident of Novato, California, and to wish the speedy recovery of three other Novato firefighters: Captain Doug McDonald, Shawn Kreps, and Barrett Smith.

These four men were among the dozens of firefighters from my district who sped to Southern California to fight the recent fires that burned hundreds of thousands of acres. Yesterday I stood alongside Officer Rucker's colleagues, firefighters and police officers, and watched the mile-long procession that carried his casket down Highway 101 from the airport in Santa Rosa to his beloved city of Novato. My heart was filled with emotion as I watched the great sadness this community felt, the sadness and grief that comes with the death of a family member. But lingering in this grief, there was also pride, pride in recalling the life and heroism of one of their own.

□ 2000

These four firefighters served the Novato fire protection district. Novato is a prosperous place, a family town that touches San Francisco and reaches into the golden coastal hills. But the warm sun of Indian summer never lulls Novato firefighters. They know that the days before the rains come are the most dangerous time of the year throughout all of California. They also know that firefighters throughout the State are members of one large community, and when help is needed anywhere, they respond. So it was that without any contractual obligation, but out of compassion and comradeship that Shawn Kreps drove Novato fire engine 6162 all night a week ago Monday to join the fire lines at the Cedar fire more than 400 miles away. And so it was that Steve Rucker, Doug McDonald, Shawn Kreps, and Barrett Smith found themselves Wednesday on a back road 5 miles from the rural village of Julian, fighting to protect a scattering of homes.

Fire can be a fierce and swift enemy, and when flames suddenly threatened to engulf the men, all they could do was run for their lives. Steve Rucker did not make it. Apparently the intense heat of the fire seared his lungs, and when Captain McDonald went out to look for his friend, he too was critically burned.

Fortunately, Kreps and Smith suffered minor injuries, and I expect they will have many fires to fight in the future. Captain McDonald, however, remains hospitalized with serious burns, the wounds of a hero. My prayers go out to him and to his family.

It was too soon for 38-year-old Steve Rucker to leave this earth. He left behind a loving wife, Cathy; a 7-year-old daughter, Kirsten, a 3-year-old son, Wesley, and a home he had just built. His friends in the department knew Steve as "the Ruckster," a cheerful, enthusiastic man ready to joke and laugh, a man they could count on to be a calm and competent firefighter and paramedic, a man who loved his job. He