

I am committed to making sure that seniors have the drugs they need to stay healthy without having to make painful choices between buying groceries or paying rent or getting prescriptions filled or even paying their utility bills.

As the Medicare issue continues to be debated in Congress, I have always supported what is best that I felt for working people of America. I understand that Medicare provides for so many who have provided so much to our Nation and continue to do so, and I believe sincerely that Medicare should have a provision to work with the pharmaceutical companies, to get discounts just as the discounts are received prior to the senior citizens turning 65.

In a study conducted nationwide, Advance PCS found that the average person over 65 fills about 20 prescriptions per year compared to about three per year for a person in their 20s. This study shows that average cost per prescription for a person in his or her late 60s is about 45 percent higher than the average cost per prescription for a person in their 20s. Brandeis University reported that the percentage of elderly spending more than \$3,000 annually on medication more than doubled from 1997 to 1999, from 3.7 percent to 8.6 percent. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that the over-65 population will increase by an average of 304,400 people each year between 2000 and 2005. According to Families USA, the average cost per prescription for seniors has already risen during that time in the past 8 years by 48 percent.

It is for these reasons that we must address the high cost of prescription drugs for our seniors. Unfortunately, legislation recently passed in this House does not entitle seniors to any particular drug benefit plan. Instead, the Republican-backed Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003 provides only a standard benefit and is merely a suggestion for what private plans might offer. This plan provides no assistance for prescription drug cost between \$2,000 and \$5,600 per year, and nearly half of all of our seniors have prescription drug expenses over \$2,000 annually.

Democrats know that the American seniors have waited long enough for relief from the Nation's skyrocketing prescription drug prices. Unfortunately, we are not giving our seniors an affordable and dependable plan with no gaps in coverage. Instead, the Republican leadership has chosen to hijack the democratic process yet again by blocking our party's attempts to provide a commonsense prescription drug benefit through the Medicare program. By shutting down opposition, rather than allowing an open debate, the Republican leadership is making it clear that they are afraid to compare their sham prescription benefit plan to the Democratic substitute. When the plans are put side by side, the American public sees that the Republican

plan fails to provide any substantive benefits. The public will see that their plan's benefits are so insignificant that it would not be worthwhile for many middle-class seniors to enroll. The Republican plan does nothing to curtail the exploding drug prices because of their ties to the pharmaceutical industry, and that is a matter of record that can be checked.

Providing affordable prescription drug coverage should be an issue that transcends partisanship. The American public should be outraged that the Republican leadership is playing politics with the health and well-being of millions of our seniors, and I hope the voters will remember their shameful abuse of power when they go to the polls next November.

CLEAR ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the tragic tale of a New York mother's brutal attack, why it should never have happened and what can be done now to ensure that it never happens again.

Mr. Speaker, just this past December, a man and woman were sitting in a New York City park when they were suddenly surrounded by a gang of young men. The gang kicked and beat the woman before dragging her along the nearby railroad tracks, forcing her into woods where they threatened to kill this 42-year-old mother of two and repeatedly raped her. Mr. Speaker, it was a vicious, shocking, horrific crime. But, Mr. Speaker, it was a crime that should never have happened.

□ 1915

That should have never been allowed to happen in the first place. The reason it should have been prevented is that the five males charged with carrying out this heinous act were living in the United States illegally. Even more unbelievable, four of them had criminal pasts and had been in the hands of law enforcement authorities, two actually having served jail time. But instead of being immediately deported, as the law says, they were released back on to the streets, back into our society, allowing them then to commit more crimes.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this is just one story of many stories, stories of crimes that should have been prevented, of victims that should have never been. These stories are a reflection of our immigration law enforcement system in our Nation that is badly broken and in need of immediate repair. It is a system that provides little or no coordination between Federal, State and local officials, is badly outmanned, and results in safe havens for common criminals who roam the countryside instead of safe streets for the law-abiding citizens who call this home, and needlessly and increasingly endangers the very

homeland security of the United States at a very critical time in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, today in America there are almost 400,000 individuals who have been ordered deported, but are instead hiding out in our communities. Of these, roughly 80,000 are criminal aliens, and I am not talking about running a stop sign, I am talking about violent criminals. That means there are 80,000 illegal aliens with criminal convictions that are on the prowl, thanks to our broken immigration system.

So what great force does our Federal Government provide to enforce the immigration laws of our Nation and account for the 400,000 illegal aliens with standing deportation orders, or the 80,000 of those who are criminal aliens? Just 2,000 folks who work for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, as they say in north Georgia, these folks have just got more than they can say grace over. These 2,000 men and women work hard, they are good people, but, as the numbers suggest, it is not a fair fight, and this is not a realistic goal, if we intend to enforce our immigration laws.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we got serious about fixing our sad immigration law enforcement system. This week, after much thought and work, I introduced the Clear Law Enforcement for Criminal Alien Removal Act. We are going to call it the CLEAR Act of 2003. It is a bill that would finally give assistance and motivation to those 2,000 agents in the field by granting local and State law officers access to data, clarification of the jurisdiction, and appropriate funding and training to help them. Finally, it gives clarification and teeth to the laws already on the books, and order and accountability to a system that has been lacking in much of that for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here, I believe, to finally insist that this country enforce the laws that are on our books. We are a Nation of laws. I believe that. I believe that is what makes America great. But for us to say that we are going to enforce our laws against 400,000 illegal aliens that are out there with deportation orders, or the 80,000 that are criminals, or the 4,000 that come from countries friendly to al Qaeda, or the 10,000 or so that are needed for questioning by our national security agencies, at a time when we are concerned about terrorists, we simply absolutely must do something about this, and the CLEAR law will do that. I encourage my colleagues to look at our bill and hopefully cosponsor it.

IMPACT OF THE BAKU-TIBLISI-CEYHAN PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to express my concern over the Baku-Tiblisi-Ceyhan pipeline, which is designed to transport oil from the Caspian Sea. This pipeline has been in the planning stages for years, but this year ground was actually broken for the pipeline in Azerbaijan. The proponents of this pipeline have touted its numerous benefits in recent years, but last month an Amnesty International report identified major problems that I would like to address this evening.

Amnesty International's report, Human Rights on the Line, is a thorough and convincing look at how large oil companies put the business of oil over the lives of those that stand in the way of its delivery. The executive director of Amnesty International, Dr. William Shultz, recently blasted the consortium, led by British Petroleum, that is financing the pipeline.

He said, "While BP claims to be socially responsible as the leader of the BCT consortium, it has essentially encouraged the Turkish Government to sign away its ability to fully uphold human rights."

Mr. Speaker, in contractual agreements between companies and governments, human rights should not be negotiable.

In their report, Amnesty International cited five main areas of concern with the pipeline project. They argue that the contract signed between British Petroleum and the Turkish Government, known as the Host Government Agreement, places the business agreement above human rights, and this agreement will violate the principles of human rights in five ways.

First, a land grab by the Governments of Turkey, Georgia and Azerbaijan along the route of the pipeline. Over 30,000 people who live in villages and farmland along the path will be permanently displaced without their having any input into the decision or receiving any compensation.

Second, little to no enforcement of health and safety legislation in each of the three host countries for the workers and locals that work on and live near the pipeline.

Third, the serious risk to the human rights of any individuals that protest the pipeline's construction. If the local residents protest the construction, they are likely to be brutally suppressed.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, all the water resources in the vicinity of the pipeline will be used for its construction. Local residents and their farms and livestock will face a severe water shortage as a result, and their water supply is also likely to be seriously polluted from the construction.

Fifth, the agreement that Turkey and British Petroleum signed actually creates an economic disincentive to uphold human rights. The text of the agreement states that Turkey has to pay compensation to British Petroleum for not meeting construction deadlines.

The Turkish Government would almost be forced to ignore the basic concerns of its population in order to meet deadlines set by the oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to bring the Amnesty International report on the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline to the attention of our Congress and our Caucus on Armenian Issues. We will ask the authors of the report to present their findings to the Armenian Caucus in the coming weeks.

This practice of sacrificing the things we hold dear for 10 to 20 years of oil cannot continue. How much of the environment are we willing to destroy? How many of our basic human rights will we continue to hand over to the oil companies?

Mr. Speaker, lastly, the U.S. Government, in my opinion, should certainly not provide any economic incentive for this pipeline until a thorough review of the human rights and ecological problems is completed.

GRANTING SALES TAX DEDUCTION ON FEDERAL TAX RETURNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1999 I began battling imposition of a State income tax in Tennessee. Our State spent 4 years debating the ability of government to levy new taxes and the meaning of tax fairness. The battle was long, and it engaged virtually every taxpayer in Tennessee. At the end of the day, those that supported the State income tax lost. Tennessee stood up and said enough is enough, and they rejected a massive tax increase.

Traveling through our beautiful State, I met people in city halls, people in coffee shops, and I gained tremendous appreciation for what those patriots must have felt when they dumped the tea into the Boston Harbor during the Boston Tea Party. I really continue to take heart in the way average citizens, people who have really never taken an interest in politics, the way they have become marching, sign-waving, horn-honking activists, and the way they have united against another tax increase.

With the defeat of a State income tax in Tennessee, I came to Washington prepared to work for legislation that would allow citizens of States without a State income tax the right to deduct the sales tax from their Federal income tax filings. Right now, if you pay State income taxes, you can deduct those payments on your Federal returns, but if you only pay sales tax, you cannot deduct it, and that is unfair.

The Nation's Tax Code effectively punishes States without an income tax, States like Tennessee, Texas, Florida, Washington, Wyoming and South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 53 million people that live in States that do not have a State income tax. That is nearly 20 percent of our entire population. I want to say that one more time. There are nearly 53 million people that live in States without a State income tax. That is nearly 20 percent of our entire population. And these people are being penalized every single year when they fill out their Federal income tax filing. All of these people have been or will be taxpayers, and they deserve tax fairness.

America's seniors would also be supportive of this effort. There are millions of seniors in this country. Many probably do not have a great deal of State income tax payments to deduct on their Federal returns, but they certainly have State sales tax payments. So the support is clear. There are millions of Americans in States across the Nation who want and deserve this deduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have made this a priority. I have worked very closely with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), and our majority leader the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). I have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on this issue, and I have taken every opportunity to talk to Members and work with Members on both sides of the aisle on this most important issue.

The sweat is paying off. Today the New York Times drew attention to this issue and pointed to this House's engagement on the effort. There have been articles in papers across Tennessee, Florida, Washington, and the list goes on and on. The word is spreading. We are closer than ever before to winning passage of a sales tax deduction, but the time is not here for celebration. It is time to put our noses to the grindstone and work to find the right vehicle for the sales tax deduction.

The momentum is building, and it is time for fairness for the people who live in States without a State income tax. They deserve this deduction, and it is time for them to have it.

GROWING CONCERNS ABOUT U.S. POLICY IN IRAQ

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, over the past few days and weeks, an increasing number of my constituents have contacted me to express serious questions and growing concerns about U.S. policy in Iraq. I, too, have questions, and I share their concerns.

For example, in the months since U.S. forces invaded Iraq, overthrew Saddam Hussein and his government, and gained control of the country, no weapons of mass destruction have been found, despite repeated assertions by