

through a group called United Seniors Association, but paid by the drug industry, spent \$3 million on an ad campaign thanking those Republican Members for passing it and thanking them for their concern for America's seniors. So the drug industry wrote the bill, the Republicans passed the bill, the drug industry gave money to the Republicans while the bill was being passed, and then the drug industry ran TV ads thanking the Republican Members and congratulating them on a job well done.

The Bush administration then, no surprise here, followed suit by claiming that seniors' best hope for drug coverage is the Republican bill.

Now, why is this? Why should the drug industry have this kind of influence here? Well, over the last 12 years, the drug industry's lobbying expenditures have increased 800 percent. In the 2000 election cycle, the drug industry contributed \$26 million to candidates running for office, the overwhelming majority of which to Republicans. The industry contributed \$625,000 to the Bush-Cheney inaugural. So far in this election cycle, the drug industry has contributed \$14.6 million in political donations, the vast majority of which to Republicans.

This may explain, Mr. Speaker, why the administration is working so hard for the drug industry, but it begs the question: Is what is good for the drug industry in the best interests of the American people?

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, WHO NEEDS IT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Homeland Security, who needs it? Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees the 9-11 tragedy confirmed a problem that exists in our domestic security and dramatized our vulnerability to outside attacks. Most agree that the existing bureaucracy was inept. The CIA, the FBI, the INS, and Customs failed to protect us.

It was not a lack of information that caused this failure; they had plenty. But they failed to analyze, communicate, and use the information to our advantage.

The flawed foreign policy of interventionism that we have followed for decades significantly contributed to the attacks. Warnings had been sounded by the more astute that our meddling in the affairs of others would come to no good. This resulted in our inability to defend our own cities, while spending hundreds of billions of dollars providing more defense for others than for ourselves. In the aftermath, we were even forced to ask other countries to patrol our airways to provide security for us.

A clear understanding of private property and an owner's responsibility

to protect it has been seriously undermined. This was especially true for the airline industry. The benefit of gun ownership and second amendment protections were prohibited. The government was given the responsibility for airline safety through FAA rules and regulations, and it failed miserably.

The solution now being proposed is a giant new Federal department, and it is the only solution we are being offered, and one which I am certain will lead to tens of billions of dollars of new spending.

What is being done about the lack of emphasis on private property ownership? The security services are federalized. The airlines are bailed out and given guaranteed insurance against all threats. We have made the airline industry a public utility that gets to keep its profits and pass on its losses to the taxpayers, like Amtrak and the post office. Instead of more ownership responsibility, we get more government controls.

Is the first amendment revitalized, and are owners permitted to defend their property, their passengers, and personnel? No, no hint of it, unless you are El Al airlines, which enjoys this right, while no others do.

Has anything been done to limit immigration from countries placed on the terrorist list? Hardly. Have we done anything to slow up immigration of individuals with Saudi passports? No, oil is too important to offend the Saudis.

Yet, we have done plenty to undermine the liberties and privacy of all Americans through legislation such as the PATRIOT Act. A program is being planned to use millions of Americans to spy on their neighbors, an idea appropriate for a totalitarian society. Regardless of any assurances, we all know that the national ID card will soon be instituted.

Who believes for a moment that the military will not be used to enforce civil law in the near future? Posse comitatus will be repealed by executive order or by law, and liberty, the Constitution, and the Republic will suffer another major setback.

Unfortunately, foreign policy will not change, and those who suggest that it be strictly designed for American security will be shouted down for their lack of patriotism. Instead, war fever will build until the warmongers get their wish and we march on Baghdad, making us even a greater target of those who despise us for our bellicose control of the world.

A new department is hardly what we need. That is more of the same, and will surely not solve our problems. It will, however, further undermine our liberties and hasten the day of our national bankruptcy.

A common sense improvement to homeland security would allow the DOD to provide protection, not a huge, new, militarized domestic department. We need to bring our troops home, including our Coast Guard; close down the base in Saudi Arabia; stop expand-

ing our presence in the Muslim portion of the former Soviet Union; and stop taking sides in the long, ongoing war in the Middle East.

If we did these few things, we would provide a lot more security and protect our liberties a lot better than any new department ever will, and it will cost a lot less.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE DRUG INDUSTRY ON THE WHITE HOUSE AND ON CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, more information comes out every day about the influence of the drug industry, both on the White House and on Congress, in terms of what kind of prescription drug plan we pass here in the House and in the other body, which is currently debating the bill.

I do not bring up the information about the links between the prescription drug industry because of any desire to defame them, but only because I am very concerned that their amount of influence that they exert here basically skews the dialogue and what we pass in a way that is not beneficial to the average Americans.

The bottom line is that Democrats in the House a few weeks ago, when the Republicans passed the prescription drug bill, were very critical of the Republican bill because it was basically giving money to private insurers in the hope that they would offer drug-only policies to senior citizens.

There was nothing in the Republican prescription drug bill that passed the House that would guarantee a prescription drug benefit for seniors. There was no guarantee, and there was no absolutely effort on the Republican part to address the issue of price, which is the main problem most Americans face now, that the price of drug continues to rise.

What Democrats said then and continue to say is that we need a prescription drug benefit under Medicare that guarantees the plan a benefit, a generous benefit, 80 percent of the cost paid for by the Federal Government, that guarantees that benefit to every American, or to every senior, I should say, to everyone who is eligible for Medicare, and that is basically under Medicare, an expansion of Medicare, and that addresses the issue of price by saying that the Secretary of Health and Human Services will basically negotiate for the 30 or 40 million Americans who are under Medicare to reduce price maybe 30 or 40 percent.

Now, the reason that the Democratic bill did not get a chance, and the reason the Republican bill, which is private subsidies for insurance companies, passed, is not only because the Republicans are in the majority, but because

of the influence of the prescription drug industry. They wanted a bill that provided a subsidy to the private insurance companies and not a Medicare benefit, and the prescription drug industry wanted to make sure that there was nothing in the Republican bill that would reduce prices.

I say that because more and more information comes out on a daily basis about the influence of the prescription drug industry. Soon after the House passed the Republican bill, the President released a study by the Department of Health and Human Services that basically said that the only way to go was to give money to private insurers; that a Medicare benefit and a program that controlled cost would actually hurt research and development of new drugs.

This was in *The Washington Post* on Thursday, July 11. It said, "The Bush administration plans to issue a study today suggesting that any new prescription drug coverage for older Americans must rely on the private sector to provide it, warning that too much government regulation could hinder access to promising new therapies. The report described effective drug therapies, and says that cost containment efforts would fail."

The bottom line is, who put out this report? We find out that the former vice president of policy for PHRMA, the prescription drug trade group, is in charge of Secretary Thompson's planning department. This is the same department that generated this study warning that a drug benefit delivered through Medicare would devastate R&D and harm seniors.

It is simply not true. It is because of the influence of the prescription drug industry, and even the policymakers in the White House that used to work for them, that now we have both the industry and the advertisements paid for by the prescription drug industry and the people at the White House coming out and saying, go to the private sector; do not do a Medicare benefit, do not control costs.

Now, by contrast to that prejudiced, if you will, study that came out from the White House, and essentially from former PHRMA people, Families USA did a report just last week issued on July 17. Their report showed that U.S. drug companies that market the 50 most prescribed drugs to seniors spent almost 2½ times as much on marketing, advertising and administration as they spend on research and development in 2001.

The report essentially debunks President Bush's recent assertion through that study of HHS, and the drug companies' claims, that rising and fast-rising drug prices are needed to support R&D. So if we look at the facts, we find out that it is not that the brand name drug companies need more money because they are going to do more R&D and come up with better drugs, it is because they are spending so much on marketing and advertising and admin-

istration, and also paying their CEOs very high salaries. That is the reason why they want the higher drug prices.

We must point this out on a regular basis.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

Captain Jeff Struecker, Chaplain, 3rd Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of my Savior, I lift up to You these men and women that You have selected to serve this great Nation. I pray that You would etch onto the souls of every man and woman here the awesome sense of responsibility for the office that they hold and the weight of that thought would drive them to their knees, every morning seeking Your leadership, as they lead this Nation, especially right now with America's sons and daughters at war.

I pray that You would also balance that serious sense of responsibility with the pleasure of knowing that they are serving as Your appointed leaders in the greatest Nation on Earth.

Father, finally I pray that You will protect those men and women who are right now involved with this war on terrorism. Give them Your peace, give them Your presence, give them Your protection. I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all

INTRODUCTION OF CAPTAIN JEFF STRUECKER AS GUEST CHAPLAIN

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to introduce Captain Jeff Struecker, Chaplain, United States Army, 3rd Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, Ft. Bragg, North Carolina. Chaplain Jeff Struecker was born in Fort Dodge, Iowa. He entered the Army as an enlisted soldier in September, 1987. He attended basic training, AIT, airborne school, and the Ranger Indoc-trination Program at Fort Benning, Georgia.

His combat experience includes participation in Operation Just Cause in Panama, Operation Iris Gold in Kuwait, and Operation Gothic Serpent, UNOSOM Two, Mogadishu, Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Struecker served in the United States Army as an enlisted soldier until April of 2000. Afterward he entered the Chaplain Officers Basic Course. While serving in Mogadishu, Somalia, Sergeant Struecker was involved in a 17-hour firefight which was later portrayed in the book and movie "Black Hawk Down." As a teenager, Jeff Struecker accepted Christ as his Savior. His faith was strengthened in Mogadishu as Captain Struecker recounted, and I quote, "In the middle of that firefight, I had to decide whether I believed what I say I believe. And when I finally answered that question, my faith became so strong, it gave me the strength to fight for the rest of the night."

Captain Struecker has received many awards and citations for his bravery, including the Bronze Star with the V device. He and his wife, Dawn, reside in Linden, North Carolina, with their five children, Aaron, Jacob, Joseph, Abigail, and Lydia.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have Chaplain Jeff Struecker as Chaplain today in the United States House of Representatives.