

2002 PHARMACEUTICAL CONTRIBUTIONS, BY PARTY—  
Continued

Rank	Organization	Amount	Democrats (percent)	Republicans (percent)
5	Pharmacia Corp .....	1,480,241	22	78
6	GlaxoSmithKline .....	1,301,438	22	78
7	Wyeth .....	1,188,919	17	83
8	Johnson & Johnson .....	1,075,371	39	61
9	Schering-Plough Corp .....	1,057,978	21	79
10	Aventis .....	954,349	22	78

Source: Center for Responsive Politics.

REGARDING REDISTRICTING  
HEARING IN HOUSTON THIS SATURDAY

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to call attention to the House to a racist piece of literature currently being circulated by the Harris County Republican Party to its e-mail subscribers. There is going to be a redistricting hearing in Harris County, Houston, on Saturday and so the Harris County Republican Party is right now e-mailing this information to all its regular subscribers. It says:

"She will be there to express her views. Will you be there to express yours?"

Who is "she"? She is the gentlewoman who is here with us right now, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE. There is a very nice colored picture of SHEILA, whom everyone can see is African American. SHEILA is one of four Democratic Congress Members from Harris County. The other three are white. One African American, three whites. Of course, the gentlewoman appears in this e-mail and there is no picture of GENE GREEN, who is white, there is no picture of CHRIS BELL, who is white, and there is no picture of NICK LAMPSON, who is white, there is only a picture of the one African-American Member.

And so what does it say? "She will be there to express her views. Will you be there to express yours? Reminder: Redistricting Hearing in Houston this Saturday." Then it gives the time and the place and the details. I would ask the gentlewoman from Houston, what does she think about this e-mail posted by the Harris County Republican Party on their Web site?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Obviously I think it is important that we all establish the fact that redistricting is a political process. That, in fact, our lines have been drawn by a duly organized and sanctioned Federal court, that we are in lines that have been re-approved by the voters of our respective districts and that this has not been done in the last 50 years, the re-drawing of district lines. I am delighted to be one of four colleagues in the Harris County area, but I am offended by the fact that my picture is

used to provoke members of the Republican Party to attend a hearing that happens to be in my congressional district. It is true that my district by the Republican plan offered by the Republicans of Washington will be a plan that literally destroys the 18th Congressional District, cuts it in half, takes out the heart of that district, the very birthplace of the Honorable Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, will be taken out of the 18th District. In fact, one of my good constituents says that the 18th does not need a bypass nor does it need heart surgery.

And so I do not mind in an open hearing anyone coming. It is an open hearing. But I am certainly concerned. What is the message of my face being utilized over my colleagues' faces? What is the intent of even putting up a picture? They might say, "SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, GENE GREEN, CHRIS BELL and NICK LAMPSON will be present. Will you be there?" That is a fair enough statement. That is a political statement. "The Democrats will be there. Will you be there?" But, no, in subtlety, not even the dignity of the name. I should sound a little bit modest. I would imagine there would be a lot of people who would not know who this is, but they know it is a black face. So maybe they are suggesting that a black person will be there to offer their views. Would you not want to run to the hearing so that you can offer yours?

I think this is a sad commentary. I believe and I hope that as I look at the Web page of Democrats and others who are working to get their constituents to this hearing that we will not stoop to this level. I want to simply say to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District in Texas, come out and have your voices heard. Come out and speak your views. You may agree or disagree with me. But I realize that those who want to be empowered will agree that this plan that they are putting forward does not help the people of the 18th Congressional District or the minorities who are represented in that district or the people that are represented in that district.

By the way, as the gentleman well knows, I represent a very diverse district and proudly so. People from all walks of life. But shame on the Harris County Republican Party. Shame on them for stooping to this level. Frankly, I am going to be reaching out and I am going to ask my constituents to call the Harris County Republican Party and ask them, do they not have a better way of communicating to the people a reasonable expression of soliciting their coming to this particular meeting.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentlewoman for her eloquent statement. I would only observe that this type of racist appeal is something that we saw in our State 20 or 30 years ago. I thought we had moved beyond that. I am ashamed for the State of Texas and I am particularly ashamed for the Har-

ris County Republican Party that they would stoop to racism in the year 2003.

FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Federal Government is so big and bureaucratic that it cannot do anything in an economical or efficient way. In fact, we read and hear about so many examples of waste of Federal money that we too often take it for granted or shrug our shoulders about it.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported recently that the Defense Department "couldn't account for more than a trillion dollars in financial transactions, not to mention dozens of tanks, missiles and planes." Listen to what this story said:

"Though defense has long been notorious for waste, recent government reports suggest the Pentagon's money management woes have reached astronomical proportions. A study by the Defense Department's Inspector General found that the Pentagon couldn't properly account for more than a trillion dollars in monies spent. A GAO report found defense inventory systems so lax that the U.S. Army lost track of 56 airplanes, 32 tanks and 36 Javelin missile command launch units."

This story, Mr. Speaker, was not based on reports from some antidefense group. It came from studies done by the Defense Department's own Inspector General and the General Accounting Office of the Congress. This comes on the heels of the Congress overwhelmingly voting for the biggest increase in defense spending ever. And now the Defense Department wants another mega-billion increase and a mega-billion supplemental appropriation, all taking place after we downsized the military by about 1 million troops and closed several bases. All of us want to support the military, but surely we cannot just sit around and allow such horrendous waste to continue.

Then there is the case, Mr. Speaker, of Eric Rudolph. The FBI spent untold millions and had hundreds of agents involved over several years in this manhunt. The FBI should be embarrassed that Rudolph was finally found by a rookie local small-town police officer who had only been on the force for about 9 months. And he found him in Rudolph's home area. We give far too much of our law enforcement dollar to Federal agencies which make only a very tiny fraction of the arrests, probably less than 1 percent. What we need to do is give far more of our law enforcement money to local police and sheriff's departments. They are the officers who are fighting the real crime, the street crime that people want fought.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, talk about waste, we have spent hundreds of billions, with a B, on our intelligence agencies over the last 10 or 15 years. We spend more on intelligence than all the rest of the world combined. We will vote to authorize even more spending on intelligence tomorrow. Yet during this time our intelligence agencies missed the coming down of the Berlin Wall; they missed, failed to predict, the breakup of the Soviet Union; they missed on 9/11. Worst of all, they missed or exaggerated on Iraq. Even the Weekly Standard, probably the most pro-war publication in America today said, "The failure to discover stocks of WMD material in post-Saddam Iraq raises legitimate questions about the quality of U.S. and allied intelligence."

Columnist Josh Marshall, writing in The Hill newspaper asked: "Did we have bad intelligence? Did political appointees dismiss good, but less threatening intelligence? Or was damning intelligence actually cooked up for political purposes? Those are all legitimate questions. But when Congress starts trying to get at the answers, we should be open to the more complex but in its own way no less disturbing possibility that at least some of the main proponents of this war were so consumed by their goal to crush Saddam and so driven by ideology that they fooled themselves as much as anyone else."

These are good, legitimate and very important questions. Another good question: Why did the National Security Agency find out "about the attacks of 9/11 by watching CNN," as reported by intelligence expert and author James Bamford?

□ 2200

This is an agency that we built a plush supertechnical \$320 million building for a few years ago at a cost of \$320 a square foot. Probably the most important question of all, why are we getting so little and so much of that for all these hundreds of billions of taxpayer money?

The standard response of all Federal departments and agencies when they are criticized is that they were underfunded. If they had just been given more money, this or that problem would not have occurred. These agencies, if anything, are overfunded, far more money than any company in the private sector. Our intelligence committees are filled with good people; but no one seeks to serve, much less is appointed, to the intelligence committees unless they are strong supporters of the intelligence community. Once they are on the committee, they are heavily courted by the intelligence agencies. So it will be very difficult for a member of these committees in either body to ask the really tough questions that need to be asked. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope for the sake of our own taxpayers and for the future of national security of this Nation that someone on one of the intelligence committees will start

asking the hard questions and demanding the truthful answers that our citizens deserve.

#### MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this evening on the east coast. It is 10 o'clock, and our schedule is such that in the House of Representatives tomorrow we should be debating on this floor a bill to provide a more modernized Medicare delivery system which will focus on the needs of those receiving Medicare, mostly seniors, senior citizens, and also those with disabilities, their needs for medication. And as I am speaking, one of the last to speak this evening, remarking on the particular needs that women have, women my age because I am in that category who live longer and perhaps have worked out of the home less because of the needs of caring for both children and sometimes elders, and, therefore, pensions and other means of having security and retirement are not quite as readily available. So this burden weighs heavily on me. As I speak this moment, deliberations are under way for the rules for which we will debate this legislation tomorrow, and we will see what comes out of our time together on the floor of the House tomorrow.

It is a momentous occasion because in my time of being a Member of Congress, having come to this place out of the health care field, having been a public health nurse for quite a few years in my community on the central coast of California, I have listened to my constituents in this new role of being their representative in the House of Representatives, the people's House, which by its very definition connects us to the citizens for whom we have this great opportunity and responsibility of being their voice here in the Federal Government to make sure that their needs and their inspiration and their motivations are heard.

So I take seriously when many folks in my congressional district tell me that they are the ones who are buying these medications because their heart ailment or their arthritis or their different chronic conditions are requiring them to take medications, that they really cannot afford these if they are retired or living on a fixed income because of Social Security requirements and also maybe their pension.

These are not exorbitant amounts usually. They do not consider themselves poor. They have worked all their life, done well really, the Greatest Generation is what many have called them; and yet they find themselves struggling at a time when they had looked to their government with the promise of Medicare, which they had seen there for their parents, this program that

was instituted in the 1960's, and they say why is it that I cannot pay for my medications? They are so expensive. I go one month and it is a particular cost, sometimes \$100 or several hundred; go another month and it has been practically doubled in price. It is terrifying for seniors who face perhaps hospital stays if they do not take their medication. The blood pressure shooting up, consequences and side effects to conditions that they want to control so that they can live independent lives, not to be dependent on their children or on others or on society, God forbid, having lived independent lives.

So I carry this burden to Congress, and I am proud of being part of a country that had the wherewithal and the mindset, first of all, to start the Social Security system so that we recognize that we really do want to respect the security needs of our seniors; and then when we recognized that health care was beyond the reach of many of them in the 1960's, we devised a plan. I was not here then, of course; but I saw that it made such an impact on citizens that I was working with and dealing with living amongst my own family members to see that Medicare could be there because the private sector, the insurance companies found that this population was hard to insure. These are the years when people need their medical doctors and their sometimes hospital stays and often medications to stay alive and to stay healthy, and Medicare has been a blessing because people are living longer. I think there is a direct connection.

Now we face this crisis. I commend this administration and this Congress foreseeing that this is a time that we must do something about this. But we now must do it in the right way. We have seen that a public provision is what is needed for Medicare. We must also make sure that we do not go off that track and try to privatize this one aspect of it. We have had that option, and that itself was rather an experiment to offer Medicare+Choice. A few years ago that became very popular. That has not worked in my area on the central coast of California, and it is rural.

I will wrap this up by saying that the decisions that we will make tomorrow will have tremendous ramifications, and we need to learn from the people we represent and listen to them and do what they have asked us to do, which is to keep this plan a public plan as it has been, provide the prescription medication in the way that we know that will serve their needs best.

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

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