

I believe that Americans should pay their fair share of the cost of developing these miracle drugs. The pharmaceutical industry has done some wonderful things for us, the American people, and the people of the world, and I think we ought to pay our fair share. But we subsidize those companies in several ways. We subsidize them through the research dollars we spend here in Washington through the NIH. It will be about \$22 billion this year. We represent about 4 percent of the world's population. We represent 44 percent of the basic research dollars being spent, and that research is available to the pharmaceutical companies free of charge.

We subsidize them through the Tax Code. When they do this research, when they invest that money that they say they spend in research, they get to write it off on their tax forms, and in some cases they get a tax credit, so there is no cost to these companies.

Finally, we subsidize them in the prices we pay that are outrageously too high relative to the rest of the world.

No, Mr. Speaker, I think we as Americans ought to pay our fair share, but I am unwilling to continue to subsidize the starving Swiss.

We are going to have a big debate next week about prescription drugs and what we can do about it, and it is time we stepped to the plate and said there is one thing we can do right now with virtually no bureaucracy, with virtually no cost to the taxpayers, that will save American consumers upwards of \$60 billion a year, and that is open the markets.

If you believe in free markets, if you believe in NAFTA and GATT and TPA and all of that, if you really believe in free trade, then open up the markets, allow American consumers, working through their own pharmacists, that is my view, to go to markets, whether it be in Germany or Switzerland or Japan. For any FDA-approved drug in the United States made in an FDA-approved facility, you ought to have access to that no matter where it comes from. I will tell you what is going to happen. You are going to see the prices in the United States go down dramatically, and you will probably see prices in the other parts of the world go up a little but, but that is how markets work.

One of my favorite Presidents was President Ronald Reagan, and he said something so powerful 30 years ago: Markets are more powerful than armies. You cannot hold back markets, and you cannot have a situation where the world's best consumers pay the world's highest prices.

Not shame on the pharmaceutical industry, shame on us. We have a chance next week to do something about it. I hope Members will join me.

CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues concerns that I have with respect to the pursuits that we are now engaged in as relates to the issue of homeland security as well as the responsibilities of this Congress, and the issues that confront us on protecting the homeland and fighting terrorism.

Let me first begin with the understanding of the words from the Constitution of the United States of America. It is well known that the Founding Fathers, who came to this land to establish this Nation on the grounds of seeking relief from persecution, that they wanted a democracy. They wanted to have a Nation that would interact and have exchange between the people and as well the three branches of government. That is why we have the judiciary, the executive, and, of course, the Legislature, which is the Congress.

We do know that the President is perceived and noted to be the Commander-in-Chief, and we respect that. After the terrible tragedy of September 11, we recognize that we must stand united with the President against terrorism.

But let me share with Members in the Constitution the duties of the United States Congress. "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impose excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

In additional language it says, "To establish a uniform role of naturalization and other laws."

I am concerned that this Congress abdicates its responsibilities in this enormous responsibility of dealing with peace, dealing with war and dealing with fighting terrorism.

Just a few days ago, in fact over the weekend, there was a pronouncement that the President of the United States had signed an order of covert action against Saddam Hussein in Iraq. There was no debate, no discussion in the United States Congress, no discussion in the People's House. No one asked the question whether this was the appropriate direction to take this Nation on behalf of our children and the safety of this country.

I would venture to say that we know that there has been no documentation or little evidence of Saddam Hussein's involvement in September 11, but we know that he is a despot, a dictator, that he is doing harm to his people. We also know that he is not allowing the inspections to go on pursuant to the United Nations. But we also recognize that there is no substance there, as much as it was some 10 years ago. So is this a valid use of our resources with-

out the debate of the United States Congress?

Why not prioritize the Mideast and establish peace there. Look at the tragedies that are occurring in the Mideast, the loss of life. Are we going to divert resources to Iraq when we still have a problem in the Mideast and most of the Muslim world will not support us in going to Iraq?

What about alternatives? We already know the CIA has failed in some of the efforts they have made in Iraq. What about alternatives to going in and doing what has been ordered or suggested by the President?

And who will be with us? This is an important question that I think is enormously valuable for us to ask.

As we ask these questions, we can make a considered decision about foreign policy on behalf of the people of the United States. We have just found out that we are going to move swiftly on the Homeland Security Department. I support that, but I raise the question whether we should move swiftly in the body of the House with the committees of the House that have jurisdiction, so that when we formulate the Homeland Security Department, we have the input of representatives from around the Nation.

I am disturbed that the leadership of this House would narrow the initial or the finalizing of homeland security to a nine-person committee, although I respect that committee. I believe it is important that the committees of jurisdiction have intimate responsibilities in dealing with homeland security because we speak for the people of the United States.

So do not narrow it to a committee that is so small. Envision the utilization of the committees of jurisdiction, because there are particular areas of expertise. What should we do with the Immigration and Naturalization Service? We should make sure that we still have a body that allows people to access legalization, to be legal, because this Nation is still a place where people come for refuge and come for opportunity, and we must recognize that every immigrant or immigration does not equate to terrorism.

So when we talk about this Homeland Security Department, which should be open to the expertise of this House, we should not narrow and give up the responsibilities of Congress that are given in the Constitution, and that is, again, to take care of the defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is abdicating its responsibilities, and I call upon us to immediately get involved in creating a Homeland Security Department, but as well to ensure that decisions of war are made in this body and not independent of this body.