

And, furthermore, I was thinking about this. This bill, if we want to call it that, is asking basically for me to say to my children, I am going to go buy a new car, but, Mr. Banker, when I borrow the money from you for that car, I am only going to pay the interest on it. And when my children become 21, send them the bill for the car. Or I am going to buy a house, but, Mr. Banker, I am only going to pay the interest on it. Send the price of the house, the money that I borrowed to buy the house, send the bill for it to my children when they get to be 21.

We are not against tax cuts. We had in our budget a \$250 billion piece. That is a pretty sizable sum. But let me tell my colleagues how irresponsible I think this is and how far the American people are ahead of us on this. When they have got an \$800 billion tax package that has got something for almost every citizen in this country in it, and they cannot sell it and they cannot override it, they know it is irresponsible. The American people know that it is irresponsible, and that is why I am glad the President did what he did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has expired.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is really humorous tonight to listen to this debate. For 40 years the liberal spending Democrats had majority in this House. When I got here, in 1994, we had a \$5 trillion debt. Now, they had control of spending for 40 years. How did we get a \$5 trillion debt?

For 40 years they did not mind spending out of the Social Security Trust Fund for every kind of program they could think of. They did not worry about balancing the budget then. They did not worry about paying down the debt. Now, all of a sudden, they are worried about it. That is very, very funny. Very strange.

Well, our plan, the Republican plan, sets aside \$1.9 trillion, 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus money, to protect Social Security. One hundred percent. What are they setting aside? Twenty-seven trillion dollars is going to come into the Federal Government over the next 10 years. What is wrong with allowing the American people to have \$792 billion back of their money?

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, all time has expired on the minority side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I say to my friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who has asked several times why we do not move to override the veto, that he knows as well as I do the very simple fact is that we do not have enough Democrats to go in with the

Republicans to raise the two-thirds majority necessary to give the American people the relief from the marriage tax penalty, relief from the death tax, and relief from so many of the other taxes that we have.

I think, too, that the Members on the other side are well aware of the fact that we have got locked away, as the gentleman from Kentucky just said, locked away sufficient dollars from the Social Security surplus in order to more than repair Social Security, more than take care of the problems that we are facing in Medicare. Indeed, it would be irresponsible to be spending that money, and that is why we passed the lockbox legislation, and that is why we have this in our budget, that was passed by the House, in order to prevent this type of spending.

But putting all this aside, and Members can say anything on this floor and it goes out like it is the truth, but the facts and the figures are there and they are there for all of us to see. But what I want to see is what is going to happen now next week as the spending bills, the appropriation bills, come to the floor. Are my friends on the other side of the aisle going to vote against them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that they will. Will the President veto them because we do not spend enough? I suggest that he will. And I wonder, when he does that, and as they vote and explain their votes on the other side of the aisle, how they will explain how they are saving this money for Social Security and saving Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PHIL ENGLISH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Phil English, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

PHIL ENGLISH,
Member of Congress.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

□ 1830

NATIONAL MONEY LAUNDERING STRATEGY FOR 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the provisions of section 2(a) of Public Law 105-310 (18 U.S.C. 5341(a)(2)), I transmit herewith the National Money Laundering Strategy for 1999.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1999.

PRESIDENT CLINTON VETOES TAX RELIEF PACKAGE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton vetoed the much-needed tax relief package passed by this Congress. President Clinton has permanently cemented his legacy as a tax raiser and sworn enemy of tax cuts.

By vetoing this legislation, the President is denying the average middle-class family relief from the marriage tax penalty. The President is robbing millions of workers the opportunity to obtain health insurance benefits who cannot afford to do so now. He is making it more difficult for parents to save for their children's education. He is making it more difficult for people to pass on the family farm or the family

business after a lifetime of toil, sacrifice, and devotion to building a great enterprise. The President is making it more difficult for people to save for their future and provide for their own retirement.

This vetoed tax relief legislation would have been a step toward more fairness in the Tax Code and it would have reduced the burden on people who are carrying the load, paying the taxes, and trying to live the American dream.

This veto is irresponsible and dangerous. Once again, Government wins and the taxpayer loses.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME-DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-330) on the resolution (H. Res. 300) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week the Office of Personnel Management announced that premiums for the Federal Employees Health Plan would increase by 9 percent next year, the third straight year of large increases.

On January 1, Medicare managed care plans in this country planned to drop 395,000 senior citizens from their plans. Last year 400,000 were dropped. Most of the remaining plans are curtailing or terminating prescription drug benefits.

Those are the numbers. Here are the stories.

Last month I received a letter from a 71-year-old widow in Sheffield Lake,

Ohio, who had taken a part-time job to help pay for her prescription drugs.

Until United Health Care pulled out of her county and left her without a health plan, she had some drug coverage. But just one of her medications, lipitor, absorbed most of her entire benefit.

I recently spoke with a woman in Elyria, Ohio, who spends \$350 out of her \$808 a month Social Security check on prescription drugs.

What is the common thread here? The high cost of prescription drugs.

Prescription drug spending in the U.S. increased 84 percent in the last 5 years. We have spent \$51 billion in 1993. Last year we spent \$93 billion.

According to the Office of Personnel Management, two factors caused the steep FEHB premium increases. One of those factors is technology. The other is the mushrooming cost of prescription drugs.

According to GAO, HCFA, and market analysts, one of the key reasons Medicare HMOs fail to turn a profit and drop so many seniors is they underestimated how much it would cost to cover the cost of prescription drugs.

I receive letters every day from seniors who cannot stretch their Social Security check far enough to cover prescribed medications. Some of the increased spending derives from expanding use of prescription medicines. But according to most analyses, two-thirds of the increases are attributable to price inflation.

The American public is right to wonder why is Congress not doing something about that. The simple reason is our threats from the drug companies. The drug companies say, if you do not leave drug prices alone, we will not produce any new drugs anymore.

I believe it is time that we use market forces, by that I mean good old-fashioned American competition, to challenge that threat. We can introduce more competition in the prescription drug market and still foster medical innovation. We need information from the drug companies to go explore industries' claim that U.S. prices are where they need to be.

The bill I introduced today, the Affordable Prescription Drug Act, lays out the groundwork we need to do both. Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place in the United States for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices under the Clean Air Act are one example, this legislation would establish product licensing for essential prescription drugs.

If a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no resemblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug companies to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic companies could then sell competing products before the brand name patent expires, paying the patent holder significant royalties for that right. The patent holder would still be amply re-

warded for being the first in the market, but Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices when there would be two or three or four sellers in the marketplace.

Alternatively, a prescription drug company could in fact lower their prices, which would preclude the Federal Government from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, high drug prices come down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited detailed information on drug company expenses.

This is not some brand new, untried proposal. Product licensing is done in France. It has been done in Canada. It is done in Germany. It is done in Israel. It is done in England.

Let me leave my colleagues with this: Through the National Institutes of Health, American taxpayers finance 42 percent of the research and development that generates new drugs, 42 percent. The private foundation and State and local governments and other non-industry sources kick in another 11 percent. That means prescription drug companies account for half the money in research and development of new drugs.

The Congress has given drug companies generous tax breaks on the R&D dollars that they do shell out. And yet, we pay the highest prices in the world in this country, sometimes two or three or four times the price for prescription drugs that people pay in any other country in the world.

Drug companies, and luck for them, drug companies score a triple-double. Congress gives the drug companies huge tax breaks. Taxpayers pay most of the cost for research and development. And yet, the drug companies charge Americans the highest price in drug world. Go figure. Drug company profits outpace those of every other industry by at least five percentage points.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Congress to pass the Prescription Drug Affordability Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BALTIMORE REGIONAL CITIZENS AGAINST LAWSUIT ABUSE

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge a group of citizens in my district who are working hard to address an issue affecting every citizen in our State, lawsuit abuse.

Throughout my district and all over the greater Baltimore area, local citizens are volunteering their time and