

a massive March on Washington set for Tuesday, designed to pressure Congress into rejecting a permanent normalized trade deal for China."

Here is the quote that is startling, made by the minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR): "Seattle was a great success. We hope we will see a repeat performance."

Let me read to the Members the performance, for those who may have been napping during Seattle's excitement: "Unrest even at the top during riots. Madeleine Albright was trapped and angry. Janet Reno was calling." "The State Patrol Leaders Saw Trouble Brewing at Starbuck's. The Secret Service threatened to cancel the President's visit."

The headlines from the Seattle Times, the success referred to by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip: "Police Haul Hundreds to Jail. National Guard on Patrol. One Thousand Protestors Enter Restricted zones."

There were fires, there was looting, there was physical harm, there was destruction of property, interruption of business. "Seattle bill hits \$9 million. Seattle taxpayers will be hit hard in the wallet for hosting the World Trade Organization."

From CNN, "Seattle authorities have placed an around-the-clock curfew on the area immediately surrounding the world trade conference."

"President Clinton arrives in a city that has been marred by broken glass, tear gas, and rubber bullets."

"The PBC found out how security forces are beefing up in anticipation of President Clinton's visit: Police douse crowds with pepper spray."

Let me re-read for the Members the quote by the minority whip: "Seattle was a great success. We hope we will see a repeat performance."

I hope, I pray, that I am misreading the newspaper. I hope and pray that the performance that we are anticipating in the seat of our government, the Nation's capital, is not one designed to bring about disgraceful headlines about riot police, pepper spray, and destruction of personal property. I thought anarchy like that only existed in Third World nations, but if people disagree with a viewpoint on trade, if people disagree on human rights in China, their response is to riot in the streets and destroy property to get their viewpoint heard.

I think it is regrettable when the minority whip would say in glowing terms that anything connected with Seattle was a success.

I have had to endure for the past couple of months a conversation about our presidential candidate attending a university, and a peaceful conversation with students, and somehow he is linked now to a quote made by the founder of the university.

□ 1630

Now we are going to hear for weeks and weeks about a peaceful meeting

with students about a democracy and yet we are hearing again from the leader of the other side, or at least the minority whip, that somehow success is articulated by a total disaster.

Seattle has yet to recover from the public embarrassment of that meeting, and I would hope that the leadership will at least look at their statements and amend the record and suggest that we can have a disagreement on trade, and I hope we will have a debate on it. The President of the United States has called for a debate. The President has called for a conversation on trade. The President, I think, has been very willing to discuss some of the problems regarding workers' rights and violation of child labor and things that I think we in Congress can accomplish and can provide as we discuss normalized trade relationships with China, but I also pray that some level-headed conversation occurs to those who would come to our Nation's capital and understand we are a people of law, we are a people of respect for democracy and that violence will not and should not and cannot be tolerated.

So let us make certain that in this Nation that we love we do not repeat Seattle; that nobody refers to Seattle as a success; that if we have a grievance with the WTO that we not destroy our cities in the process and maim and injure people.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to reinforce what the gentleman is saying about protesters coming here with respect to the WTO. I would hope that in the city of Washington we do not have a repeat of what happened in the State of Washington. The gentleman is perfectly right, the gentleman is entirely right, we can disagree without tearing up our city, especially the Nation's capital.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for joining me in that admonition to those who would come here to be peaceful, respect the rule of law and respect personal property.

BLAME CANADA, BLAME CANADA

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Blame Canada, Blame Canada. It is the Oscar-nominated song from the movie South Park, Blame Canada, Blame Canada. It is also the latest defensive ad campaign by the pharmaceutical industry's front group, the so-called Citizens for Better Medicare. Frankly, both belong in the garbage.

In the movie, the mothers of South Park are revolted by the dirty words their children learn at the movies but instead of taking responsibility themselves, they blame Canada.

In the ads, the drug industry tries to divert attention from its discriminatory pricing practices but instead of taking responsibility themselves, they blame Canada.

The pharmaceutical industry ads are running in the northern border States and elsewhere in an effort to convince consumers that the Canadian health care system is bad because prescription drugs are cheaper for Canadian seniors than they are for American seniors.

So let me thank the pharmaceutical industry for making the point that they charge Canadian seniors far less than they charge American seniors for the same drugs from the same manufacturers in the same quantities. It is what we have been saying all along.

Does the innovation of Canadian pharmaceutical companies suffer under the Canadian system? No. Let me read just a few statements.

Here is a statement, and I quote, in the last 10 years the rate of growth in R&D spending by Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada, member companies, has almost doubled that of the United States. That is a statement put out on March 2, 1999, a press release from the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada.

In June of 1999, the same organization talked about the massive research efforts taking place across Canada, and in 1998, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada's innovative pharmaceutical companies funded an estimated \$900 million in medical research and development.

Since 1987 R&D spending by the PMAC member companies have grown by almost 700 percent, almost twice the growth rate of the United States in the same period of time. Yet, the pharmaceutical industry is trying to tell people in the United States that R&D will not happen in Canada because they are not earning enough money up there.

Yesterday my office received a call from the Canadian Embassy, and the Canadians are perplexed because they do not understand why U.S. companies are running TV ads trashing the Canadian health care system. Imagine what the Canadians think. The most profitable industry in the country is upset that they are not able to charge as much in Canada for prescription drugs and engage in the same price discrimination in Canada as they do in the United States.

Speaking of profits, I urge every Member to check out the latest Fortune 500 list which shows once again that the pharmaceutical industry is the most profitable industry in the country, number one in return on revenues at 18.6 percent, number one in return on assets at 16.5 percent, and number one in return on equity at 35.8 percent. One cannot do any better than that.

Even with all the attention on their price discrimination against seniors, the pharmaceutical industry continues to be the most profitable industry in the country, charging the highest

prices in the world to people who can least afford it, our seniors who do not have any prescription drug coverage on Medicare.

Studies show that seniors in this country pay 72 percent on average more than Canadians. We pay 102 percent more than Mexicans for the same drugs in the same quantity from the same manufacturer. Why do seniors have to choose between food and medicine?

Industry says, blame Canada.

Why do seniors have to cut their pills in half in order to take them?

The industry says, blame Canada.

Why do seniors have to go across the border to buy affordable prescription drugs?

The industry says, blame Canada.

Democrats in the House have two approaches. We have legislation to establish a Medicare prescription drug benefit to cover all seniors on Medicare. We have legislation which I have introduced which would provide a discount for all Medicare beneficiaries in the costs of their prescription drugs. We have legislation from the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) to make sure that drugs that are sold in Canada can be brought into this country and sold to American seniors at reduced prices. Our seniors continue to suffer from price discrimination. They demand a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is universal, meaningful and affordable but instead of bringing equality to its pricing structure all the drug industry can come up with is Blame Canada, Blame Canada.

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

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

ALL CITIZENS OF AMERICA SHOULD HAVE A VOTING REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to let the House know that a decision has been handed down in a consolidated case, the Adams case and the Alexander case, challenging the denial of full voting rights in the House and the Senate to the residents of the Nation's Capital and full self-government here. In a 2-to-1 decision, the court ruled that because the District is not a State it does not have the privilege that every other American citizen has of having a voting representative.

Mr. Speaker, this decision is on its way to the Supreme Court. I would like to note for the record the courageous lawyers who are appealing this deci-

sion, John Ferren, former corporation counsel who was in the case at that time; Charles Miller and Thomas Williamson of Covington and Burling who handled one of the cases pro bono; professor Jamin Raskin, who is responsible for much of the thinking that went into these cases, professor of the American University School of Law; and George LaRoche, who brought a separate case.

Judge Louis Oberdorfer will be remembered by history for his ruling that, indeed, the District of Columbia residents are entitled to voting representation in this House and that the rights involved are not rights of States but of the people who live in the States, that the reference in the Constitution to the States is a term of convenience not meant to deny any American citizen the right to voting representation on this floor.

In going to the courts, District residents signal that there has been a failure of the political process. I remember a failure of the political process when I was a school child in this town. The political process failed and that is why the District of Columbia was among five jurisdictions that went to the Supreme Court and finally got that court to declare that separate but equal was in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I trust that the failure of the political process here, the failure of the Congress to grant full voting rights to the residents of the District of Columbia, will produce a similarly favorable decision in the Supreme Court of the United States for the residents of the capital city.

Judge Louis Oberdorfer's wise and scholarly opinion raises our hopes that there will not be five justices of the Supreme Court in the 21st century that are willing to sign their names to an opinion that would deny voting rights in the national legislature to any citizen of the United States. One would think that no citizen on the planet would be so denied today.

At the very least, what this body should prepare itself to do now, pending a favorable decision of the Supreme Court or other action, is to restore the vote I won in 1993 for residents of the District of Columbia on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole. It would appear that at the very least, the residents of the District of Columbia, who pay full Federal income taxes the way the residents of other Members do, would be entitled to that respect.

I know that there are Members on the other side, because they have gone with me through the Committee on Rules, who also believe that the tax-paying residents of the District of Columbia should be recognized on this House floor to the maximum extent possible, and certainly that would mean a vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Meanwhile, there is an organization which has been energized to start energizing the country by these decisions.

It is called D.C. Vote, and my hat is off to D.C. Vote which is raising consciousness first in the District of Columbia and then intends to raise the consciousness of our country to what we know would not be condoned by the American people and that is that any people that pay taxes in this country would be left without their full representation in the Congress of the United States.

The ball now comes to the floor of this House. The ball comes to those with a political and a moral conscience, to those who serve in this House to make sure that the residents who pay taxes equal to the taxes their residents pay get from this House, from the people's House, the maximum in representation that the people's House can offer.

SENIORS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN FOOD AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about an issue of enormous consequence in my State of Vermont and for people throughout this country, and that is the outrageously high prices that we are forced to pay for prescription drugs. In Vermont, it is not uncommon for many people, including the elderly, to make the impossible choice about whether they buy the food that they need, whether they heat their homes adequately in the winter or whether they have the money to purchase the prescription drugs that their doctors prescribe.

It is not uncommon in that reality that American citizens are forced to cut their dosages in half or take a dose once every other day rather than what they are supposed to take because they simply cannot afford what they need to ease their pain, and in some cases to keep themselves alive, and this is an outrage. This is unacceptable.

Meanwhile, as the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has just indicated, the pharmaceutical industry remains the most profitable industry in the United States of America. In addition, not only are they raking in the profits, but it is not widely known but true, the pharmaceutical industry receives billions of dollars every year from the taxpayers of this country in order to help them with their research. The pharmaceutical industry receives billions of dollars in tax breaks from the people of this country.

What do we get in return? What we get in return is, by far, not even close, the highest prices for prescription drugs in the entire industrialized world.

Now we have heard a whole lot about Canada, and I will say more about it in a moment, but it is not just that the Canadians are paying substantially less