

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REDUCING THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago I came to the well of the House, and I said that the FDA had declared war on American consumers. Now the battle is joined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share a brochure, a little brochure that my staff and I have put together. On the cover it says, "If we want to allow Americans to keep and spend over \$600 billion during the next 10 years, here is a good place to start." Then at the bottom you have a picture of some pharmaceutical capsules.

Then if you open the brochure, the second page says, "That is right. According to the CBO," that is congressional language for the Congressional Budget Office, they are our official bean counters, "According to the CBO, American seniors will spend over \$1.8 trillion." By "seniors" they mean only those people who are 65 years of age or older. So over the next 10 years, the CBO tells us that seniors alone will spend over \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs.

Now, a conservative estimate, not done by me, but by experts who are a whole lot smarter than I am, a conservative estimate would be that we can save 35 percent by allowing free markets to work. Again, I am not particularly good at math, but 35 percent times \$1.8 trillion works out to \$630 billion.

Here we have a chart. This is the latest chart. I have actually had in the last 4 years four different charts. I do not use my own numbers, although we have actually done our own research to confirm that these are very accurate in terms of the average prices that Americans pay, and these are some of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States.

Let us start right at the top, a drug called Augmentin. Here in the United States, according to the Life Extension Foundation that has been doing research on this for more than a decade, the average price for a 30-day supply in the United States is \$55.50. That same drug sells in Canada for about \$12, and it sells in Europe for an average price of only \$8.75. There are differences in the value of currency, but the net ef-

fect is that Americans pay that much more for the same drug.

Look at another drug, a drug made by a German company called Bayer. We usually call it Bayer, Bayer Aspirin. Cipro became real popular last year when we had anthrax here in these buildings, because it is one of the most effective drugs for things like anthrax. But Cipro in the United States sells for an average of \$87.99 for a month's supply. In Canada it sells for \$55.53 cents, and in Europe, in Germany, where they make it, they sell it for \$40.75.

The list goes on. Let me talk about a drug called Coumadin. My 85-year-old father takes Coumadin. Fortunately, because he worked for a union all of his life, worked as a union worker all of his life, under his contract he has prescription drug coverage, so it does not cost him \$64.88, which is what it costs the average American consumer in the United States if they do not have prescription drug coverage; \$64.88 in the United States, \$24.94 in Canada, and only \$15.80 in Europe.

The list goes on. This is reflective, and it goes on and on and on.

Down here, I put a famous quote by one of my favorite Presidents, President Ronald Reagan. He said, "Markets are more powerful than armies." At the end of the day, you cannot hold markets back; but unfortunately, that is what is happening in the United States.

Now, I have no qualms with the big pharmaceutical industry in the sense that they ought to be able to sell their drugs for what they want to sell them for. But they should not be allowed to hide behind the FDA to do it. So I do not say shame on them as much as I say shame on us. It is we the Congress, we the policymakers here in the United States that have allowed these disparities to happen.

Finally, we are having a big debate right now about tax cuts, how much should we give in tax cuts. Is it going to be \$625 billion or \$535 billion or \$375 billion?

Tax cuts are great, particularly at a time when the economy is soft. But if we really want to help seniors, if we want to lower prescription drug prices and allow Americans to keep and spend \$630 billion of their money over the next 10 years, let us open markets now.

Finally, it just says simply Americans deserve world-class drugs at world-class prices. All we are asking for is open markets. All we want is what German pharmacists have the right to do, and that is buy drugs where they can get them the cheapest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to one of my heroes. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) held a hearing last week, and it was one of the best hearings I have ever participated in.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman covered the issue very well.

I just wanted to make one comment, and that is that some of the pharmaceutical companies, like SmithKline of

England, are going into Canada and saying if you sell pharmaceutical drugs in the United States for the price that you are paying in Canada, which is about one-fourth or one-half of what they are here, we are going to cut you off. They are doing that in a bullying way.

I do not think pharmaceutical companies should say to a country, you cannot sell those drugs in the United States because it is the same product that in America we are paying two or three times for it. It makes no sense to me.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely right. What is being done by some of the big pharmaceutical companies is nothing short of shameful. I also say shame on us.

I said the other day that Teddy Roosevelt must be rolling in his grave, the Republican President who believed in breaking up the trusts, in enforcing competition, because he understood, as President Reagan understood, that markets are more powerful than armies.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to live up to its responsibilities. It is time for Congress to allow Americans to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1036

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1036.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

WINNING THE ECONOMIC WAR AT HOME

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there are two major stories in the news. There is one that we see daily, and that is the story of the war in Iraq. The other story we hear little about, and that is the economic war right here at home.

Last month the Pentagon announced we will be sending another 100,000 troops to Iraq, and our hearts are with them. They are putting their lives at risk for us. They deserve our support. But last week the Associated Press reported that an even greater number of people, 108,000, lost their jobs, as U.S. companies dealt with the battered economy right here at home. These Americans also work every day to support the ideals of our Nation and the work ethic. They deserve our support.

It is also ironic to note that prior to the Pentagon's recent deployment, there were already 300,000 troops in the vicinity of Iraq. In February, according to the Associated Press, businesses here at home shed almost as many

jobs, 357,000 more than previously reported; and yet this morning, President Bush announced his opposition to the unemployment extension that we attempted to get here today in the budget resolution, calling it "objectionable" in the statement of administration policy.

We are hearing lots of plans about aid to flow to the Iraqi people, including food and medicine. This is aid that must be provided. But while the United States Army also takes on the role of humanitarian assistance in a military zone, the Salvation Army here at home is facing a swelling need for services and a downturn in donations that have led to an unprecedented lack of food for people in our own economic war zone.

The Salvation Army in my own hometown has seen a 42 percent increase in requests for assistance just this year. At the start of the fiscal year last October, our Women, Infants and Children food program reported the highest level of participants ever; and nationally we have the highest number of participants in the last 5 years.

Just since January 2001, America has lost nearly 2 million more jobs. In Toledo, my hometown, military spouses are showing up at the Women, Infants and Children feeding offices because their husbands have been called up for active duty, cutting the income of families by drastic amounts.

□ 1830

The Cleveland Plain Dealer last month told us, at a pantry in Columbus's west side, a 67-year-old retiree gets groceries to help feed a daughter and a granddaughter who moved in with him last year. He remembers relatives telling of bread lines during the Great Depression. He never imagined he would see himself in one, let alone wait in one.

There is no doubt that the United States is the freest and most bountiful Nation on earth. That is why people want to come here. But do we not owe as much to hardworking Americans as we do to war-torn Iraqis? Do we not need to build our economic might here at home as much as our military might abroad? Do we not need to plan as much for our economic-torn economy as much as we do the Iraqi war-torn economy? Do we not need a coalition of allies with labor and management for job creation and economic improvement as much as we need a coalition of military forces in the Gulf? If we can provide money to airlines who are claiming they are being hurt by the war, should we not also provide an additional 26 weeks of unemployment benefits to airline workers who are the real victims of the slowdown?

Military war, of necessity, is receiving most of our attention of late, but how about the enemy within? The economic war here at home? It seems to me that the weapons of war may be more visible when they are used, but the damage of an economic war is just as real for individuals and families and

communities that are suffering here at home. Our State is over \$4 billion in debt. Our mayor, he is broke. It just seems to me that our news ought to talk a little bit about what is happening here at home.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the second war that we are in on our home soil gets equal attention in the media.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS FAILING IN ITS DUTIES TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO PROVIDE FUNDING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is still not doing its job on homeland security. It is failing in a very, very elementary manner. The way it is failing is that it is failing to give the tools that our local communities need to prepare an adequate homeland security plan and procedures in our towns and in our cities.

It is very sad to say that where the rubber meets the road on homeland security, and that is in our cities and towns, this administration and the majority party in this Congress are not giving our cities and towns the tools they need to do the job. The sad fact is, the Federal Government is not cutting the mustard when it comes to helping our cities and towns prepare their police departments for terrorism, prepare their fire departments for terrorism, prepare their emergency response plans for terrorism. The job is simply not getting done.

Now, we had a little bit of good news today out in the State of Washington. The city of Seattle will be receiving about \$11 million to help with some of their plans. But unfortunately, all of the cities and towns around Seattle are not getting help from the Federal Government, and they need it.

I will give an example. The town of Bothell, Washington has and will spend over \$200,000 this year on their homeland security plans to deal with terrorism, from buying gas masks to training for their personnel. Over \$200,000, Mr. Speaker, and no help from the Federal Government. The city of Monroe will spend over \$45,000. The city of Monroe is not the largest city in the whole country. They are not getting help from the Federal Government. Mountlake Terrace, a small town in my district, they are spending \$2,400 on gas masks, just one little tiny element for their expenditures, together with overtime for their officers, no help from the Federal Government. The city of Edmonds is spending \$145,000 for homeland security, a significant figure for overtime, for training of their personnel, and over \$30,000 of training of their fire department for hazardous materials training, no help from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, where is the help of the Federal Government for Edmonds to deal with terrorism training, for Bothell to deal with gas masks, for Mountlake Terrace to deal with overtime, for Edmonds for their HAZMAT training? Where is the help for our cities that the Federal Government should be giving to these local communities? It is not getting done. The reason it is not getting done is that this Chamber and the other Chamber are not passing the appropriations that should be passed to help these local communities.

Now, on this floor last week, we in the minority party made an effort to increase the appropriation and supplemental budget to get help to Edmonds, to Mountlake Terrace, to Bothell so that they can prepare an adequate homeland security response. And we wanted to boost, by \$2.5 billion, help for our first responders, for our police and fire departments. But unfortunately, the majority party stymied that and would not support these increases in our plans to deal with homeland security.

I think it is important to point out the reason for that. The reason that this bill did not pass to help these local communities is that the majority party thought it was more important to give the folks at Enron tax breaks in their multibillion-dollar tax package than it was to give the city of Edmonds help for gas masks, the city of Bothell help for overtime for their police departments.

We believe in the Democratic Party it is more important to help these local communities deal with the threat of terrorism as a first job before giving these tax cuts, a predominant amount of which goes to the wealthiest Americans in the country. We believe that, because the city of Edmonds has a job to do for the people they represent, and that is to do an adequate job to get ready for potential terrorism. The city of Bothell has that responsibility. The city of Mountlake Terrace has that responsibility. We are going to continue working on this until we get this job done, because Americans are entitled to know their local communities have responded with as much vigor as we are seeing in Iraq from our very, very proud, honest, and effective military personnel today serving in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that folks will join us in this effort, because our local communities need the help of the Federal Government.

IMPORTANT TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

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

HONORING OFFICER CHARLES CLARK, A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many times we come, sadly,