

Republicans may on occasion say they care about American families, but their actions expose their feelings. When offered the choice between making the rich a little bit richer or helping working families make their lives a little easier, Republicans pick the wealthy every time.

Madam Speaker, the budget process often forces us to make tough decisions, but if one asks me, the choices being made today are not difficult ones. Helping families so that they can do the best to make ends meet or enriching the wealthiest who do not even need our fiscal help is a no-brainer. In the same way that parents put the needs of their children over frivolous luxuries, it is time to adopt fiscal policies for this Nation that prove that we have our Nation's priorities in order, and that means, Madam Speaker, we need to work for hard-working families.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE HIGHER COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to speak about the issue of the higher cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

The gentlewoman who just preceded me who was talking about tax relief, I think I agree with some of the points she raised. When we talk about tax cuts, what we are really talking about is allowing people to keep more of what they earn. In soft economic times, I happen to believe it makes sense to allow people to keep more of what they earn.

As you see on this chart, which you can find on my Web site, we start by saying 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. It has got a picture of prescription drug capsules here.

The next page says, "That's right. According to the CBO," that is the Congressional Budget Office, "American seniors will spend over \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years on prescription drugs."

This is a conservative estimate. We are going to show you a chart in a minute that says that we could save 35 percent by allowing free markets to work. Thirty-five percent of \$1.8 trillion translates to \$630 billion.

Let me show you this chart. This is not my chart. I have a number of inde-

pendent experts around the country that have been working on this a lot longer than I have, they are a lot smarter than I am, but they have actually done some of the comparisons in terms of what we as Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to the rest of the world.

This is a chart by a group called the Life Extension Foundation out of Florida. They have been studying this for more than a decade. Here are some of the figures in terms of the prices we pay versus what Canadian consumers pay and what European consumers pay for the same drugs.

Let us look at the top right here. We have Augmentin. In the United States, a 30-day supply sells for about \$55.50. That same drug in Canada, made in the same plant under the same FDA approval, sells for \$12. In Europe it sells for \$8.75.

Cipro. We learned a lot about Cipro last year when we had anthrax here in the Capitol building. It is made by a German drug company called Bayer; we usually call it Bayer, Bayer aspirin. Cipro in the United States sells for \$87.99 for a 30-day supply. That same drug in Canada sells for \$53.55. Over in Germany it sells for \$40.75.

My father takes a drug called Coumadin. Here in the United States the average price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin is \$64.88. That same drug, again made under the same FDA approval in the same FDA-approved plant, sells in Canada for \$24.94. Over in Europe the average price is \$15.80.

Madam Speaker, as you look at this list, it just becomes very, very aggravating, when you see how much we pay. Glucophage, an amazing drug we sell here in the United States, the average price, according to the Life Extension Foundation, the average price in the United States, the average price, is \$124 here. The average price in Canada for the same drug, same dosage, is \$26.47. Over in Europe the same drug sells for \$22. Glucophage.

A couple of weeks ago I and one of my staffers were in Germany. We had the opportunity to actually do some shopping of our own. We bought a drug called Tamoxifen. It is amazing in terms of being one of the most amazing drugs we have developed in the United States.

Let me just talk about the drug itself, because it was developed largely with American taxpayers' money. Tamoxifen is the most effective drug against women's breast cancer that we have developed, but the American taxpayers paid for most of the research costs.

This drug in the United States at a pharmacy here in Washington, D.C. for a 3-month supply just like this sells for about \$360. In Munich, Germany, we bought it a week and a half ago for \$59.05, the same drug.

Now, some people would say shame on the pharmaceutical industry; but I have to say shame on us, because we have allowed this environment to be

created. It is not shame on them, because they are only exploiting a market opportunity that we have allowed them. The answer is open markets.

Many years ago President Ronald Reagan said that markets are more powerful than armies.

My time has expired, but I will be back in coming nights to talk about this issue and how Members can help solve this problem.

AN OVERVIEW ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, we of the Public Broadcasting Caucus are pleased to share with our colleagues this evening some very good news from the world of public broadcasting. The Overseas Press Club has presented NPR with the 2002 Lowell Thomas Award for the series "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict." This groundbreaking seven-part series, which aired on NPR's Morning Edition last fall, tells the history of the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Veteran NPR News correspondent Mike Shuster researched, reported, and chronicled this in-depth series on the key moments in the history of the struggle between the two peoples. It covered the early Zionist movement during the turn of the 20th Century and traced the intensifying conflict between Jews and Palestinians during the years of the British mandate, leading up to David Ben-Gurion's announcement of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," also explored the events that led up to the Six-Day War, the Yom Kippur War, the first Intifada, and the Oslo Peace Process. It concluded with investigations on the reason why the Oslo Peace Process collapsed and how and why the second Intifada started.

Kevin Klose, NPR's president and CEO, put it best when he said, "This series tells the history of the confrontation using radio to bring the views of leading historians of the region to air, documenting the deep and conflicting roots of today's Middle East. The series touches on the beliefs and emotions that motivate both sides."

Madam Speaker, it was no surprise when the Peabody Awards were recently announced for excellence in television and radio; public broadcasting was honored with one-third of those over-30 awards. This is part of why one in seven adults listens to public radio by tuning into more than 700 stations which carry NPR programming. Each week, over 20 million Americans listen to NPR, an audience that exceeds the top 35 U.S. daily newspapers combined.

When we consider this figure, along with 100 million people who watch public television each week, we see the

profound reach of public broadcasting stations. They connect people with their local community, their Nation, and their world in a way that no other outlet can or does.

The caliber of public broadcasting is unmatched by any other programming. Public radio and public television provide valuable commercial-free educational, informational, and cultural programming for communities all across America.

But it is not just an addition; it is not just an add-on and a frill. Many communities rely on public broadcasting stations as their only source of news and information. Some even use the public broadcasting system for day-to-day or emergency communications, such as AMBER Alerts and severe weather detection. As we work to improve our hometown security, Federal funding for these services is increasingly important.

Sadly, the future is cloudy. Nationally, while 41 States have public broadcasting operations, the source of the State support, which averages \$7 million a year, is in jeopardy. Given the current times of economic slowdown and State budget crises, many stations are facing severe financial cuts.

I am sad to say in my home State of Oregon, which faces one of the Nation's worst budget deficits, our State is considering eliminating funding for Oregon Public Broadcasting altogether. Even though only 6 percent of that \$33 million budget for the last 2 years comes from State funding, slightly more than \$2 million, right now the loss of any of that funding is compounded by the recession and the squeeze on corporate and individual donors.

Oregon is not alone in its public broadcasting cuts. Minnesota's Governor has recommended a 25 to 35 percent reduction in its public broadcasting budget. But there are some States that are standing firm. I was pleased to note that Nebraska, for example, reaffirmed its commitment to public broadcasting. Despite a 14 percent shortfall in its biannual budget, it will maintain its yearly State funding of approximately \$8 million.

Madam Speaker, we are all in this together: the Federal and State governments, our listeners, viewers and private sector donors. This is all the more reason for us to keep our commitment to public broadcasting. If we do not, many of the award-winning programs, like the one I just mentioned, "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," will be at risk. All of us need to do our part, whether elected officials or individual listeners, to support this critical national resource.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2004 THROUGH 2013

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004. The authority to make these adjustments is derived from Sections 421 and 507 of H. Con. Res. 95 (H. Rept. 108-71).

As enacted, H.R. 1559, a bill making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, contains changes in new budget authority, outlays and revenues that differ from those assumed in the budget resolution. For fiscal year 2003, the supplemental provides \$4,432,000,000 in budget authority, \$3,745,000,000 in outlays, and \$2,000,000 in revenues above the amounts assumed in H. Con. Res. 95. The supplemental also provides \$215,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$332,000,000 in additional outlays for fiscal year 2004; over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, it provides an additional \$888,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,406,000,000 in outlays over the amounts assumed in the resolution.

Under section 421 of the resolution, the Chairman of the Budget Committees are authorized to adjust the budget resolution to reflect the differences between the levels assumed in the budget resolution for the supplemental and the levels provided in the enacted bill. The adjusted levels of budget authority and outlays in the functional levels for net interest (900) and allowances (920) are as follows:

NET INTEREST (900)

Fiscal year 2003: \$240,203,000,000 in new budget authority and \$240,203,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: \$259,528,000,000 in new budget authority and \$259,528,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$310,822,000,000 in new budget authority and \$310,822,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$352,463,000,000 in new budget authority and \$352,463,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$380,846,000,000 in new budget authority and \$380,846,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$405,947,000,000 in new budget authority and \$405,947,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$429,867,000,000 in new budget authority and \$429,867,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$450,997,000,000 in new budget authority and \$450,997,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$473,746,000,000 in new budget authority and \$473,746,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$496,401,000,000 in new budget authority and \$496,401,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$514,926,000,000 in new budget authority and \$514,926,000,000 in outlays.

ALLOWANCES (920)

Fiscal year 2003: \$79,190,000,000 in new budget authority and \$42,024,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: -\$7,406,000,000 in new budget authority and \$22,678,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: -\$6,366,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,921,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: -\$7,151,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$5,581,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: -\$8,835,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$8,666,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: -\$9,875,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,873,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: -\$11,476,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,922,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: -\$12,860,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$10,864,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: -\$16,396,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$12,653,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: -\$21,444,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$15,691,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: -\$25,608,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$19,171,000,000 in outlays.

The changes in the functional levels cause changes in the budgetary aggregates. Accordingly, I also modify the budgetary aggregates and revenues for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 to the following levels:

BUDGET AUTHORITY, OUTLAYS, AND REVENUES

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,867,072,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,819,167,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,303,113,000,000 in revenues.

The amount by which revenues should be reduced, fiscal year 2003: \$56,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,861,333,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,884,280,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,990,603,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,981,995,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,122,725,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,089,892,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,233,213,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,190,978,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,349,256,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,307,637,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,454,814,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,420,227,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,555,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,528,260,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,669,845,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,651,603,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,754,409,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,724,337,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,875,544,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,855,914,000,000 in outlays.