

much of the research was paid for by the American taxpayers through the NIH.

What is more troubling than that is that we bought this box of Tamoxifen a few weeks ago at the pharmacy at the Munich airport in Germany, and we bought this Tamoxifen for \$59.05 American. This same box of drugs in the same label under the same everything, the same dosage, here in Washington, DC, sells for \$360; \$59.05 in Munich, Germany; \$360 in the United States. It is outrageous.

Then you hear that 29 percent of Americans fail to have their prescriptions filled because they cannot afford the drugs. Our own FDA is standing between Americans and the drugs that they need.

We hear all the time that we have to pay a lot of money for prescription drugs because it is for research. She begins to break down in her book how much actually goes to research. Of the \$100 that we might spend for a typical prescription in the United States, use, for example, Lipitor, 35 percent of the cost that you pay is for marketing, advertising and administration; 26 percent is for what they call "other," such as manufacturing, executive pay, worker costs, labor and so forth; 24 percent is pure profit; and only 15 percent actually goes to research.

Madam Speaker, as I have said before, I am not here to say, shame on the pharmaceutical industry, although more and more people are. People who are doing the research are saying, shame on the pharmaceutical industry. The truth of the matter is it is shame on us, because we have created an environment where we literally hold American consumers hostage.

Imagine, for example, if there were two stores in town. One consistently had dramatically lower prices on the same products, and then there was another store that had dramatically higher prices. But yet your own government said you have to shop at the higher-priced store.

In an era with bar-coding technology and all the new technology we can use in terms of counterfeit-proofing these packages, we can come as close as humanly possible in guaranteeing this is, in fact, Tamoxifen, and whether you get it from Geneva, Switzerland, or Munich, Germany, or the local drug-store, your local pharmacist ought to have the ability to shop around and get you the best price.

Finally, let me explain how big a problem this is. Our own Congressional Budget Office tells us over the next 10 years seniors, just seniors, will spend \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs. Conservatively we are spending 35 percent more than the rest of the G-7 countries on average. Thirty-five percent of \$1.8 trillion works out to \$630 billion.

Then some people say we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit. Of course we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit if we make American consumers pay the highest prices in the world, not just a little higher.

Do not take my word for it. There are several groups that are now doing the research. I do not know why the FDA does not do the research, because a drug you cannot afford is neither safe nor effective. Americans deserve world-class drugs at world-market prices.

FCC SHOULD ALLOW PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.) Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, this past Monday I hosted a forum in my district with Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps about his agency's rules on media ownership. We had nearly 400 of my constituents packed into an auditorium at Dominican University in San Rafael. As their attendance testified, the FCC rules on media ownership is an extremely important issue and an issue that, unfortunately, has been underreported by the very media that will be most affected.

In fact, as proof of that, as proof of underreporting, today, just an hour or so ago, over a dozen concerned Democratic Members of Congress held a press conference on this very issue, the issue of media consolidation, and not one member of the press showed up, until, that is, a member of Roll Call, our newspaper here on the Hill, came to experience a press conference without press. We were glad that that individual showed, but that was as far as it went.

So, what is this all about? Well, on June 2, the Federal Communications Commission has scheduled a vote on new regulations that have the potential to drastically change the face of broadcasting and newspaper ownership, and, in so doing, the flow of free information.

First, the proposed changes to FCC rules would break down the decades-long firewall between media ownership in single markets. Gone will be the prohibitions against corporations owning newspapers and TV stations in the same town, or cable TV stations and TV stations in the same town. Gone also will be the limits on the number of TV stations and cable TV stations a corporation can own nationally. Also allowed would be cross-ownership of print media and broadcast media in the same media market.

In the 1996 Telecommunications Act, similar rules were proposed, but they were stopped by the threat of a veto by President Clinton. Now, under the Bush administration, the FCC Chairman, Michael Powell, who is an avowed free marketer, has said that these proposed rules should come back. Chairman Powell has scheduled a vote on the rule changes in less than a month, and, with a Republican majority on the Commission, these changes are pretty certain to pass.

It is a sham, and it is a shame, that the FCC has not scheduled official hearings across the Nation like the official one that Commissioner Copps and I hosted Monday in my district. The FCC has held only one, only one, official hearing on this subject, just outside the Beltway in Virginia.

If it was not for FCC Commissioners Copps and Jonathan Adelstein, it is doubtful that this discussion would have gone beyond a few lobbyists and public interest activists in the first place.

I am against the proposed deregulation, and I believe we should look back to the relaxation of radio ownership under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. We should use that for our guidance, because virtual elimination of radio ownership restrictions has resulted in a reduction of radio ownership by at least one-third across our Nation. In the San Francisco market alone, seven stations are now owned by Clear Channel Communications, seven by Infinity Broadcasting and three by ABC. Across the Nation, 10 companies broadcast to two-thirds of the Nation's radio audience and receive two-thirds of the broadcast revenues.

Let me say that again: Since the 1996 Telecommunications Act, 10 companies broadcast to two-thirds of the radio audience and receive two-thirds of the broadcast revenues nationwide.

Has the quality of radio broadcasting improved because of these changes? Is there more local programming, more local news, a greater variety of programming? Is there free flow of information, or is there censorship? Ask the Dixie Chicks.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I are cosponsoring House Resolution 218 that calls on the FCC to examine and inform the public of the consequences of the new round of deregulation. It asks that the FCC allow for extensive public review and comment on any proposed changes to media ownership rules before issuing a final rule.

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

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

MAKING AMERICA'S ECONOMIC PROBLEMS WORSE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, May 31 is going to be quite a sad day in the history of the United States Congress, but I believe that the real tragedy is for 36,500 Ohioans and over 2 million Americans whose unemployment benefits will expire on May 31.

I do not understand how we can look these people in the eye. I think it is

disgraceful. I think it is shameful. How do we look those Americans in the eye who are struggling to feed their kids, who do not have work, and we tell them that we have a solution to the problem?

What is the solution? I do not believe it is adopting the President's leave-no-millionaire-behind plan. Ever since this President has taken office, we have said we are going to cut taxes. We have a recession, we are going to cut taxes; the economy is down, we are going to cut taxes; you want to go to war, we are going to cut taxes; if tuition goes up, we are going to cut taxes; if health care goes up, we need to cut taxes; and if schools are cutting the year short because they cannot afford to educate their kids, we are going to cut taxes.

We hear a lot, Madam Speaker, about compassionate conservatism, when it seems the only thing being conserved in the United States Capitol is compassion.

I do not understand what is compassionate for the 8.8 million unemployed people in this country. To me, leaving them hanging is cruel. I do not understand what is compassionate for the 80,000 workers who are exhausting their unemployment benefits every week. To me, Madam Speaker, that is cruel. And I do not understand what is compassionate for the 360,000 Ohioans who cannot find a job. I think it is cruel. I do not think it is compassionate.

During our country's last major recession, in the early 1990s, Congress kept the extended unemployment benefits program in place for 27 months; 27 months. Earlier this year, we had to beg and plead just to get the current program extended to 15 months, and the unemployment problem is worse today than it was then.

I must say, Madam Speaker, what I really have a problem with and what I am really not understanding, there was an article today in the Washington Post, and it talked about deflation and how the Fed and the policy advisers of the Federal Reserve are starting now to worry seriously about deflation. They are saying that there are too many goods in the marketplace, there is too much labor in the marketplace, and the prices are going to be driven down because of the oversupply.

There are three job seekers for every job opening. This is one of the worst labor markets since the Great Depression, and we have too many goods, and we have too many workers, too much supply, and the answer is to go back to the supply-side economics of the 1980s.

We have enough supply. We do not need to cut taxes for the wealthiest people. We need demand-side economics, and the greatest stimulus that we can give is to extend these unemployment benefits.

One study says that each dollar spent on unemployment benefits would boost the economy by \$1.73. We need people to buy products. There are enough products trying to be sold. If you cut

taxes for the top 1 percent, they are not going to produce anything, because there are enough goods already in the marketplace.

We need to take care of the 2 million people and the 36,500 Ohioans, give the money to them, let them feed their families, let them clothe their families, and let them stimulate the economy. We have tried the supply-side economics once in the 1980s. It did not work. We ran tremendous deficits. We increased the burden on future generations. What we need to do is put the money in the pockets of the people who need it, average, middle-class Americans.

Again, Madam Speaker, this is voodoo economics, it is smoke and mirrors, it is bait and switch, and it does not work, and I do not think we should try it again.

□ 1700

CONGRESS SHOULD EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS IMMEDIATELY

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I stand before my colleagues today to call on this Congress to pass an extension of unemployment benefits immediately. Just listen to the unemployment numbers from labor market areas in my congressional district; they are glaring: 30 percent in the Millinocket and East Millinocket area, 13 percent in Calais, 12 percent in Jonesport-Millbridge, 11 percent in Dexter-Pittsfield, 11 percent in Machias-Eastport.

The fact is behind those figures are real people and real families, and they go to bed every night with the uncertainty that hangs over their beds.

As a mill worker in northern Maine myself for nearly 30 years, I know the stories of those who have lost their jobs. I know the people. They are my neighbors, they are my friends, they are my relatives. They are the very men and women whose hard work fueled a decade of economic expansion, which they barely enjoyed, and they have now become the victims of a fallen economy.

The Federal Government reported that 8.8 million Americans are out of work and that our country's unemployment has risen to 6 percent. Over the past 2 years, the economy has lost over 2.7 million private sector jobs, and our economy has suffered a net loss, on average, of more than 74,000 jobs a month.

In Maine, over the last 8 years, we have lost over 22,000 manufacturing jobs alone from companies like Georgia-Pacific to Dexter Shoes to Fraser Paper Company to Great Northern Paper Company to Hathaway Shirts to Foster Manufacturing, just to name a few. Almost every week my office re-

ceives news of yet another company that has shut its doors or has laid off people.

By the end of May, over 2,700 workers in Maine will have exhausted their benefits, and 10,600 workers in Maine could be helped by an extension, not to mention the nearly 4 million jobless Americans.

How can this Congress turn its back on them?

An extension would also do much more than provide just aid. At a time when we are trying to get this economy moving again, putting money in the hands of people who will spend it on consumption is one of the best investments that we can make.

According to an independent research group, each dollar devoted to UI extension would boost the economy by \$1.73. By contrast, each dollar that is connected with the tax reduction dividends would boost the economy by just 9 cents. I think the choice is very clear.

But, despite these facts, last Friday this House passed a so-called recovery plan that is centered around reducing taxes on capital gains and dividends. Madam Speaker, 94 percent of the people in my district will get an average tax cut totaling only \$52 from the cuts on capital gains and dividend taxes. How will that plan put money in their hands to spend and consume so they can stimulate the economy? How will this help get them jobs?

After nearly 30 years working in a paper mill, I know what working people need, and the bill that was passed last Friday will not help working people at all. It will not help the people in Millinocket, Jonesport, Dexter or Bangor.

By contrast, an alternative plan that I supported would actually deliver billions of new tax relief. It would give incentives so companies will hire the long-term unemployed, it would deliver \$44 billion in aid to struggling States like Maine, and it would also extend unemployment assistance to those struggling to find a job. This would deliver over 1.1 million new jobs.

We could do all of this in 10 years at zero cost, nothing; no additional budget deficits, no more borrowing from Social Security. This is the best course for the State of Maine. This is the best course for America.

So let us take the first step, and that first step is we must pass an unemployment insurance extension today so those areas with high unemployment such as 30 percent unemployment in the Millinocket area will be able to benefit and get the economy moving again.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?