

This is a fact. The American people are paying so much more for pharmaceutical products than other countries and people who are buying prescription drugs in other parts of the world that Americans are going across the border into Canada in droves to buy their pharmaceutical products because it saves them so much money. When you have a little old lady who cannot afford her pharmaceutical products and her health is at risk, you cannot blame her for going across the Canadian border to buy the very same prescription drug for one-fourth or one-fifth or one-sixth of what it costs here in the United States.

It is very important that this message be gotten out to all of our constituents around this country, so that we can bring about some positive change that will make sure that Americans pay a fair price for world class drugs.

I just would like to say to my colleague who has been leading the fight on this issue, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), what do you think about this?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, if the gentleman would yield, I think President Reagan had it best, quoting John Adams, when he said, "Facts are stubborn things."

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), the gentleman from (Mrs. EMERSON) and so many other people in the House.

This is not a single-person issue. We have been involved in this for many years. The gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) has been among the only chairmen here in this Congress who have been willing to have real hearings and bring in both sides and let both sides present their case and let the facts come out.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mrs. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one of the things that bothers me is the gentleman has been talking about how safe it is to buy pharmaceutical products from other industrialized nations.

There are some 940 FDA approved facilities around the world that produce these products. They are sent around the world in bulk, so the safety issue appears to be a bogus issue. But today, in USA Today, the head of the Food and Drug Administration, Mr. Mark McClellan, said that the seniors and others who are buying their pharmaceuticals from Canada are buying under "buyer-beware" conditions, which indicates he thinks they are at great risk.

Would the gentleman explain to us why that is not accurate?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Once again, the facts do not support that. We know, for example, how many people have died from taking legal FDA approved drugs from other countries. It is a nice, round number, easy to remember: It is zero. We know that more people be-

come ill and die from eating foods, fruits and vegetables, which the FDA is also responsible for, than they ever will with the drugs we are talking about.

More importantly, this is happening now. Americans are doing this right now, many of them knowing that, technically, the FDA says this is illegal. I do not necessarily agree that this is illegal.

Congressional intent is very clear: We intend to make this legal, and we intend to make it safer, using tamper-proof, counterfeit-proof packaging, which is not required today, actually making this business even safer.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The thing that is interesting is there are containers that are tamper-proof, and you just showed one of them there. But these 940-some production sites around the world that are FDA approved, they send these pills around the world in bulk, in huge containers, and it seems to me if there was any threat of sabotage or messing around with those, it would be in those bigger containers, not in a tamper-proof vial like that.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman is absolutely right. The drug Lipitor, for example, every single tablet is imported into the United States, because it is only made in Ireland in an FDA-approved facility. When they ship into the United States, they do not bring it in in armored cars, they bring it in in big bulk containers that sit on a loading dock in New Jersey for a week or so. If there is any chance to get in there and tamper with those drugs, there is a much better chance at that time than in an individual package.

So, ultimately the safety argument, and I think most Members and Americans, voting with their feet, have come to the same conclusion, the safety argument is just pure bogus.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. So it boils down to why is the Food and Drug Administration trying to protect the huge profits that are being made here in the United States by the pharmaceutical companies, when at the same time in other parts of the world it is not that great.

TRIBUTE TO MILDRED "MILLIE" O'NEIL

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise to pay tribute to Mildred, better known as Millie, O'Neill, wife of former Speaker Tip O'Neil, who passed away peacefully yesterday.

She did so in between watching her sports. She was a great sports fan. She enjoyed seeing Tiger Woods win on Sunday and, of course, she was getting ready for the Red Sox game that was to come on last night.

Millie was a true heroine to our party and our country, and we will miss her terribly. As Democratic Lead-

er of the House, I am humbled to occupy the office which was once occupied by the great Democratic Speaker, Tip O'Neil.

Tip loved his country, his party, his church, his family, and, above all, he loved Millie. Millie was Tip's partner in everything that he did. She was a wonderful, wonderful mother to their children and she became the godmother to the Democratic Party.

Always warm, always caring, and, at the same time, very, very strong, Millie was someone in whose presence we all loved to be.

Again, Millie loved her Red Sox. She was thrilled that they were in the playoffs this year and, of course, I think she has a front row seat for the series coming up now. Now, maybe, I would say to my colleagues from Massachusetts, maybe now that Millie has a front row seat from even higher than the Green Monster, she and Tip can break the "Curse of the Bambino" and have the Red Sox win the World Series, the first time since 1918. It will probably take that kind of divine intervention. But if anybody can make it happen, it is Millie.

Our thoughts and prayers are with her family, with her children and grandchildren, whom she cherished. I have the privilege of working on a daily basis with one granddaughter, Catlin O'Neill. We honor the legacy of Tip and Millie O'Neill every day we serve here.

I hope it is a comfort to Thomas III, Rosemary, Christopher, better known as Kip, and Susan, that so many people in our country mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time.

Millie has joined Tip and her son Michael, who preceded her to heaven, now in praying for us where they have, shall we say, more access. Let us think of them as we undertake our responsibilities, and know the proud tradition that they were a part of and that we have a responsibility to carry on.

With that, Madam Speaker, once again I express condolences, not only my own personal and that of my family, but that of all the Democratic Members of the House in sending our condolences to the O'Neill family.

I am pleased to do this under the leadership of the dean of the Massachusetts delegation (Mr. MARKEY), and join other members of the delegation in remembering Millie and celebrating her life.

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS: DUPLICATION

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, I rise again this week as cofounder of a new Republican effort, dedicated to bringing the disinfectant of sunshine into the shadowy corners of the wasteful Washington bureaucracy. We call ourselves the Washington Waste

Watchers, and we are here to look after the family budget by checking the growth of waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal budget.

Madam Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues are well aware of the size of our Federal budget deficit. It is large, and growing larger every day. To compound the challenge, we are presently faced with an additional \$87 billion supplemental appropriation request to help fight the war on terror.

Now, I believe, after much debate and due diligence, that this body will pass most, if not all, of this request, and I for one, agree that it is far better to fight this war on terror over there than it is over here. So, faced with unparalleled homeland security needs and a growing budget deficit, what are we to do?

Democrats say the only way to cut the deficit is to yet again raise taxes on the American family. Sound familiar? It is the only budget idea that they have.

We do have a large deficit, but it is not because the American people are undertaxed, it is because Washington spends too much.

Since I was born in 1957, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget. Seven times faster. This is unconscionable and unsustainable. And over and above the expenses connected with the war on terror, Democrats have voted to spend almost \$1 trillion more than the budget allows, \$1 trillion more in spending, and they claim to be concerned about deficits.

Madam Speaker, much of this spending in Washington is pure waste, fraud and abuse, and by attacking it every day, we can begin to close this deficit.

Once again this week, let us talk about duplication.

The Federal Government administers 50 different programs scattered across eight Federal agencies to assist the homeless. Combined, these duplicative programs cost Americans close to \$30 billion a year. Fifty different programs all engaged in roughly the same mission. Yet Democrats want to raise taxes to pay for more of this?

Six different agencies administer 26 programs offering food and nutrition benefits to the homeless, including the USDA, HHS, Department of Education, FEMA, HUD and the VA. What is it that one of these agencies knows about feeding the homeless that the other agencies do not know? Whatever it is, I hope they figure it out pretty soon, because these duplicative programs cost roughly \$43 billion a year. Just think how much we could save the American taxpayer over 10 years through consolidation of just some of these 26 programs. Yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

More than 50 different Federal agencies are responsible for waging the war on drugs. Four agencies are responsible for coordinating and developing narcotics detection technologies, more than 70 programs in 13 Federal depart-

ments and agencies are eligible to disperse resources to prevent substance abuse, and 16 different agencies deal with treatment. How many billions could be used to lower the Federal deficit if we simply consolidated a few of these programs? Yet the Democrats wanted to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Sixteen Federal agencies operate roughly 75 international education, culture and training programs. Seventeen agencies monitor and enforce trade agreements. Ten of them operate export subsidy programs, and 12 oversee importation of agricultural products. How much more could we save if we simply consolidated a few of these programs. Yet the Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

Madam Speaker, these are just a few of the examples of the rampant duplication in waste in our Federal Government that has been here for years. Once you begin to look closely, it is easy to see that many Federal programs routinely lose 10, 20, even 30 percent of their taxpayer-funded budgets in waste, fraud and abuse.

□ 1945

In the real world, when people lose this much money, they are either fired or they go to jail; but in Washington, it is yet another excuse to take even more money away from the American family.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways that we can save money in Washington without cutting any needed services and without raising taxes on the American family. Because when it comes to Federal programs, it is not how much money Washington spends; it is how Washington spends the money.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF MILDRED A. O'NEILL AND CELEBRATING GREAT AMERICANS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of coming to Congress in 1981. Some of my colleagues on the floor were here when I came. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and I came in the same class. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the dean of the Massachusetts delegation, was already here. Those who came after 1987 lost an extraordinary experience, and that experience was to serve in this House with one of America's great political leaders, so defined by Bob Dole. His name, of course, was Thomas P. O'Neill. He was a large man physically, but his heart was much larger, and his commitment to people even larger still.

Those of us who came to the Congress at that time obviously met Tip, serving under Speaker O'Neill and with him. But shortly thereafter, we had an extraordinary privilege, and that privi-

lege was to meet his partner. Mildred A. O'Neill, affectionately known to all of us as Millie, became, in many respects, at least for those who were young enough to consider her as such, as sort of the den mother of the Democratic House. She was a wonderful, warm, committed, devoted human being. She was the kind of human being that everybody would want to be born and have as their grandmother or their mother, period, because she was filled with love and caring for humankind. And my, how she loved our Speaker. And my, how our Speaker loved her.

We talk about family values. It is easy to talk about family values, but I suggest that no one has lived family values any more than Tip O'Neill and Millie O'Neill.

Millie O'Neill was born in 1914, the same year that my mother was born. My mother, unfortunately, passed away in 1975 at a too-young age. Millie O'Neill lived until just a day ago. She died at the age of 89, having seen extraordinary history in her State and in her country and, indeed, with her husband, had impacted on that history in a most positive way.

When Tip O'Neill left the Congress, or shortly before, there was a poll taken in the South. And the two most popular figures in the United States, political figures at that time, were Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill in the South.

Now, obviously, they disagreed on many issues. So what was the cause of that support and popularity? It was because they were both viewed as two men of principle and the courage of their convictions. People could disagree with either one, but there was that respect for their character that was reflected. Millie O'Neill was a critical component of the character of her husband. They had been married for over half a century. Tip in his book referenced how loyal, how important Millie was to his life, both at times of triumph and times of trial.

Mr. Speaker, I count myself uniquely privileged to have come to Congress in time to know and become a friend of Mildred A. O'Neill. I believe she loved each and every one of us; and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of us loved her.

Let me say that I was also advantaged because, on the other side of the aisle, there was a leader who shared the compassion and commitment to this institution that Tip had, and that was Bob Michel. Bob has a wonderful wife, Corrine. She is ill today, and I know that she, too, and Bob Michel will grieve for the loss of their friend. It was a time, frankly, I say to my colleagues, when Bob Michel and Tip O'Neill knew that they were friends, knew that they had different views; but both were committed to this institution, and their wives, Millie and Corrine, were fast and true friends as well. America has lost a great American, a great grandmother, a great