

great significance for the American people and for our global community, for on April 26, 1954, on the grounds of Franklin Sherman Elementary School in McLean, Virginia, the first dose of the Salk Polio Vaccine was administered as part of the National Field Trial Program. In the months that followed, more than 1,800,000 school children, America's "Polio Pioneers," participated in these trials. It was the largest peacetime volunteer mobilization in United States history, and it represents a remarkable act of collective courage and citizenship by the youngsters and adults who participated.

The crusade against poliomyelitis began at Warm Springs, Georgia, a spa where Franklin Delano Roosevelt first traveled in 1924, seeking the therapeutic effects of the warm spring waters. Other polio victims followed, and in 1926, Roosevelt purchased the entire property establishing the "Warm Springs Foundation" with former law partner Basil O'Connor. As the polio epidemic spread, in 1938, this Foundation grew into the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, emphasizing the nationwide significance and non-partisan character of the polio crusade. Believing that people could solve any problem if they worked together, Roosevelt appealed to the masses for financial help—asking the country to send their dimes directly to the White House, thus coining the phrase described by Comedian Eddie Cantor, "March of Dimes".

Over the next 17 years, the National Foundation focused on funding research to develop a vaccine against polio. While researchers worked tirelessly in their labs, volunteers helped polio victims and their families around the country. For a number of years, I served as the Lafayette County, Missouri, March of Dimes Secretary, helping to coordinate volunteer and fundraising efforts in my home area.

In 1948, with funding from the Foundation, Dr. Jonas Salk was able to grow the three known types of polio virus in his lab and eventually develop an experimental killed virus vaccine. In 1952, Salk tested the vaccine on children who'd already recovered from polio as well as himself and his family. The results were amazing. No one became afflicted with the disease as all volunteers had produced the needed antibodies.

In April 1954, nationwide testing of the vaccine began. The results of the field trials were clear. Statistics showed that the Salk vaccine was 80 to 90 percent effective in preventing polio. In the next four years, 450 million doses of the vaccine were administered, making it a standard fixture among childhood immunizations. As a result, in 1979, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis officially changed its name to the March of Dimes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me today in commemorating April 26, 2004, as the 50th Anniversary of the Salk Polio Vaccine field trials and a day that truly holds great significance for the world.

DRUG INDUSTRY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 2004

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because, once again, the drug industry has lied

to the American people in another desperate attempt to justify their outrageously high profits. While this fact should shock no one—indeed, it has become routine—we must not let their ridiculous propaganda go unchallenged.

On Wednesday, April 7, speaking on C-SPAN's Washington Journal, Pfizer CEO Hank McKinnell told listeners that Pfizer spends only two percent of its revenue on advertising for prescription drugs. Even under the most optimistic projections, that's just fuzzy math.

In 2003, total advertising expenses for Pfizer were a whopping \$2.962 billion. That's 6.55 percent of the company's revenue, over three times the amount cited by Mr. McKinnell. Moreover, a report from Families USA, Profiting from Pain: Where Prescription Drug Dollars Go, which was based on a review of industry annual financial reports submitted to the SEC, found that Pfizer spent 35 percent of its revenue on marketing and promotion, and only 15 percent on research development (and 24 percent on profit). That same study found that Pfizer spent 8 percent more of its revenue on marketing than the average of all companies reviewed.

Not only does Pfizer and the drug industry lie about the amount of money they spend on ads, but the ads also mislead consumers about the advertised drugs themselves. According to one advertising executive with significant experience with DTC ads, the purpose of advertising is not to educate consumer, but rather "to identify the emotions we can tap into to get that customer to take the desired course of action." Moreover, in a survey of 1,872 people who viewed drug advertisements, 70 percent said they had learned little or nothing more about the conditions the drug is supposed to treat, and over half said they learned little or nothing more about the drug being advertised. Very few ads informed viewers of how successful the treatment is, what alternative treatments are available, how long a patient needs to take the drug, or attempts to correct common misconceptions about the disease the drug treats. Predictably, a strong majority of doctors—75 percent—said that the ads caused patients to think that advertised drugs work better than they do.

These ads have contributed to the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs. In fact, a 2000 study showed that nearly half of the increased spending on pharmaceuticals was attributable to the fifty most advertised prescription drugs.

Americans have been clamoring for lower prescription drug prices, yet all the drug companies have offered them is a string of excuses, empty promises, and outright lies. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve better.

COMMEMORATION OF THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CESAR ESTRADA CHAVEZ

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 2004

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, today we must take a moment to commemorate the life and legacy of a national leader Cesar Estrada Chavez. It is an honor for me to have this opportunity to discuss the life of this man. Cesar E Chavez was born and died in the district

that I represent, in Yuma and San Luis, Arizona. Today would have been his 77th birthday.

The celebration of his life is a legacy that he leaves with us; however, upholding a chronological, biographical statement of the life of Cesar E Chavez would not embrace the essence of what he stood for in life or the expectations and opportunities he left for others. I stand before you to honor a man, not for what material wealth he accumulated or positions he held, rather for his pursuit for justice.

For me to make Cesar E Chavez bigger than life and to describe him as a hero would be offensive to him. He was a man that did not want to be bigger than life. He was human and stayed that way but his beliefs and way of life are the future and the legacy that he left all of us to uphold. Cesar E Chavez, co-founder, along with Dolores Huerta, of the United Farm Workers' Union, initiated a historic struggle for labor unions, grassroots efforts, and mobilization to show power of the people.

The United Farm Workers' Union and the tactics that Cesar E Chavez incorporated for justice changed the face of activism and consumerism. His non-violence and popular education approach made the country recognize that renouncing a system of injustice was the right of all Americans. He reminded us then, and now, of our role to seek humanity and justice; and to be aware of our decisions in life from minor accountability, like where to buy basic home products, to protecting our soldiers and looking for effective non-violence approaches as an alternative to war.

Through the influence of Cesar E Chavez and the UFW, the face of labor unions in this country was changed. The awareness of strikes, went beyond the bargaining table for basic rights such as just pay and benefits. Strikes become a responsibility for all consumers to demand justice and peace of mind to the consumer and the employer that the employee was respected in all aspects. The union struggle also became more inclusive in fighting for justice in this country, going beyond the calls for labor rights to include human rights, immigrant rights, and civil rights. Labor unions across the country are currently among the leaders of creating coalitions and developing the grass roots community to strengthen representation for all Americans.

The concept of grass roots and the belief in the power of the people was strengthened through the works of Cesar E Chavez. The leading energy/influence in providing a voice for the masses was simply stated in three words *iSí, se puede!*, which roughly translates to yes, it can be done. A simple phrase that Cesar E Chavez coined, but like his life and legacy a powerful action that cannot be measured. This assurance in people and the ability of communities and movements resonates throughout our great Nation today. *iSí, se puede!* is an attitude and way of life for change, hope, and our constituency, especially our youth.

Cesar E Chavez, although a Latino, did not limit the group he strived for to an ethnicity. He understood the need to be inclusive in his service to others in the plight for justice. The legacy he leaves us is to uphold his approach to life and to educate our youth for future generations on his teachings of non-violence, justice, and equity for all. I challenge my colleagues to remember Cesar E Chavez not

only for his history, but also for his approach to life and the example he left us.

GUARDSMEN AND RESERVISTS FINANCIAL RELIEF ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 2004

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Guardsmen and Reservists Financial Relief Act of 2003.

This bill allows military reservists or national guardsmen to make withdrawals from their retirement plans without incurring penalties.

Unfortunately, this bill is a short-term fix for a larger problem.

Why hasn't the Administration and Congress done more to help reservists and soldiers in Iraq?

Our brave men and women are fighting and dying in Iraq. Their families are struggling to get by.

We need to help our soldiers.

We can start by giving targeted pay raises. We can give meaningful tax relief for military families, not tax cuts for the rich that President Bush supports.

We can make sure they receive the benefits and healthcare that they have more than earned!

We can make sure that our veterans, those brave Americans who already gave so much for this country are also taken care of.

Over 500,000 veteran's benefits claims are still pending in the VA. My bill, H.R. 1264, will help reduce this backlog of claims. This is the type of help our soldiers and veterans need!

Our reservists, soldiers, and veterans deserve our help! Let's not keep them waiting any longer!

Congress has to put its money where its mouth is when it comes to taking care of those who help protect this nation. We have no other choice.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON H.R. 4062

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 2004

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 2004, the House took up consideration and passed H.R. 4062, a bipartisan bill to resolve problems associated with the restrictions imposed by the Small Business Administration on loans made pursuant to §7(a) of the Small Business Act. The bill was then passed by the Senate and signed into law by the President. Since the bill was taken directly to the floor, no committee report accompanies the bill. As Chairman and on behalf of the Ranking Democratic Member, NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ, I am submitting for insertion into the RECORD, the attached explanation of the bill by its sponsors. We would expect the Administrator, in implementing the provisions of H.R. 4062, to accord the enclosed explanation the same weight in divining congressional intent that the Administrator would give to a committee report

on a bill that first went through a mark-up prior to floor consideration.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON H.R. 4062
Filed by Chairman MANZULLO for himself and
Ranking Democratic Member VELÁZQUEZ
Section 1. Additional Temporary Extension
of Authorization

Temporary authorizations are needed to ensure continued operation of certain programs authorized by the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958. This section extends those programs while the House and Senate work out their differences on a broader reauthorization package.

Section 2. Extension of Certain Fee Authorizations

The qualified state and local development company (referred to in this statement as "certified development company" or "CDC") program authorized by Title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 operates on fees charged by the Administrator to lenders. Those fees need to be reauthorized to prevent the program from ceasing operation. Given the complexity of the financing arrangements loans made pursuant to Title V, CDCs and small businesses need sufficient time to develop the appropriate financing packages and submit applications to the Administrator. To accommodate the needs of lenders and borrowers under Title V, the sponsors determined that an extension of the fee authorization through the end of the fiscal year would be appropriate. Furthermore, the sponsors believe that if the recent problems in the loan programs authorized by 7(a) of the Small Business Act were resolved through the end of this fiscal year, equity demands that CDCs be able to operate unencumbered for the same period.

Section 3. Fiscal Year 2004 Purchase and Guarantee Authority under Title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958

The Small Business Investment Company ("SBIC") program operates without the use of appropriated funds. Fees and profits are used to cover the cost of the program, including coverage of losses in investment portfolios. While the sponsors believe that the fees authorized for the purchase of securities and debentures would allow the program to continue full operation without modification to the authorization levels, clarification to ensure that the program could continue operations was an appropriate course of action. To avoid any possible confusion or action by the Administrator to curtail the operation of the program, the sponsors extended the authorizations for both the purchase of participating securities and guarantees of debentures at FY 2003 levels for the rest of the fiscal year.

Section 4. Combination Financing

For a number of years, the Administrator authorized the use of so-called piggyback financing when using the loan program authorized by 7(a) of the Small Business Act. The Administrator defines "piggyback financing" as a situation in which "one or more lender(s) provides more than one loan(s) to a single borrower at or about the same time, financing the same or similar purpose, and where the SBA guarantees the loan secured with a junior lien position." Small Business Administration, Standard Operating Procedure 50-10(4)(E), at 20. Furthermore, the Administrator notes that the determination of "piggyback financing" requires an assessment of both the lien position and the commonality of purpose. Id.

Earlier in the year, the Administrator, presumably pursuant to the authority set forth in §7(a)(24) of the Small Business Act, made

certain policy changes to the operation of the guaranteed loan program. In particular, the Administrator prohibited the use of piggyback financing.

The sponsors believe that "piggyback financing" plays a valuable role in the provision of capital to small businesses. This is particularly the case for small businesses requiring larger loans in cyclical sectors of the economy. The financing technique is quite similar to that statutorily authorized in Title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Section 4 creates, for the rest of fiscal year 2004, a temporary combination-financing program by adding a new paragraph (31) to §7 of the Small Business Act. The provisions sunset at the end of the fiscal year, i.e., at the end of the day on September 30, 2004.

The sponsors adopted the more formal language "combination financing" rather than the term "piggyback financing." The sponsors define "combination financing" as a loan consisting of both a commercial loan and a guaranteed loan. A commercial loan is defined as one that has no portion guaranteed by the government. The sponsors intend the term "combination financing" to have the same characteristics as "piggyback financing" as that term is used in the Small Business Administration's Standard Operating Procedure already cited in this statement.

The authorization of combination financing is limited to those situations in which the small business concern (borrower) obtains both a guaranteed loan pursuant to §7(a) of the Small Business Act and a commercial loan. Again the sponsors intend that the provision should operate in a manner similar to the Small Business Administration's determination that the commercial and guaranteed loans are obtained for the same or similar purposes and the loans are originated and disbursed (in whole or in part) at about the same time.

To ensure that the public fisc is protected even when the Administrator's lien is subordinate to the commercial loan, the sponsors restricted the size of the combination loan to that of the guaranteed loan. In other words, there is a one-to-one ratio between the commercial and guaranteed loans. While the commercial loan cannot exceed the size of the guaranteed loan, the sponsors do not intend to prevent a commercial loan from being smaller than the guaranteed loan.

The sponsors authorize the commercial loan may be made by the lender that is making the guaranteed loan. However, the sponsors also permit the commercial loan to be made by a different lender as long as the loans meet the simultaneity of time and purpose already limned. In addition, the sponsors also authorize lenders designated as "Preferred Lenders" by the Administrator to make the commercial loan in such combination financings.

The sponsors also authorize lenders designated as "Preferred Lenders" by the Administrator to make the commercial loan in combination financings. In order to expedite the processing of combination financings in these circumstances, it is the sponsors' intent that the Administrator process applications for combination financings submitted by such "Preferred Lenders" through the Preferred Lenders Program Processing Center.

The sponsors explicitly authorize the commercial loan to be secured by a lien senior to that of the guaranteed loan. Nothing in this provision prevents the Administrator from continuing or discontinuing this practice after September 30, 2004 unless directed otherwise by statute.

In normal commercial transactions, lenders that take a subordinated lien position on