

the FDA is reforming the generic approval process.

Cracking down harder on pharmaceutical companies that are exploiting loopholes to modify patents for not-so-unique drugs is one way to grow generics. Currently, even a small modification in a drug can be enough to get it approved by the Patent and Trademark Office.

In 2018, an analysis found that patent protection for 70 percent of the 100 best-selling drugs was extended at least once. This is a significant cost driver.

According to the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, when generic competition exists, prices are often 80 percent to 85 percent less than brand-name drugs. With 90 percent of generic prescriptions available for less than \$20 for patients with insurance, that translates into very real savings for families across this country.

The Government Accounting Office says that generics can save the United States healthcare system—get this—well over \$1 trillion in a 10-year window.

We could spend another hour speaking about the financial difficulties that we are having. We have a good, strong, growing economy. Many people are finally, thankfully, finding access to meaningful work, and there is an appropriate upward pressure on wages in this country.

But what erodes that? The escalating cost of healthcare. For people who are in need of lifesaving drugs, this is fundamentally unfair.

Again, our efforts at trying to move generics faster to market, identify abuse, and stop it can result in savings like this. This is huge. This is good public policy, and we are working on it.

Another important piece of legislation allows the pharmacist to tell a patient about therapeutically equivalent but less costly drugs as an alternative method that is less expensive. For a small number of lifesaving but rarely used what we call orphaned drugs, we also need to prevent single corporations from exploiting a small market niche of desperate patients who sometimes find themselves in a life-or-death struggle.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest this: Getting at another root cost driver of prescription drugs, we need to change how we procure drugs in large public programs. Our government, through Medicare, Medicaid, TRICARE, and other programs, is the largest purchaser of prescription drugs in the world. The Department of Health and Human Services, however, is prohibited by law from negotiating with manufacturers what it pays, but not the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the way.

There is broad bipartisan consensus in Congress, as well as with the White House, that this policy needs to change. We should be negotiating. I should note that was part of the earlier bill submitted to the floor—again, substantive policy disagreements that

could potentially undermine America's leading role.

But that aspect of this in the Democratic bill that was submitted is an important public policy initiative. Again, I commend my colleagues in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, a prescription drug should do two simple things. It should cure disease, but at a fair price. And as we have seen today, there were two very large bills debated, but unfortunately, in this political environment, one is a Democratic bill, and one is a Republican bill, and no consensus exists.

But after the smoke clears, I hope that reasonable people will make way and will make a pathway for the right solutions and not political anger.

This system is sick. Our people deserve better cures at fairer prices.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, with love of country at heart and my mnemonic notes in hand.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, remembering something from my childhood. My grandfather was a minister, and he reminded the grandchildren that there is no one so blind as he who chooses not to see. 20/20 vision, but the person who chooses not to see is the blindest of all. No one is so blind as those who choose not to see.

I bring this to the attention of those who are listening for a specific reason. I cannot impose understanding. I cannot cause people to say that they understand that which they already understand but choose not to acknowledge.

What I can do is this: I can encourage us to open our eyes and see what is happening to our country, the country that I assume we all love. I encourage us to see what is happening to public discourse, to pay attention to things that are happening in the public arena that are greatly different than the things we have been acclimated to.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we should have, in our public discourse, the Chief Executive Officer saying things that we don't want our children to repeat. The Chief Executive Officer is to be a leader in many ways.

We tell our children: One day you can grow up and be the Chief Executive Officer. You can be the head of state. And we want people to look up to the Chief Executive Officer, to the head of state.

□ 1600

I don't think most of us would have our children go to a public rally and engage in some of the discourse that we have seen, some of the scatology,

the profanity that seems to become a part of this discourse and is almost commonplace now from the Chief Executive Officer.

My dear friends, there is something happening to us. While it may not occur all in 1 day, over a period of time, it can become commonplace.

Have you not noticed how on the various talk shows people are using a level of discourse that we would find unacceptable, that I find unacceptable, that was not commonplace some years ago, not so very long ago? I am hearing more profanity being used.

I am not a perfect servant. I am a public servant. I am not a perfect person. I don't claim to be perfect. But I can say to you that I want to live in a country where children are proud to grow up and say they want to be like that person who happens to be the Chief Executive Officer.

At some point, something has to say to us that something is going on here that is unacceptable. When you weaponize hate so that you can have an advantage, there is something wrong. We ought not weaponize hate and bigotry to gain an advantage. We ought not try to, with intentionality, create ashes on the dreams of others, turn them into ashes so that we can fulfill some desire. We ought not, with intentionality, say things that we know are not true that can be harmful to others.

I am not a perfect servant, but I see something happening to my country, and I beg that we open our eyes and look at this for what it is. The level of hate is increasing. The level of harm being done to people by others that they don't know who will traverse great distances just to hurt them because they happen to be of a certain ancestry, who go into a certain neighborhood to hurt people because they happen to be of a certain religion, we are seeing more of this level of hate.

I say to you that we must open our eyes and see what is happening to our country. There is a desire to believe that this is just something that we can laugh at, that it is just amusing. This discourse that we see when the Chief Executive Officer has throngs of people around him making light of things that at one time we would not tolerate.

There is something wrong when you start to tolerate this. Those who tolerate hate perpetuate hate. We are going to be a part of the reason why this continues to grow, to propagate, to infect our society.

We can do something about this. We should not allow this level of discourse to continue.

By the way, the something that we can do about it is not allow it to be something that we accept. We don't have to do anything more, for some of us, than change the channel. Maybe that will send a message, when they don't get good ratings. Or don't attend events where these kinds of things are taking place. We don't have to make this something that is acceptable to any one of us.

I mention all of these things because I know that this level of ugly discourse is going to be something that we are going to have to live with for a lot longer than we choose, unless we choose to do something about it.

I ask of you just to pay attention to what is happening to our society. Pay attention to the words that are being said and the way people are being demeaned by the Chief Executive Officer, who sets the standard, who is a standard-bearer. Pay attention to what is going on.

I beg that, please, let's open our eyes and see how a single person is corrupting the discourse, not only, by the way, at rallies and among those who are on talk shows but also here in the Congress of the United States of America.

I arrived here in 2005. Since then, the discourse in Congress has changed to the extent that people are saying things that I thought we would never hear in the Congress in terms of scatology, profanity, demeaning commentary.

Now, I am not saying don't speak truth. Speak truth. But what I am saying is what we are saying to hurt people just to be harmful, to let people somehow be demeaned just to demean people, I find that unacceptable.

I just beg that we would not be so blind as those who choose not to see. I think that society is not lost overnight, but the genesis of the loss is discourse, public discourse that degenerates to the extent that the humanity of every person is lessened, where people at some point conclude: Those people, they don't belong. Those people, they don't count.

Every human being means something and counts. We ought not allow ourselves to allow things to happen to babies in cages. We ought not allow ourselves to conclude that certain religions are unacceptable. What can happen to one religion can happen to any religion. Every child is precious. We ought to respect the humanity of every person and accord a certain amount of decency to all people. I cannot believe some of the things that we are now tolerating.

There was a time in this country when we would not tolerate having a person acknowledge that, among racists and bigots, there were some very fine people or nice people. There was a time when we wouldn't tolerate that, but we do now. There was a time when certain tropes that are being used and propagated, we wouldn't tolerate it, but we do now.

My comment to America, to our country, and to the people who care is, at some point, this level of hate is going to become a bigger problem than we care to deal with, unless we deal with it now. We should. We should deal with it. We cannot allow it to become something that future generations will have to contend with. It is easy to believe that this is a temporary condition until it is no longer a temporary condition.

"Irreparable harm" is a term that we use in law. At some point, this becomes irreparable harm. At some point, there are some people who will suffer to the extent that they can't recover.

I know of people in the Latino community who live with a great degree of apprehension. People born in this country, Americans, live with a great degree of apprehension because of what happened in El Paso.

I know of people who are of a certain faith, citizens of this country, who live with apprehension because of what happened in Charlottesville.

We ought not allow the discourse, this incitive discourse, to create circumstances where people are harmed. We are seeing it happen, but I think that some of us choose not to see the harmful impact that it is having on our society.

My message is very simple today. I beg, let's take a look, just open our eyes and let's look at what is happening to our country. If we can do this, we can change this.

This ought not be the case in the greatest country in the world. There is no one so blind as he who chooses not to see. I hope that understanding will prevail and that we will decide that we will not tolerate the level of hateful discourse that we are suffering and that many people suffer from because there are other persons who hurt them after being exposed to this incitive discourse, this incendiary language, this weaponization of hate. People are hurting.

I don't say these things because I want to make sure I personally am protected. I come to this podium to bring these words and this message because I know of the suffering in various communities.

Those who are suffering from anti-Semitism, I know about it. Those who are suffering from racism, I know. Those who are suffering from the various insidious forms of hate related to who you happen to be, I know about it. The homophobia, the Islamophobia, the xenophobia, all of the various phobias that are harmful to people, I know.

I have constituents, and I know that they expect me to do this. They expect someone to say that people are quietly suffering. They expect us to do this. They send us to Congress to do this. We ought not tolerate this level of hate because we perpetuate it, and we ought to do something about it.

In the beginning was the word. This is the word. I am talking about it now. But there is much more that we can do, and I pray that we will become, each of us, a committee of one to do something about the hate that is being perpetrated among people in this country that is causing harm to other people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

EXPLANATORY MATERIAL STATEMENT ON INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION MEASURES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018, 2019, AND 2020, SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHIFF, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The following is the explanation of the Damon Paul Nelson and Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020 (hereinafter, "the Act").

This explanation reflects the result of negotiations and disposition of issues reached between the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) (hereinafter, "the Agreement"). The explanation shall have the same effect with respect to the implementation of the Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a conference committee.

The explanation comprises three parts: an overview of the application of the annex to accompany this statement; unclassified congressional direction; and a section-by-section analysis of the legislative text.

PART I: APPLICATION OF THE CLASSIFIED ANNEX

The classified nature of U.S. intelligence activities prevents the HPSCI and SSCI (collectively, the "congressional intelligence committees") from publicly disclosing many details concerning the conclusions and recommendations of the Agreement. Therefore, a classified Schedule of Authorizations and a classified annex have been prepared to describe in detail the scope and intent of the congressional intelligence committees' actions. The Agreement authorizes the Intelligence Community (IC) to obligate and expend funds not altered or modified by the classified Schedule of Authorizations as requested in the President's budget, subject to modification under applicable reprogramming procedures.

The classified annex is the result of negotiations between the congressional intelligence committees. They reconcile the differences between the congressional intelligence committees' respective versions of the bill for the National Intelligence Program (NIP) for Fiscal Years 2018, 2019, and 2020. The Agreement also makes recommendations for the Military Intelligence Program (MIP) and the Information Systems Security Program (ISSP), consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, and provides certain direction for these two programs. The Agreement applies to IC activities for Fiscal Year 2020.

The classified Schedule of Authorizations is incorporated into the bill pursuant to Section 5102 of Subdivision 1. It has the status of law. The classified annex supplements and adds detail to clarify the authorization levels found in the bill and the classified Schedule of Authorizations. The congressional intelligence committees view direction and recommendations, whether contained in this explanation or in the classified annex, as requiring compliance by the Executive Branch.

PART II: SELECT UNCLASSIFIED CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

Unclassified Direction related to Subdivision 1 of the Act relates to Fiscal Year 2020. Unclassified Direction related to Subdivision 2 originated in Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The term "Committees" refers to both SSCI and HPSCI.