served UTEP in numerous administrative capacities, including chairman of Modern Languages, associate dean and dean of Liberal Arts, vice president for Academic Affairs, interim president, and finally as president in today's capacity.

Dr. Natalicio has served on numerous boards and commissions, appointed to those boards and commissions by President Clinton, former President Bush, and Governor Bush as well. Some of them are the National Science Board, NASA Advisory Council, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, the ''America Reads Challenge'' Steering Committee, the Advisory Commission on Educational Excellence and many, many others that are important in her role as president of a dynamic university.

Dr. Natalicio has received countless awards and honors, which include the Harold W. McGraw, Jr. Prize in Education, the Outstanding Contribution to Education Award by the Hispanic and Business Alliance for Education, the Humanitarian Award from the League of United Latin American Citizens, and the distinguished Professional Women's Award.

□ 1245

In 1999, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Natalicio was inducted into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame. She has also written numerous books, articles and reviews in the field of applied linguistics.

Under Dr. Natalicio's leadership, UTEP has become the largest Hispanic majority university in the Nation. Its budget has increased from $64 million in 1988 to over $146 million today, and its doctoral programs have grown from 1 to 8 programs and it is still growing.

In the last decade, Dr. Natalicio has been an effective and increasingly influential individual in raising the visibility and the funding of the University of Texas at El Paso.

Dr. Natalicio began visiting Washington, D.C. some 10 years ago in an attempt to solicit Federal research dollars. At the time, Dr. Natalicio today reflects, they did not even know who UTEP was. I had to go and create an identity for the institution in Washington, D.C.

UTEP's Federal research grants have increased to $53 million last year from $3.5 million in 1987. The university spent some $27.8 million in 1999 moving up to fifth place among the State's 35 public academic universities in actual expenditures for Federal money.

Dr. Natalicio has constantly pushed UTEP towards becoming a Tier 1 research university. In May of 1997, under the leadership of Dr. Natalicio, UTEP embarked on an unprecedented fundraising effort called the Legacy Campaign, an initiative which, to date, has raised some $50 million in new endowments, tripling the university's total endowment from $25 million to over $75 million today.

Within one year, Dr. Natalicio has announced that the university's Legacy Campaign has raised $45 million, 95 percent of its goal. This generous financial commitment has resulted in the creation of more than 200 new endowments, including 80 newly endowed scholarships; 26 new professorships and chairs; and 48 new departmental excellence funds.

Dr. Natalicio's efforts to expand UTEP's Development and Alumni Affairs office has resulted in a steady increase in annual giving to the university. Dr. Natalicio further is proud of the accomplishments and can be traced to the courageous decisions and an appreciation for the contributions of others. She has been an instrumental force in transforming UTEP from a regional institution to an international university whose vision is outward and whose growth and phenomenal success in garnering additional funds for new programs are the envy of other universities. She is responsible for developing, during radically changing times, an atmosphere in which students, faculty, and staff are stimulated, inspired, and challenged.

VOTE AGAINST WELFARE FOR LARGE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, later today we will have an opportunity to vote on H.R. 4986, the FSC replacement bill. That is a foreign sales tax credit that was inaugurated by President Nixon in which the Washington Times recently, in an editorial, referred to it as one of the largest bipartisan and unanimous blunders passed by the House of Representatives.

In the early seventies, I opposed the FSC bill, or the foreign sales tax credit, and was successful at least in denying that tax credit to weapons manufacturers, on the theory that all weapons sold to foreign countries had to be approved by the Defense Department and the Secretary of State and basically were sold by our government to other governments, and there was no reason to give a subsidy, which is what this FSC thing is, to weapons manufacturers in the United States.

The Senate saw fit to reduce that to a 50 percent limitation and that has been the law for some 20 years. Recently, without any hearings and without any discussion, almost in the dead of night, the 50 percent limitation to defense contractors was removed. The World Trade Organization has filed a lawsuit against the United States saying that this foreign sales tax credit is a hidden subsidy, and they are right. It is a subsidy. It is being changed now in language in this bill that will come up under suspension, but the old saying, it is a duck if it quacks like a duck and it waddles like a duck. In this case, it quacks like a subsidy and it gives money back to companies out of the taxpayers' pocket to subsidize sales overseas.

What is perhaps most egregious at this time is that we are now cutting taxes to and for U.S. pharmaceutical companies to get the U.S. pharmaceutical companies to sell cheaper drugs to foreigners while at the same time selling them at higher prices here at home to our seniors. That is what will be done if my colleagues vote for 4986, and they should vote no.

The pharmaceutical industry does not need another corporate subsidy at the expense of the American taxpayer. Why give an incentive for the pharmaceutical companies when they sell their products to other developed nations for less than we can buy them here? I offered an amendment to say that pharmaceutical companies could not have this subsidy if they were selling their drugs for 5 percent more in this country than they sell in Canada and Mexico. That, unfortunately, was defeated.

We have shown, or studies have shown, that the American seniors are without drug coverage, pay almost twice as much for their pharmaceutical drugs as do our neighbors in Canada and Mexico. Why on Earth we should be giving companies like Merck, already one of the most profitable drug companies in the world, with more than twice the profits of, say, engineering and the construction industry, why we should give them an additional subsidy to continue to sell drugs for less money in Canada and Mexico and Germany and Japan than they do to the seniors in my district in Fremont, California, escapes me.

I hope that my colleagues will see the nonsense in this bill. It is being run through. We will not even see a report. They have held the report up so nobody can read that. There were a few of us on the committee who signed dissenting views. It is a bad bill. It does nothing but take money from the average senior, the average purchaser of pharmaceutical drugs, and give it to the richest companies in this country.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if I understand what the gentleman is saying, we, of course, are well aware that America's seniors, indeed uninsured people in America of all ages, a young family that has a sick child that does not have insurance, these individuals across America, millions of them, are paying the highest price for drugs of anyplace in the entire world, and an American pharmaceutical company under this bill can continue to do that, to charge them the highest prices in the world and export the same drug to another country, whether it is Canada, Europe, wherever.

Mr. STARK. Precisely. My Zucor, which got my cholesterol down from

220 to 160, great stuff, 1,200 bucks a year for Zucor. Fortunately, Blue Cross pays some of that for me. I could buy the same drug in Canada for $600. And I am giving this company a subsidy so they can sell it for less in Canada and I have to pay more for it here? I cannot figure that out.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is the vote we will be taking today, whether to reward these companies that charge Americans more money than anywhere else in the world, reward them by giving them a tax subsidy?

Mr. STARK. That is what it seems to me, and that seems like a dumb idea, and I hope the gentleman and my colleagues will vote no.

WE SHOULD NOT SUBSIDIZE AN INDUSTRY THAT OVERCHARGES AMERICAN CONSUMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because of my commitment to expanding international trade, I voted in favor of H.R. 4986 in committee. I must say that I was forced to cast that vote under very strange circumstances, with very limited information about the full content of this bill because of the way it was brought up. Because of the secrecy surrounding this bill and the deceit surrounding it, I am reconsidering that vote and will expand on the concerns that I just expressed in the discussion with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK). On pharmaceuticals, I question why it could possibly be right to subsidize an industry that overcharges American customers and sells the very same product made in America in other parts of the world for less. Why should there be a subsidy designed to encourage lower prices for seniors in other parts of the world for American pharmaceuticals than right here at home? The high cost of prescription drugs represents an injury to American consumers, but it really does add insult to injury to reward pharmaceutical companies with a tax break with reference to those foreign sales in addition to the gouging of the American consumer.

It is very important for our colleagues to understand that H.R. 4986, which will be coming up for a vote later today, was considered under the most extraordinary and unusual circumstances before the Committee on Ways and Means. There was no public hearing. There was no report that has yet been published. There was even an attempt to limit the ability of the members of the committee to ask questions to any resource witnesses about the nature of this bill. The lead official for the administration on this, Secretary Eizenstat, was rushed out of the committee before he could answer a single question about the bill. Highly unusual that an administration official would be unwilling to publicly answer questions about a bill that will cost American taxpayers $4 billion to $6 billion each year. Apparently the entire process for putting this bill together was to gather in a room outside of public purview those people who would benefit, like the pharmaceutical industry, from the tax break and work with them to figure out how they could get the most tax break without any input from anyone other than those who stood to gain from the tax subsidy.

It is particularly ironic that we would be taking this bill up today, because we have just had released this morning a new study concerning the very highly addictive quality of nicotine; that it takes a child a very short period of time of being exposed to a cigarette before they become addicted to nicotine. Yet one of the principal beneficiaries of this piece of legislation are the giant tobacco companies. They are involved in a worldwide effort to spread the plague of death and disease associated with tobacco use. We have learned today that tobacco is even more addictive than previously known for children.

Phillip Morris, for example, runs these ads all the time, they are spending millions of dollars to tell us how they do not put their logos on clothing; they do not sponsor youth-oriented activities; they do not try to attract children to smoke in the United States. While such claims are very questionable even here at home, none of them apply abroad. Phillip Morris is directly targeting the world's children, as are other tobacco companies.

Under this piece of legislation, the American taxpayer will be an unwilling accomplice of this attempt to addict children around the world. The tobacco industry, if this bill is passed, will get at least $100 million every year in special tax breaks for the purpose of allowing it to go around and do the same thing to children in other parts of the world, particularly in the developing countries, that it has done to our children. Nor does the American tobacco industry need a special tax break in order to enjoy a competitive advantage. Big tobacco companies have already gained extensive experience as they abused American children, as they successfully addicted millions of American children who grew up to die of emphysema and lung cancer and heart problems as a result of their exposure to tobacco.

Big tobacco has the tremendous marketing expertise, paid for with millions of lives in this country, to apply to Eastern Europe, to Asia, to Africa, to South America, to addict the children in that part of the world. And, as I indicated, they have specifically refused to apply any of the very modest limitations on marketing to children that they now apply in this country to their efforts to addict children around the world.

Why should we reward this malicious industry with $100 million a year tax cut? That is what the members of this Congress will have to answer this afternoon when this bill comes up.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUINN) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Sister Catherine Moran, O.P., New Community Corporation, Newark, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Lord God,

As Members of the House of Representatives meet today, give this Nation the strength and wisdom to follow Your way.

By Your gentle prodding, Lord, help those elected to public office to act on the promises made to those who rely on them.

By loosening the bonds that have held Your people in the past, may this body give service to all.

In deliberating and making decisions, may the poor and the oppressed never be forgotten.

With Your guidance, Lord, may Your servants be instrumental in fashioning a better tomorrow for all.

We ask Your blessing on the work of this Congress and we thank You for Your presence among us.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PAYNE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME AND CONGRATULATIONS TO SISTER CATHERINE MORAN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)