

Watt	Wexler	Wolf
Waxman	Whitfield	Woolsey
Weldon (FL)	Wicker	Wu
Weldon (PA)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)

763, designating the "Birch Bayh Federal Building and United States Courthouse," rollcall No. 251.

Like Will Rogers, though, all I know is what I read in the newspaper, and this weekend in *The Washington Post* there is a very compelling story. What it essentially says is it is not just Tamoxifen any more. In fact, let me just read for you from essentially what is a GAO study.

## NOT VOTING—51

Ackerman	Gallegly	Mollohan
Baird	Gephardt	Nadler
Baker	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Becerra	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Berkley	Grijalva	Reyes
Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Rush
Brown (OH)	Herger	Shimkus
Brown, Corrine	Houghton	Simpson
Burr	Istook	Smith (MI)
Conyers	Jenkins	Smith (WA)
Cox	Kennedy (RI)	Stark
DeMint	Kilpatrick	Sweeney
Dingell	Lantos	Taylor (NC)
Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Toomey
Fattah	LaTourette	Towns
Feeney	Lewis (GA)	Weiner
Ford	Lipinski	Young (FL)

□ 1915

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2143, UNLAWFUL INTERNET GAMBLING FUNDING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 263) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to prevent the use of certain bank instruments for unlawful Internet gambling, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## BRINGING AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL PRICES DOWN TO COMPETITIVE LEVELS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise tonight to talk about the high cost of prescription drugs here in the United States, and especially the high cost relative to what the rest of the industrialized world pays for the same drugs.

I have told this story to many of my colleagues repeatedly about how about a month ago we went to Munich, Germany, and bought a list of 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs in America. The total price tag for all 10 of those drugs compared to the average price here in the United States is about triple. It is more than double what we pay in the United States.

I have used the example of this drug, and this is the actual drug, Tamoxifen, one of the most popular, most effective anti-breast cancer drugs ever developed. The interesting thing is that the National Institutes of Health, using taxpayers dollars, paid for most of the research. What makes us even more upset is not just that the American taxpayer paid to develop the drug, but the difference now between what American consumers have to pay for this drug compared to the rest of the world.

This drug, for example, we bought at the Munich airport pharmacy for \$59.05 American. To put that in context, this drug sells at pharmacies here in Washington, D.C., for \$360. In other words, to round off the numbers, \$60 in Germany, \$360 in the United States. Worse than that, the American taxpayers paid for the research.

The headline is, "U.S. Netted Little From Cancer Drug, GAO Reports."

"The U.S. Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars to help develop Taxol, the best-selling cancer drug ever, but failed to get much money back on its investment, according to a government report issued yesterday.

"Drug maker Bristol-Myers Squibb earned \$9 billion from Taxol, which has been used to treat 1 million cancer patients, but the National Institutes of Health received only \$35 million in royalties, the Government Accounting Office found."

Now, on top of that, Medicare has spent over \$687 million on Taxol, so there are more taxpayer dollars going into Taxol.

Finally, the report says, and I am shortening it down to the bottom, but if you want a copy we will have this up on our Web site by sometime tomorrow afternoon, but the bottom line is the GAO, the investigative arm of Congress, said that the NIH spent \$484 million in research on Taxol through 2002.

Mr. Speaker, we subsidize the pharmaceutical industry in three separate ways.

First of all, we subsidize it on all the money we spend on basic research. I am proud of the fact that here in Congress, the NIH, the National Science Foundation, even DOD, we will spend this year about 29 billion taxpayer dollars on various kinds of basic research. Much of that research goes to benefit the pharmaceutical industry. So we subsidize them through the basic research we pay for them.

Secondly, we subsidize them through the Tax Code. They receive very generous tax benefits for the research we do.

Finally, and what disturbs us the most, is we subsidize them in the prices we pay. Americans pay far more than the rest of the industrialized world for prescription drugs.

I believe Americans should pay their fair share. I think we should be willing to subsidize Sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think we ought to have to subsidize the starving Swiss.

Americans deserve world-class drugs at world market prices. I hope Members will support my bill, which I hope to introduce later this week, to open up American markets to foreign competition to bring prices down to reasonable levels so that all Americans can afford them.

## EXTENDING THE CHILD TAX CREDIT TO ALL CHILDREN

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1915

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcalls 249, 250, and 251. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on each of those rollcalls.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today, Monday, June 9, 2003, to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 249, 250, and 251 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" and rollcall vote No. 249 on H.R. 1610, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Ritchie Avenue in Marceline, MO, as the "Walt Disney Post Office Building"; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 250 on H. Con. Res. 162, honoring the city of Dayton, OH, and its many partners, for hosting "Inventing Flight: The Centennial Celebration", a celebration of the centennial of Wilbur and Orville Wright's first flight; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 251 on S. 763, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 46 East Ohio Street in Indianapolis, IN, as the "Birch Bayh Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, official business prevents me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, June 9, 2003. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following rollcall votes: H.R. 1610, to redesignate the post office located in Marceline, MO as the "Walt Disney Post Office Building," rollcall No. 249; H. Con. Res. 162, honoring the City of Dayton, OH for hosting "Inventing Flight: The Centennial Celebration," rollcall No. 250; and S.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise to urge the Republican leadership of this House to bring legislation to the floor which would create the expansion of the child tax credit for many, many more families in America. Last week, many of us spoke on this floor urging the Congress to act, to act for America's children, to act for America's working families. The Senate has acted; and now the main obstacle, indeed the only obstacle to those children having the benefit of the tax credit, is the Republican leadership in the House.

Today, Senator DASCHLE, the distinguished minority leader in the Senate, and I sent a letter to the President thanking him for expressing his support for expanding the child tax credit. Unfortunately, again the Republican leadership in the House is blocking consideration of this vital legislation.

The President's immediate intervention with House Republicans is required to ensure that 12 million working and military families are eligible for the child tax credit. These families need the money now, but this tax relief will not be made available to them apparently unless the President intervenes and urges the Republican House leadership to pass this extension immediately.

How can we pass a tax bill that gives nearly \$100,000 in tax cuts to people making over \$1 million a year, \$100,000 tax cut to those making \$1 million a year, and yet say to people in our country who make the minimum wage, your children are not worthy of a \$400 expansion of the tax credit?

How do we say to our men and women in uniform, whose courage and patriotism we salute on a regular basis on this floor, how can we say to them we appreciate your courage, your patriotism and the sacrifice that you are willing to make for our country, but your children are unworthy of receiving the expansion of the tax credit because your military pay is not enough to qualify you for this tax cut?

Putting money into the hands of these working and military families will help increase demand in our economy, creating jobs and stimulating the economy. There is a very practical and economic reason to do this, in addition to just a sense of decency and doing what is right for America's children.

Because of the economic benefits and the fact that it is the right thing to do, the bill passed the Senate last week 94 to 2. But this week the bill is nowhere in sight.

We want this freestanding bill to come to the House of Representatives. We want the House Republicans to stop their opposition to this tax relief for America's children. We want them to stop refusing to bring it to the floor of the House.

Asking millions of working families who need the tax credit to help make ends meet in this stagnant economy, to sacrifice in order to pay for additional tax breaks for those who need it least

is simply not right. Approximately 250,000 children of our men and women in uniform are being deprived of the expansion of this \$400 tax credit in order to pay for a tax cut for millionaires in our country. I do not think it is an appropriate way to go.

Who is looking after the children in our country? Clearly it is the Democrats.

#### LOWERING THE COST OF PHARMACEUTICAL DRUGS FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) to join me in this small 5-minute Special Order. He just read part of an article in The Washington Post about pharmaceutical products that are manufactured in part with taxpayers money, where the pharmaceutical industry is making billions and billions of dollars while the taxpayer is getting virtually nothing back in return. The American people are paying exorbitant prices for these pharmaceutical products as compared to the rest of the world.

When these products are imported by Americans when they go up to Canada and buy these products, either through the Internet or go to Canada, when they bring them home to use them because they cost one-tenth, one-fifth, or one-half of what they would cost in the United States, the Food and Drug Administration, our regulatory body, says there is a question of safety; and they actually try to block or stop the reimportation of these pharmaceutical products, where the research is paid for in large part by the taxpayers of this country.

So I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), maybe he can enlighten me on this subject. Why is it that the Food and Drug Administration is not investigating why the pharmaceutical industry is manufacturing these products with taxpayers' money, or conducting the research with taxpayers' money, making these exorbitant profits, and the money that is given back to the taxpayer in royalties in this country is very nominal, almost nothing, compared to the \$9 billion the gentleman cited? Why is it the FDA is not investigating this, instead of stopping the American people from getting these pharmaceutical products at a reasonable price?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I cannot answer that question; but I think it is the question that we in Congress should try to get the answer to.

Why is it that the FDA is investigating little old ladies trying to save money on Tamoxifen? I spoke recently to the Pharmacists Association, and I asked them, how many of you have had

this experience, where an elderly person comes into your pharmacy, hands you a prescription. You tell them how much this prescription is going to cost, and their head drops, and they go, oh, well, I will come back tomorrow. Because we know from research done by the Kaiser Foundation, 29 percent of seniors in America are saying that they have prescriptions that go unfilled because they cannot afford them.

□ 1930

And the answer is, the FDA is not investigating companies that make \$9 billion off of Federal taxpayer research; no, they are not investigating them, they are investigating little old ladies, treating them as common criminals.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes. And the question that comes up is why they are not doing that. They are supposed to protect the American consumer and they are supposed to make sure the American consumer gets a fair deal, and it is simply not happening.

I would like to just read from what the gentleman read, real quickly. Squid made \$9 billion from Taxol, Bristol-Myers Squibb, and it has been used to treat 1 million cancer patients, but the National Institutes of Health got only \$35 million back in royalties. Squibb made \$9 million and they only gave \$35 million back for the research money that was paid for by the taxpayer. And then down at the bottom it says the GAO, the investigative arm of Congress, said NIH spent another \$484 million in research on Taxol through 2002. So the taxpayers paid for all of this research, but Squibb is making all the money and the taxpayer is getting nothing for it, except a shot in the jaw when they try to buy this product from another country where they can get it cheaper. It makes no sense to me.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It makes no sense to me. It is really time for us as Members of Congress to do something about it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman and some of our other colleagues, a growing number of our colleagues, in demanding that the GAO do an entire study of this to find out why the American people are being ripped off by the pharmaceutical companies when, in large part, the taxpayer is paying for that research. It makes no sense to me. And why is the FDA, why is the FDA protecting the pharmaceutical industry? It is something that should not be tolerated.

Any other comments from my colleague?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, the FDA is also responsible for all of the fruits and vegetables coming into the country. The issue they raise is safety, yet we import 318,000 tons of plantains that come into our borders, through our borders every year, and we do almost no investigation. We are much more likely to get sick from fruits and vegetables than we are from legal prescription drugs from FDA-approved facilities around the world.