

Our study showed many other examples of price discrimination. One drug, Synthroid, a hormone treatment, had a price difference of 1350 percent. The most favored customers were paying \$1.78 for the prescription, while our senior citizens in their local pharmacies are paying \$25.86.

Some would say, well, maybe the local pharmacies are getting rich. The truth is the markup on drugs at a local pharmacy is very small. Our study indicated that it ranged anywhere from a 1 percent markup to a high of 19 percent. So it is not our local pharmacies that are responsible for this problem. It goes back to the big drug manufacturers and their discriminatory pricing practices. It is wrong, and we need to do something about it.

H.R. 4646 addresses this problem by allowing our local pharmacies to buy directly from the Federal Government at these lower prices and then resale, resale to our senior citizens at much lower prices. We think this is a common sense solution, will cost the government nothing, but it should be done for folks like Ms. Daley in Orange, Texas. The big drug companies will not like it, but for Ms. Daley it is worth the fight.

RESPECT WILL OF HOUSE AND SENATE AND ALLOW WOMEN EQUAL BENEFITS UNDER FEDERAL HEALTH PLANS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, last night the Treasury-Postal conference settled virtually everything except the controversy over contraceptives in this body.

Normally, such controversies concern differences between the House and the Senate. There are no differences between the House and the Senate on the matter of allowing Federal employees options for contraception. This matter was won in the House; it was won in the Senate. There is an attempt to undemocratically overturn the will of this House and the will of the Senate in conference. Both the House and the Senate understood that this no-cost health necessity for women is elementary. Yet a group of men, largely of men, in this body is trying to reverse what the majority of two houses have done.

What have we done? We simply require that health plans cover contraception as they do other prescriptions. Most of what men need in prescriptions are covered, yet many health plans do not cover contraception. This is essential for the health of American women, in this case Federal employees, because of vast differences in contraceptives.

We all know, for example, of the pill. And there are some people who cannot take the pill. Some kinds of contraception do not work for some people. Some

have serious side effects. Some are uncomfortable. Some have long-term effects and people do not wish to take the risk.

Federal employees do not have the options necessary for their health today. Eighty percent, that is the vast majority of Federal plans, do not cover the range of available contraceptives and, thereby, are putting the health of women in the Federal service at risk. Ten percent do not cover contraception at all. Imagine that. Often plans cover abortion but not contraception. Really turns on its head the way we should be going at this issue.

One reason why women of reproductive age spend 68 percent more in out-of-pocket costs for health care is this failure to cover contraception which most American women use and need. Most Americans, including the majority of pro-life voters, support the requirement that health insurance cover contraception. So why is it, then, that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CHRIS SMITH), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), and all the Republicans on the conference committee on the House side, and even the gentleman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), who is on that committee, are trying to defeat the will of the majority in conference?

The bipartisan Women's Caucus of this House supports this measure. This measure was won fair and square in committee, and then there was an attempt to overturn it here in the House. Now it has been won fair and square in both Houses, and democracy does not yet rule.

This gets to be very personal, Mr. Speaker, because we are here not only talking about women's health, we are talking about the most personal side of their health: reproductive health. We have no right to limit what contraception a woman may use. The five leading methods, oral contraception, diaphragm, IUD, Norplant, and Depo-Provera, are none of them associated with abortion. That, of course, is already taken care of in the bill. Federal employees are put at considerable disadvantage by having their options limited in so basic a way.

Allow women equal benefits under Federal health plans. Let the will of the majority of the House and Senate prevail. Do not give in to an energetic minority not committed either to women or to democracy in this body.

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

(Mr. BERRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1030

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA, RECOGNIZE THE FREEDOM IN WHICH WE LIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Under a pre-

vious order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in less than a week the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, on October 5 will convene for what I believe will be an important hearing.

I thought it was important this morning, in light of the press conference yesterday of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), to try to not only clarify for myself but to articulate some of the views of those of us who are Democrats juxtaposed against the chairman's remarks yesterday.

This committee now has a task that for many is not a pleasant task. It is not a pleasant time for America or Americans. It is a somber time and a highly serious commitment on all of our parts, for the concept of impeachment goes to the very infrastructure of this Nation.

As I reflected on the will of the Founding Fathers in their design of article 2, section 4, the impeachment provision, I now more than ever understood their thoughts. This fledgling nation they wanted to survive. How well they do, that in 1998, we live in a free nation, a sovereign nation, that respects the First Amendment and certain rights under the Bill of Rights, such as the Fifth Amendment of due process.

The Founding Fathers were immediate immigrants from desperate nations, or nations with monarchies. I believe what they said, that we will have a nation that elects, where the head of government is not a monarchy and we will have a right as a people to elect that person but as well we will have a right to remove that person.

At the same time, I would simply say that they did not want this process to be frivolous and without meaning. Nor did they give us any fine definition.

High crimes and misdemeanors, many may think of the word high as very important. If one reads further one might find that it is high, meaning against the crown. So, in fact, they did leave the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors to the ongoing time frame of when we might find it.

So in 1974, as the Nixon proceedings moved forward, we found that the Republicans, who were then in the minority, decided that high crimes had to be a commitment of a crime and as well it had to be against the government, for obviously Mr. Nixon was of the Republican Party.

We now have had 6 days of hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary. None of them have been on the issue of defining what high crimes and misdemeanors might portend to be in 1998. We have spent a lot of time playing to the public opinion, the media blitz. We have spent a lot of time releasing documents that most Americans thought were sacred because they were part of a grand jury system.