In the district I represent, Sonoma County seniors pay on the average of 145 percent more for the most commonly used drugs than favored customers pay for the same drugs. For one drug, they pay 242 percent more than favored customers. I know this, because I asked the minority staff of the Committee on Government Reform to look into prescription drug pricing in Sonoma and Marin Counties. I released the results to that report to my community and its central conclusion can be summed up in the report subtitle, Drug Companies Profit at the Expense of Older Americans. As Members can see by these charts, for Sonoma County alone, the study looked into five commonly used prescription drugs, charted their price at local pharmacies and compared those prices to what the Federal Government pays for the same drugs. The Federal negotiated price is nearly the same, you must know, as that charged to favored private customers, large insurance companies and HMOs. Senior citizens and other individuals who pay for their own drugs pay more than twice as much for these drugs than do the drug companies' most favored customers. For some drugs listed in the report, the price is even more outrageous. Synthroid, for example, a hormone treatment, costs Sonoma County seniors 1,738 percent more than it cost the manufacturer's favored customers. By looking at these charts, we can see that for Medicare patients, those who need the cholesterol drug Zocor, their costs are significantly greater than the favored customers. This comes out to $115 for Medicare patients and $34 for the favored customers. That is 231 percent different. The difference is not in price because the HMOs, the large insurance companies and government buyers are able to negotiate and buy in bulk. The difference is because they are charging seniors to make up the difference for what they cut for their most favored customers.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO HELP AMERICA'S FARMERS

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, American agriculture today and rural communities today face an extraordinary challenge, the challenge of having farm policy change in 1996 with the consent and approval of this Congress and the consent and approval of the President of the United States for the good, to have an opportunity to have less farming for the government and more farming for the market. Overall, combined with the freedom that this new agriculture policy provides and the additional expenditure of taxpayer dollars for agriculture research with the movement toward reduction of Federal regulations that hampered the farmer's freedom to do what the farmer does best, and that is farm for the market and other changes that were made in the 1996 farm bill, it has overall been a good thing. What the American farmer faces today is low prices and lack of markets. Our farmers do not have the ability to market overseas the products that we grow so well in this country.

My State of Washington is a perfect example, and the Fifth Congressional District is a more narrow example of a perfect example. That is, our farmers in the Fifth District grow wheat and barley and oats and peas and lentils and potatoes and apples, the best in the world. But yet most of our products, on our grain products and commodities, are exported overseas. My farmers are limited in those exports because of unilateral American sanctions on countries that used to be wonderful trading partners of Washington State farmers and agriculture in the West.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 212, earlier in this Congress as a priority matter for not only the farmers of the Pacific Northwest but the farmers of the country. What that bill does is lift the unilateral sanctions that are currently in place by our government that prevent our farmers from selling to countries that other farmers around the world can sell to. We used to have a fine market in wheat sales to Iran and Iraq and the Sudan and other places that are currently sanctioned. The sanctions are imposed because of our disagreements with the terrorist policies and the enemy policies of these governments.

I disagree with those policies of those rogue nations that have used terror in the world and oppression in the world. But yet selling agriculture and medicine to those countries does not in my judgment pose a national security threat on our country. What it does as we unilaterally impose those sanctions is hurt our farmers. So H.R. 212 does two things. It lifts the sanctions that are currently in place for food and medicine only, and it gives the President the opportunity in the event that the President feels that lifting those sanctions poses a national security threat, the President has the ability to reimpose those sanctions on that basis. But in the meantime, it allows our farmers, then, to seek to reclaim those markets that we have lost by virtue of the sanctions.

In 1980, President Carter imposed a sanction on the Soviet Union for political purposes. Who did that hurt? It hurt the Olympics, and the American interest in the Olympics, and it hurt American farmers, a market that was a prime market for my farmers in the West. We have yet to get that agriculture market back by virtue of those sanctions back in 1980.

□ 1630

Yesterday in the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies on which I serve as a subcommittee member I introduced a narrower version of H.R. 212 which would lift of the sanctions on food and medicine for these countries that are currently sanctioned, but it would not allow any government spending in connection with the lifting of those sanctions. In other words, the taxpayer would not bear any of the burden for allowing our farmers to deal directly with those countries and make sales. It is a $6 billion plus market for our farmers in commodities as diverse as rice and corn and peas and wheat and barley. It is a great market that is exposed to our farmers.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends on the appropriations subcommittee defeated this amendment by a vote of 28 to 24. It was a very close vote, but it was a great debate, and we ought to have that debate again on H.R. 212 and on this next version of this amendment that went into the appropriation bill yesterday.

So, I urge my colleagues to study H.R. 212, study the concept of lifting sanctions on food and medicine. It is a humanitarian basis that is good policy for our country, and it will absolutely help our agriculture markets who are struggling to find markets overseas.

One final point: In the event that we lift these sanctions and allow farmer-to-country correspondence and sales, it prevents the agriculture community that is in straits from coming to the Congress and seeking Federal tax dollars. It is the free market approach to agriculture success.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROADCASTERS FAIRNESS IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, today I am here to introduce the Broadcasters Fairness in Advertising Act of 1999. There is a silent and pervasive trend among ad agencies and the companies they represent to engage in discriminatory practices which are called, quote, ''no urban/Spanish dictates'' end of quote, and they are called, quote, ''minority discounts,'' end of quote. The term: ''No urban slash Spanish dictates'' means not advertising products on stations that cater to minorities. ''Minority discounts'' means paying minority-owned stations far less for advertising the same product that is paid to nonminority-owned stations. These policies have no business rationale and are purely discriminatory.

Madam Speaker, year in and year out minority broadcasters lose millions of dollars in revenues, however the advertising companies would have us believe otherwise. They will contend that they do not advertise in these stations because minorities do not buy their products.