

Only by disclosing all the facts will the credibility of the Defense Department be maintained. For this reason, I have several questions I would like you to answer formally;

Did U.S. forces encounter any Iraqi forces in the hospital?

Were U.S. troops fired upon during the rescue operation? If so, please describe specifically the nature of the interchange.

Did U.S. have any information suggesting that Iraqi forces had abandoned the hospital?

Did Private Lynch sustain any gunshot or knife wounds?

Did U.S. officials have any information suggesting that Iraqi medical staff were trying to deliver Private Lynch to American forces?

Did U.S. forces at any time fire on any ambulances?

In addition to posing these questions, I would like to make two additional requests. First, there has been a great deal of commentary in the manner in which the Department edited and aired a videotape of the rescue operation. Several media representatives have requested that the full tape be released so the American people can make an independent assessment of these conflicting claims. I see no reason for the Department to reject this request. Therefore, I request that you order the public release of the unedited footage taken by the military cameraman. Of course, if you have security or other concerns, I would be happy to review the tape myself and discuss those issues with you personally.

Finally, I understand the Department has ordered an investigation into the facts surrounding Private Lynch's capture by Iraqi forces. I also understand, however, that investigators were not asked to examine the circumstances surrounding Private Lynch's rescue. In light of the controversy that has arisen regarding this case, I suggest that the Pentagon's ongoing investigation also include the facts surrounding Private Lynch's rescue, as well.

If you have any questions about this request, please call my Chief of Staff, Jaron Bourke, at (202) 225-5871. I look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. KUCINICH,

Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). 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.

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

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

TAX FAIRNESS FOR EVERYONE, EXCEPT LOW-WAGE WORKING FAMILIES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans passed a bill last week which will provide a \$90,000 tax cut to the Nation's millionaires, but let us look at what else it does.

The independent Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center estimates that making the earned income tax credit marriage penalty relief effective this year would have offered an average tax cut of \$340 to 4 million working American families. But the President decided to make them wait until 2008 for the marriage penalty relief he offered their more affluent neighbors. House Republican leadership had several opportunities to correct the President's mistake and restore fairness to the tax bill, but they decided to cut working families loose. So that is \$90,000 for millionaires, not a cent for working lower-income families.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, said, "If you are not going to incentivize marriage, at the very least make sure you don't punish it." The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the House majority leader, said, "A country founded on freedom should not maintain a tax code that arbitrarily places an extra burden on husbands and wives." Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), said, "We need a tax code that doesn't punish married couples. They don't need the Federal Government picking their pocket."

\$90,000 for a millionaire, but nothing for married, poor, or working families.

Any one of those powerful officials could have taken a stand, could have spoken up for low-wage working families, could have ensured that no legislation would pass this House that valued the marriages of families of wealthy Americans above those of their less affluent neighbors. But none of those Republican leaders said a thing. None of them raised a voice of concern or lifted a finger to stop the advance of a bill that says loud and clear to millions of Americans, your marriage is worth less than your neighbor's marriage or your boss's marriage.

\$90,000 of tax cuts for a millionaire, but not a cent for low-income working couples.

Given that track record, it was disappointing, but not surprising, to learn the White House and the congressional Republican majority used their last-minute back-room deal in the tax bill to take another cheap shot at low-wage working families. The final conference bill brokered by Vice President CHENEY included a last-minute change that freezes 12 million low-wage families out of the bill's child tax credit increase.

\$90,000 for millionaires, nothing for working families, lower-income working families.

At the signing ceremony for this bill, the President said, "We are helping workers who need more take-home pay." But 7 million American families who pay income tax will get no benefit at all from this bill.

\$90,000 for millionaires, nothing for low-income families.

Now that the word is out, some of our Republican colleagues are saying they did not know about these changes. They are looking for someone to blame for the decision to cut low-wage working families loose on the child tax credit. But the deal was cut by the Vice President and his party's leadership, so the "I did not know it" excuse just simply does not wash.

If the White House had wanted to correct the injustices in the tax bill, if Republican leadership had been serious about fairness for married couples and children, there were plenty of opportunities. They could have dropped the average tax cut for millionaires, like the President's friend, Enron's CEO Chair Ken Lay, from \$93,000 to \$88,000, and that would have left enough money to give that tax break to working families.

They could have dropped the dividend tax cut that the President and Vice President worked so hard for, just over 2 percent, and the capital gains provision cost just 2 percent; and that would have paid for those lower-income working families who do pay taxes.

So they could have offset the cost by including some responsible corporate tax loophole reforms. We all know corporate expatriates like Tyco and Stanley use loopholes in the law to abandon their U.S. headquarters and reincorporate overseas. So they give tax breaks to them, they give tax breaks to millionaires, but not a cent for so many low-income working families in this country.

The simple truth is this was not a mistake. Any Republican Member of the House who thinks it was should listen carefully to today's statement by their elected majority leader. Asked about the prospects for legislative proposals to restore just some fairness, just a bit of fairness to the child tax credit, the majority leader, DELAY, said, "There is a lot of other things that are more important than that."

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, \$90 million for millionaires, not a cent for working, lower-income families. It is shameful.

PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES RUN ROUGHSHOD OVER AMERICAN CONSUMERS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, it was Will Rogers who said, "All I know is what I read in the newspapers," and I was reading yesterday's Wall Street Journal, and I would invite my colleagues to read the Wall Street Journal of yesterday, as well, because there is a story there that is just shameful about American policies as it relates to prescription drugs.

Let me read from this article from the Wall Street Journal front page yesterday. Let me read a couple of paragraphs. In fact, the headline is, "Empty Shells: As U.S. Balks on Medicine Deal, African Patients Feel the Pain," and the subtitle is "Big drug makers protecting their patents seek limits to a global trade accord, searching for insulin in Chad." As one reads the article, it is shameful.

Let me just read a couple of paragraphs for the benefit of Members. "Wealthier countries where drugs are produced and patented promised 18 months ago at global trade talks in Qatar to loosen patent restrictions in order to ease shortages and reduce prices. It was just after September 11, and the U.S. led the rhetorical charge, eager to demonstrate its desire to battle suffering among the world's poor while mounting a war on terrorism. But last December when all of the other 143 countries in the World Trade Organization had lined up behind a new plan on the trade of medicines, the United States blocked the proposal.

"The Bush administration, under heavy lobbying from the pharmaceutical industry seeking to limit the scope of the deal, endorsed a list of some 20 infectious diseases, and that was it. That was all they were willing to address. These included HIV-AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, typhus, hemorrhagic fever, and others categorized as epidemics in the developing countries, but that was it. Drug manufacturers feared that without the limitation, the deal could lead to a broader undermining of their lucrative patent rights. Poor nations were outraged."

Mr. Speaker, we should be outraged. As we speak, there are people suffering from diabetes in the country of Chad in sub-Saharan Africa that cannot get insulin. It is time for us to take control of this issue. For too long we have allowed the special interests and some of the misinformed people over at the FDA to sort of box us into a corner so Americans now pay the world's highest prices. We are the world's best customers, but yet we pay the highest prices for prescription drugs.

Do not just take my word for it. We were in Munich, Germany, about a month ago, and we bought and I have the receipt here for what we paid for these drugs. Let me take this drug, Cipro, which we all know about after the anthrax scare. In Germany, at the Munich airport, we paid 35.12 Euros for this product. That is about \$34. This same product in the United States sells for \$60. The average price in the United States, according to one study, is over \$80. We paid \$34.

Let me take Coumadin, and this is a drug that my father takes, made by DuPont. This drug in the United States, the average price is over \$64. In Munich, Germany, we bought this drug for 20.43 Euros. That works out to about \$19 in American currency; \$64 in the United States, \$20 in Europe.

Glucophage, a marvelous drug for diabetics, which we bought in Germany

for \$5. This drug can cost as much as \$100 here in the United States of America.

But here is the one that really got to me. This is a drug called Tamoxifen, probably the most effective drug we have ever seen on the market in treating and perhaps preventing breast cancer among women. It is a miracle drug, and we are thankful it exists. We bought this drug at the Munich Airport pharmacy for \$59.05 American. This same drug here in the United States sells for \$360 for the same box; \$60 in Germany, \$360 in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is not shame on the pharmaceutical industry, it is shame on us. We have created an environment where we permit these companies to literally run roughshod over American consumers.

Let me add one other thing about this drug, American taxpayers paid for almost all of the R&D costs to have it developed. In fact, the company originally said they would not patent it because it was the taxpayers who paid for the R&D. But I guess they have patented it.

I will yield back the balance of my time, but I will be back; and I have a bill that will begin to resolve this, and I hope all Members, Democrats and Republicans, will join me in cosponsoring that legislation.

TAX CUTS LEAVE OUT WORKING POOR

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about what the recent tax cuts will do for our economy, and I would like to talk to Members about what they will not do and who they will not help.

The \$350 billion in tax cuts leaves out the working poor, and many, in the State of California, working families. Republicans rejected a Democratic attempt to try to get child tax credits to low-income families earning less than \$10,500. To add insult to injury, last-minute changes made by Republicans also will prevent families with incomes between \$10,500 and \$26,625, and that includes about 11.9 million children, and they will not receive any kind of a child tax credit or be eligible for one. One out of every four families in my district in California will get no child tax credit.

Families like this one pictured here, who live in my district in East Los Angeles, Ruben and Teresa, whose son is proudly serving us right now in Iraq, this family makes \$24,000 a year. They will get no tax break, no tax break. Yet somehow Republicans found \$90 billion to give to 200,000 millionaire families. That money will not make it to my district, no way, since 99 percent of the families there earn less than \$200,000.

Republicans left out all of these families to accommodate tax cuts on divi-

dends that go mostly to rich and wealthy people. The tax cuts leave out married tax filers who happen to be living in poverty. The Republicans postponed marriage penalty relief under the earned income tax credit which is claimed by many working families earning \$34,000 or less. This means that working-class married tax filers are treated as second-class citizen.

The tax cuts leave out the people of California, and although California suffers from the largest budget deficit in the country, it is ranked at 43rd in terms of per capita State aid allotted by the Republican tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, 31 percent of California families are not helped by the child tax credit. That is 2.4 million children in California alone, and I mean all children; and 47 percent of Californians will get a total tax cut of less than \$100. That is barely enough to take them to the movies, buy a pizza and maybe have some extra spending money to buy book supplies, if that.

Mr. Speaker, 28 percent get nothing at all. It is a sign of a grossly skewed priority by Republicans that would leave a lot of people out, yet they give \$100,000 tax breaks to the largest SUVs, which pollute our air, keep us dependent on foreign oil, and spew out greenhouse gases.

So while the typical millionaire gets over \$93,500 in tax cuts and another \$100,000 break for their huge SUVs, working-class people are left sitting in the smog with almost nothing in their pockets. If we had only given those millionaires \$88,000 instead of \$93,000, we could afford to give the child tax credit to all families. That means 140,000 hard-working families in my district would have gotten some kind of tax relief.

Democrats tried to offer an economic stimulus plan with an immediate increase in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief for all, and the expansion of the 10 percent tax bracket, and Democrats tried to put money in the pockets of working-class people. These are the people who would stimulate our economy, pull it out of the tailspin it has been in ever since this President took office.

With more than 2.7 million jobs lost in the last 2 years, we in Congress should be declaring war against poverty. Instead, Republicans have declared a war against working families, families like this who send their children to serve in our wars. We need to change that, and we need to support and extend benefits for those hard-working Americans, especially families like this that right now are hoping that their son will come home, and even he would not be eligible for a tax credit because he makes less than the amount required under this bill that was passed by the Republicans.