

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about America, we often pride ourselves upon being a free country, a free country; and it is easier to stand in front of the American flag and give great speeches about freedom than it is to really fight for freedom, because one of the elements of freedom is to understand, among other things, that not everything, not everything that somebody says or does is something that we agree with, but what freedom is about is tolerating and respecting other points of view, of understanding that people have the right to read whatever they want to read, have the right to an attorney when they need an attorney.

I was one of the relatively few people in the House who voted 6 weeks after the horror of 9/11 against the USA PATRIOT Act, and I voted against the USA PATRIOT Act not because I am not concerned about terrorism. I happen to believe that terrorism is a very serious issue and that the United States Government must do everything that it can to protect the American people and fight terrorism, but I voted against the USA PATRIOT Act because I believe we can fight terrorism without undermining basic constitutional rights, which is what the USA PATRIOT Act is doing.

Again, on this issue, we have seen some very interesting nonideological coming-together. We have seen some really very conservative people who are honest conservatives who say because they do not believe in Big Government they do not want the United States Government monitoring the reading habits of the American people in their libraries or their bookstores. Unfortunately, again, on this issue, the Bush administration and Attorney General John Ashcroft are on the wrong side. They are, in many respects, working to undermine the basic constitutional rights that are given, that have made this country a free country.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by stating that it is high time that the Congress of the United States begin to focus on the needs of the middle class, the vast majority of our people, the middle class of which is shrinking, the middle class in which the average person is working longer hours and for lower wages. America will grow when the middle class grows; and to do that, we need some fundamental changes in our policies.

We need a national health care system which guarantees health care to all Americans. We need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. We need to fundamentally change our trade policies so that we do not continue to see the collapse of manufacturing. We need to make sure that every American, regardless of income, has a right to go to college. We need to rescind the tax breaks that have been given to the wealthiest people and the largest corporations and create a tax structure which works for the middle class and not just for the wealthy and the powerful.

There is a lot of work that must be done, and I look forward to participating in that effort.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). 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 come here tonight to set the record straight because last night the Food and Drug Administration Commissioner, Mr. Mark B. McClellan, made some statements in a speech before the National Press Club that I think need to be corrected.

One of the big problems that we face as a Nation is that pharmaceutical products and the cost of them is totally out of line with the rest of the world. For instance, and I have used this example many times on the floor of the House, a woman who has breast cancer, a doctor will tell her the drug of choice is Tamoxifen, and Tamoxifen in Canada costs about one-sixth or one-seventh of what it does here in the United States. There are a number of other pharmaceutical products that cost five, six, or seven times what they cost here in the United States. The same thing is true in Germany, in Spain, and France and a lot of other countries in the world. So the American people are paying five, six, or seven times what it costs in other parts of the world for the very same pharmaceutical product.

The big issue has been whether or not these products, if they are reimported into the United States, are safe. Over 1 million, probably a million and a half, American citizens have been buying their pharmaceutical products from Canada because they can get them so much cheaper up there than they can here in the United States. So there was a question of safety, are these people being injured by reimporting these pharmaceutical products from Canada?

I had four hearings before my committee and subcommittee on this very issue, and we had people from the Food and Drug Administration, Mr. Hubbard who is a deputy over there, come and testify before our committee about the safety of the reimportation of these pharmaceutical products. I asked him on four separate occasions to give us any examples of where people had been injured by pharmaceutical products, FDA-approved, that had been reimported into the United States. He could not find one example, not one, and yet the FDA continues to say that there is a safety issue about the reimportation of these pharmaceutical products.

They do not mention that they are supposed to check the food supply and the importation of foods from around the world, but 40 percent of our orange juice comes from around the world, and that is not checked, maybe 1 percent of it is, and raspberries are imported from

Guatemala. We had 1,024 people either get sick or die from those that we know of, and yet we do not mention those, and yet they talk about the safety of pharmaceutical products when we have not had one case of people being damaged by reimportation of pharmaceutical products from Canada.

Yet, last night, Mr. McClellan said in his speech, "But at the same time, these Members," talking about Members of Congress, "at the same time, these Members" of Congress "are clearly out of touch with the realities of keeping our drug supply safe, and the clear and present dangers to America's drug supply that their bills would create."

□ 1745

He is talking about a bill that we passed overwhelmingly here in the House that would allow American citizens to buy pharmaceuticals at lower cost from other parts of the world because they are costing so much here in the United States.

Now, the Food and Drug Administration, in my opinion, is marching in lockstep with the pharmaceutical industry, which is making huge profits here, while in other parts of the world they are making very small profits. The big profits and the big costs are to the American consumer, while the rest of the world does not bear those expenses. I just think that is dead wrong.

The safety issue is a bogus issue. And there is another example that I would like to cite that shows that it is not a safety issue. The FDA has approved 949 different sites where they produce FDA approved drugs in the world. That is 949, and in places like Haiti and India and China and elsewhere. There are 949 sites. When they produce drugs in those sites, they send them out in large containers. Now, if there is a safety issue, it would be at those sites, because they are sending these drugs out in large containers where there could be some tampering taking place. But when they are sent in in very small amounts from Canada or Germany to United States citizens, they are usually in containers that are tamper proof, or could be made tamper proof so that the people would have absolutely no safety issue to be concerned about.

So I am very disappointed that the Food and Drug Administration continues to say to the American people and is trying to scare senior citizens and others that they should not buy their pharmaceuticals from Canada or Germany or elsewhere, because the safety issue simply has not manifested itself. As a result, many Americans, who cannot afford prescription drugs, are going to the pharmacist and saying, How much is it? And the pharmacist says, Well, it costs this much; and they say, Well, maybe I will come back tomorrow, or they buy half a prescription and split the pills, while at the same time they could go to Canada and buy the same prescription product at one-sixth or one-seventh what it costs here in the United States.

The Food and Drug Administration ought to be doing everything they can to make sure Americans get the best product, the best prescription drug at the best price in the world marketplace. World class drugs at world class prices. They should not be trying to say there is a safety issue when none exists.

THE CASE FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to come before the House tonight in a continuous series that this Member of Congress had the privilege of beginning scarcely a month ago, but a series of speeches that I hope will periodically and intermittently be a part of the fabric of my congressional career for howsoever long the Lord permits me to serve here.

I simply call it, Mr. Speaker, the case for life, and it is my ambition from time to time to come onto this blue and gold carpet of this Capitol and speak to my colleagues, and anyone else who may be listening, on the moral and intellectual and historical arguments for the sanctity of human life; and to perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in some small way enliven the moral sensibility of a Nation and be a part of an ongoing debate in America on this topic.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate that continues at this very hour in the other body of this Congress. At this very moment, I am pleased to say, as a pro-life Member of Congress, that the United States Senate is at this very moment passing a conference report on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. That legislation, as of today, will have three times passed the Congress since 1995 and will be delivered for the first time to the willing desk of President George W. Bush, where, unlike the veto stamp of President Clinton that met the ban of partial-birth abortion not once but twice, President George W. Bush, upon returning from his tour of the Asia-Pacific Rim, will no doubt, in an emotional ceremony, put his pen to this legislation and end a practice that has no place in civilized society.

So it is especially poignant for me, just a few steps down the hallway from that Chamber, to rise tonight and continue my discussion of the case for life. And particularly tonight, Mr. Speaker, I feel prompted to speak about abortion and American women. You see, it has always been my belief, since first having my conscience enlivened on this issue, that there is not one victim of abortion, but there are two. There is undoubtedly the nascent human life that is ended abruptly and in darkness, but there is the other life that goes on that pays a price that psychologists are talking about today, but many Americans simply choose to ignore.

There are also other voices that I want to reflect on tonight as well, chiefly from our own history. As we think about the great American women who led this Nation in increasing measure towards equal status for women in voting rights and in property and in station in our society, women like Susan B. Anthony, Emma Goldman, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton come to mind.

I just came from a stroll in the rotunda, Mr. Speaker, where I grabbed a piece of paper and scribbled the names of a few of those heroic women that actually appear on a statute at the very center of our Capitol. In the rotunda, there is a statute that bears the likeness of the three great heroes of the suffrage movement. Two of them I would like to speak about tonight as we talk about great American women and abortion, but then also talking about what women of America today face in the struggle over the sanctity of human life.

One of the faces on that statute is Susan B. Anthony, a name that is almost like mom and apple pie for most Americans. Susan B. Anthony was born February 15, 1820 in Adams, Massachusetts. She was brought up in a Quaker family that had long activist traditions. Early in life, she developed a deep sense, historians tell us, of justice and what could only be described as moral zeal.

After teaching for 15 years, Susan B. Anthony became active in the temperance movement. Because she was a woman, she was not allowed to speak at rallies, and this experience, as well as her acquaintance with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, led her to help form what became the Women's Movement in 1852. Soon afterwards, she would dedicate her entire life to winning women not only the right to vote, Mr. Speaker, but Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were about winning women a seat at the civic table; the opportunity not to be viewed, as women were in some aspects of common law, as the property of their husbands, but rather to be seen as coequal heirs of everything that freedom offers.

Ignoring opposition and abuse, Susan B. Anthony traveled, lectured, and canvassed across the Nation for the vote. She also campaigned for the abolition of slavery, women's rights to their own property and earnings, and even women's labor organizations. In 1900, she achieved a major victory in convincing the University of Rochester to admit women for the first time in their storied history.

Susan B. Anthony, who had never married, and was remembered as an aggressive and compassionate person with a keen mind and the ability to inspire, she remained active in the movement that she began until her death in March of 1906.

And Susan B. Anthony was pro-life. Let me read, if I may, from her publication, "The Revolution," on this

topic, published July 8, 1869. Susan B. Anthony wrote: "No matter what the motive, love or ease or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed." Referring to abortion. She went on to write: "It will burden her conscience in life; it will burden her soul in death. But, oh," she wrote, "oh thrice guilty is he who drove her to the desperation which impelled her to the crime."

So wrote Susan B. Anthony, words that we will reflect on before I take my seat tonight. Brokenhearted words of the suffering of the unborn innocent and also of the suffering of the American woman who would burden her conscience in life and burden her soul in death, but of the guilt of the man who drove her to the desperation which impelled her to perform the abortion.

Susan B. Anthony, memorialized in marble in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, a woman whose name is synonymous with the voting rights and the equal status that women of 21st century America enjoy, was pro-life and understood the moral consequences of the act on an American woman and the deplorable position of a man that would force the outcome.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton also appears on the monument in the rotunda. And she, like Susan B. Anthony, her friend and colleague and collaborator for women's issues in America, was pro-life. Elizabeth Cady, the daughter of Daniel Cady, a lawyer and a politician, was born in Jonestown, New York, 12 November 1815. She studied law under her father, who became a New York Supreme Court judge, and during that period of time she became a very strong advocate for women's rights.

In 1840, Elizabeth married the lawyer, Henry B. Stanton. The couple became active in the American antislavery movement, and later that year Stanton and Lucretia Mott traveled to London as delegates to the World Antislavery Convention. Both women, history records, were furious when they, like the British women at the convention, were refused the permission to speak at the meeting to denounce slavery.

Stanton later recalled, "we Resolved to hold a convention as soon as we returned home and form a society to advocate the rights of women." And so she did. But it was not until 1848 that Stanton and Lucretia Mott organized the Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls. Stanton's resolution, that it was "The duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves the sacred right to the elective franchise," was passed, and this became the focus of the group's campaign for years to come.

□ 1800

In 1866, Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucy Stone established the American Equal Rights Association. The following year, the association became active in Kansas where Negro suffrage and women's suffrage were to be decided in a popular