compared to Zoloft's five and a half days. The consultant also found that Prozac produced far more side effects, including headaches, sexual dysfunction, insomnia, diarrhea, anxiety and agitation. Yet the PCS letter subsequently sent to thousands of physicians erroneously suggested that Prozac had the shortest adjustment time and fewest side effects.

The misuse of this PCS drug utilization letter for transparent promotional purposes was one of the reasons the FDA recently decided to monitor drug substitutions. HCFA recently reported that PCS believes that 30 percent of the prescriptions written under its preferred drug program are successfully switched, providing some measure of how extensive this practice is becoming.

Such drug policies influenced by commercial interests can have damaging effects on care. Patients are being switched to chemically dissimilar agents that are not rated as equivalent by the FDA, and usually have different side effects, dosages and efficacy rates. Patients stabilized on one medication are also being moved to another without any clinical cause, leading one doctor to label these switching strategies ''massive unfunded human experimentation.'' With doctors constrained by preferred lists, the many differences between patients—age, ethnicity, multiple disease states—are not always factored into prescribing decisions.

Hurt most by these practices are the elderly and chronically ill because they often consume daily dosages of a variety of highly competitive medications. Take the example of 65-year-old Clara Davis, a retired grocery store manager from Bolivar, Tennessee. She lost a third of her stomach after her ulcer medication was switched. Her physician tried to persuade her plan not to force the substitution but it insisted. While recovering from the operation she suffered a paralyzing stroke.

As we meet, several states—Maine, New York, California and Virginia—are considering legislative action to protect the Clara Davis' of this country and to restrict drug formularies based more on commercial, rather than health, considerations. But ultimately, since drug sales are obviously national in scope, there must be a national policy on drug substitutions. I urge you not to squander your once-in-a-generation opportunity to stop this new and growing trend of HMOs—not physicians and pharmacists—prescribing the pills that we all swallow.

Given how extensive and harmful managed-care-driven drug substitutions have become, I urge the Commission to include this language in their final report. I believe that these recommendations implement the mandates of the Consumer Bill of Rights on Information Disclosure and Participation in Treatment Decisions:

''Consumers should be fully informed about all factors affecting a prescription choice. Health care organizations and physicians should disclose any possible side effects or economic reasons for a recommended therapeutic switch. Health care organizations should restrict substitutions to those that are found to be therapeutically equivalent by the FDA. Consumers should be free to reject these recommended switches without penalty, such as the imposition of a higher copayment. Consumers have the right to continue on a drug regimen that has been medically beneficial for them, without pressures on their physician to switch. Health care organizations should make their preferred drug lists, as well as formularies, available to consumers. Drug substitutions should take into account the potential overall cost of a change in care, not merely the comparative costs of two medications in the same therapeutic category.

''The President should provide strong, continuous leadership to improve the quality and delivery of prescription drug care in the United States. The President should act to eliminate all commercial interests advising, selecting or influencing prescription drug treatments and act to improve the health of all Americans by developing a patient-specific prescription drug policy.''

REFERENCES

Scientific Studies and Reports

1. Bloom BA, Hacobs J: ''Cost-effects of Restricting Cost-effective Therapy.'' Med Care 23:872–80, 1985.

2. Bootman JL, Johnson JA: ''Drug-Related Morbidity and Mortality: A Cost-of-Illness Model.'' Arch Intern Med 155:1949–56, 9 Oct. 1995.

3. Cromwell DM, Moore RD, Steinberg EP, et al.: ''Florida's Restrictions on Reimbursement for Peptic Ulcer Disease Drugs Associated with Increased Hospitalizations.'' Presented at the First Annual Research Service Award trainees Research Conference. Chicago; 3 June 1995.

4. Etheredge L: ''Pharmacy Benefit Management: The Right Rx?'' In: Research Agenda Brief, from a discussion by the George Washington University National Health Policy Forum. Washington DC; 21 May 1995.

5. Horn SD, Sharkey PD, Tracy DM, et al.: ''Evidence of Intended and Unintended Consequences of HMO Cost Containment Strategies: Results from the Managed Care Outcomes Project.'' Am J Man Care 2:253–264, 1996.

6. Krelig DH, Knocke DJ, Hammel RW: ''The Effects of an Internal Analgesic Formulary Restriction on Medicaid Drug Expenditure in Wisconsin.'' Med Care 27:34–44, 1989.

7. Levy RA, Cocks D: ''Component Management Fails to Save Health Care System Costs: The Case of Restrictive Drug Formularies.'' Washington DC: National Pharmaceutical Council 1996.

8. Magid D, Douglas JM, Schwarz JS: ''Doxycycline Compared with Azithromycin for Treating Women with Genital Chlamydia Trachomatis Infections: An Incremental Cost-effectiveness Analysis.'' Annals of Intern Med 124–389–399, 1996.

9. Moore JM, Newman R: ''Medicaid Drug formularies: Opening Closed Doors.'' Washington DC: American Legislative Exchange Council 1990.

10. Schulman KA, Rubenstein LE, Abernathy DR, et al.: ''The Effect of Pharmaceutical Benefits Managers: Is It Being Evaluated?'' Annals of Intern Med 124:906–913, 1996.

11. Shulman SR, DiCerbo PA, Ulcickas ME, Lasagna L: ''A Survey of Therapeutic Substitution Programs in Ten Boston Area Hospitals.'' Drug Info J25:41–52, 1992.

12. Sloan FA, Gordon GS, Cocks DL: ''Hospital Drug Formularies and the Use of Hospital Services.'' Med Care 31:851–867, 1993.

13. Smalley WE, Griffin MR, Fought RL, et al.: ''Effect of a Prior-authorization Requirement on the Use of Nonsteroidal Antiinflammatory Drugs by Medicaid Patients.'' N Engl J Med 332:1612–7, 1995.

14. Soumerai SB, Ross-Degan D, Fortess EE, Abelson J: ''A Critical Analysis of Studies of State Drug Reimbursement Policies: Research in Need of Discipline.'' Milbank Quart 71 (2):217–252, 1993.

15. Soumerai SB, McLaughlin TJ, Ross-Degan D, Casteris CS, Bollini P: ''Effects of Limiting Medicaid Drug-reimbursement Benefits on the Use of Psychotropic Agents and Acute Mental Health Services by Patients with Schizophrenia.'' N Engl J Med 331:650–655, 1994.

16. Soumerai SB, Lipton HL: ''Computer-based Drug-utilization Review: Risk, Benefit, or Boondoggle?'' N Engl J Med 332:1641–5, 1995.

Federal Government Agencies—

United States Food and Drug Administration

1. ''Guidance for Industry: Promoting Medical Products in a Changing Healthcare Environment; I. Medical Product Promotion by Healthcare Organizations or Pharmacy Benefits Companies (PBMs)''. Docket No. 97D–0525) 1998.

United States General Accounting Office

1. ''Pharmacy Benefit Managers: Early Results on Ventures with Drug Manufacturers'' GAO/T–HEHS–96–85 (Nov. 1995).

United States Health Care Financing Administration

1. ''Assessment of the Impact of Pharmacy Benefit Managers.'' HCFA–95–023/PK (September 30, 1996).

United States Office of Inspector General

1. special fraud alert issued by OIG (August 1994).

2. ''Experiences of Health Maintenance Organizations with Pharmacy Benefit Management Companies.'' OIG–01–95–00110, April 1997.

State Attorneys General

1. In the Matter of the Upjohn Company: Assurance of Discontinuance/Assurance of Voluntary Compliance. Entered by the State Attorneys General of Arizona, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Texas and Wisconsin, July 1994.

Medical and Healthcare Groups

1. American College of Cardiology: ''Position statement: Therapeutic substitution.'' 22 Feb. 1988.

2. American College of Physicians: ''Position paper: Therapeutic substitution and formulary systems.'' Annals of Intern Med 113–160–2, 15 Jul. 1990.

3. American Medical Association: ''AMA policy on drug formularies and therapeutic interchange in inpatient and ambulatory patient care settings.'' Am J Hosp Pharm 51:1808–10, 1994.

4. American Pharmaceutical Association: ''Statements at the Food and Drug Administration's Hearing on Pharmaceutical Marketing and Information Exchange in Managed Care Environments.'' 19 Oct. 1995.

5. National Association of Chain Drug Stores: Petition to the Federal Trade Commission (12 Jun. 1996).

Legislative Initiatives

1. California Senate Bill 625 (Senator Rosenthal), passed the Senate, in the House. California Assembly Bill 1136 (Assembly member Brown), passed in Senate and House, died in Conference Committee, Nov.30, 1996.

2. New York State Assembly. Hearing held by the Standing Committees on Insurance and Health, New York City: May 1, 1997

3. Virginia Senate Bill No. 1114, as amended, 1997.

Litigation

1. Pfizer v. PCS, No. 96–126154 (S.D.N.Y. filed Oct. 1995).

IN RECOGNITION OF JETER NIMMO

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1998

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to a good friend, fine Texan and more importantly a great American—Mr. Jeter Nimmo. Jeter was born on January 24, 1920 in Delta County, Texas, where he learned the importance of family, church and community. Jeter took these values with him to the University of Texas at

Austin, where he earned a degree in engineering, and to the Army Air Corps, where he served his country as a pilot during World War II.

Jeter spent the majority of his adult life in Van Zandt County, Texas, where he was a community leader. Actively involved in church and community affairs, Jeter often volunteered his time, labor and talents to the First Baptist Church of Van Zandt. Not only did Jeter dedicate himself to his family and church, but he also served as an officer for both the Federal Land Bank and the Texas Farm Bureau Association. Such tireless efforts to his community made Jeter the wonderful man and special friend that I stand here today to honor. Giving not only of himself, but even of his own money to those individuals and families less fortunate, Jeter was a daily testimony of his commitment to God, family, friends and community.

Mr. Speaker, Jeter Nimmo passed from us on February 25th of this year. He is survived by his two daughters and their husbands: Nancy and Joe Lambert of Colfax, Texas and Caroline and Mike Athey of Niceville, Florida.

Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today's session, let us do so in honor of this outstanding husband, father, friend and American, Mr. Jeter Nimmo. He will be missed by all those who knew him.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTION OF FORT MONMOUTH TO THE UNITED STATES ARMY SIGNAL CORPS

HON. MICHAEL PAPPAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1998

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to offer congratulations to the United States Army Signal Corps which is celebrating its 138th anniversary. In particular, I would like to recognize Fort Monmouth Army Base in my district, New Jersey's twelfth, which was ''home'' to the Signal Corps for 58 years of crucial advances in military communications.

On June 21, 1860, the Signal Corps was born, the brainchild of Albert James Myer, an Army doctor who believed there should be a trained, professional military signal service. From its first use in New Mexico during a Navajo expedition, to its use during the Civil War, the Spanish American War, the two World Wars, the Korean and Vietnam Wars to the present day, the Signal Corps has provided necessary communication devices which have protected the lives of the men and women who have advanced the cause of freedom.

Fort Monmouth was ''home'' to the Signal Corps School from 1917 to 1975. As the center for signal education, as well as major laboratory, Fort Monmouth played an important role in the major world conflicts of this time period. Early radiotelephones developed at Fort Monmouth were used in the European theater during World War I. The first Army radar was developed in 1938. This new technology, as well as the development of the tactical FM radio, were important communications devices which helped to lead the Allies to victory in World War II. These innovations are still used today, by military and non-military alike.

Fort Monmouth has also made major contributions to the development of space communications. ''Project Diana'' in 1946 successfully bounced electronic signals off of the moon, a milestone on the road to space communication. Solar-powered batteries, typewriters for space shuttles, and communications satellites were some of the other advances developed at Fort Monmouth. Though no longer home to the Signal School, Fort Monmouth continues to serve as an important technological logistics, and training center. Today, Fort Monmouth serves as home to CECOM, the Army's Communication and Electronic Command.

I would like to thank the men and women of Fort Monmouth for their continuing dedication to the protection and promotion of freedom. I am confident that their important work will continue well into the next millennium.

HONORING SISTER WINIFRED DANWITZ, Ph.D.

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1998

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in celebrating the Golden Jubilee of Sister Winifred Danwitz, a woman whose accomplishments are so many that they seem crammed into those fifty years, but one who looks forward to doing even more.

Sister Winifred is the former Administrator of the Mount Saint Ursula Speech Center for New York City and Professor Emeritus of Special Education at the Graduate School of the College of New Rochelle. She was selected a Fellow of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

Her teaching experience includes the College of New Rochelle and its graduate school, Fordham University, Hunter College and Iona College. The list of her organizational activities where she served in a senior position runs off the page. She has almost as many awards.

Now she is embarking on her latest venture as Executive Director of Angela House. Angela House began as her idea. It will be an innovative demonstration project to address the problems confronting homeless women and their young. Angela House will serve as a model supportive transitional residence to provide these women and their children with the supervision, support and training in a nurturing environment.

Sister Winifred will be as successful in helping these women and their children as she has been in her other endeavors. Her generosity of spirit has made beneficiaries of all of us. I am proud to be able to praise her work, her dedication and her innovation. She is our treasure.