## ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair redesignates the time for the resumption of the proceedings on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) until Tuesday, October 19.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2260, PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today a ''dear colleague'' letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet later this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2260, the Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules up in H–312 of the Capitol by 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 20. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Commerce on October 13. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the committee. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments to both bills are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

I would like to inform members of the Committee on Rules that we are going to be meeting in 10 minutes upstairs for the consideration of two measures.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2670 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. UPTON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system).

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 14, I missed five votes because I was in Texas on official House business. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall 500; yes on 501; no on 502; no on 503; and no on 504.

## APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON ONLINE CHILD PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 1405(b) of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on Online Child Protection:

Mr. John Bastian, Illinois, engaged in the business of providing Internet filtering or blocking services or software;

Mr. William L. Schrader, Virginia, engaged in the business of providing Internet access services;

Mr. Stephen Blakam, Washington, D.C., engaged in the business of providing labeling or ratings services;

Mr. J. Robert Flores, Virginia, an academic expert in the field of technology;

Mr. William Parker, Virginia, engaged in the business of making content available over the Internet.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## THE AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

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, many of us in this institution have been highly critical of the American pharmaceutical industry. Maybe, maybe we have been a bit too harsh. From a market perspective, drug companies are doing everything they should be doing. We cannot blame drug companies for maximizing their profits. That is their job. Nor can we blame the Federal Government for taking steps to protect seniors and the uninsured and to address the ramifications of what drug companies are doing to the disadvantaged. That is our job.

To address this issue, I have introduced H.R. 2927 to bring down prices without taking away the industry's incentive to act like an industry. My bill promotes good, old-fashioned American competition. The Affordable Prescription Drug Act does not use price controls, does not use regulations to bring down prescription drug prices. What my bill does is reduce drug industry power and increase consumer power by subjecting the drug industry to the same competitive forces that other industries bear. It is a means of moderating prices that are too high without inadvertently setting prices that are too low.

Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place for the U.S. for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices come to mind, the legislation would establish product licenses for essential prescription drugs. If, based on criteria published by the Department of Commerce, a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no semblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug manufacturers to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic drug companies could then sell competing products before the brand name patent expires, paying the patent holder royalties for that right.

The patent holder would still be amply rewarded for being the first on the market, and Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices.

Alternatively, a drug company could voluntarily lower its prices, which would preclude the Federal Government from being involved, from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, prescription drug prices come down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited, detailed information on drug company expenses. Given that these companies are repeatedly asking us to accept a status quo that is bankrupting seniors and fueling health care inflation, they have kept us guessing about their true costs for far too long. We can continue to buy into drug industry threats that research and development will dry up unless we continue to shelter them from competition. The argument, however, Mr. Speaker, falls apart when we actually look at how R&D is funded today.

Long story short, it is mostly funded by American taxpayers. Fifty percent of research and development for new drugs in this country is done by the Federal Government, by local governments and by foundations. The other 50 percent that the drug company spends, the Federal Government, Congress, has bestowed tax breaks on those companies for those dollars they do spend. The drug companies turn around and thank U.S. consumers by charging us two times, three times, four times what consumers in other countries pay.

We pay for half the research. We give tax breaks on the dollars they do spend. They turn around and charge American consumers twice or three times what consumers of prescription drugs pay in every other country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we can do nothing or we can dare to challenge the drug industry on behalf of seniors and every health care consumer in this country. We should take a serious look at the Allen bill, the Berry-Sanders bill, the Brown bill. There is no excuse for inaction.

☐ 1945

I urge my colleagues to support lowering the cost of prescription medicine. Let us act responsibly before it is too late.