

prices in the world to people who can least afford it, our seniors who do not have any prescription drug coverage on Medicare.

Studies show that seniors in this country pay 72 percent on average more than Canadians. We pay 102 percent more than Mexicans for the same drugs in the same quantity from the same manufacturer. Why do seniors have to choose between food and medicine?

Industry says, blame Canada.

Why do seniors have to cut their pills in half in order to take them?

The industry says, blame Canada.

Why do seniors have to go across the border to buy affordable prescription drugs?

The industry says, blame Canada.

Democrats in the House have two approaches. We have legislation to establish a Medicare prescription drug benefit to cover all seniors on Medicare. We have legislation which I have introduced which would provide a discount for all Medicare beneficiaries in the costs of their prescription drugs. We have legislation from the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) to make sure that drugs that are sold in Canada can be brought into this country and sold to American seniors at reduced prices. Our seniors continue to suffer from price discrimination. They demand a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is universal, meaningful and affordable but instead of bringing equality to its pricing structure all the drug industry can come up with is Blame Canada, Blame Canada.

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

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

ALL CITIZENS OF AMERICA SHOULD HAVE A VOTING REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HOUSE

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to let the House know that a decision has been handed down in a consolidated case, the Adams case and the Alexander case, challenging the denial of full voting rights in the House and the Senate to the residents of the Nation's Capital and full self-government here. In a 2-to-1 decision, the court ruled that because the District is not a State it does not have the privilege that every other American citizen has of having a voting representative.

Mr. Speaker, this decision is on its way to the Supreme Court. I would like to note for the record the courageous lawyers who are appealing this deci-

sion, John Ferren, former corporation counsel who was in the case at that time; Charles Miller and Thomas Williamson of Covington and Burling who handled one of the cases pro bono; professor Jamin Raskin, who is responsible for much of the thinking that went into these cases, professor of the American University School of Law; and George LaRoche, who brought a separate case.

Judge Louis Oberdorfer will be remembered by history for his ruling that, indeed, the District of Columbia residents are entitled to voting representation in this House and that the rights involved are not rights of States but of the people who live in the States, that the reference in the Constitution to the States is a term of convenience not meant to deny any American citizen the right to voting representation on this floor.

In going to the courts, District residents signal that there has been a failure of the political process. I remember a failure of the political process when I was a school child in this town. The political process failed and that is why the District of Columbia was among five jurisdictions that went to the Supreme Court and finally got that court to declare that separate but equal was in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I trust that the failure of the political process here, the failure of the Congress to grant full voting rights to the residents of the District of Columbia, will produce a similarly favorable decision in the Supreme Court of the United States for the residents of the capital city.

Judge Louis Oberdorfer's wise and scholarly opinion raises our hopes that there will not be five justices of the Supreme Court in the 21st century that are willing to sign their names to an opinion that would deny voting rights in the national legislature to any citizen of the United States. One would think that no citizen on the planet would be so denied today.

At the very least, what this body should prepare itself to do now, pending a favorable decision of the Supreme Court or other action, is to restore the vote I won in 1993 for residents of the District of Columbia on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole. It would appear that at the very least, the residents of the District of Columbia, who pay full Federal income taxes the way the residents of other Members do, would be entitled to that respect.

I know that there are Members on the other side, because they have gone with me through the Committee on Rules, who also believe that the tax-paying residents of the District of Columbia should be recognized on this House floor to the maximum extent possible, and certainly that would mean a vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Meanwhile, there is an organization which has been energized to start energizing the country by these decisions.

It is called D.C. Vote, and my hat is off to D.C. Vote which is raising consciousness first in the District of Columbia and then intends to raise the consciousness of our country to what we know would not be condoned by the American people and that is that any people that pay taxes in this country would be left without their full representation in the Congress of the United States.

The ball now comes to the floor of this House. The ball comes to those with a political and a moral conscience, to those who serve in this House to make sure that the residents who pay taxes equal to the taxes their residents pay get from this House, from the people's House, the maximum in representation that the people's House can offer.

SENIORS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN FOOD AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about an issue of enormous consequence in my State of Vermont and for people throughout this country, and that is the outrageously high prices that we are forced to pay for prescription drugs. In Vermont, it is not uncommon for many people, including the elderly, to make the impossible choice about whether they buy the food that they need, whether they heat their homes adequately in the winter or whether they have the money to purchase the prescription drugs that their doctors prescribe.

It is not uncommon in that reality that American citizens are forced to cut their dosages in half or take a dose once every other day rather than what they are supposed to take because they simply cannot afford what they need to ease their pain, and in some cases to keep themselves alive, and this is an outrage. This is unacceptable.

Meanwhile, as the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has just indicated, the pharmaceutical industry remains the most profitable industry in the United States of America. In addition, not only are they raking in the profits, but it is not widely known but true, the pharmaceutical industry receives billions of dollars every year from the taxpayers of this country in order to help them with their research. The pharmaceutical industry receives billions of dollars in tax breaks from the people of this country.

What do we get in return? What we get in return is, by far, not even close, the highest prices for prescription drugs in the entire industrialized world.

Now we have heard a whole lot about Canada, and I will say more about it in a moment, but it is not just that the Canadians are paying substantially less