

away from the United States; but those young men have done an outstanding job. Congratulations, and we wish them the best as they go forward to the next level. I believe we may just be the winners.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. THURMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that the House is going to be addressing in the next several weeks. We are going to start having hearings, I understand, later this week or early next week on the issue of prescription drugs. What I want to talk about tonight is the difference between what Americans pay for prescription drugs and what consumers in the rest of the world pay.

I have on my Website a chart which is absolutely eye-opening when one looks at the differences for the 15 most commonly prescribed drugs, what we pay in the United States versus what they pay in Europe, and let me give one example. My father is 83 years old. He takes a drug called Coumadin, which is a blood thinner, and one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States.

In the United States, the average price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin is \$64.80. That exact same drug made in the same plant under the same FDA approval sells in Europe for \$15.80. It is four times more expensive in the United States. That pattern repeats

itself with drug after drug after drug. A few years ago when we first started doing this research, the price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin in the United States was not \$68, it was \$38. It has gone up by approximately \$30 in a little over 2.5 years. That is being repeated.

Last year the amount that Americans spent on prescription drugs went up almost 19 percent. That is at a time when the average Social Security recipient received an increase of only 3.5 percent.

It is outrageous. And I am not here to blame the pharmaceutical industry. I am not here to say, shame on the pharmaceutical industry. They have really done some marvelous things, and we all enjoy better health today thanks to the pharmaceutical industry.

I think we need to pay for the research, but what we are finding out more and more is not only do we pay for the research, we pay for the advertising, the marketing. We are paying for a tremendous amount of overhead, and they still are the most profitable industry listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Almost any way it is measured, they are the most profitable.

The American consumer is subsidizing the pharmaceutical industry essentially in three ways: First of all, we subsidize them in the amount that we spend on basic research through the NIH, the Science Foundation, other groups that are doing research. We are subsidizing basic research in the United States by over \$20 billion a year. That is through the taxpayers.

Then we subsidize them in the Tax Code. When they talk about how much they spend on research, that is not exactly the whole story, because when they spend that money on research, at least they can write it off on the bottom line. Most of these companies are extremely profitable, in the 50 percent tax bracket. Half of their research costs, at least, are written off. In some cases they qualify for investment tax credits, and so they get dollar for dollar. In other words, they write off all of the expense on the Tax Code.

The third way we subsidize the pharmaceutical industry is in the prices we pay. Conservatively, we could save American consumers 35 percent if we simply do what we do with virtually every other product, and that is open up the American market so Americans would have access to drugs at world market prices. My vision is that the average consumer should be able to go to their local pharmacy, deal with their local pharmacist, and have this option. If their drug has to come from the American inventory, then they would have to pay the American price, whatever that is, and we will let the pharmaceutical industry decide that.

But if the pharmaceutical industry is willing to sell drugs like Cipro, for example, for half the price in Germany, and that is made by a German company, Bayer. Bayer makes it in Germany, and they will sell it in Germany for half the price that they sell it for

here in the United States. If that is the case, at least allow that consumer to say to their pharmacist, is there a way we can place this order over the Internet and save some money? Then the pharmacist could say, I can order this out of a pharmaceutical supply operation out of Paris, France; Geneva, Switzerland, and you can save 50 percent, whatever the number is.

The reason this becomes important is our own Congressional Budget Office is estimating that American seniors over the next 10 years will spend \$1.8 trillion.

Madam Speaker, if we are correct, by allowing open markets, free markets, we believe in NAFTA, GATT, free trade, except where American consumers could save the most, if we would just simply open our markets and allow that kind of competition, we could save American consumers \$630 billion over the next 10 years.

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

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

#### H.R. 3250, CODE TALKERS RECOGNITION ACT

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, my State of South Dakota has had a long history that extends back before the founding of our country by western explorers, back to a time when buffalo roamed the land and Native American culture was the way of life. Regrettably, the important and revered culture of these great people was nearly erased from American history.

However, at a time when Sioux Indians were discouraged from practicing their native culture, a few brave men used their language to help change the course of our Nation's history. These men are known as the Sioux code talkers. They served our country with distinction in both the Pacific and European theaters of World War II. These code talkers used their Lakota, Dakota and Nakota dialects to send coded communications that the enemy was unable to crack.

They were often sent out on their own to communicate with headquarters regarding enemy location and strength without protection from the enemy. Sometimes they spent over 24 hours in headphones without sleep or food, in terrible conditions.

Today, military commanders credit the code talkers with saving the lives of countless American soldiers and being instrumental to the success of the United States military during World War II.

Two of these Sioux code talkers are still alive today: Clarence Wolf Guts of the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Charles Whitepipe, Sr., of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

Unfortunately, the nine other known Sioux code talkers, John Bear King of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Simon Broken Leg and Iver Crow Eagle, Sr., of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Eddie Eagle Boy and Philip LaBlanc of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Baptiste Pumpkinseed of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, Edmund St. John of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, and Walter C. John of the Sioux Tribe of Nebraska, have passed away.

In a time in which we fully understand the meaning of the word "hero," I believe we can all agree that these 11 men are truly heroes of our country.

Clarence Wolf Guts and Charles Whitepipe can tell us the stories of the trials and tribulations that they faced as they served our country. Families of the other Sioux code talkers can pass on the stories told them by their husband, father or uncle. These code talkers provided safety to fellow Americans who were fighting so hard for our Nation. They did so by using their culture and their native language which had been passed down to them through the generations.

Last year we rightly honored and recognized the Navajo code talkers for the important role that they played and their heroism during World War II. It is now time to honor and to recognize the Sioux code talkers for their contributions.

Madam Speaker, I was proud to introduce H.R. 3250, The Code Talkers Recognition Act, to honor the men who had risked their lives to save others. Congress should recognize these courageous men for their bravery and heroism in the face of adversity. Tomorrow we will consider this important bill and finally recognize these men for their heroic efforts. I encourage Members to support this legislation to give honor to these brave men.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I heard the gentleman's discussion on the floor about the code talkers and their value to the U.S. military efforts, and I just wanted to add my voice in support for the gentleman's bill.

We knew one of the great code talkers, Carl Gorman, who was a Navajo who fought in major campaigns in the South Pacific. Later while he was recovering from wounds in the war, he became an artist. Part of the rehab was to learn art at the rehab center in Los Angeles, and he became one of the Native American leaders in art, and his son, R.C. Gorman, is now one of the leading artists in the world. Carl was a wonderful guy. He told many great stories, which I know is now reflected in a film that is now playing across America.

I think it is long overdue that all of the code talkers, Navajos and the gen-

tleman's constituents, be given the recognition that they are due. I am happy to offer my full support for the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, who has been a strong advocate for America's military and recognizing the heroes, those in our veteran community who have fought and served.

I would simply add that as we look at the contributions that have been made by the Native American culture to our success in a lot of different conflicts throughout our Nation's history, that these particular men made an enormous contribution in helping America through very turbulent times in succeeding and winning a war that literally liberated the world from nazism.

As we consider this legislation tomorrow, I hope Members will support it and pay the tribute and recognition that is long overdue to the code talkers. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for being here.

□ 1930

#### AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REVITALIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to discuss a very important issue for our Nation. I am most proud to introduce in a bipartisan fashion legislation entitled the Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act, H.R. 4653, to which we are also continuing to seek cosponsors.

Since the historic flight of Mr. Lindbergh more than 75 years ago this past May, the United States has risen to commercial air dominance, so much so that in this fast-growing industry in 1985 we dominated the market, controlling more than 73 percent of the commercial aircraft industry. Since 1985, however, the United States has been on a perilous slip, so much so that today we control under 50 percent of the global market. The reason I have such great concern about this is because it impacts us not only from a commercial standpoint but also from a military standpoint.

I would draw my colleagues' attention to this first projected chart that we have here. This was a report issued that said "Buy European." Basically, it is saying that the Europeans have set out on a vision, a vision that they call Aeronautical Vision 2020, to capture the market by the year 2020. And so what we see going on in Europe these days is direct subsidization of their industry, direct subsidization by Air Bus, direct subsidization that leads both to the creation of jobs and the ability to take control of this market away from the Americans.

The depth of this concern and the strategy behind it is well thought out and well planned. Here in this country, and rightfully so, we are driven by quarterly returns, driven by the fact that our shareholders of our respective industries expect a good return on their dollar. In order to compete with us long term, what the European Union has recognized is the need to directly subsidize their industry. In the process, Americans continue to shed jobs. We only have to look at the reports of what has happened to Boeing, Lockheed, General Electric, and Pratt & Whitney and understand the concern of a number of Members in this House of ours about the loss of jobs that has occurred, while the European Union would suggest that they are more than willing to spend the kind of money that is necessitated to keep jobs in Europe, recognizing that as we continue our efforts here in this country adhering to quarterly returns that they will be able to augment their industry and make sure that they continue to employ people as we continue to shed jobs here in the United States.

This has long-term ramifications militarily for exactly that reason. Because if we continue to shed jobs here in the United States, we lose the critical mass of highly trained, highly skilled employees who have been the backbone of the aerospace industry here in our great Nation. They have also been the backbone of making sure that we have an unparalleled military and command of the airspace. But if we continue on this precipitous slide, we will soon find ourselves in the position where American-made when it comes to aerospace will no longer be the case.

If you look at these charts, what we have found is that the United States' share of aerospace markets has fallen dramatically. There is a direct correlation between what has happened since 1985 in terms of our share of the market and our willingness to invest in research and development. What we have witnessed is a precipitous dropoff, again where we have gone to more than 70 percent share of the market down to under 50 percent of the market. By the same token, we have seen our investment rise from greater than \$30 billion in research and development to under 15.

I thank the Speaker for the opportunity to point this out. I hope that Members will sign on to H.R. 4653. I look forward to further discussions.

JUNE 10, 2002.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LARSON: The Aviation Coalition endorses H.R. 4653, the "Aeronautics Research and Development Revitalization Act of 2002." The Aviation Coalition is comprised of professional societies and trade groups representing more than 1 million engineers, scientists and researchers.

In recent years, our Coalition has expressed concerns that reducing federal funding for aviation research and technology will jeopardize the nation's leadership in providing the technologies needed to develop