

that needs to be made. When we disagree with the President and his administration during a war, we have not merely a right but a responsibility to publicly air those disagreements. Accepting that responsibility is imperative for the survival of the Republic as we know it. Without it the checks and balances of our separated system of government would be lost. The suppression of dissent in wartime would provide an unscrupulous or overzealous President with additional motivation to wage war. Senator Robert LaFollette said it best on a speech on the Senate floor in 1917. "It is no answer . . . to say that when the war is over, the citizen may once more resume his rights and feel some security in his liberty and passion. . . . If every preparation for war can be made the excuse for destroying free speech and a free press . . . then we may well despair of ever again finding ourselves for a long period in a state of peace."

LaFollette was not un-American nor were Abraham Lincoln or Theodore Roosevelt. They were patriots in the true sense of the word as are Michael Moore and Susan Sarandon and the Dixie Chicks. Patriotism is defined as "love for or devotion to one's country." Our country is not one President or one administration or one military action or even one flag. It is a place where we are free to openly disagree with our President and his decisions. That is what our country stands for. That is the principle to which we are devoted, and that is what we love.

The most recent ostensible reason we went to war to remove Saddam's regime was to bring this principle to Iraq. Would we have any credibility as freedom preachers if there were no public disagreement in our own home? Vocal displays of dissent during war do not hurt the cause of democracy and freedom. On the contrary, they provide a shining example for those parts of the world that are not yet free. Let us continue to show the world what it is like to live in a country where one can protest against its leaders without fear of reprisal. Let us continue to speak out. Let us continue to be true patriots.

THE OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. BASS. Madam Speaker, 4 days ago New Hampshire lost an old friend. It went unnoticed probably between 2 a.m. in the morning on Saturday. The Old Man of the Mountain collapsed and fell a thousand feet off the face of Canon Mountain, and I know New Hampshire mourns the loss of this great icon as if it were a friend. We all got to know the Old Man of the Mountain very well. We take it and took it very seriously. I remember as a child driving up through Franconia Notch and always stopping to see the Old Man

because it was really an extraordinary landmark. As recently as a month and a half ago, I drove down through Franconia Notch with my two children, ages nine and eleven, and we stopped for a moment just to take a look at it and get a quick photograph. Indeed, it was an extraordinary symbol of our State.

I have to say, however, that its loss was not totally unexpected. As long ago as 1880, people began to notice that there was some cracking and slipping beginning on this face, and it has continued to deteriorate over the years, and there have been organizations and groups who formed over the years to try to preserve it, but ultimately the day came when this 10,000-year-old rock formation which consists of over seven different ledges together to create this allusion of a face finally perished.

What does this loss mean for my State of New Hampshire? As I said a minute ago, the Old Man of the Mountain was indeed an icon for New Hampshire; yet it meant something different to each and every one of us. To some it was a tourist attraction, an important part of the local economy. As I said a minute ago, it was a childhood memory for me and my children and countless millions of other people not only from New Hampshire but all over the country. And most importantly, perhaps it is a symbol of what New Hampshire is all about and what New Hampshire has been for the last 200 years.

Indeed, those of us from New Hampshire take this symbol very seriously. The Old Man of the Mountain is on every single road sign of New Hampshire, every single license plate in the State. Highway tokens have the Old Man's face on it. The U.S. commemorative quarter for New Hampshire has the Old Man on it and the postage stamp which was created a couple of decades ago commemorating the Old Man of the Mountain.

I want to quote Daniel Webster, if I could, who served in Congress from New Hampshire over 200 years ago. He once wrote of the Old Man: "In the mountains of New Hampshire, God almighty has hung out a sign to show that he makes men."

We will all miss the Old Man of the Mountain. He is gone. But like any loss, his symbol and his memory will live on and New Hampshire will be a greater and stronger State as a result.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, budgeting is about choices, whether they are a working family or the Federal Government. Working families know far too well that they cannot afford everything. They often must decide between making a mortgage payment or taking a family vacation or

between paying for health insurance or buying a new car. Their decisions reveal their priorities. It is more important to have a safe home for their families and to know that they can take their children to the doctor if they get sick. Parents routinely forego luxuries in order to ensure their children are safe and secure. The future of their children is clearly a top priority.

Just like working families, the Federal Government has limited resources, and just like working families, the decisions we make about how to use our limited resources say a great deal about our priorities. The tax package presented by the Republican leadership once again reveals what we have known for a long, long while: Working families are not their priority. When push comes to shove and difficult decisions are made under the Republican leadership, working families get the short end of the stick each and every time.

The message Republicans are sending with their tax package is clear: If one is wealthy, if one is heavily invested, they deserve a huge amount of permanent tax relief. If one is a working parent with a child, forget it. Not only will their tax cut be much, much less if they get one at all, it will be temporary. The \$1,000 per child tax credit will be lowered in the year 2006 to \$700, proving once again that families are not a priority.

The message from Republican leaders is clear: Working families are not their priority. I say that is a very bad policy. These are the toughest fiscal times that our States have seen in decades, and working families are suffering the consequences. As States are forced to tighten their belts and make cuts, teachers are losing their jobs and children are being taught in overcrowded classrooms. State health insurance programs now cover fewer children and are not providing as many services, and in many States families must now meet stricter eligibility requirements to enroll in State childcare programs, and all of this is done so the Republicans can give our Nation's wealthiest a big tax cut.

But the fact is we have a choice. We can help States meet these shortfalls or we can give tax breaks we cannot afford to the wealthiest people in this country, people who are actually not particularly feeling the pain of these bad times. The Republican message is inescapable. The rich are more important. If one is among the more than 1 million unemployed workers in this country who have exhausted unemployment benefits, this administration is saying you are certainly not a priority. Instead of extending benefits which would help care for families and immediately stimulate the economy for those who are out of work and out of their unemployment benefits, it is more important to put a little extra cash in the pockets of investors in the hopes they eventually will invest this extra money back into the economy.

Republicans may on occasion say they care about American families, but their actions expose their feelings. When offered the choice between making the rich a little bit richer or helping working families make their lives a little easier, Republicans pick the wealthy every time.

Madam Speaker, the budget process often forces us to make tough decisions, but if one asks me, the choices being made today are not difficult ones. Helping families so that they can do the best to make ends meet or enriching the wealthiest who do not even need our fiscal help is a no-brainer. In the same way that parents put the needs of their children over frivolous luxuries, it is time to adopt fiscal policies for this Nation that prove that we have our Nation's priorities in order, and that means, Madam Speaker, we need to work for hard-working families.

□ 1945

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE HIGHER COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES

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 speak about the issue of the higher cost of prescription drugs in the United States.

The gentlewoman who just preceded me who was talking about tax relief, I think I agree with some of the points she raised. When we talk about tax cuts, what we are really talking about is allowing people to keep more of what they earn. In soft economic times, I happen to believe it makes sense to allow people to keep more of what they earn.

As you see on this chart, which you can find on my Web site, we start by saying if we want to allow Americans to keep and spend over \$600 billion during the next 10 years. Here is a good place to start. It has got a picture of prescription drug capsules here.

The next page says, "That's right. According to the CBO," that is the Congressional Budget Office, "American seniors will spend over \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years on prescription drugs."

This is a conservative estimate. We are going to show you a chart in a minute that says that we could save 35 percent by allowing free markets to work. Thirty-five percent of \$1.8 trillion translates to \$630 billion.

Let me show you this chart. This is not my chart. I have a number of inde-

pendent experts around the country that have been working on this a lot longer than I have, they are a lot smarter than I am, but they have actually done some of the comparisons in terms of what we as Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to the rest of the world.

This is a chart by a group called the Life Extension Foundation out of Florida. They have been studying this for more than a decade. Here are some of the figures in terms of the prices we pay versus what Canadian consumers pay and what European consumers pay for the same drugs.

Let us look at the top right here. We have Augmentin. In the United States, a 30-day supply sells for about \$55.50. That same drug in Canada, made in the same plant under the same FDA approval, sells for \$12. In Europe it sells for \$8.75.

Cipro. We learned a lot about Cipro last year when we had anthrax here in the Capitol building. It is made by a German drug company called Bayer; we usually call it Bayer, Bayer aspirin. Cipro in the United States sells for \$87.99 for a 30-day supply. That same drug in Canada sells for \$53.55. Over in Germany it sells for \$40.75.

My father takes a drug called Coumadin. Here in the United States the average price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin is \$64.88. That same drug, again made under the same FDA approval in the same FDA-approved plant, sells in Canada for \$24.94. Over in Europe the average price is \$15.80.

Madam Speaker, as you look at this list, it just becomes very, very aggravating, when you see how much we pay. Glucophage, an amazing drug we sell here in the United States, the average price, according to the Life Extension Foundation, the average price in the United States, the average price, is \$124 here. The average price in Canada for the same drug, same dosage, is \$26.47. Over in Europe the same drug sells for \$22. Glucophage.

A couple of weeks ago I and one of my staffers were in Germany. We had the opportunity to actually do some shopping of our own. We bought a drug called Tamoxifen. It is amazing in terms of being one of the most amazing drugs we have developed in the United States.

Let me just talk about the drug itself, because it was developed largely with American taxpayers' money. Tamoxifen is the most effective drug against women's breast cancer that we have developed, but the American taxpayers paid for most of the research costs.

This drug in the United States at a pharmacy here in Washington, D.C. for a 3-month supply just like this sells for about \$360. In Munich, Germany, we bought it a week and a half ago for \$59.05, the same drug.

Now, some people would say shame on the pharmaceutical industry; but I have to say shame on us, because we have allowed this environment to be

created. It is not shame on them, because they are only exploiting a market opportunity that we have allowed them. The answer is open markets.

Many years ago President Ronald Reagan said that markets are more powerful than armies.

My time has expired, but I will be back in coming nights to talk about this issue and how Members can help solve this problem.

AN OVERVIEW ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, we of the Public Broadcasting Caucus are pleased to share with our colleagues this evening some very good news from the world of public broadcasting. The Overseas Press Club has presented NPR with the 2002 Lowell Thomas Award for the series "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict." This groundbreaking seven-part series, which aired on NPR's Morning Edition last fall, tells the history of the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Veteran NPR News correspondent Mike Shuster researched, reported, and chronicled this in-depth series on the key moments in the history of the struggle between the two peoples. It covered the early Zionist movement during the turn of the 20th Century and traced the intensifying conflict between Jews and Palestinians during the years of the British mandate, leading up to David Ben-Gurion's announcement of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," also explored the events that led up to the Six-Day War, the Yom Kippur War, the first Intifada, and the Oslo Peace Process. It concluded with investigations on the reason why the Oslo Peace Process collapsed and how and why the second Intifada started.

Kevin Klose, NPR's president and CEO, put it best when he said, "This series tells the history of the confrontation using radio to bring the views of leading historians of the region to air, documenting the deep and conflicting roots of today's Middle East. The series touches on the beliefs and emotions that motivate both sides."

Madam Speaker, it was no surprise when the Peabody Awards were recently announced for excellence in television and radio; public broadcasting was honored with one-third of those over-30 awards. This is part of why one in seven adults listens to public radio by tuning into more than 700 stations which carry NPR programming. Each week, over 20 million Americans listen to NPR, an audience that exceeds the top 35 U.S. daily newspapers combined.

When we consider this figure, along with 100 million people who watch public television each week, we see the