

Davis. Mr. Davis, the Democrat's chief economist on the House Committee on Ways and Means, was one of those classic Capitol Hill staffers whose effectiveness cannot be measured by the number of times they are mentioned in a newspaper. From his cluttered office in the Longworth House Office Building," and we knew well of the clutter in that office, "Mr. Davis helped mold and inform the public debate about what he saw as the troubling direction of the Nation's economic policy, churning out fact sheets that were as accurate as they were partisan. He could get as worked up, maybe more, about Democrats using distorted numbers as about Republicans who did so."

Like so many others, I will miss Al very much. He was not only an important asset to the country, but for so many of us, he was a friend. Our words today cannot replace the loss felt by Al's longtime companion, Mary Beilefeld. I express my deepest condolences to Mary. I hope it is somehow comforting that her loss is not only hers but is shared by all of us on the Committee on Ways and Means and by all of us in this institution who had the privilege of working with Al Davis.

[From the Washington Post]

ALBERT J. DAVIS

Unless you're a tax and budget wonk, you probably didn't know Al Davis. Mr. Davis, the Democrats' chief economist on the House Ways and Means Committee, was one of those classic Capitol Hill staffers whose effectiveness can't be measured by the number of times they are mentioned in the newspaper. But from his cluttered office in the Longworth House Office Building, Mr. Davis helped mold and inform the public debate about what he saw as the troubling direction of the nation's economic policy, churning out fact sheets that were as accurate as they were partisan. He could get as worked up—maybe even more—about Democrats using distorted numbers as about Republicans who did so.

Mr. Davis had the gift of being able to translate the most arcane economic data into real-world language that Democratic lawmakers—the people he called his "customers"—could use to make their case. For reporters scrambling to make sense of a study or to dredge up an obscure detail, he was the ultimate resource, with a seemingly encyclopedic understanding of the tax code. If you wrote or advocated about such matters, you'd quickly find your way to Al—or he to you. He patiently educated the uninitiated, from green legislative aides to reporters new to the economics beat. When a bill was on the floor, Mr. Davis was always there with his bulging accordion file, colleague Janice Mays recalled, offering when the most obscure of points came up, "I just happen to have a memo here."

Mr. Davis died last week at 56 after being struck by a cab on his way home from work. The accident occurred as Congress was finishing work on a tax bill that Mr. Davis detested, and, as he lingered in a coma for 11 days after the accident, we can only imagine how frustrated he would have been not to be immersed in the debate. Len Burman, co-director of the Tax Policy Center, recalled visiting Mr. Davis at George Washington University Hospital and delivering updates on the latest outrages in the tax measure. "I kept on thinking, he's definitely going to wake up for this," Mr. Burman said. Mr.

Davis's boss, Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.), said that Mr. Davis "promoted truth in an institution too used to skirting around politically inconvenient facts."

#### OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH PRESCRIPTION DRUGS 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. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about the outrageously high prices that Americans pay for prescription drugs. But before I get started, I want to yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) because the gentleman wants to correct something that he said earlier.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I mentioned Glaxo that made the \$9 billion, and I think they made money on other drugs that we will be discussing later, but the company in question was SmithKline Beecham that made \$9 billion and returned only \$35 million back in royalties to this government for the patents they had.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. And there are published reports that the president of SmithKline Beecham 2 years ago earned over \$200 million.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just comment on that. If he earned \$200 million, maybe he deserved it for ripping off the American people to the tune of \$9 billion for their very small investment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana mentioned earlier, we had a Special Order the other night and we had Republicans and Democrats, and we hope to do it next week with Republicans and Democrats because this issue about what Americans pay for prescription drugs is not a matter of right versus left, it is right versus wrong.

I think anybody who spends any time at all on this issue realizes it is wrong to force American consumers to pay the world's highest prices partly because we subsidize the research and development. There was a study done by the Boston Globe several years ago, and what they found was that of the 35 largest selling drugs in America, 32 of them were brought through the R&D channel by the Federal Government. The NIH paid for the basic research and development, got them to phase 3 trials. So we subsidize them in the research and development, we subsidize them in the Tax Code, and yet we are still required to pay the world's highest prices.

Two years ago this Congress came together, the House and Senate, and we voted 304-101, I believe was the final vote, but it was over 300 votes in the House, and we said Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. That bill passed. It is on the books right now.

□ 1945

But unfortunately the FDA is not enforcing the law because in the con-

ference committee they put a little safety language in there that says essentially if they cannot absolutely guarantee safety, the FDA does not have to enforce that.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk about safety. What I have in my hand tonight is a counterfeit-proof package of prescription drugs. It is called a blister pack, counterfeit-proof package of prescription drugs. This packaging is available today at a cost of about two cents per package. It is available today. Let me tell you what is available soon. They have been working on this at MIT. I do not expect anyone to see this because I cannot see it; but in this little vial, and if you would like to see this, I will share this with Members, in this little vial are 150 tiny computer chips, microchips. Ultimately, this is going to become the next UPC code. With this little chip, we can know where that product was manufactured, where it came from. It can help with inventory control, and ultimately it can guarantee that it is in fact Prilosec and not something else.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can solve this problem. I have said before, it is not shame on the pharmaceutical industry; it is shame on us. The President of Glaxo or SmithKline does not work for us, but the head of FDA does. It is time for us as Members of Congress to do our responsibility, to make certain that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices. No, there is nothing wrong with the word profit. I believe in the word profit. But there is something very wrong with the word profiteer. It seems to me in the heritage of Teddy Roosevelt and so many other politicians who have been here in this city who stood up for the little guy, it is time for us to say, it is not a matter of right versus left; it is a matter of right versus wrong. We need to do the right thing. We need to open American access, we need to create competition here in the United States, and we need to make certain that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world market prices.

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

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Oregon's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.