

□ 1530

And, yes, Mr. Leader, with you on some very issues of great importance to this institution. And I continue to be in that posture, but, yes, we do see it differently. The leader got, at 10 p.m. last night, the opportunity to review this in a meaningful way.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly when I got it, too.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this was of great import. Every speaker that came to the floor expressed outrage, expressed deep concern about what this had done and the impact it would have on America and our image abroad but, more importantly than our image, on our ability to continue to lead on issues of freedom and justice and human rights throughout the world. At 10 p.m., whether it was same time he got it or not, I would suggest to the leader is not a time frame in which we can thoughtfully try to reach a bipartisan agreement.

We do not expect nor do we ask for you to accept without question our position or our changes. But we do expect to have the opportunity to discuss them. I did not have an opportunity to discuss it with you, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), or the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). I saw the resolution at 9 a.m. this morning. I had no ability to put input nor did others. And the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), I think, is on the floor and I would be glad to yield to him if he would want to make a comment.

If not, in my discussions with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), he believes there was not the full opportunity that he would have liked to have considered in a bipartisan fashion. And that committee, as you well know, and that gentleman from Missouri has been one of the most bipartisan Members of the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand that because the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) wrote the draft. It was done by late yesterday afternoon. It was sent to the legislative counsel. The entire draft was done, their agreed-to draft, both the Democrat ranking member, Republican chairman putting together a draft, coming together, and having done that, then it was vetted with the leadership. How much time does one need?

After they finish writing the draft, do they sit around and wait? For what? The two gentlemen that were charged with writing the resolution came together, wrote a resolution that they both put their name on and had agreed to; then it was given to the leadership

staff and the leaders, and then that is when the leader wanted to eliminate two clauses and insert another clause. We agreed to eliminate the two clauses. We did not agree to insert the third clause, and that is when negotiation and bipartisanship, which, by the way, that only 50 voted against the resolution, broke down.

Evidently 365 Members thought it was a very well-crafted bipartisan effort.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have been in a position where I was one of four voting against something if I thought it was appropriate to do. So he can keep saying there were only 50 as long he wants. There should have been zero. His side believes that and our side believes that. Our side is as deeply committed to supporting the troops as is his side. That is good news of this day. Everyone has expressed that.

It does not serve our purposes further, related to staff here, they did not get a draft from their perspective until after 6 p.m. last night when, as you know, we had adjourned. I was at the Fire Service Caucus with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), with whom I work in lock-step, and have for 13 to 14 years in a bipartisan way. We understand bipartisanship. We have a Fire Service bill on this floor totally bipartisan.

So I understand bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker. It does not serve our purpose to further discuss procedures. I agree on that. We have a different view. But what it does serve our purposes for is trying to come together not in a way that will divide the House, but in a way that will bring the House together. That, I believe, is the best interest of our country. I would hope we could do that, and I will work with the gentleman to accomplish that objective, and I presume he will work with me as well.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to work with the gentleman because the gentleman has shown good faith in trying to work in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 10, 2004, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 11, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, May 10, 2004; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 627, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President's Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Thompson, who has previously said he will not allow the reimportation of less expensive FDA-approved drugs from Canada or any other country, deeming them unsafe, of course his assistant secretary, Mr. Hubbard, when questioned before a congressional committee, could not document one single instance of safety problems with Canadian drugs, yet can document thousands of problems with the supply chain here in the United States because of a virtually uncontrolled wholesale drug market.

So it really is not the issue of safety. It is the issue of the profitability of the pharmaceutical industry. They make their profits all in the United States, and that allows them to sell drugs very cheaply in other countries, and they say that is necessary to protect their investment in new technologies and new drugs.

I certainly want to see new drugs and new technologies developed, but why should Americans only pay for those investments? And that is the system they are attempting to perpetuate, and there is also of course the issue that it is only recently that the pharmaceutical industry has been allowed to advertise on television and now they are spending upwards of 6, \$7 billion a year on promotion, which of course drives up the cost of drugs, and I am