

League of United Latin American Citizens, and the distinguished Professional Women's Award.

□ 1245

In 1999, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Natalicio was inducted into the Texas Women's Hall of Fame. She has also written numerous books, articles and reviews in the field of applied linguistics.

Under Dr. Natalicio's leadership, UTEP has become the largest Hispanic majority university in the Nation. Its budget has increased from \$64 million in 1988 to over \$146 million today, and its doctoral programs have grown from 1 to 8 programs and it is still growing.

In the last decade, Dr. Natalicio has been an effective and increasingly influential individual in raising the visibility and the funding of the University of Texas at El Paso.

Dr. Natalicio began visiting Washington, D.C. some 10 years ago in an attempt to solicit Federal research dollars. At the time, Dr. Natalicio today reflects, they did not even know who UTEP was. I had to go and create an identity for the institution in Washington, D.C.

UTEP's Federal research grants have increased to \$53 million last year from \$3.5 million in 1987. The university spent some \$27.8 million in 1999 moving up to fifth place among the State's 35 public academic universities in actual expenditures for Federal money.

Dr. Natalicio has constantly pushed UTEP towards becoming a Tier 1 research university. In May of 1997, under the leadership of Dr. Natalicio, UTEP embarked on an unprecedented fundraising effort called the Legacy Campaign, an initiative which, to date, has raised some \$50 million in new endowments, tripling the university's total endowment from \$25 million to over \$75 million today.

Within one year, Dr. Natalicio has announced that the university's Legacy Campaign has raised \$45 million, 95 percent of its goal. This generous financial commitment has resulted in the creation of more than 200 new endowments, including 80 newly endowed scholarships; 26 new professorships and chairs; and 48 new departmental excellence funds.

Dr. Natalicio's efforts to expand UTEP's Development and Alumni Affairs office has resulted in a steady increase in annual giving to the university. Dr. Natalicio further is proud of the accomplishments and can be traced to the courageous decisions and an appreciation for the contributions of others. She has been an instrumental force in transforming UTEP from a regional institution to an international university whose vision is outward and whose growth and phenomenal success in garnering additional funds for new programs are the envy of other universities. She is responsible for developing, during radically changing times,

an atmosphere in which students, faculty, and staff are stimulated, inspired, and challenged.

#### VOTE AGAINST WELFARE FOR LARGE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, later today we will have an opportunity to vote on H.R. 4986, the FSC replacement bill. That is a foreign sales tax credit that was inaugurated by President Nixon in which the Washington Times recently, in an editorial, referred to it as one of the largest bipartisan and unanimous blunders passed by the House of Representatives.

In the early seventies, I opposed the FSC bill, or the foreign sales tax credit, and was successful at least in denying that tax credit to weapons manufacturers, on the theory that all weapons sold to foreign countries had to be approved by the Defense Department and the Secretary of State and basically were sold by our government to other governments, and there was no reason to give a subsidy, which is what this FSC thing is, to weapons manufacturers in the United States.

The Senate saw fit to reduce that to a 50 percent limitation and that has been the law for some 20 years. Recently, without any hearings and without any discussion, almost in the dead of night, the 50 percent limitation to defense contractors was removed. The World Trade Organization has filed a lawsuit against the United States saying that this foreign sales tax credit is a hidden subsidy, and they are right. It is a subsidy. It is being changed now in language in this bill that will come up under suspension, but the old saying, it is a duck if it quacks like a duck and it waddles like a duck. In this case, it quacks like a subsidy and it gives money back to companies out of the taxpayers' pocket to subsidize sales overseas.

What is perhaps most egregious at this time is that we are now cutting taxes to and for U.S. pharmaceutical companies to get the U.S. pharmaceutical companies to sell cheaper drugs to foreigners while at the same time selling them at higher prices here at home to our seniors. That is what will be done if my colleagues vote for 4986, and they should vote no.

The pharmaceutical industry does not need another corporate subsidy at the expense of the American taxpayer. Why give an incentive for the pharmaceutical companies when they sell their products to other developed nations for less than we can buy them here? I offered an amendment to say

that pharmaceutical companies could not have this subsidy if they were selling their drugs for 5 percent more in this country than they sell in Canada and Mexico. That, unfortunately, was defeated.

We have shown, or studies have shown, that the American seniors are without drug coverage, pay almost twice as much for their pharmaceutical drugs as do our neighbors in Canada and Mexico. Why on Earth we should be giving companies like Merck, already one of the most profitable drug companies in the world, with more than twice the profits of, say, engineering and the construction industry, why we should give them an additional subsidy to continue to sell drugs for less money in Canada and Mexico and Germany and Japan than they do to the seniors in my district in Fremont, California, escapes me.

I hope that my colleagues will see the nonsense in this bill. It is being run through. We will not even see a report. They have held the report up so nobody can read that. There were a few of us on the committee who signed dissenting views. It is a bad bill. It does nothing but take money from the average senior, the average purchaser of pharmaceutical drugs, and give it to the richest companies in this country.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if I understand what the gentleman is saying, we, of course, are well aware that America's seniors, indeed uninsured people in America of all ages, a young family that has a sick child that does not have insurance, these individuals across America, millions of them, are paying the highest price for drugs of anyplace in the entire world, and an American pharmaceutical company under this bill can continue to do that, to charge them the highest prices in the world and export the same drug to another country, whether it is Canada, Europe, wherever.

Mr. STARK. Precisely. My Zucor, which got my cholesterol down from 220 to 160, great stuff, 1,200 bucks a year for Zucor. Fortunately, Blue Cross pays some of that for me. I could buy the same drug in Canada for \$600. And I am giving this company a subsidy so they can sell it for less in Canada and I have to pay more for it here? I cannot figure that out.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is the vote we will be taking today, whether to reward these companies that charge Americans more money than anywhere else in the world, reward them by giving them a tax subsidy?

Mr. STARK. That is what it seems to me, and that seems like a dumb idea, and I hope the gentleman and my colleagues will vote no.