

letter with Congressman BEN CHANDLER, the Democrat from Kentucky, to the House Budget Committee, signed by 54 Congressmen opposing the sale of 300,000 acres of national forest lands.

Well, where do we go from here? The U.S. Department of Agriculture will continue to receive comments on this proposed sale until May 1. It is our hope and request that the administration withdraw this proposal.

Fortunately, the House budget which we will be voting on this week does not contain any language endorsing the administration's proposal to sell these forest lands. If the administration does not withdraw their proposal, I am confident and optimistic that this House will vote down this proposal with a very large bipartisan vote. Our children and grandchildren deserve no less.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address the confusing new Medicare Prescription Drug Program, in light of yesterday's visit to my Ohio congressional district by Bush administration Health and Human Services Director Michael Leavitt. Yesterday, Monday, April 3, Secretary Leavitt arrived hours late in a blue bus after people had waited and waited in very cold weather. He spent only a few minutes, shook the hands of a couple of staff people, and spoke briefly with only two hand-picked seniors, and, by the way, spoke to them in front of the news cameras, before making his prepared remarks to the press.

To the one senior that had a chance to ask the Secretary a question, explaining that they could not afford their medicines, he towed the administration line saying, "This is a good program that helps a lot of people."

When asked by one senior about the program not covering his wife's medication needs, incredibly, the Secretary answered in the same way, and this was to the one person, "This is a good program that helps a lot of people."

Now, the Secretary had his picture taken. It was on the front page of our newspaper, but of the 79 people in the room, he shook hands with only two, spoke to only one and left. I guess he is doing this all over the country.

The Secretary says, yeah, this program has had a few bumps in the road. It is a new program but we fixed them.

No, Mr. Secretary, you have not fixed them and they are more than bumps in the road. The one thing that is guaranteed is that the pharmaceutical companies are making billions.

Here are a couple of comments that have come from consumers and seniors in my district. A husband and wife team says they take five prescriptions each. Under their old plan they had a 20 percent co-pay, but by this summer they will have reached the \$2,250 cap. And the new drug plan is a farce and an insult to seniors of this country because now they are going to have to pay the amounts beyond that and they ask, "Is there anyone that cares or is listening in Washington?"

Another husband wrote, "It is costing my wife and me more per month for the new Medicare coverage premium. The only way we have any coverage is to purchase an insurance policy from a private insurance company. On top of that there are the ridiculous amounts that Medicare has set that won't cover any meds until we reach some huge amount in the thousands of dollars. My wife informed me today she is going off her psychiatric medicine. We used to receive patient assistance directly from the drug manufacturers through a clinic and we can no longer receive the drug samples or any patient assistance. We cannot afford to purchase our meds, Congresswoman. Isn't it wonderful how the Bush government has helped us?"

Another senior writes they find that their medical costs increase at every turn in the road. They currently pay nearly \$6,000 annually for prescriptions of which insurance pays \$600. "For the first four months of the year," this senior says, "I have to pay \$5 for generic drugs, \$18 for preferred drugs, with a cap of \$35 for the brand name drugs. But under this new plan that will increase to \$10, \$25 and \$50. And believe it or not, of the eight prescription drugs I need, only two are on the preferred list for \$25 each and the rest will each cost \$50 each. Congresswoman, please do your part in righting this wrong."

Health professionals have been writing to us. Another senior wrote us, "When I went to the pharmacy to pick up my prescription I brought \$20 with me because that is what I always paid. I couldn't believe it when the pharmacist said I had to pay \$260. I had to leave the pharmacy without medicine. It was embarrassing. How am I going to afford \$260 a month? I just don't have it. I guess the people who are for this plan want us to die."

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight not just to outline problems with the program, because they are significant, but also to place in the RECORD what we can do to fix it. First of all, to let the government negotiate the prices that seniors have to pay with these pharmaceutical companies. They can't stand up to these big companies. We need to extend

the deadline this year so that they can try to get qualified for the program, but there is so much confusion out there. Why should there be a May deadline? We ought to cushion that.

We ought to standardize plans like we did for Medicare part B so there is only 10 standard plans and people know what is in them. We ought to ban the gifts that these pharmaceutical companies are giving to people as lures in order to try to sign them up for these inadequate programs.

We ought to disclose coverage gaps. Companies which do not offer gap coverage should be required to make that fact known in writing.

We ought to disclose plan changes. It should be stated clearly that a company might drop a drug from coverage. We ought to create uniform ID numbers, simplify the application, expand extra help eligibility, and require broad formularies.

There are many other ways to fix this program, Mr. Speaker, but we surely should not put that burden on our seniors.

21ST CENTURY ECONOMY

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order in the place of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, every day Americans are living the 21st century economy. We use BlackBerries and cell phones to stay in touch and stay in business. We order birthday presents online. We buy German cars made by American workers in South Carolina. We use Google to find restaurant recommendations. We treat previously debilitating illnesses with innovative pharmaceutical products, non-invasive surgery techniques and cutting-edge medical devices.

Nearly every aspect of our daily lives is impacted by our high-tech, innovation-driven, globally engaged economy. It has so thoroughly revolutionized our lives that it almost seems absurd to point out that the modern economy is vastly different than the economy of the 1930s and 1940s. And yet our methods for measuring this economy remain much the same as they did during the Great Depression and the era that followed.

Gross domestic product is still calculated by tallying industrial investments like heavy machinery and taking an old-economy view of exports and imports. Mr. Speaker, under this system new factory equipment counts as a long-term investment, but R&D does

not. And an IPOD which became a global powerhouse band on the strength of its superior design and savvy marketing strategies, developed by Apple in my State of California, is simply counted as another good imported from China, where the final product is assembled. Clearly, these products do not fully account for the essential role that knowledge and innovation play in our global economic leadership role.

Our economic strength here in the United States is no longer based solely on the goods we produce but on the ideas that we as innovative, creative Americans create. We add value and increase productivity, not by manufacturing more widgets, but by improving the widgets' design, by making the global distribution of widgets more efficient, by marketing, financing and servicing widgets.

□ 2015

The full value of innovation, knowledge and best practices can be difficult to ascertain, but they have replaced mere goods as the bedrock of our Nation's economy.

Michael Mandel at Business Week demonstrates how Wal-Mart is an excellent example of this. Few companies have revolutionized their industries the way that Wal-Mart has revolutionized the retail world. Its operational and managerial innovations have made it a global leader that its competitors fail to emulate at their peril: the big-box format; the everyday low prices; the electronic data interchange with suppliers; the highly sophisticated data analysis, done to such detail that inventory managers know to order extra strawberry Pop-tarts when the weather gets bad, because the data crunchers have discovered that customers stock up on them just before a storm.

Mr. Speaker, these innovations and best practices, developed by Wal-Mart and copied by its competitors, have led to enormous productivity gains throughout the retail industry and our economy at large.

A study conducted by the McKinsey Global Institute in 2002 found that 25 percent of the major jump in productivity that came during the second half of the 1990s was due to gains in the retail sector, of which Wal-Mart is clearly a major contributor.

According to the study: "More than half of the productivity acceleration in the retailing of general merchandise can be explained by only two syllables: Wal-Mart." By innovating its operational structure, Mr. Speaker, Wal-Mart became one of the single greatest contributors to American productivity at the height of the tech stock bubble.

This is an instructive and remarkable fact, that a single company made a major contribution to the productivity of the world's largest economy, not by building new factories or buying new equipment, but by developing new

ideas and applying them so successfully that they transformed their company and their entire sector.

And yet, as Mandel points out, these operational innovations, less tangible than a widget but far more valuable, do not get counted in our gross domestic product calculation. They are not tallied as an investment, nor are they counted as an export when Wal-Mart buys stores overseas and applies their innovations and best practices abroad to other countries.

Recent GDP numbers have certainly demonstrated tremendous economic strength, with 17 straight quarters of growth, 3.5 percent of GDP growth last year, and projections of nearly 5 percent growth for the first quarter this year. Mr. Speaker, when knowledge-economy intangibles are included, the positive economic outlook becomes all the brighter for us as a Nation.

CAMPAIGN REFORM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight because I am concerned over this Republican Congress that is now speaking about having further campaign reform legislation put before us tomorrow, and I rise tonight to clarify the myths and to speak the truth about the reforms that we have done, the reforms that are not needed, and the reforms that this Republican House is about to undertake.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the scandals that are permeating the Congress would be a wake-up call for the majority not to continue their business as usual in terms of running the people's House. Yet, they have introduced H.R. 4975 as a feeble answer to their ethics problems.

Unfortunately, the bill that is going to come before us, called a reform campaign bill, will not only be a bogus bill, but it includes language that restricts the first amendment rights of Americans.

Instead, the majority reveals their ongoing and reckless infatuation by thwarting the constitutional freedom of speech and association rights of concerned citizen groups. Now, we know these groups were under the BCRA law that are called 527s, and these groups, Mr. Speaker, were groups that had never really had a voice in the political process.

In this last election, they came out and they were a very strong force in providing an increasing voter participation, giving voice to the voiceless and becoming more involved in this democracy of ours.

When I hear the Republicans talk about gaping loopholes that they must close, how do you close gaping loop-

holes when we have a chart that speaks about total U.S. voter turnout? This is not gaping loopholes, for heaven's sake. This is democracy.

In 1990, we had a 105.1 million voter turnout. In the 2000 election year, we had a 110.8 million turnout. In 2004, we had a record-breaking 125.7 million people become involved in this political process. So why are we now trying to pass legislation that merely muffles the mouths and the voices of those who want to take part in this democracy?

When the majority of Democrats and a handful of Republicans voted for this Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, we sought to sever the connections between Federal office holders and the raising of non-Federal money, which is so-called soft money. BCRA, which is the campaign bill, was necessary, Mr. Speaker, to cut the perceived corrupting link between office holders, the formation and adoption of Federal policies, and soft money; and yet the majority is bringing us a bill that is so broad in its application that it stands to severely hamper voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities for civic-minded, nonpartisan organizations. It casts such a wide net that it will ensnare groups whose activities Congress should be promoting, not impeding. This is America. We should be promoting democracy, not impeding it.

By failing to distinguish between groups whose activities are designed to influence the election of clearly identified Federal candidates and those whose sole purpose it is to enhance participation, this legislation imposes too high of a price on election activities.

Now we have heard that the 527s do not have to report. So wrong, Mr. Speaker.

The Internal Revenue Service suggests that during an election year the political organizations have the option of filing on either a quarterly or a monthly schedule, and these organizations must continue on this same filing schedule for the entire calendar year. So it is absurd for them to say that these organizations do not have disclosure and do not file. In the last 6 years, Congress has increased the regulations of independent political committees organized under the section of 527s of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow this legislation to pass this floor. We must continue to allow the American people to have a voice in this democracy. We must continue to have American voices heard.

When the majority of Democrats and a handful of Republicans voted for the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, they sought to sever the connection between Federal officeholders and the raising of non-federal money, so called "soft money." BCRA was necessary to cut the perceived corrupting link between officer holders, the formation and adoption of federal policies, and soft money.