

Weldon (PA)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Wexler	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Woolsey	
Wicker	Wu	

NAYS—1

Nadler

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus	Fattah	Millender-
Carson (IN)	Gephardt	McDonald
Cubin	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart, M.		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes within which to record their vote.

□ 1715

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 283 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 279, I would have voted "no"; Nos. 280, 281, 282, 283, I would have voted "yea." I was detained at the airport unable to get here for hours due to inclement weather and traffic jam and congestion.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERMISSION FOR PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2417, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight, June 17, 2003, to file its report on the bill H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I understand the other side of the aisle is in agreement with this request.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DINAN

(Mr. McCOTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, a friend to all my community, Mr. John Dinan, passed away following a courageous fight with cancer, but his unique achievements as a developer will long stand as a testimony to his vision and innovation.

After graduating from the University of Detroit High School in 1944, John went off to serve in the Navy during World War II, and returned to earn a degree in civil engineering.

John began his career in public service, becoming Farmington City Manager, where he garnered experience and recognition by leading the city's successful downtown redevelopment project, despite difficult fiscal conditions. Upon leaving his post, John formed his own development firm, committed to an architectural style, incorporating and complementing the community's natural aesthetics.

During his rise and tenure at the pinnacle of his profession, John always gave back to the neighbors in the communities he developed.

Thus, on behalf of us all, I extend my deepest condolences to his wife Jean, and his entire family, for their loss.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1472

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1472.

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

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.

TIME TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON CHILD TAX CREDIT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today is Day Five of the House Republican leadership's campaign to kill the extension of the child tax credit.

The issue is very simple: The Senate has passed the child tax credit, the President says he will sign it, twelve million children in America need it, but the House Republicans want to kill it. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says there is not enough time to meet in conference with the Senate. That reveals his true intent. He does not want this bill to become law.

A conference with the Senate could take just 5 minutes. The House Republicans could simply stop their delaying tactics and accept the Senate bill in the House-Senate conference. The con-

ference report would be quickly approved by each House and sent to the President, who, as I mentioned, has said he will sign it.

But let us be clear, the House Republicans do not want this bill to become law. In the 12 days since the Senate passed its bill by a 94 to 2 vote on June 5, a strong bipartisan vote, 94 to 2, the Republican majority in the House has voted six times not to accept the Senate bill. Instead, the Republicans voted to send a bloated \$82 billion bill to conference, which they know the Senate will not accept. It is not paid for, it is reckless, it is irresponsible.

The Republican leadership in the House simply does not want to expand the child tax credit, which corrects the unfair omission of nearly 12 million children, including 250,000 children of our active duty military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because our constituents have entrusted us with serious responsibilities. We have the responsibility to our veterans and our military to make sure we honor their sacrifices and be true to the resolutions that we make honoring them here in this House almost on a daily basis. That is appropriate, to honor them, to respect their patriotism, their courage, and to recognize the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country. How then can we say to them that their children are not worthy of this extension of the tax credit?

We also have a responsibility to our parents and grandparents to improve and strengthen the Medicare program they know and trust, and we have a responsibility to future generations to leave them with a country that is even better and stronger and more secure than the one we inherited from our parents.

Providing the tax credit to working and military families is not something that we do not have time for. If children are a priority for us, then we make them a priority, and that means we have time for them. It is not something that we can cavalierly shrug off with phrases like "It ain't gonna happen," to quote my colleagues. It is not something that "we should only consider if we get something for it," to quote my colleagues.

This is a central question of fairness and of responsibility to the children and 6.5 million families who are waiting, still waiting, for us to fulfill a promise we made to them.

□ 1730

We are saying to those children, wait until next year, or the check is not in the mail. Whatever it is, it is bad news if you are a family working full-time, but do not make over \$26,000 a year; and it is bad news for our children of the military.

These working and military families pay taxes, just like everyone else, and are struggling to make ends meet in today's stagnant economy. On behalf of the families of 12 million children now waiting for this tax relief, we must correct this callous omission as quickly as possible.

The Senate tax credit bill is fiscally responsible, it is paid for, and it costs \$10 billion compared to the \$82 billion in the House bill. The Senate bill is supported by Democrats and rank-and-file Republicans in the House, and it would immediately provide the tax credit to millions of working and military families let out of the final tax cut bill approved last month. We can pass the bipartisan legislation and send it to the President today.

It is interesting that after the vote on the tax credit last week, where the Republicans' reckless and callous policy prevailed, that on the motion to instruct which followed, 12 Republicans joined the Democrats in a motion to instruct the conferees to take up the Senate bill. We did that because we know we can invest in our children or we can indebt them. That is the choice that the Republicans have put before us.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said, "Children are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future." I urge my Republican colleagues to do the right thing and accept the Senate bill and, in doing so, support the value we place on our children. We cannot say that some children are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future, but not if your parents make the minimum wage or if they are risking their lives on active duty in the military. We recognize our children as our messengers to a future many of us, most of us, will never see. We want them to take forward a message of respect for children, all children in our country. We want to show them that they really are our greatest resource and our best hope for the future.

There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for the Republican majority not to go immediately to conference and send this bill back to the House for approval and to the President's desk before the end of the month so that every child in America can take advantage of the tax credit whose parents qualify.

THE STRAIGHT STORY ON THE HIGH COST OF PHARMACEUTICALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, a number of us have been coming to the floor of the House to talk about the high cost of prescription drugs here in the United States. We pay more for prescription drugs than any country on the face of the Earth, and many of our senior citizens and others have been going right across the border into Canada and buying pharmaceutical products for half or one-tenth the cost that they are here in the United States.

Now, the Food and Drug Administration and the pharmaceutical companies are doing everything they can to stop Americans from buying pharma-

ceutical products from Canada by saying that there is a safety issue. The fact of the matter is, we checked, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and myself and others; and we have found no cases, none, where Canadian pharmaceutical products that were made here in the United States and reimported back into this country have caused anybody any harm. Absolutely zero.

Now, in my congressional district, the PhRMA companies have been mailing literature to senior citizens saying that there is a safety issue if you buy pharmaceutical products from Canada because they may be contaminated or counterfeit or something else. We have found no cases like that. But they are mailing them into my district trying to scare people trying to influence them to influence me to change my position. Americans should pay no more for pharmaceutical products than they do in other parts of the world; and yet we pay more, by far, than any country: France, Germany, Spain, Canada, anyplace.

Now, today I was watching television and there is a man I respect a great deal, Neal Cavuto; he has a great television show, and he is a very fair newsman. He had a gentleman on his program that said that there was a real problem with safety of these pharmaceutical products coming in from Canada, and the gentleman who was on was so vociferous and so adamant about this that I feel that he must have been paid by the pharmaceutical companies; and if he is not, he should be. Because he is trying to scare Americans into believing they should not buy these pharmaceutical products from Canada.

We have over a million people a year that buy their products from there because they cost so much less, and the attempt is being made to stop that by the Food and Drug Administration saying they are not safe when there is no evidence of that, and by the pharmaceutical companies who are saying they are following the edicts of the Food and Drug Administration.

Now, we are coming up with a prescription drug benefit before too long, and unless we get a handle on these prices and make sure that the American people are paying prices similar to the rest of the world, the taxpayer is going to be picking up the difference between what they pay in Canada and what they pay here in the United States. The senior citizens want the prescription drug benefit, and we want to give it to them; but we do not want the taxpayers of this country saddled with extremely high prices for the products they can buy right across the border for less money.

So it is extremely important, in my opinion, that we get this message out to the American people. And the pharmaceutical companies have \$150 million they are dumping into an ad campaign to try to convince people that these products are not safe when that is just not the case.

So I would just like to say if Mr. Cavuto happens to be watching tonight or any other television commentator, please be fair. Be sure to have the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) or myself or somebody else who has been studying this issue for some time on the program as well to rebut those who are paid for by the pharmaceutical companies to make sure the American people are getting the story straight; not biased, but straight.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

A HATE-HATE RELATIONSHIP WITH MEDICARE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have just never really liked Medicare. Medicare was enacted in 1965, despite the overwhelming opposition of Republicans in Congress. Only 13, fewer than 10 percent, only 13 of the 140 Republicans in the House in those days backed Medicare. Bob Dole voted "no." Gerald Ford voted "no." The soon-to-be minority leader, John Rhodes, voted "no"; Strom Thurmond voted "no," Donald Rumsfeld, a Member of Congress then, all leaders in their party, in the Republican Party, voted against the creation of Medicare. They were unapologetic at the time. Most of them are unapologetic about their opposition and their willingness to undercut Medicare today.

Senator Bob Dole, 20 years later as a candidate for President representing the Republican Party, told a conservative group called the American Conservative Union, he said, "I was there, fighting the fight, one of only 12 voting against Medicare." Actually, I do not know where he came up with 12, there were many more than that, but one of a few, he said, voting against Medicare. The Reagan administration some years later led the first substantive swings at Medicare. With the help of congressional allies, he succeeded in cutting Medicare payments to doctors and raising seniors' Medicare out-of-pocket expenses. But it was not until Republicans took over the House in 1994 the Republican leadership had a realistic chance at obtaining their long-held goal of killing Medicare. House Speaker Newt Gingrich, almost immediately after being sworn in in January, led a failed bid to cut Medicare by \$270 billion to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in the country. Sound familiar? Cut Medicare, free up the dollars, so you can give a tax cut to the richest 5 percent, richest 6 percent of people in this country.

Among the Gingrich Medicare plans, a key supporter was then Governor of