WASHINGTON, DC,
June 28, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM DAVIS to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through July 10, 2001.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON EMERGENCY REGARDING PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107–93)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Enclosed is a report to the Congress on Executive Order 12938, as required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)).

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 2001.*

PRESIDENT'S COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the first actions I took when I became President in January was to create the National Energy Policy Development Group to examine America's energy needs and to develop a policy to put our Nation's energy future on sound footing.

I am hereby transmitting to the Congress proposals contained in the National Energy Policy report that require legislative action. In conjunction with executive actions that my Administration is already undertaking, these legislative initiatives will help address the underlying causes of the energy challenges that Americans face now and in the years to come. Energy has enormous implications for our economy, our environment, and our national security. We cannot let another year go by without addressing these issues together in a comprehensive and balanced package.

These important legislative initiatives, combined with regulatory and administrative actions, comprise a comprehensive and forward-looking plan that utilizes 21st century technology to allow us to promote conservation and diversify our energy supply. These actions will increase the quality of life of Americans by providing reliable energy and protecting the environment.

Our policy will modernize and increase conservation by ensuring that energy is used as efficiently as possible. In addition, the National Energy Policy will modernize and expand our energy infrastructure, creating a new high-tech energy delivery network that increases the reliability of our energy supply. Further, it will diversify our energy supply by encouraging renewable and alternative sources of energy as well as the latest technologies to increase environmentally friendly exploration and production of domestic energy resources.

Importantly, our energy policy improves and accelerates environmental protection. By utilizing the latest in pollution control technologies to cut harmful emissions we can integrate our desire for a cleaner environment and a sufficient supply of energy for the future. We will also strengthen America's energy security. We will do so by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of oil, and by protecting low-income Americans from soaring energy prices and supply shortages through programs like the Low Income Housing Energy Assistance Program.

My Administration stands ready to work with the Congress to enact comprehensive energy legislation this year.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 2001.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain 1 minute requests.

CONSERVATION IS CRITICAL PIECE OF PUZZLE

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, while we all know we cannot conserve our way out of the energy crunch, conservation is a critical piece of the puzzle if we are going to solve this problem. In times like these, each and every American must do their part. This means turning out the lights when leaving a room, walking more often instead of driving, and investing in new technologies and alternative renewable energy sources.

While some in this Chamber merely talk about conservation, President Bush is actually doing something about it.

Today, President Bush announced $77 million in Federal conservation grants which will help accelerate the development of fuel cells in new technology for tomorrow's cars and buildings. These grants will play a critical role in lowering emissions and improving energy efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, instead of throwing rocks and using America's energy problems for political gain, President Bush is providing leadership and solutions.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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, today I rise to talk about an issue that is of great concern to all Americans, but is of particular concern to the 53

million Americans that have no health insurance and to the 14 million American seniors that do not have prescription drug coverage under their Medicare benefit. What I am talking about is the high cost of prescription drugs.

I want to show a chart for the benefit of the Members that begins to illustrate just how serious this problem is.

The first chart I want to show my colleagues begins to talk about the differentials or the difference between what we pay in the United States and what they pay in Europe for some of the most commonly prescribed drugs.

We have heard a lot over the last several years about how much difference there is between Canada and the United States and how much difference there is between Mexico and the United States. But many Americans do not realize there are enormous differences between what we pay for exactly the same drugs made in the same plants here in the United States compared to what they pay in Europe.

For example, the first drug on this list is a drug called Allegra, 120 milligrams. It is triple in the United States what they pay in Europe for the same drug. Some people will say, well, they have price controls in Europe. In some countries in Europe, that is true. But in Germany and Switzerland, it is not true.

Take a look at the drug Coumadin, which is a drug that my father takes. In the United States, it is quadruple the $8.22, which they charge for the average price in Europe.

Glucophage, which is a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have diabetes. In the United States, it sells for $30.12 on average for a 1-month supply. In Europe, it is only $4.11. That is seven times more than Americans are required to pay.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues need to understand that, once a person is diagnosed, it is likely that they will stay on that drug for the rest of their lives. So we are talking about an enormous difference over the life-span of a patient who needs that.

Take a look at a drug Zithromax down here at the bottom. It is a new wonder drug in terms of being an antibiotic. It is a marvelous drug. But I wonder whether Americans should really have to pay triple what consumers in Europe have to pay.

As my colleagues can see, it is $486 for a month's supply here in the United States on average. In Europe, it is only $176.19.

□ 1830

The next chart I want to show is really one of the most troubling charts of all. Last year the average senior got in their cost of living adjustment in the United States a 3.5 percent increase in their Social Security. At the same time, prescription drugs went up 19 percent. My colleagues, this is unsustainable.

Now, I intend to offer an amendment to the ag appropriations bill that will at least clarify that law-abiding citizens have a right, if they have a legal prescription, to buy drugs in Europe. And we are trying to work out the language right now. That is all I want to do.

Some say that the FDA lacks the resources to inspect mail orders. The truth is the FDA is focusing its inspections in the wrong places. Instead of stopping illegal drugs reported by illicit traffickers, the FDA concentrates on approved drugs being brought in by law-abiding citizens. So far this year the FDA has detained 18 times more packages from Canada than they have from Mexico. This is outrageous. They are spending all of their resources chasing law-abiding citizens.

One of the biggest arguments of the people who oppose my amendment is that they say, well, we are going to ultimately have a Medicare benefit, a prescription drug benefit, that will eliminate the need to open the markets so that we get competition in prescription drugs. Well, the truth is simply shifting the burden from those people who currently do not have insurance to the taxpayers will not solve this problem. The problem is there is no real competition.

But the biggest concern that a lot of people raise is what will this do in terms of public safety. Let me say this. More people have been killed in the United States from unsafe tires being brought into the United States from other countries than by bringing legal drugs into the United States by law-abiding citizens. As a matter of fact, there is no known scientific study that demonstrates that there is a threat of injury to patients importing medications, legal medications, with a prescription, from an industrialized country.

What is more, millions of Americans have no prescription drug coverage. Stopping importation of FDA-approved drugs only threatens their safety. Remember, Members, a drug that an individual cannot afford is neither safe nor effective, and too many Americans are put in the position where they simply cannot afford the drugs that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for the world. The amendment I intend to offer is very narrowly focused. It simply says that the FDA cannot stand between law-abiding citizens who have legal prescriptions and allowing them to bring into the country drugs which are otherwise approved by the FDA. In fact, we even go further. We say it cannot be a controlled substance. It cannot even be codeine. The drugs we are talking about are drugs that are commonly prescribed. I will appreciate my colleagues' support on that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the RECORD a few fact sheets regarding the Medicare drug benefit argument.

Some say a Medicare drug benefit will eliminate the need for importation. The truth is—Simply shifting high drug prices to the government only transfers the burden to American taxpayers. Moreover, Medicare coverage won't help the millions of Americans without health insurance.

Some say importation is merely an indirect way of enacting price controls. The truth is—''Importing prescription drugs to the United States will lower prices here and, in the long run, force Europe to pay more drug research and development costs. The best way to break down price controls is to open up markets.''—Stephen W. Schondelmeyer, Pharm.D., Ph.D., Professor and Director, PRIME Institute, Head, Dept. of Pharmaceutical Care & Health Systems, College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota.

Some say the FDA lacks the resources to inspect mail orders. The truth is—The FDA is focusing its inspection resources in the wrong places. Instead of stopping illegal drugs imported by illicit traffickers, the FDA concentrates on approved drugs imported by law-abiding citizens. So far this year, the FDA detained 18 times more packages coming from Canada than from Mexico. Last year, the FDA detained 90 times more packages from Canada than Mexico. Worse, last year Congress appropriated $23 million for border enforcement, but the Secretary of Health and Human Services refused to use the funds.

Some say importation jeopardizes consumer safety. The truth is—No known scientific study demonstrates a threat of injury to patients importing medications with a prescription from industrial countries. What's more, millions of Americans have NO prescription drug coverage. Stopping importation of FDA-approved drug threatens their safety. A drug you can't afford is neither safe nor effective.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act and Sec. 221(c) of H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations.

As reported to the House, H.R. 2330, the bill making appropriations for Agriculture and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2002, includes an emergency-designated appropriation providing $150,000,000 in new budget authority and $143,000,000 in new outlays. Under the provisions of both the Budget Act and the budget resolution, I must adjust the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates upon the reporting of a bill containing emergency appropriations.

Accordingly, I increase the 302(a) allocation to the House Appropriations Committee contained in House Report 107–100 by $150,000,000 in new budget authority and $143,000,000 in new outlays. This changes the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2002 to $661,450,000,000 for budget authority and $683,103,000,000 for outlays. The increase in the allocation also requires an increase in the budgetary aggregates to $1,626,638,000,000 for