

the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2003, and Section 221 of H. Con. Res. 83.

As passed by the House, H.R. 4775, a bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2002, includes emergency-designated appropriations. The fiscal year 2002 allocations to the Appropriations Committee were previously increased by \$29,432,000,000 in new budget authority and \$8,466,000,000 in outlays to reflect the amounts in the House-reported bill. I am adjusting the budgetary aggregates and the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations for the difference between the House-reported and House-passed measures. This adjustment equals—\$5,000,000 in new budget authority. (There was no change in outlays.) Accordingly, the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2002 for the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$735,427,000,000 in new budget authority and \$736,420,000,000 in outlays. The budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2002 become \$1,708,599,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,653,073,000,000 in outlays.

Outlays flowing from fiscal year 2002 emergency appropriations increase the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2003 outlays. Under the procedures set forth in section 314 of the Budget Act, adjustments may be made for emergency-designated budget authority through fiscal year 2002 and for the outlays flowing from such budget authority in all fiscal years. The outlays flowing in fiscal year 2003 from H.R. 4775, as passed by the House, total \$10,715,000,000. The 302(a) allocation for outlays to the House Committee on Appropriations and the budgetary aggregate for outlays are increased by this amount. Accordingly, the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2003 for the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$748,096,000,000 in new budget authority and \$785,190,000,000 in outlays. The budgetary aggregates for fiscal year 2003 becomes \$1,784,073,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,767,146,000,000 in outlays.

Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski at 6-7270.

FERC HAS NOT AND CANNOT DO ITS JOB

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to briefly discuss this week's release by the General Accounting Office, the GAO, its study on actions needed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, that is, FERC, to confront challenges that impede effective oversight. That was the title of this GAO report. This report vindicates those of us who have been standing up for 2 years now to tell this body that FERC was simply not doing its job protecting California and the rest of the country, and this report vilifies those who doubted us for the last 2 years.

In the conclusion of the report, we read that "FERC is not adequately performing the oversight that is needed to ensure that prices produced by these markets are just and reasonable." Let me repeat that, "FERC is not ade-

quately performing the oversight that is needed to ensure that prices produced by these markets are just and reasonable." That means that illegal prices have been charged to electricity consumers all over this country, but specifically in California, and the report goes on to say, FERC has been simply not fulfilling its regulatory mandate.

The GAO report says that FERC does not even know how to carry out its mandate to ensure that interstate wholesale natural gas and electricity prices are, as the law states, just and reasonable. If FERC does not know how to regulate power markets, who does?

We need a change because we do not need a repeat of the inaction we saw from FERC in 2000 that has drained the California Treasury of almost \$50 billion and has created a severe deficit in our State's budget this year.

Two years ago, California and the hands-off treatment it received from FERC was the canary in the gold mine, if I may say so, that is exposing the glaring fissures in our so-called energy policy. The lack of action by FERC, or as it should be called the Federal Enron Rubber-Stamping Commission, hurt many everyday Americans in our State and throughout our Nation.

FERC did not do its job in 2000. It did not do its job in 2001, and the GAO report says that FERC cannot do its job even now. My constituents in San Diego, California, and millions of other Californians lost billions during this crisis, and FERC reported no evidence of price-fixing.

Now FERC says it is waiting for the regional transmission organizations, the RTOs, to provide front-line monitoring for new, unregulated power markets. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that it may take several more years for these RTOs to form, and in a gross understatement the GAO report says, "As the California crisis has made adequately clear, FERC simply cannot let the markets go unmonitored for this length of time."

It is abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a lot of damage, and we need a fresh look, farther away from this administration, farther away from the FERC Commissioner, farther away from people tainted with association with Enron.

We need to know how Enron and other members of the electricity cartel robbed California and eluded the oversight of the Federal Enron Rubber-Stamping Commission. This should lead, by the way, to every State in this country and other countries around the world to really questioning whether they should deregulate to the so-called private market electricity and other basic commodities that are necessary for our economic life.

There is no public oversight, as the GAO report shows, of what the so-called private market will do. They will rob us blind as they did to us in California. That is why I continue to call for the Attorney General to name

a special prosecutor to look into this whole case.

My bill, H. Con. Res. 333, would make this request on behalf of our entire Congress. We must not have even the perception that the fox, that is, FERC, is guarding the hen house, that is, our electricity market.

This Congress must demand that this situation end and appoint a special prosecutor and figure out what happened and how we are going to proceed from here.

HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to talk about the high cost of prescription drugs and, more importantly, the difference between what we in America pay for those same drugs and what they pay in other parts of the industrialized world.

I have a chart here, and again, I want to remind my colleagues, these are not my numbers. I did not invent this chart. This chart was developed by some people who have been studying this issue for decades, and disparities get worse by the year. And here we see some of the most commonly prescribed drugs in America. Let me point out a couple of them.

Cipro, a drug that we became very familiar with last year when we had the scare over the anthrax, and let me say that Tommy Thompson did a very good job in negotiating with the German maker Bayer, we sometimes call it Bayer, and we got a very good price for the Federal Government, but if someone is a normal individual and they need Cipro, they need that antibiotic Cipro, in the United States average price for a 30-day supply of Cipro is \$87.99. That same drug in Europe sells for half that price, less than half, \$40.75.

Let us look at another drug that is important to diabetics, one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States or in the world, Glucophage. The average price in the United States \$124.65. That same drug made in the same plant under the same FDA approval in Europe sells for an average of \$22.

I think we should pay our fair share for prescription drugs. We ought to pay our fair share of the cost of developing those drugs, but I do not think we ought to have to subsidize the starving Swiss, and that is what is happening today. It is not shame on the pharmaceutical industry, it is shame on the FDA, and it is shame on us.

It has been said that consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds. Next week we are going to have two very interesting debates on the floor of this House, one about trade promotion authority. We are going to have people

come to the well of this House, and they are going to talk about how important it is that we have free trade, that we ought to have open markets, that we ought to allow our markets to work. In fact, some of them may even quote the former President Ronald Reagan when he said that markets are more powerful than armies.

Some of those same people are going to come to the floor of the House the next day, and they are going to say, well, we need open markets, but not when it comes to pharmaceuticals, not where it can really save Americans billions of dollars. And it really is billions of dollars, because according to the estimates by the Congressional Budget Office, seniors over the next 10 years in the United States of America, that is, people 65 and over, are going to spend \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs. They cannot afford that, and neither can the taxpayers.

It is time to open the markets and allow Americans to have access to these world drugs at world market prices and let us talk about the savings.

The estimates that we have from independent experts is that Americans could save 35 percent minimum simply by opening up the markets and allowing Americans to have access to those drugs at world market prices. What does that mean? If we take \$1.8 trillion, divide it evenly over the next 10 years, that is \$180 billion a year. If we could save 35 percent, how much is that? That is over \$50 billion a year, \$50 billion a year, and we have arguments here on the floor about tax cuts.

How much good would we do if we gave Americans a \$50-billion-per-year tax cut? That is what we are talking about if we simply open the markets. There is something wrong when we allow our own FDA to stand between American seniors and lower prescription drug prices. We ought to pay our fair share, but we should not be held hostage to the big drug cartels that are exploiting their market opportunities here in the United States at the expense of seniors, at the expense of taxpayers, and incidentally, I had a meeting this morning, at the expense of the big corporations.

One of the largest corporations in the United States, one of the representatives told me today they spend \$1 billion a year on prescription drugs. They are spending \$1 million a month on just one name-brand pharmaceutical each month, \$1 million a month just on one drug. Even they are starting to say, wait a second.

We believe in open markets. We believe in free markets. We believe in competition. It is time to open the markets, create some competition so that we do not have these huge disparities between what Americans are required to pay for the same drugs, made in the same FDA-approved facilities.

Let us have that debate next week about free markets. I believe in free markets. Let us have that debate about

making it easier for all Americans, not just seniors, to pay for the drugs they need. No senior should have to choose between food and prescription drugs. We can go a long way simply by opening markets, allowing world markets to work, allowing that thing that we talk about and will talk about next week, free trade, to work to the advantage of American consumers. We could save American consumers \$50 billion a year.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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.)

SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMS DESERVE SUPPORT

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to support global school feeding programs as part of a strategy to reduce hunger among the world's children and to increase their ability to go to school. Along with the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), I have introduced H.R. 1700, the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001.

That bill, which has 116 bipartisan cosponsors, was established as a permanent program in the farm bill reauthorization which the President recently signed into law. If adequately funded, this program will purchase and allocate U.S. commodities and other resources to provide millions of hungry children around the world with a healthy, nutritious meal in a school setting.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, over 300 million of the world's children are hungry. About 130 million of these children do not even go to school. School feeding programs clearly demonstrate that more families send their children to school when a meal is provided. U.S.-supported school feeding programs have documented significant increases in student enrollment, especially among girls. The children become more alert and more capable of learning when better nourished. More children advance to the next levels, and they acquire skills that help them to be productive members of society.

U.S. Private Voluntary Organizations have long been involved in this effort, working on the front lines, delivering nutritious food to needy children around the world. Two members of my staff recently attended a conference in Indonesia on school feeding programs. The conference sponsors included the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Land O'Lakes. My staff were able to review the Land O'Lakes school feeding model firsthand and to meet other U.S. PVOs involved in the school feeding effort in Indonesia, like Mercy Corps International, ACDI/VOCA, and International Relief and Development. Together, these organizations are feeding over 900,000 schoolchildren.

Land O'Lakes' school feeding endeavor in Indonesia began in November of 2000, with USDA 416(b) commodity donations. Indonesia is the fourth most populous nation in the world, following China, India and the United States. It is also the world's largest Muslim nation. As a result of the economic slowdown and decreasing resources provided to the national government for school feeding initiatives, the nutritional status of Indonesian elementary schoolchildren has deteriorated. The economic situation in the country has encouraged children to leave school early, with young girls being the first to go.

The Land O'Lakes Indonesia program is presently reaching over 450,000 schoolchildren in more than 2,900 schools on the islands of Java. It focuses on local capacity building, making sure all the products used in this program are processed locally. Land O'Lakes works with the three local processors who produce the fortified milk and wheat biscuits that are distributed to schools. This partnership exemplifies how this program can also be a catalyst for strengthening the local food industry.

Land O'Lakes works with Indonesian NGOs in the communities where targeted schools are located. Involving local participation stimulates community empowerment and helps build sustainability and ownership in the implementation and oversight of these programs.

The Land O'Lakes model has been so successful it will be replicated in Vietnam and Bangladesh as part of the Global Food for Education pilot program.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of these programs are enormous, starting with the positive nutritional impact on children's lives and helping them obtain the education necessary to improve their standard of living. There are also all the auxiliary benefits: facilitating economic development, strengthening social institutions, empowering women, and promoting stable democratic societies throughout the world. Clearly, these programs play a critical role in any strategy to provide education and improve children's health.

Mr. Speaker, ending hunger among the world's children is achievable. For