

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

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.

CHINA'S THREAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED DURING APPROPRIATED SEASONS

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight, as my colleagues know, the first vote we had dealt with the issue of American scholars of Chinese ancestry being held in detention, and this was passed overwhelmingly by the House. Everyone supported calling on China to release these people.

I had planned last week to come on the floor and talk about North Carolina because I am one who is very, very concerned about the fact as we begin very shortly to discuss and debate the appropriations for our United States military.

Too many times I think we as a Nation fail to realize that this is a very unsafe world that we live in. When I think about China and the things that China is doing to build up their military, then I think I have a responsibility back in the third district of North Carolina, which I have the privilege to represent to talk to the people about my concerns as their elected representative.

Tonight, I wanted to take just a couple minutes of my time to say to the House and to those throughout this Nation that China has definitely positioned itself, in my opinion, to be an adversary of this country. We know what happened with our reconnaissance plane that has been held by the Chinese for several months now, which I understand is being taken apart and soon will be shipped back to America. That plane was in international airspace. It should never have been challenged by the Chinese fighter, but it was; and, therefore, the pilot, the American pilot had to land in China.

I wanted to make reference to this chart that I have in front of the podium tonight, which was in The Washington Times, February 29 of the year 2000. And it says "China Warns U.S. of Missile Strike."

Mr. Speaker, that to me is an arrogant statement and a very belligerent statement that China would be making towards the United States of America. This was when China was somewhat trying to threaten the Taiwanese Government by saying that we are going to fire missiles towards your country.

I want to read one of the subtitles to this article. Again the title of the arti-

cle by Bill Gertz is "China Warns U.S. of Missile Strike"; and the subtitle says, "It is not a wise move to be at war with a country such as China, a point which the U.S. policymakers know fairly well also."

This, Mr. Speaker, was a quote of the Liberation Army Daily, the official newspaper of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. Again, I think that is a very threatening statement. I think it is a statement of belligerence. That, again, was long before our reconnaissance plane was forced down in China.

Mr. Speaker, there is a book that I have finished reading that I think is an excellent book to inform the people of my district, the third district of North Carolina. It is called The China Threat. It is written by Bill Gertz. Bill Gertz writes for The Washington Times, and I think he is highly respected in certainly this city of Washington, this Nation, and throughout the world of his accuracy and his research. If people would get a chance to read this book, The China Threat, the subtitle, "How the People's Republic targets America."

I want to read you just one aspect that is contained in this book: "An international Chinese military document exposes how Beijing is willing to launch a nuclear attack on the United States if America forces an attempt to defend Taiwan."

I bring that point up again, Mr. Speaker, because you can see from this chart that Admiral Blair spoke to the House and Senate Committee on Armed Services back on March 28 of the year 2001, and the admiral warns of perilous buildup of Chinese missiles.

The commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific told Congress today that China's ongoing missile buildup opposite Taiwan is destabilizing and leads to a U.S. response unless halted.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that those of us in the United States that will soon be debating the needs of our military that we remember and the American people remember that this is a very unsafe world that we live in.

The only other chart I want to bring up, Mr. Speaker, was in The Washington Times just a few weeks ago. My colleagues can see this. It says, "China Secretly Shipping Arms to Cuba." This was just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that, when we have a chance, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services, to talk here on the floor of the House as well as back in our district, that we need to remind the people of this country that there are those who do not appreciate our way of life and those who would like to challenge this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I do want to again say that it is always a privilege for me to represent the third district of North Carolina, the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and the Coast Guard. I have over 50,000 retirees in my

district who have served this Nation, veterans and retirees.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I will close. I will say in closing this is a great book for anyone that is concerned about the national security of this Nation, The China Threat by Bill Gertz.

HIGH-PRICED 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, I rise tonight to talk about an issue that is not a partisan issue, but it is a very important issue that we have not talked about much on the House floor in the last year.

Last year, we passed an amendment to the House Ag appropriations bill, and ultimately was included in the omnibus bill that went to the President's desk, some language which clarified that Americans would have access to prescription drugs at world market prices.

Unfortunately, Secretary Shalala said that her department would not enforce that legislation. Up until this point, Secretary Tommy Thompson has followed suit. So we are going to be forced to offer another amendment in the next several days.

I would like to share with the Members tonight a chart talking about the outrageously high prices that Americans pay for prescription drugs. Now, unfortunately, this chart is outdated. We are having a new one made up. But even the worst news is that the differences between what we pay in the United States and what consumers around the rest of the world pay have not changed.

For example, my 82-year-old father takes a drug called Coumadin. It is a blood thinner. It is one of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. A few years ago when we had this research done, the average price in the United States was \$30.25. The average price in Europe was \$2.85 for exactly the same drug in exactly the same dosage.

Now, as I said, the numbers have changed, and I have a new chart that is available. We will have it in this form probably by tomorrow at noon. But Members who would like a copy of this chart can go to my Web site. It is simply gil.house.gov. One can see for oneself the differences that Americans pay.

For example, let us take a commonly prescribed drug called Claritin that is prescribed for allergies. A lot of Americans take it. The average price for that drug in the United States is \$63.06 for a 30-day supply. But that same drug, the average price in Europe, in the European Union, is only \$16.05.

Let us take another drug that is commonly prescribed here in the United States, Prozac. In the United States, the average price for a 30-day supply is

\$71.94, but that same drug in Europe sells for \$44.10.

Now, these are the same drugs, Mr. Speaker. They are made by the same companies in the same FDA approved facilities.

Now the big pharmaceutical companies are arguing safety. They are saying we have got to worry about safety. That is a legitimate concern. I am concerned about safety as well. But remember this, a drug that consumers cannot afford is neither safe nor effective.

Today in America, 14 million seniors have no prescription drug coverage. That speaks also to the some 53 million Americans who have no other health insurance. So we may be talking about as many as 57 million Americans who were forced to pay full retail price for these drugs. They get no help.

Now, some people say, well they have price controls in other countries, and that is true. In some countries, they do have price controls. But it is also true there are countries in Europe that have no price controls. Yet, we pay in America sometimes three times more for exactly the same drug.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for bulk importation this year, although I believe an amendment will be offered, and I will certainly support it. All I am really asking for is a clarification so that American consumers that have a legal prescription for a legal drug in the United States from any G-8 country or any NAFTA signatory country ought to be able to get those drugs from those countries at world market prices.

I believe that if we could simply have access to drugs at world market prices, because I am a free trader, I do not believe in price controls, but I do believe that ultimately markets are more powerful than armies. If Americans have access to those markets, we will see drug prices in the United States come down by at least 30 percent. And 30 percent last year or the last year that we have numbers for seniors, they spent something like \$50 billion on prescription drugs. Thirty percent of \$50 billion is real money even here in Washington.

So I am not asking for the world. I am simply saying we need a clarification for our own FDA that law-abiding citizens with a legal prescription ought to be able to buy drugs at world market prices. If they want to use the Internet, that is up to them. Or if they want to go through their local pharmacy, I would certainly permit that as well. But we are not going to stand idly by.

I ask my colleagues, if they could explain this chart and these differentials to their seniors in their districts or their consumers in their districts, then they have every right to vote against my amendment. But if they cannot explain this, I expect that they will be asked by seniors and others in their district why they voted against the amendment. It will be a simple amendment. We hope to offer it later this

week. We appreciate our colleagues' support.

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH DRUG PRICES
(For a 30-day supply)

Drug	U.S. price	Euro. price
Allegra 120	\$69.99	\$20.88
Atarax	28.62	4.20
Biazin 250	113.25	61.74
Claritin	63.06	16.06
Coumadin	37.74	8.22
Glucophage	30.12	4.11
Lipitor	52.86	41.25
Premarin	17.10	9.90
Prozac	71.94	44.10
Zestril 5	25.92	5.52
Zithromax 500	486.00	176.19
Zyrtec	50.10	17.73

□ 1900

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

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise a couple of things that were in yesterday's newspaper that illustrate that as much as we would like the drug problem in America to go away, it has not gone away.

The front page of The New York Times says, "Violence Rises as Club Drug Spreads Out Into the Streets." And it is yet another story about Ecstasy. On the front page of USA Today just a month ago, "Ecstasy Drug Trade Turns Violent." What we see from the charts is that it is exploding on the West Coast, it is stabilized on the East Coast, in the Midwest it is soaring; and in the south it is roughly stabilized.

We are seeing more and more kids realize the extreme dangers as more and more overdose, as more and more lose ground in their schooling as they see side effects like depression, particularly at the so-called rave parties which have been featured a lot in New Orleans and other places on some national TV shows. Just as crack cocaine became an epidemic in America, we are seeing the start of the Ecstasy movement. This is partly because of the drug legalization movement in the Netherlands and in Europe. We are seeing Ecstasy exported from Belgium and the Netherlands into the U.S. It is increasingly becoming the drug of choice. We need to be aggressive in our law enforcement, we need to be aggressive in our prevention and treatment programs, in our outreach programs, as well as our interdiction programs.

In the Indianapolis Star yesterday, the headline says, "Drug Test Ban Felt at State Schools. Ball State University survey shows rise in drug and alcohol

use and student discipline since court rejected policy.'

A number of years ago, when I was a staffer for former Senator Dan Coats, we allowed drug-free schools money to be used for drug testing of student athletes. This policy had been spreading through the United States and beyond just the athletic departments to general, random drug testing. In my district, at East Noble High School, at Fremont High School, we had several model programs developed. In Anderson High School, a State court ruled that drug testing the students was illegal search and seizure.

How exactly are we supposed to do prevention programs if the court decides it is the legislative body and does not have any legal precedent with which to decide that but makes that decision?

What we do know, and ironically it took a court decision to overturn a broad drug testing policy of schools, is in fact that in Indiana drug use and alcohol use had gone down, and then when they were ordered to stop the program, in 1 year it has gone back up. So the question is, as we see the results when a program is pulled back, not whether drug testing works, it is how can we do it in a constitutional way, that is sensitive to the individual, whether in the workplace, whether at school or wherever it be? Because drug testing is one of the most effective prevention programs. We have maintained this for years, and this new study in Indiana proves it.

Unless we all work together in prevention, in treatment, in interdiction, and in law enforcement, we are going to continue to lose many more of our young people and adults to the scourge of illegal narcotics.

REJECT RENAMING OF NATIONAL AIRPORT IN METRO SYSTEM

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House is scheduled to consider the transportation appropriation bill. Within that bill there is a provision requiring that the local governments in the Washington, D.C. area spend hundreds of thousands of dollars of their own money to add the name of Ronald Reagan to the Metro system every place it says National Airport.

Now, the local governments have the authority to do this. When a local government requests a name change, the name of the Metro station within its jurisdiction is changed. That deference to local government is really one of the principal things that Ronald Reagan stood for. But this body, deciding that it did not like the fact that the local government had resisted adding those two additional names, is now going to require them to do so, even though this is not a Federal facility. It gets only 6 percent Federal money, 94 percent of