

\$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.

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

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
Biaxin 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
Ytrec	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

which comes from the riders of the Metro system.

So we ought to ask ourselves, do principles only apply when it is convenient, when it suits our politics; or do we vote consistently with principles like deferring to the sovereignty of local governments in opposition to unfunded Federal mandates? Because this is what this is, an unfunded Federal mandate. It would not be done in other congressional districts, but we are going to be doing it over the opposition of this local government and the regional authority. We are going to do it out of what I can only consider to be partisan petty politics.

We greatly regret the fact that Ronald Reagan today is suffering from Alzheimer's disease. But I know, and I particularly regret it for one reason because I know that if he were able to, he would adamantly insist the Congress not do this to his name. George Will wrote an editorial making this point: he quoted Cato, the famous Roman, who made the point that he would rather have people asking why is this place not named after Cato, than asking why did they name this coliseum or facility after Cato. In other words, modesty ought to be a hallmark of great people. Resistance to arrogance. Yet that is what this provision is. It is an arrogant Federal imposition upon the will of local government.

Local government did not resist adding the name out of resentment of Ronald Reagan, although they certainly represent the fact that they were never consulted when they changed the name of the airport from George Washington's honor to Ronald Reagan. Because it is on the very road that leads to George Washington's home. George Washington's family owned the land that National Airport was built on. In fact, Franklin Roosevelt, when the main terminal was constructed, had it constructed to resemble Mount Vernon. So if they had been consulted, they would have said, well, we really think it should be continued to be named after George Washington since Ronald Reagan never used this airport. It did not offer transcontinental flights. He used Andrews Air Force Base when he was President. So they resent that.

But that is not why they resisted this. They resisted because it does not make practical sense. You cannot fit four long names, Ronald Reagan National Airport, on the literature. But most importantly, all the stations are named after places, not after people. When some people wanted to honor Robert Kennedy by naming the Metro station at the RFK Stadium after Robert Kennedy, the Metro Board likewise resisted. They said, no, we name them after places, we will name it Stadium Armory, not after an individual. Likewise, this metro station should be named National Airport.

Now, many people will think this is a petty picayune issue, but it is a principle. We voted unanimously against unfunded Federal mandates. This is an

unfunded Federal mandate. That principle should be preserved, and so should respect for local government wishes.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress should reject this language that purports to honor Ronald Reagan, but actually defiles his legacy.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-110) on the resolution (H. Res. 178) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 Extension 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE ENERGY SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to devote my comments to a focus on energy and the energy shortage that we have. On one hand I think in some areas we have an energy crisis, on the other hand I think at times we really have an energy problem. In either case, whether an energy crisis or an energy problem, the fact is we need to apply an ingredient called common sense.

There is a lot of areas of common sense. We can find a lot of common sense, like conservation. Issues like conservation, when applied to energy, can be done without a lot of pain. It

does not affect our life-style. In fact, it is a contribution to our country's energy woes, so to speak. So I will visit a little about conservation this evening.

I also want to address where we are, what kind of problem we are facing in future generations. I think it is incumbent upon us, as leaders, to exercise some leadership not for today, which obviously we have to do, but for the future. Our questions about energy should not be questions about energy today exclusively, but should in fact include questions about energy for tomorrow. Of course issues like conservation and issues like alternative power, solar and other types, wind power, et cetera, are a part of our leadership obligations to help address or at least help prepare some answers for future generations on their energy problems.

I thought it would be very good this evening to take a look at what common sense does for us. For example, hydropower. Hydropower does not use coal. Hydropower does not use electricity. It generates electricity. Hydropower does not require natural gas. Hydropower does not require fuel. The fuel that generates hydropower is the natural flow of water. So we are going to talk a little about hydropower. We are going to talk about why hydropower is important for our environment.

In our mad rush to supply energy, regardless of the source, we always have to consider what is the impact to the environment and how can we mitigate the environment. In some cases, not just mitigate the environment, and in fact mitigation of the environment may be old news, the new news for the environment may mean that we have to enhance the environment, a step higher than mitigation of the environment. But I want to stress here this evening that mitigation or enhancement of the environment is not an exclusive set of its own. In other words, we can have the environment, and we can have power production regardless of the source. In fact, through utilization of common sense, we can have protection of an environment and production of energy resources that every one of my colleagues in this room and every one of their constituents is dependent upon.

Something a little interesting happened the other day. I like to mountain bike. I like to ride bikes, though I am just learning. My wife, Lori, Carey and Bruce are trying to get me educated on riding these bikes in a little more sophisticated form, but I saw someone the other day on a mountain bike and we were talking and this individual said to me, he says, You know, mining is so terrible and the energy companies are so terrible, look what they are doing. So I said, You know what, that bike you have got, that bike you paid \$3,000 or \$4,000 for, has titanium in it. It is interesting to me you criticize on one side but you take advantage on the other.

My reason for using this example this evening is to tell my colleagues that I