

The results are based on a survey of retail prescription drug prices in chain and independently-owned drug stores across my district. These prices were compared to the prices paid by the drug companies' most-favored customers.

For the 10 drugs cited above, the study found that the average difference between the price paid by a senior citizen and the price paid by an HMO was 98 percent, almost double the price for a senior citizen. Similar studies have recently been conducted by other Democratic Members in their districts, including the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TOM ALLEN), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. JOHN TIERNEY), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TOM BARRETT), the gentleman from California (Mr. HENRY WAXMAN), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JIM TURNER). The average price differential of these studies combined is 108 percent.

With this in mind, I hasten to say that the high price of prescription drugs is not the fault of the pharmacist or the pharmacies. Pharmacies in fact have very small markups for prescription drugs, sometimes as low as 3 percent.

The problem is with large drug companies who drive up prices. Drugmakers whose annual profits top \$20 billion make six times more profit on prescription drugs than do retail pharmacists. It is no secret that greed is the driving force behind this problem. Because HMOs buy their drugs in bulk, manufacturers sell to HMOs at a discount, and then conveniently shift that cost to the drugmaker on the backs of our seniors.

Pharmacies, as to our seniors, have no real choice in the matter. Unfortunately, seniors, many of whom are on fixed incomes, are obviously the ones who suffer. As we all know, the later years of life often bring reduced incomes and higher health care costs. Few elderly can escape this dilemma. We have a responsibility to take steps to make medicine more affordable for older Americans.

I want to tell the story of one elderly woman who lives in Elyria, Ohio, in the county in which I live, and is a victim of this ongoing price discrimination. This woman, who asked to remain anonymous, is 67 years old. She suffers from poor eyesight, high blood pressure, and a number of other serious ailments. She takes 13 prescription medicines. Her only income is social security, which is roughly \$800 per month. While she has some insurance coverage, this woman's drug costs amount to almost 40 percent of her income. She said after she pays for her medicine, she has about \$20 to buy groceries for the whole month.

More tragically, she has had to begin reducing some of the dosages to save money. She is supposed to take four pills a day. She will cut them into half and take four half pills a day, for instance.

This situation is surely unacceptable. The bottom line is we need to take

steps to protect the elderly, who should not suffer this indignity. Our Nation's seniors should not bear the burden of paying for pharmaceutical company profits.

To address this issue head on, I signed on as an original cosponsor to a bill introduced by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. TOM ALLEN) to reduce the costs of prescription drugs for senior citizens. The Prescription Drugs Fairness for Seniors Act aims to protect senior citizens from drug price discrimination by making prescription drugs available to Medicare beneficiaries at the reduced price.

The bill achieves this by allowing pharmacies that serve seniors in Medicare to buy prescription drugs at the best market price available under the Federal supply schedule, which will reduce prescription drug prices for senior citizens by up to 50 percent.

An elderly person's well-being and quality of life are often determined by access to medicine prescribed by their doctor. This legislation directly addresses a problem we can no longer ignore. I urge my colleagues to act on behalf of the elderly and support this important measure, H.R. 4627.

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

Mr. STEARNS 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 Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### A TRIBUTE TO WAYZATA HEAD FOOTBALL COACH ROGER LIPELT UPON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a Minnesotan who represents the greatness and goodness that is America. I rise today to pay tribute to one of our State's top teachers and coaches who personifies Minnesota values. I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend of some 20 years, Coach Roger Lipelt of Wayzata High School.

Roger Lipelt, the highly successful head coach and outstanding teacher at

Wayzata the past 22 seasons, is retiring this year after a legendary career. Under Coach Lipelt, the Wayzata Football Trojans have won 204 games and 11 conference championships. His boys' tennis team won a State title several years ago.

Coach Roger Lipelt has received countless honors during his brilliant coaching career: Coach of the Year, Head Coach of the Minnesota All-Star Football Team, Hall of Fame selection by his alma mater, Hamline University, to name just a few.

Despite all the attention this legendary coach has drawn, if a stranger walks up to Roger Lipelt and asks him what he does, he will most likely say, "I am mainly a social studies teacher."

Yes, teaching is what Roger Lipelt is mainly about. Roger has taught all of his students and his athletes many valuable lessons about life, about winning and losing, about family and faith, about love of country and community, and about how to treat other people.

Through his inspirational leadership and by his example, Roger Lipelt has profoundly affected the lives of countless young people, and shown them the way to lead healthy and productive lives. Never give up on yourself, Roger Lipelt tells his students and his athletes. For 22 years, Roger's spirited coaching has made the Wayzata Football Trojans one of the most consistently successful football teams in the State of Minnesota, season after season.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Roger Lipelt, I am grateful to say, for two decades. I could tell the Members firsthand the power and the guidance he has brought to so many young people's lives. He has been a member for many years of a small Bible study group that I am part of. We meet every Saturday at a local restaurant in Wayzata. Members of our Saturday morning group have been truly blessed by Roger's friendship and his faith.

Above all, Roger Lipelt's life is about faith, family, and friends. Roger's love for his family is an inspiration to all of us who know him. Roger's wonderful wife, Jo, and their daughters Heidi, Heather, and Holly, have been Roger's biggest boosters, and have shown all of us the true meaning and the importance of family.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all those people whose lives Roger Lipelt has touched through the years, I am honored to stand here today to pay tribute to our Wayzata hero on his well-deserved retirement. We wish Roger and Jo Lipelt many more years of happiness together.

Congratulations, Coach, on a great career, and thanks for all the memories. Thanks, also, Coach, for putting the ball in the air.

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

(Mr. MINGE 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 Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASTLE 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.)

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

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

#### REGARDING STATEMENTS BY CHAIRMAN HYDE OF THE COM- MITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary held a press conference in which he made announcements which I had, until I read the report, known nothing about. There are comments here that I think require us to examine this quite carefully.

First of all, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) has indicated his intention to vote for an inquiry of impeachment of the President of the United States, quite within his scope of his duties, or any other Member, for that matter. But to suggest that Democrats ought to vote in the committee along with him to show bipartisanship I think stretches the bounds of reasonableness to a breaking point.

Every Member in this body has their own responsibility and inquiry within themselves to determine, especially on the Committee on the Judiciary, whether or not there should be an inquiry.

□ 1930

The fact that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has decided that there should be, should not influence anybody else in this body. For him to suggest that Democrats should show bipartisanship by voting with him is, indeed, an incorrect position which I hope he will repair immediately tomorrow.

I just left his office, and he was not there. The office was closed. But one of his staffers was nice enough to inform me that I am on his schedule to meet with him tomorrow.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) cannot dictate what the Committee on the Judiciary's Members, 21 Republicans and 16 Democrats, are

going to vote a week from now. He cannot do it. Neither can I. Neither can the Speaker.

To announce to the press unilaterally that that vote will take place a week from today begs common sense. We are out until Thursday. There is a weekend of 2 days. We are supposed to come back on Monday, and the most important vote of the Committee on the Judiciary in its recent history is supposed to happen between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. a week from today. I suggest that is an incorrect way to proceed. It is unilateral. I am reading about it.

When by chance does the committee get a chance to examine the materials for something other than looking for redactions to send out to the American people? We still have not finished. Because we sent over staffers to find out that there are even more boxes in the independent counsel's office in which he said he deemed them irrelevant and of no consequence to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Well, thank you, Mr. Starr. But I think that is within our jurisdiction to make the determination whether anything is irrelevant or not. He sent us 37 boxes. Send it all and let us examine it all.

But let us not be deceived. Going through materials for redactions that may contain 6(e) materials, that is Grand Jury materials that are accorded privacy, or that there may be defamatory materials that will harm innocent Americans, or that women's phone numbers and addresses should be redacted is a completely different matter from examining the materials with an eye to whether or not we should have an inquiry of impeachment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### THE EXPORT ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, fiscal year 1998 ends in 3 days, and President Clinton has let cob webs grow on the Export Enhancement Program.

Yes, as our farmer constituents struggle through one of the most devastating downturns in commodity prices our country has seen, our President has sat on \$150 million that could have been and should have been utilized to prevent the loss of markets in wheat, wheat flour, vegetable oil, and other commodities.

The 1996 farm bill made over \$1.5 billion available for EEP, and this admin-

istration has used it to move some frozen chickens and some barley. They should be ashamed.

This administration's trade policy should be called promises made, promises broken. Understanding the need to open new markets for our commodities, the President has promised to utilize EEP to its fullest. This is a promise he has not kept.

In March of this year, I joined my colleagues from Oklahoma in sending a letter to Secretary Glickman outlining our thoughts on the need for the administration to utilize EEP. I would like to read the letter we sent.

Dear Mr. Secretary: It has come to our attention that according to the United States Department of Agriculture . . . February supply/demand report, the season average price for wheat is expected to decline by at least twenty percent compared to the 1996/97 season. This price decline is causing serious concern to our producers, and we strongly urge the Department to use all discretionary programs to strengthen market prices and export opportunities for U.S. producers.

We believe the Department should aggressively utilize export enhancement tools in strategic markets, including the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) and the GSM credit programs. All agree that export growth is fundamental to improved market prices for producers. As we talk it our producers/constituents throughout Oklahoma, they time and time again express great dissatisfaction with the Department's reluctance to use the EEP to counter competitive subsidization of wheat in world markets. The unwillingness to utilize this program has weakened its effectiveness both as a deterrent to unfair trade practices and as a means of gaining access to markets.

As U.S. producers lose market share to a growing list of countries with state trading enterprises, it is imperative that the Department implement a long-term strategy to counter these entities. As you begin the preparation for the next round of World Trade Organization Negotiations in Agriculture, we hope that you will utilize all export tools available.

Thank you for consideration. We are looking forward to your response. FRANK D. LUCAS, J.C. WATTS, JR., ERNEST ISTOOK, STEVE LARGENT, WES WATKINS, and TOM COBURN.

How did he respond? Nearly \$50 million a month has sat idly by as our markets have dried up throughout the world as the administration plays partisan politics with the future of our producers. I would argue that one of the main problems plaguing those trying to earn a living off this land is this administration's lack of an agricultural trade policy. Mr. President, this needs to change.

#### SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY WHILE PROVIDING TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to echo everything that my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), just said because that is a very important issue to the farmers and ranchers in my home State of South Dakota.