level of their advertising budgets and their level of inducements offered to prescribing physicians.

This Member firmly believes that many of the safety issues which opponents have brought to the forefront in this debate are really red herrings. The real issue is the prices Americans pay for the medicines they need.

According to a recent Washington Post-ABC News poll, there is strong support for opening drug markets, despite warnings by FDA that it cannot guarantee the safety of these life-saving medicines. Even with the possibility of a drug safety issue being mentioned in the question, more than two-thirds, or 69 percent of respondents, said it should be legal for Americans to buy prescription drugs from Canada or other industrialized countries. In fact, 12 percent of those surveyed said that they or a family member had purchased prescription drugs from Canada or other country in order to obtain a better price.

The reimportation debate is not a battle of right versus left, it is a battle of right versus wrong. It is simply wrong to require Americans to pay the world's highest prices for prescription drugs, so they thereby can subsidize consumers everywhere else on earth to generate the research, advertising and profit revenues for pharmaceutical companies.

As a Member of Congress serving in the people's House, this Member has a responsibility to do what is right for Nebraskans and all Americans. This Member supports prescription drug reimportation because Americans deserve access to quality drugs at world market prices and reimportation seems to be the only solution immediately available to reduce the gross overcharge of American consumers for prescription drugs.

A typically cynical comment was made by an unnamed health care lobbyist found in the November 1, 2003, Congressional Quarterly Weekly regarding the Medicare bill and the likelihood that the final bill will include importation provisions that will never be implemented. The unnamed source is quoted as saying, ''You tell them that this will only kick in after FDA has appropriated $100 million for border safety, or FDA has a counterfeit, tamper-resistant device packaging system in place.'' The lobbyist concluded, ''Whatever the trigger is, just say it will never be met.''

Mr. Speaker, there have been rumors that the Medicare conference report will come out of committee with a drug reimportation provision which will contain language under which the FDA can say they cannot responsibly or legally implement, as they did on two previous congressional efforts to provide for prescription drug reimportation. This is unacceptable.

Governor Rod Blagojevich, our former colleague in the House, is asking the FDA to allow Illinois to explore a plan to import approved medications from Canada, and knows this issue well. He recently said, ''It is awfully hard to stop an idea whose time has come.'' He is absolutely right in that assessment. Americans will find a way to buy FDA-approved drugs from abroad, either legally or illegally. The FDA needs to face the fact and get on with the method of discharging its responsibilities given those realities.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious call for action from the American people. We must open the drug markets so Americans can obtain the prescription drugs they need when they need them most and at affordable prices.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article published in the Los Angeles Times today entitled, ''Open Door to Drug Imports.''

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 6, 2003]

OPEN DOOR TO DRUG IMPORTS

In the 2002 election cycle, the U.S. drug industry gave political candidates nearly $30 million. For the 2004 cycle it has already spent more than $3 million, two-thirds of it on GOP members of Congress. The industry is getting a good return on its money. Bush administration officials and sympathetic legislators are still trying to add a $400-billion drug benefit to Medicare that prohibits, not just omits, cost controls. House and Senate conferees have proposed forbidding the federal government to negotiate better prices, as such countries as Canada and agencies as the Department of Veterans Affairs do.

The glimmer of good news is that at least one consumer-friendly reform may survive. The conferees, pressured by state and local leaders, last week began considering an amendment to let consumers buy drugs directly and more cheaply from Canada.

The Bush administration and most legislators on the conference committee, including some Democrats, say it is dangerous to legalize drug purchases from Canada. They echo Food and Drug Administration head Mark B. McClellan's line that the agency can't guarantee the safety of drugs that aren't manufactured, stored and distributed under FDA guidelines. McClellan says he fears tampering by shippers as well. Canada, however, has one of the world's most stringent pharmaceutical quality oversight systems. As for adulteration in shipping, that can happen in any mail-order operation.

Californians are right to ask why importation from Mexico, which also has lower prices than the U.S., was excluded. Legislators argue that Mexico's prescription drug oversight is too lax, but it's also because strong proponents of drug importation—Reps. Bernard Sanders (I-VT.), Gil Gutknecht (R-Minn.) and Jo Ann Emerson (R-Mo.)—are in states closer to Canada.

A temporary solution, which the Canada measure would be, is better than no solution. Plenty of individuals and even municipalities are already importing from Canada, mostly over the Internet. Legalizing the practice would allow for better safety regulations.

On Tuesday, two top negotiators on the conference committee, Rep. Bill Thomas (R-Bakersfield) and Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), said the Medicare drug benefit was ''on life support,'' imperiled by partisan disagreements. That's good news, because the bill would create a gigantic, cost-ineffective benefits shaped behind closed conference doors.

Regional leaders whose budgets are being busted by drug prices—including Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty and New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, both Republicans—are pressuring the conferees to pass the Canada measure even if a larger Medicare drug benefit dies. As Pawlenty recently framed the issue: ''There's a rebellion brewing across America. It is the prescription drug equivalent of the Boston Tea Party.''

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

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

WHAT IS THE PLAN IN IRAQ?

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today the President signed the bill taking $87 billion to deal with Iraq.

I will include for the RECORD an article from the Everett Herald entitled, ''Parents Who Protested War Mourn Death of Soldier Son.'' This man from my district leaves behind a wife who is pregnant to deliver in 1 month and two small girls.

As we held the memorial service today for the 15 troops that were killed on Sunday in Iraq when one of our Chinook helicopters went down, I could not help thinking about the memorial service that will be held for the person who died last night and the one who died this morning, and there will be more and more. The memorial service for Benjamin Colgan from my district is down the road yet.

This morning I spoke about the President's need to present a plan for stopping the bloodshed. As far as we know, there is no plan. Our experience shows us there was no or little planning about what would happen after the military action stopped. They have never stopped because there was no plan. Now, apparently we are going to sit in Iraq while the President continues to say ''bring 'em on'' until the war on terror is won, until Iraq has free enterprise, until Iraq has good roads, until Iraq loves Americans. Well, it is not going to happen.

The war on terror is much like the war on drugs or the war on poverty, we have to keep at it, but we are not going to defeat the enemy and get a surrender sign on the battleship Missouri. If the President says we are going to keep troops in Iraq until the war on terror is over, then the President is planning to keep troops in Iraq forever.

Maybe the Iraqis are ingrates or foolish, or maybe they are reacting like people have reacted since time immemorial to occupations. Many have lamented the way the President squandered the good will of the nations of the world after September 11. Now, the President is squandering the goodwill of the Iraqi people, most of whom were