

House Committee on Appropriations printed in House Report 106-660. In total, these revisions reduce the Committee's allocations by \$201,000,000 in budget authority and \$227,000,000 in outlays.

Floor action on H.R. 4577, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, removed the emergency designation from \$501,000,000 in budget authority contained in the House-reported bill. Outlays flowing from that budget authority totaled \$240,000,000. The allocations to the House Committee on Appropriations and budgetary aggregates were increased to reflect the emergency funding in the House-reported bill in a letter dated 6 June 2000. The allocations to the Appropriations Committee and the budgetary aggregates are reduced by \$501,000,000 in budget authority and \$240,000,000 in outlays to reflect floor action. This sets the allocations to the House Committee on Appropriations at \$601,180,000,000 in budget authority and \$625,735,000,000 in outlays. Budgetary aggregates become \$1,529,385,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,494,956,000,000 in outlays.

As reported to the House, H.R. 4635, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, includes \$300,000,000 in budget authority and \$13,000,000 in outlays for emergencies. The allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations are further adjusted to reflect those amounts, establishing allocations of \$601,480,000,000 in budget authority and \$625,748,000,000 in outlays. Budgetary aggregates become \$1,529,685,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,494,969,000,000 in outlays.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at 67270.

#### LOOKING AT WAYS TO CONTROL THE RISING PRICE OF GAS IN AMERICA

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, the nations of OPEC will meet once again to determine the fate of practically every family across the country, and that is whether to increase oil production in those nations.

Now, it is no secret, Mr. Speaker, to every family and business across this Nation that gas prices are through the roof. Lately, we have been hearing a lot of excuses as to why that is occurring. But let us not lose sight of why it is occurring. It is fundamentally a law of supply and demand. As we keep down production, and the demand for that product, in this case oil, continues to grow, prices will rise. So not only must we call upon our OPEC nations to increase production, to lessen the price at the pump, but we also I think have

to look inside our unnecessary rules and regulations that cause those gas prices to jump as well.

For months now, more than a year, Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, have tried to plead with the administration to find ways to stimulate domestic production to decrease our reliance on OPEC nations. If they want to keep those production levels at what they are now, fine. That is their right. I do not agree with it, but that is their right. But why can we not, the United States of America, find ways to decrease our reliance upon OPEC nations and look right here in our 50 States to develop ways to lessen the burden to that family at the pump?

Do the math. It is very simple. If you have a 15-gallon tank in your car, and you go to the pump, say, once a week, you are paying \$10 to \$15 more just to fill up your family car, to take your kids to the Little League game or to school. Over a month, you are looking at another \$40 or \$50 out of your family wallet. Over 6 months, you are in the \$200 to \$300 range. If you do a lot of driving, you have to fill up twice a week, we are talking about \$500 or \$600 for a 6-month period that has got to come from somewhere. It does not fall from the sky; it comes from the family wallet. That means no vacation perhaps; that means maybe we are not going to buy the clothes for the kids for school; maybe we are going to put off buying that microwave oven that we wanted.

What do we hear from the administration? Let us see if there is price gouging. Fine, go, see if there is price gouging, but also be honest with the American people and tell them that there are a lot of unnecessary rules and regulations and a commitment to keep production in this country down.

□ 2145

Only when we are totally honest with the American people can we find ways to truly decrease the price at the pump.

If anybody thinks this is not affecting our everyday American out there, I think they are losing a lot of disks out in Los Alamos that they are so busy they cannot understand what is happening. Small businesses are forced to raise their fees, taxi drivers are forced to find alternative sources of income or go out of a job, small business owners who have to pay this additional freight, the additional gas costs.

This is not right, and for so many folks who claim to feel the pain of others, we are turning our cheek, turning our head away from the folks who cannot afford the costs the most.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think in more than the year of promises that were made and not fulfilled, the American people deserve more of a response that allows the United States companies to increase production, to decrease

these onerous rules and regulations that do nothing but increase the price at the pump, and give the American family a break.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC PLAN FOR A MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to talk about the need for a Medicare prescription drug policy, and talk a little bit about the Democratic plan, the President's plan, in contrast with what I consider the lack of plan that the Republican leadership appears to have come up with and apparently is attempting to move through the House over the next week or two.

My colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), has been a leader on this issue and introduced legislation more than a year ago to deal most specifically with the issue of price discrimination.

As he has said many times and I will reiterate, there are really two aspects to this Medicare prescription drug proposal. One is to provide the benefit, and the other is to make sure that the price discrimination that we have witnessed so often in the last few years does not continue.

I would like to commend the gentleman for all that he has done to address this issue of price discrimination with his legislation, and also with his effort to get so many cosponsors to that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are again, back in the well of the House, talking about a problem that is a matter of immediate concern to seniors and others all across the country.

A little history. I want to talk in a few minutes about the debates that are going to come up this week and next week here in the Congress over the issue of prescription drugs, but a little history is worth recalling.

It was almost 2 years ago when I released the first study done by the Democratic staff of the Committee on Government Reform which shows that, on average, seniors pay twice as much for their prescription medications as the drug companies' best customers, being big hospitals, HMOs, and the Federal government itself buying either for Medicaid or through the Veterans Administration.

That is an astonishing difference, a difference of about 100 percent of the most commonly-prescribed prescription drugs.