

coverage won't help the millions of Americans without health insurance.

Some say importation is merely an indirect way of enacting price controls. The truth is—"Importing prescription drugs to the United States will lower prices here and, in the long run, force Europe to pay more drug research and development costs. The best way to break down price controls is to open up markets."—Stephen W. Schondelmeyer, Pharm.D., Ph.D., Professor and Director, PRIME Institute, Head, Dept. of Pharmaceutical Care & Health Systems, College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota.

Some say the FDA lacks the resources to inspect mail orders. The truth is—The FDA is focusing its inspection resources in the wrong places. Instead of stopping illegal drugs imported by illicit traffickers, the FDA concentrates on approved drugs imported by law-abiding citizens. So far this year, the FDA detained 18 times more packages coming from Canada than from Mexico. Last year, the FDA detained 90 times more packages from Canada than Mexico. Worse, last year Congress appropriated \$23 million for border enforcement, but the Secretary of Health and Human Services refused to use the funds.

Some say importation jeopardizes consumer safety. The truth is—No known scientific study demonstrates a threat of injury to patients importing medications with a prescription from industrial countries. What's more, millions of Americans have NO prescription drug coverage. Stopping importation of FDA-approved drug threatens their safety. A drug you can't afford is neither safe nor effective.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act and Sec. 221(c) of H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations.

As reported to the House, H.R. 2330, the bill making appropriations for Agriculture and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2002, includes an emergency-designated appropriation providing \$150,000,000 in new budget authority and \$143,000,000 in new outlays. Under the provisions of both the Budget Act and the budget resolution, I must adjust the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates upon the reporting of a bill containing emergency appropriations.

Accordingly, I increase the 302(a) allocation to the House Appropriations Committee contained in House Report 107-100 by \$150,000,000 in new budget authority and \$143,000,000 in new outlays. This changes the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2002 to \$661,450,000,000 for budget authority and \$683,103,000,000 for

outlays. The increase in the allocation also requires an increase in the budgetary aggregates to \$1,626,638,000,000 for budget authority and \$1,590,801,000,000 for outlays.

The rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2330 strikes the emergency designation from the appropriation. Upon adoption of the rule, Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act provides that these adjusted levels are automatically reduced by the amount that had been designated an emergency. Should the rule (H. Res. 183) not be adopted, 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 at 67270.

MICROBICIDES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Microbicides Development Act of 2001. I am pleased that so many of my good friends and colleagues have signed on as original cosponsors of this legislation which I am dropping in this evening. My thanks go to them.

Mr. Speaker, this week the United Nations convened a special session of the U.N. General Assembly to address how to combat the spreading HIV and AIDS epidemic. We have entered the third decade in the battle against HIV and AIDS. June 5, 1981, marked the first reported case of AIDS by the Centers for Disease Control, and since that time 400,000 people have died in the United States, and globally 21.8 million people have died of AIDS.

Tragically, women now represent the fastest growing group of new HIV infections in the United States, and women of color are disproportionately at risk. In the developing world, women now account for more than half of the HIV infections, and there is growing evidence that the position of women in developing societies will be a critical factor in shaping the course of the AIDS pandemic.

So what can women do? Women need and deserve access to a prevention method that is within their personal control. Women are the only group of people at risk who are expected to protect themselves without any tools to do so. We must strengthen women's immediate ability to protect themselves, including providing new women-controlled technologies; and one such technology does exist, called microbicides.

The Microbicides Development Act, which I am introducing, will encourage Federal investment for this critical research with the establishment of pro-

grams at the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Through the work of NIH, nonprofit research institutions, and the private sector, a number of microbicide products are poised for successful development. But this support is no longer enough for actually getting microbicides through the development pipeline and into the hands of millions who could benefit from them. Microbicides can only be brought to market if the Federal Government helps support critical safety and efficacy testing.

Health advocates around the world are convinced that microbicides could have a significant impact on HIV and AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases. Researchers have identified almost 60 microbicides, topical creams and gels that could be used to prevent the spread of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases, such as chlamydia and herpes. But interest in the private sector in microbicides research has been lacking.

According to the Alliance for Microbicide Development, 38 biotech companies, 28 not-for-profit groups, and seven public agencies are investigating microbicides, and phase III clinical trials have begun on four of the most promising compounds. The studies will evaluate the compounds' efficacy and acceptability and will include consumer education as part of the compounds' development. However, it will be at least 2 years before any compound trials are completed.

Currently, the bulk of funds for microbicides research comes from NIH, nearly \$25 million per year, and the Global Microbicide Project, which was established with a \$35 million grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. However, more money is needed to bring the microbicides to market. Health advocates have asked NIH to increase the current budget for research to \$75 million per year.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States has the highest incidence of STDs in the industrialized world. Annually, it is estimated that 15.4 million Americans acquired a new sexually transmitted disease. STDs cause serious, costly, even deadly conditions for women and their children, including infertility, pregnancy complications, cervical cancer, infant mortality, and higher risk of contracting HIV.

This legislation has the potential to save billions of dollars in health care costs. Direct cost to the U.S. economy of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV infection is approximately \$8.4 billion. When the indirect costs, such as lost productivity, are included, that figure will rise to an estimated \$20 billion. With sufficient investment, a microbicide could be available around the world within 5 years. Think of the difference that would make.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this vital legislation.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Bethesda, Maryland, for her long-time concern on issues related to women's health.

I think this is a vitally important bill. It is something that this Congress should pass. It will affect millions and millions of women in a positive way. Sexually transmitted disease is a tremendous problem in this country. My hat is off to the gentlewoman, and I am happy to be a cosponsor of her bill.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) for being a cosponsor and for his work in making sure that Americans have appropriate access to health care.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to enter our July recess for the 4th of July holiday, and it must be noted that this Congress has completed two major legislative developments to date. One of those, of course, has been fully completed: the tax bill. That is fully completed, signed into law, and checks will begin to move soon.

Those checks will be going to the people at the very bottom of the rung as a result of legislation which was first proposed by the Progressive Caucus that every American should get some benefit from this tax cut. That did not exactly happen, but every taxpayer is getting a small benefit as a result of the action taken early in the session by the Progressive Caucus. The idea got out there and kept moving until finally it was incorporated in another form in the tax bill. So people at the bottom are going to get some small amount of money from the tax bill. That is real. It is completed.

The other piece of legislation that has almost been completed is the education bill, the leave-no-child-behind legislation of the President. The new President, of course, made this a high priority; and we have moved in both Houses, with both parties cooperating extensively, to pass the leave-no-child-behind legislation separately in the House and in the Senate. But there has been no conference, and the bill is now on hold.

I think it should be noted that there are rumors that the bill will be held deliberately until we have a chance to negotiate the major question of financing for the education bill. Education is on the legislative back burner right now;

but in the hearts of the people who are polled out there, legislation is still a number one concern.

Education has to remain on the front burner. The fact it is being held here is a good development in that the critical question in the legislation that passed the House versus the legislation that passed the Senate is the amounts of money that are appropriated to carry out the features of the bill. The amounts of money are critical.

We do state in the legislation that passed the House that there will be an increase in an authorization for an increase in title I funds of double the amount that exist now in 5 years. In 5 years, in other words, we will have twice as much funding for title I as we have today. It will move from the present amount to about \$17.2 billion in 5 years under the authorization. Authorization is there. That does not guarantee that the appropriation, of course, will keep pace.

The Senate bill has even more money earmarked for increases, but they do not have a commitment from the White House that the appropriation is going to follow the authorization. The big question is will the authorizations be honored. We had a great deal of effort to get bipartisan agreements.

I reluctantly voted for the education legislation because of the fact it did two things: one, it got rid of the consideration of vouchers for private schools as a Federal policy. And I think to clear the board and have vouchers off the discussion table was good for Federal legislative policy. However, the critical question of will we have more resources was also addressed. And the fact that the bill does promise to double title I funds, which are the funds that go most directly to the areas of greatest need, impressed me to the point where I voted for the bill, even though there were some other features, which I will discuss later, which I do not consider to be desirable.

The critical point is, are there more resources? The need to have resources to maintain what I call opportunity-to-learn standards is a critical point that I have been trying to make for all these years. Opportunity to learn is the most important factor if we really want to improve education and have more youngsters who are attending our public schools benefit from the process. What we are trying to do, however, is force a process of accountability, insist that schools measure progress by the tests that are taken by the students and the scores on the tests, and that that is the way we should measure accountability. A school system is held accountable for improved test scores.

On the other hand, the opportunity-to-learn standards are ignored completely. Opportunity to learn means that before the test is given we must guarantee that the student will have

an adequate place to learn; classrooms that are not overcrowded, libraries that have books that are up to date, laboratories that have science equipment. The opportunity to learn means that we have the right equipment, the right facilities. It means that we have certified teachers in the classroom. It means that all the resources that are needed are there before we start the testing.

□ 1845

But the process that we have pushed here is a process which tries to ignore the opportunity to learn as a major factor.

So we need to hold the education legislation because that vital component is missing. Let us hold it until we can negotiate an increase in the resources, an increase in the amount of money we use to purchase resources, and those resources will provide the opportunity to learn. It may be that it will be end-game negotiations all of the way to the end of the session. Education legislation has benefited greatly over the last few years through the end-game negotiation process, right down to the very last hours of the session. When the White House and the Congress came together and they had their priorities on the table, education has fared very well.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that by holding the legislation this time until we get to that end-game negotiation, we will get the kind of funding necessary to make the legislation that we have passed have some real significance. If we do not get some additional funding for the Leave No Child Behind funding, then it is a fraud. It has no substance if it is not going to provide additional resources.

There is a need to refresh ourselves and come back to an understanding of the fact that we have passed these two pieces of legislation in the House of Representatives and the Senate. There is no reason to rest on our laurels. We still have a basic problem of that bill that passed having great gaps in it, and those great gaps are not going to be closed in the end-game negotiation unless the people that we represent, our constituents, understand where we are and why there is a great need for more Federal involvement in the improvement of education.

I want to use as an example a series of articles that have appeared in the Daily News in New York City to talk about the New York City school system, and I want to use New York City as a negative model. It is not the way it should be, but it is the way that it is in most of our large cities. I would not bore my colleagues with a discussion of what is going on in New York City unless I did not think that it was applicable all over the country in other big cities, and it is also applicable in rural areas.