low-grade Russian uranium into enriched uranium to be used for fuel for nuclear power plants as part of the Swords-Into-Plowshares deal entered into with Russia in 1993.

Mr. Riskind further says that this bailout request might intensify the push for congressional hearings about the Clinton administration's decision to push forward with privatization of the Nation's uranium enrichment operations. A privatization investigation launched by the House Committee on Commerce was first disclosed in August by the Columbus Dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a case where a company has been privatized and over the course of the last year, they have given dividends to their private investors of about $100 million, dividends which exceeded the profits of that company. They also are paying exceedingly high salaries to their executive staff, in some cases including stock options worth well over $2 million. They also have spent this last year about $100 million to purchase back their own stock in order to prop up the value of their own stock, and yet they are now coming to the taxpayers of this country saying we need a $200 million bailout or else we may have to withdraw as the executive agent of the Russian HEU deal.

This, in my judgment, is a rip-off of the taxpayer, and I plead with the Members of this body not to let this happen. If this private company wants a $200 million bailout from the taxpayer, there ought to be some strings attached. They ought to open up their books. We ought to know exactly why they are paying such exceedingly high dividends, dividends which exceed the profits of the company, why they are paying such high executive salaries, why they spent $100 million to purchase back their own stock, and then they are crying that without a government bailout they may have to withdraw as the executive agent of this exceedingly important national security issue.

I plead with my colleagues to investigate this issue. I know it is esoteric, I know it is complex, I know it is not easily understood; but it is a matter that is of critical importance to the national security of this Nation, and communities may face economic decimation if we allow this corporation to continue to look after itself and its employees and its shareholders, and to ignore what is right and best for this country and for our local domestic workers and for the local communities who have borne the burden of winning the Cold War for this country over the years.

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

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

PROTEST TRADE POLICIES WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, most Americans and, for that matter, most Members of Congress probably have not perhaps until recently heard of Falun Gong. I had never heard of it until last summer, when the People's Republic of China banned it and started throwing thousands of people in jail for practicing their faith.

It is hardly surprising, Mr. Speaker, that China systematically is arresting and torturing and even killing its own citizens for practicing Falun Gong. After all, this is the same gang of dictators that persecutes Christians, that tolerates, maybe even encourages, forced abortions, the exact same regime that had the People's Liberation Army crush hundreds of democracy advocates 10 years ago at Tiananmen Square in Beijing.

But even though this latest purge is completely in character, it is a perfect illustration of the fact that 10 years of giving the Chinese government trading privileges with the United States, giving them most-favored-nation status, still has not brought about the rule of law in China.

I cannot recall ever seeing less respect for human life, nor do I think there is better evidence to contradict the incessant drum beat from corporate America and the Republican allies in Congress that free trade is the magic bean that is going to sprout democracy in China. There is simply no evidence for that, because when Beijing decided to make practicing Falun Gong a capital offense, which is exactly what the rubber-stamped Chinese Congress did last week, we see that life in the People's Republic of China is exactly the same as it was before American CEOs streamed into Shanghai last month to celebrate 50 years of communism. Topping off this event was a presentation by one major American CEO of a bust of Abraham Lincoln to Chinese President Jiang Zemin.

Regardless of what the business community or the lawyers at the Commerce Department or their Republican allies tell us, our trade with China is completely one-sided. Just look at our trade deficit figures and tell any of us otherwise. Walk into a Wal-Mart, count the number of items that are stamped ''made in China,'' and you can see the picture. If you are still not convinced, then read the administration's own report on the effects of a WTO deal with China on our economy.

□ 1215

That report tells us that even under the best possible circumstances, which might mean that the totalitarian government actually lives up to the promises they made any time in the last 10 years to our government, even under those circumstances, the best of circumstances, our exports to China would barely increase and our trade deficit, even under the best of circumstances, would continue to balloon out of control.

Mr. Speaker, this not a report by a college student or a Washington think tank, this is a determination of our own International Trade Commission. These are the men and women that our constituents pay to analyze just what kind of deal we are getting from letting China dump its goods here, from letting it keep our goods and services out of their market.

The men and women of the ITC are telling us that a WTO deal for China could not help our economy any more than a WTO deal for Mars would help stop the factory closings or help sell American cars or help sell American planes to China's 1 billion consumers.

That is because there are not really 1 billion consumers in the People's Republic of China. That is not how corporations of the United States look at China. There are 1 billion potential low-wage workers. That is what excites American corporations. The average person in China makes less than $800 a year, and we are supposed to believe they are going to buy our products. Even the ITC has concluded that that is a preposterous assumption.

Mr. Speaker, before we close one more factory, before we permit one more forced abortion in China, before we allow China to continue to operate its slave labor and child labor camps and sell goods to the United States, we need to stop kidding ourselves and get out of the business of trading with dictators, because as I speak, there are thousands of men and women in China who are being beaten and killed for choosing to believe in ideals that we take for granted in this country, ideals from Abraham Lincoln that Jiang Zemin really does not admire, clearly, whether it is our faith in God, our right to vote, or simply wanting to go on an early morning jog.

I urge all of my colleagues to protest and oppose any more trading privileges with the People's Republic of China until its government proves it actually is capable of respecting law.

INTRODUCTION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG BILL

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues some information that they probably already know, but they need to be reminded of.

Recently there have been a number of reports, this one happens to be from MSNBC, about what is happening in America relative to drug prices. The headline was ''High Drug Prices Burden Many Seniors.'' ''The cost of medicine

for elderly people far outstrips inflation,'' according to the Associated Press.

These stories are being repeated around the country. CNN and the New York Times did a story on this, and a number of publications have reinforced the point that Americans in general, seniors in particular, are paying far too much for prescription drugs.

I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, excerpts from a letter to the community from George Halverson. George Halverson is the President and CEO of HealthPartners. It was printed in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune on 10/29/99.

Let me just read from this: ''The cost of prescription drugs varies to an amazing degree between countries. If you have a stomach ulcer and your doctor says you need to be on Prilosec, you will probably pay about $99.95 for a 30-day supply in the Twin Cities. But, if you were vacationing in Canada and decided to fill your prescription there, you would pay only $50.88. Or even better, if you are looking for a little warmer weather south of the border in Mexico, the same 30-day supply would only cost you $17.50. That's for the same dose, made by the same manufacturer.

If we could get only half the price break that Canadians get, our plan, referring to HealthPartners, ''our plan alone could have saved our members nearly $35 million last year.''

He goes on to say, ''When the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, was passed by Congress to allow free trade between the United States and our neighboring countries, HealthPartners decided to follow the lead of Minnesota Senior Federation and buy our drugs in Canada at Canadians' prices. We were disappointed to learn of the rules and the practices which kept us from succeeding. There is no free trade in prescription drugs. We need to do something about this.''

Mr. Halverson, we agree. It is outrageous, when our seniors have learned now that they can go across the border and save 30, 40, 50, and even 60 percent on prescription drugs, the outrageous part is they are stopped from doing that by our own FDA.

Mr. Speaker, here is what happens when seniors or any American consumer learns that they can get prescription drugs from across the border. Seniors in Minnesota have tried to set up relationships with their local pharmacists, and we need the local pharmacist to be involved in this.

They have learned that they can, using the Internet, using the web, using a fax machine, they can set up corrrespondent relationships. Many of them are going to to the local pharmacy, having a prescription filled there by actually getting the drugs shipped in by parcel post from Canada.

What has happened? The FDA intervenes and they inspect the packages. Then they send a very threatening letter to our seniors and other consumers who are practicing this method of trying to save some money on prescription drugs.

Let me just read the first paragraph of this letter: ''This letter is to advise you that the Minneapolis District of the United States Food and Drug Administration has examined the package addressed to you containing drugs which appear to be unapproved for use in the United States.'' It goes on to threaten the senior, that if they try to do this again, they could be in big trouble. I would be threatened by that letter, but my parents would be far more threatened by this letter.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. I say it is outrageous because the law, in my opinion, and I think the opinion of legal scholars around the country is fairly clear, the law is section 381, imports and exports. It basically says they have got to give notice to the owner or consignee. Then such articles shall be refused admission.

In other words, if it really is an illegal drug, it can be stopped. But if it is a drug that is otherwise approved in the United States, the FDA is on very thin ice.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference in opinion in this between myself, between seniors, between consumers groups, and the FDA. Today I am going to introduce legislation which will remove all doubt. It will make it clear that the burden now will be on the FDA that this is an illegal practice, because I am committed and a growing number of Members of Congress are committed to making a very clear statement to the people at the FDA: We will not allow a Federal bureaucracy to stand between American consumers and lower prices. It is wrong, and if there is anything we can do to stop it, we will.

I am introducing the legislation today. I am calling on my colleagues from both sides of the political aisles to join me in this debate. Prescription drugs are too expensive for American consumers in general, and seniors in particular. We can do something about it. We should do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.)

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1555

Mr. GOSS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1555), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–457)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1555), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.
Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.
Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.
Sec. 105. Authorization of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.
Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.
Sec. 303. Diplomatic intelligence support centers.
Sec. 304. Protection of identity of retired covert agents.
Sec. 305. Access to computers and computer data of executive branch employees with access to classified information.
Sec. 306. Naturalization of certain persons affiliated with a Communist or similar party.
Sec. 307. Technical amendment.
Sec. 308. Declassification review of intelligence estimate on Vietnam-era prisoners of war and missing in action personnel and critical assessment of estimate.
Sec. 309. Report on legal standards applied for electronic surveillance.
Sec. 310. Report on effects of foreign espionage on the United States.
Sec. 311. Report on activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in Chile.
Sec. 312. Report on Kosova Liberation Army.
Sec. 313. Reaffirmation of longstanding prohibition against drug trafficking by employees of the intelligence community.
Sec. 314. Sense of Congress on classification and declassification.
Sec. 315. Sense of Congress on intelligence community contracting.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Sec. 401. Improvement and extension of central services program.
Sec. 402. Extension of CIA Voluntary Separation Pay Act.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 501. Protection of operational files of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency.