Similarly, Mrs. Shuping writes on behalf of her father, James Archie Wells, who fought to liberate Okinawa, and Captain Monday recalls his reconnaissance missions over the Philippines. This, Mr. Speaker, is the best of American history—and there is an abundance of it. That's why this legislation is so very important. The memory of those we lost and the sacrifice of those who lived to tell the tale must be preserved and held in high esteem by a Congress and a country that extends our veterans its utmost respect and heartfelt gratitude.

I commend my colleague from Wisconsin for his initiative on this issue and urge my colleagues support for this worthy legislation.

IN HONOR OF ABBOT ROGER W. GRIES

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Abbot Roger W. Gries who has been named ''Catholic Man of the Year'' by the Greater Cleveland Knights of Columbus Luncheon Club.

This is certainly a well-deserved title for Abbot Gries, a native Clevelander who has devoted most of his life to education, his faith and the Catholic Church. He professed his vows as a Benedictine monk more than 40 years ago and was ordained to the priesthood in 1963. Throughout his many years of dedicated service to Benedictine High School, Abbot Gries has held a number of different posts. He started out teaching mathematics, but his extraordinary skill as an educator was soon recognized as he was named Assistant Principal in 1965 and Principal in 1968.

Abbot Gries continued his successful reign as Principal at Benedictine until 1977, when he was appointed Prior of St. Andrew Abbey, the second superior of the monastery. Because of his outstanding work as Prior, his fellow monks elected him the fourth abbot of St. Andrew Abbey on June 9, 1981, a position that he holds to this day. In addition to his commitment to St. Andrew Abbey, Abbot Gries is also President of Benedictine High School. At this time, he is overseeing the implementation of the Master Plan currently underway at the Abbey and high school in the Buckeye-Woodland community.

Aside from his prominent role as an educator and abbot of St. Andrew Abbey, Abbot Gries also served at the Holy Family Parish in Parma, OH on weekends for 18 years and previously acted as the chaplain of the Maple Heights Knights of Columbus. He continues his active association with the Alhambra.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in honoring Abbot Roger W. Gries. This remarkable man reminds us all of the importance of faith, community, and volunteerism. We are truly lucky to have him in Cleveland.

TRIBUTE TO PRISCILLA HILLGREN

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, and I am proud to recognize Priscilla A. Hillgren in the Congress for her invaluable contributions and service to our nation.

Priscilla Hillgren distinguished herself through her devotion to her family, friends, and community. She was born in Beresford, South Dakota on June 26th, 1904, the daughter of a Lutheran minister. Her family instilled in her the value of an education, and she and her sisters attended college, which she interrupted twice to teach in a country school.

One of the happiest days of her life surely must have been June 26th, 1929, when she married Ralph O. Hillgren, who was city editor of the Argus Leader in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Many more happy days followed, thanks to the births of her son John, her daughters Annette Bray and Sonja Hillgren Hill, two grandchildren, five great-grandchildren, three step grandchildren, and three step great-grandchildren.

Priscilla Hillgren is probably best-known for her work with mentally handicapped children at three Sioux Falls private schools from 1958 to 1972. Her generosity and hard work touched many families in that area, and her legacy will inspire those who continue to provide these important services.

She also was active in the American Association of University Women, with membership in two AAUW book groups, and was honored by AAUW as a Named Gift Recipient in 1977. Moreover, Priscilla was president of the Augustana College Auxiliary, and a member of the Civic Fine Arts Center and the American Legion Auxiliary, among other organizations.

Sadly, Priscilla Hillgren passed away last month. Her congregation at the First Lutheran Church, where she was a Sunday School teacher for 26 years, will miss her greatly, as will her family and friends.

I am among this group, and on behalf of the Congress I extend my deepest sympathies to her family, even as I encourage them to join me in celebrating her extraordinary life.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, transportation is vital to the social and economic health of our nation. During the past twenty years, however, transportation systems have struggled to keep pace with America's growing and changing needs. For example, between 1970 and 1990, the U.S. automobile population grew almost three times faster than the human population. In fact, in 1995 Americans averaged about 4.3 one-way trips per day and about 14,000 miles per year—up from 2.9 trips and 9,500 miles in 1977. Other forms of transportation have seen dramatic growth as well. Since 1980, freight railroad traffic has increased 47 percent and the number of airports has increased 20 percent.

Explosive transportation growth has led to inefficient movement of people and goods, reduced productivity, wasted energy, and increased congestion and emissions. A recent study conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute found that in 1982, ten of the 70 urban areas studied had unacceptable levels of congestion, but by 1996, that number had almost quadrupled, to 39 areas.

As the number of cars, trucks, freight trains and planes grows and America's transportation network expands, the need for fuel increases. In 1997, the volume of imported oil exceeded domestic production for the first time in U.S. history. Our thirst for oil is fueled by the transportation sector, which uses over 65 percent of the petroleum consumed in the United States.

Our transportation system is over 90 percent dependent on oil—and that's too much when over 50 percent our nation's oil comes from overseas and the price has almost quadrupled in 18 months. Powering our cars and buses with alternative fuel is an environmentally sound way to reduce our dependence on foreign oil—and it's good for the economy, too, because alternative fuels can be produced here at home.

Alternative fuels, such as electricity, natural gas, methanol, hydrogen and propane, provide a plentiful, domestically produced and environmentally friendly source of energy. And, when integrated into America's transportation network—in meaningful quantities—alternatively fueled vehicles (AFVs) contribute to mitigating the energy and environmental problems caused by the transportation sector.

In addition, to alternative fuels, the implementation of intermodal transportation networks is another component to alleviating America's transportation problems. Intermodalism refers to interconnections among various modes of transportation, or the use of multiple modes of transportation during a single trip. Employing the concept of intermodalism offers the promise of lowering transportation costs, increasing economic productivity and efficiency, reducing the burden on existing infrastructure, while at the same time reducing energy consumption and improving air quality and the environment.

In an attempt to address the energy and environmental concerns that an ''over-stressed'' transportation network has created, Congress passed several pieces of legislation. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, established programs and regulations directed at the mobile sector to decrease major automotive pollutants that are the key contributors to urban smog, or ozone. Today, however, nearly 100 cities throughout the United States continue to fail to meet federal air quality guidelines.

In 1991, Congress also recognized the impact and sought to mitigate some of the problems associated with the growing number of cars, trucks, freight trains and planes in the United States when it enacted the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA established the National Commission on Intermodal Transportation and tasked it with conducting a complete study of intermodal transportation in the US. ISTEA also established the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program which

provides federal funding for innovative transportation projects designed to assist States in meeting their transportation/air quality plans. The CMAQ program cuts across traditional boundaries and includes projects dealing with transit and highways, as well as non-traditional areas, such as vehicle emission inspections and maintenance. Although inroads have been made, and intermodal transportation systems have been applied in the movement of goods, large-scale intermodal systems have yet to be meaningfully applied to the movement of people.

Finally, in 1992, Congress enacted the Energy Policy Act (EPAct) which recognized that alternative fuels and alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) can provide substantial environmental benefits and at the same time can decrease our dependence on foreign oil. EPAct included a modest set of tax incentives intended to support the development and introduction of AFVs to the market.

Today I am introducing legislation that builds on the very important work that has been done as a result of these landmark bills that have focused our efforts on dealing with transportation, congestion, air quality and energy security issues holistically, rather than as separate non-connected issues. I believe, firmly, that we must look to address many of the problems created by a growing transportation system and the need to ensure and indeed enhance mobility as a single issue, a single goal. The ''Alternative Fuel Vehicles Intermodal Transportation Act'' provides funding for a $200 million federal pilot program to demonstrate the use of alternative fuel vehicles in intermodal applications. Importantly, the goals of the program will be accomplished through partnerships between Federal, State and local governments, metropolitan transportation authorities, industry and business. This legislation would help urban centers develop and demonstrate effective, alternative fuel transportation networks to move people.

By combining intermodal transportation systems with alternative fuels, the United States can build transportation networks that efficiently and cleanly transport passengers and goods.

In the long run, alternative fuel vehicles will obviously have to succeed in the marketplace entirely on their own. But the federal government should be doing more to encourage the development and deployment of alternative vehicles because there are clear public benefits and the technology will develop too slowly without incentives. In addition, public entities are the main purchasers of buses so the government is the market in that area.

What will this legislation achieve? The proposed pilot program would assist up to 15 locations throughout the United States to put in place clean, innovative, linked transportation systems that reduce dependence on foreign oil, increase reliance on alternative fuels, enhance the usefulness of public transportation systems, protect the environment, and speed the deployment of alternative fuel technologies. Participants in the program would be required to match federal dollars with an equal contribution from State and local governments and the private sector. Projects would be awarded to applicants that meet criteria including: the number of riders served or goods transported; the ability to achieve national, state or local air quality goals; and the deployment of innovative transportation technologies or new intermodal systems that increase the use of alternative fuels.

How could this legislation impact your community? Imagine a linked transportation system where commuters use electric station cars or ''neighborhood electric vehicles'' to reach an electrified commuter train or a natural gas powered bus, which would then deliver them to the urban center. And once in the urban center, the same people might transfer to a propane-powered shuttle bus or fuel cell bus for the last leg of their trip to the office, the shopping district or the doctor.

Another travel scenario that releases near zero-emissions while improving the quality of a trip might involve the business traveler who arrives in a city by plane, transfers to a light rail system that deposits her in the urban center where she checks-out an electric ''station car'' to travel to meetings in three different locations. Upon concluding business, she returns to the light-rail station, plugs in the rented station car for the next driver, hops on the light rail and returns to the airport. This business traveler has left no environmental footprint during her visit to your community.

Enhance the environment—relieve traffic congestion—increase alternative fuel use—effectively demonstrate viable and sustainable alternative fuel vehicles and their interconnected use in transportation networks—bring together all levels of government and industry as partners in this effort—and educate the public that alternative fuel technologies work . . . these are the goals of the Alternative Fuel Vehicles Intermodal Transportation Act. The price tag for reaching these goals is relatively modest; the price for not supporting this type of paradigm shift in the way we move people and goods is incalculable. And it is a price that will be paid not just with dollars, but with our natural resources, our air, and the quality of life for generations to come. I hope many of my colleagues will recognize the value and importance of this innovative program and will support this important legislation.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2000

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress continues to debate the question on how to provide seniors with affordable prescription drugs, I wanted to bring to my colleagues attention the article ''Prescription Drug Costs: Has Canada Found the Answer?'' by William McArthur, M.D. Dr. McArthur is a palliative care physician, writer and health policy analyst in Vancouver B.C. Some of our colleagues have been touting the affordability of prescription drugs in Canada and in some cases sponsoring bus trips for seniors across the border to obtain these drugs. We should be skeptical of this approach because, in reality, the Canadian government drug mandates harm patients and increase the costs in other sectors of the health care system.

The Canadian bureaucracies cause significant delays in access to new and innovative drugs. First, at the federal level, Canadians wait up to a year longer than Americans do for approval of new drugs. Then the delays continue at the provincial level where various government ''gatekeepers'' review the ''therapeutic value'' of prescription drugs before they are included in the formulary. The length of the delays varies widely. The government officials in Nova Scotia approve drugs for its formulary in 250 days, while the wait in Ontario is nearly 500 days.

Canadian patients are often forced to use the medicines selected by the government solely for cost reasons. Patients who would respond better to the second, third, or fourth drug developed for a specific condition are often denied the preferred drug, and are stuck with the government-approved ''one size fits all'' drug.

I urge my Colleagues to read this article and keep in mind that while prescription drugs appear to cost less in Canada than in the United States, there is a costly price associated with the Canadian system that ultimately translates into a lack of quality care for patients.

[From the National Journal's Congress Daily, Oct. 2, 2000]

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS: HAS CANADA FOUND THE ANSWER?

(By William McArthur, M.D.)

Some Americans faced with the rising costs of prescription drugs look longingly at Canada, where prescription drugs appear to cost less than in the United States. The fact is that, while some drugs do cost less in Canada, others don't. Furthermore, many drugs are not available at any cost in Canada. The effect of Canadian policies is to restrict the overall availability of prescription drugs through a combination of a lengthy drug approval process and oppressive price controls.

First of all, Canada's federal drug approval process takes much longer than that of the U.S., resulting in delayed access for Canadians to new drugs. For example, Canadian acceptance of the drug Viagra came a whole year after it had been available in the U.S. For 12 months Canadians who needed Viagra, or another of the many drugs delayed or denied approval, had to go to the U.S. to get their medication.

Even if a drug wins federal approval, it faces 10 more hurdles to become widely accessible—the 10 provinces. Each province has a review committee that must approve the drug for reimbursement under the public healthcare system. For example, in British Columbia, neither the new anti-arthritic drugs Celebrex and Vioxx, nor the Alzheimer's treatment Aricept, have been approved for reimbursement, severely limiting their availability. Further, the provincial approval times vary greatly from province to province, creating further inequities.

Price controls imposed by a government agency, the Patented Medicines Price Review Board (PMPRB), are the reason some prescription drugs cost less in Canada than in the United States. However, while keeping some prescription drug prices down through price controls, Canada has been unable to control overall drug spending. OECD statistics reveal that when the PMPRB was created in 1988, per capita expenditure on prescription drugs was $106; by 1996 that had doubled to $211 per person. One study of international drug price comparisons by Prof. Patricia Danzon of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania concluded that, on the average, drug prices in Canada were higher than those in the United States. Some individual drugs, particularly generics, cost far more in Canada. For example, the anti-hypertensive drug atenolol is four times more expensive in Canada than in the United States. And a University of Toronto study found that the main effect of price controls