

Pascarell	Sensenbrenner	Stupak
Paul	Shays	Tancredo
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	
Royce	Stark	

## NOT VOTING—13

Bereuter	Isakson	Lee
Carson (IN)	Istook	Majette
Deutsch	Jackson-Lee	Saxton
Gutknecht	(TX)	Vitter
Houghton	Larsen (WA)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1856

Mr. BUYER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their voted from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 370, on passage of H.R. 4766, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 37 and H.J. RES. 66

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 37 and H.J. Res. 66.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3575

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3575.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3575

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today I learned that I have been listed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3575, something I was not aware of and I did not ask to be cosponsor of, and I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3575.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

#### BUSH ECONOMIC POLICY

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Vice President CHENEY came to my home State of Ohio last week to try to explain the Bush economic policy, visiting a State with high unemployment, a State that has lost 200,000 jobs since President Bush took office, a State that has lost one-sixth of its manufacturing jobs and a State that has lost about 190 jobs every single day of the Bush administration.

His answer to every economic problem is more tax cuts for the wealthiest people. Somebody making a million dollars gets a tax cut of \$125,000, hoping it will trickle down to create jobs and more trade agreements like NAFTA, which instead have simply shifted jobs overseas.

We need to change direction on this economy. It is not working in Ohio. It is not working in the industrial Midwest. We need a better manufacturing policy that pays attention to American manufacturing but does not shift jobs overseas.

#### OIL-FOR-FOOD FRAUD

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to begin to look at one of the most far-reaching scandals that our generation has seen. The Oil-for-Food fraud is possibly the largest scandal in the history of the United Nations. We have got several speakers who are going to address the situation there where the United Nations Security Council possibly changed the votes in order to benefit themselves and certainly became very close to this scandal of tremendous proportions. Iraqi individuals appear to have bribed or coerced members of the U.N. who are administering the program.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that this issue is only being addressed by one side of the House. I would request that my colleagues on both sides begin to talk about the Oil-for-Food scandal, which possibly reached \$10 billion and certainly affected the U.N. votes as we considered going to war with Iraq.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### DRUG REIMPORTATION

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, while Congress is working to provide affordable pharmaceuticals to American citizens through reimportation legislation, the Bush administration is

working to undermine those efforts. We will soon vote on the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

Article 17.9.4 of the U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement would allow pharmaceutical companies to prevent imports of drugs to the United States. That means the Australian Free Trade Agreement is directly inconsistent with provisions in the bipartisan drug reimportation bill sponsored by Senators DORGAN, MCCAIN, SNOWE, LOTT and DASCHLE. Under its comprehensive pharmaceutical benefits scheme, the Australian government negotiates today lower prices for its citizens through mass procurement. In other words, they use volume purchasing.

The U.S. pharmaceutical industry has made sure that our government cannot use mass procurement to bring down drug prices for U.S. citizens, and that is not good enough.

□ 1900

Now they want to go a step further.

The U.S. Trade Representative's office, the President's person at the trade table, has included language in the Australian Trade Agreement that will forbid importation of cheap, affordable and safe Australian pharmaceuticals into our country. The clear winners as always in this Congress, as always in the White House, the clear winners are the large pharmaceutical companies; and the big losers, again, as far as prescription drugs and the Republican leadership, the big losers are American consumers, particularly millions of American retirees who lack drug coverage.

The Bush administration and its pharmaceutical allies argue the only way to ensure lower drug prices for Americans is by raising drug prices on every other nation, ostensibly because these nations are not helping to pay for research and development. That argument is not just specious; it is absurd.

Foreign drug prices already are high enough to cover research and development costs and still return a healthy profit to the drug industry. If you do not believe me, look at Pfizer's balance sheet, look at Pharmacia's balance sheets, look at Merck's balance, look at Schering's balance sheet.

Glaxo is headquartered in England. Aventis is headquartered in France. Bayer is headquartered in Germany. Would these companies set up shop in a country where they cannot do business and make a profit? What if other companies do increase their drug prices? Do we really think the drug industry is going to turn around and reduce their prices just because they can get higher prices in Europe? Not on your life.

Drug companies charge U.S. companies outrageous drug prices for one reason and one reason only, because they can. The Australian Trade Agreement simply helps them get away with it in that country too. Drug industry profits to \$59 billion. Last year the drug industry has been virtually the only industry in America left unscathed by the

Bush recession. Year after year after year they earn higher profits than any other industry in America for 20 straight years. Meanwhile, drug spending is fueling double-digit increases in health insurance premiums, drug spending is draining tax dollars out of the Federal Treasury hand over fist, drug spending is undermining the financial security of millions of seniors who have to choose between a full prescription drug dosage and their food or their utility bills.

Meanwhile, other countries are fighting back all over the world, but our government is not. Instead, at the behest of the drug industry, the Bush administration is trying to undermine price negotiations in Australia and block lower price prescriptions from even reaching our country.

Catering to a major campaign contributor like the drug industry is nothing new to this administration, but is it not getting a little ridiculous. If trade agreements are about creating open markets for cheaper goods and better market access, why are we trying to do something the opposite of that? Why are we trying to raise the price of prescription drugs across the world? The answer is easy: the pharmaceutical industry wants to make more money and the Bush administration and Republican leadership want their campaign help.

Enough is enough. A vote for the Australia Free Trade Agreement is a vote against U.S. consumers. It is as simple as that.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4759, UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-602) on the resolution (H. Res. 712) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4759) to implement the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4634

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) as a cosponsor of H.R. 4634.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### TELL AMERICA THE TRUTH

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, this week had barely begun before three more U.S. soldiers died in Iraq. The U.S. casualties keep mounting and that is a tragedy, but this administration remains silent on a coming travesty in Iraq.

The President's appointed interim Iraqi government is preparing to offer amnesty to Iraqi insurgents, amnesty to the very people who are killing and wounding U.S. soldiers in Iraq. Our soldiers remain on patrol in the most dangerous place on Earth; and the snipers, bombers, and militants are about to be offered amnesty. What in the world is going on in this administration? Is this what the administration calls the road to peace? What is the President going to tell the families of every U.S. soldier killed or wounded in combat? What is the President going to tell the U.S. people?

The interim Iraqi government was created by the U.S. administration, make no mistake about that, so no one should think that this policy was not put in place without the express approval of the White House.

Now, Iraq says it is in their national interest to offer amnesty to the very insurgents U.S. soldiers have been battling day by day. This administration had no reason to start a war with Iraq. This administration had no plan to prosecute the war with Iraq, and now this administration demonstrates it has no plan to end the war in Iraq. What do we say to the dead? What do we say to the families of those who died? What do we say to the soldiers injured by roadside bombs and mortar attacks and snipers?

Is this the President's exit strategy in Iraq? 160,000 soldiers remain in harm's way in a country that is about to offer amnesty to the people who are attacking them. If the interim Iraq government can offer amnesty, why can the U.S. not offer every U.S. soldier the option to leave? If Iraq's insurgents are offered freedom, why are U.S. soldiers not offered the freedom to choose whether they stay?

Why will the people shooting at U.S. soldiers get special treatment while our soldiers get stop loss orders, forcing thousands of them to remain in harm's way. What in the world is going on in Iraq? We have to be brave enough to accept our people and embrace all Iraqis. That is a direct quote from Iraq's interim President, Sheikh Ghazi al-Yawar.

So much for the U.S. being seen as a great liberator. Even the interim government sees the U.S. as an occupier. So in their view it is okay to cut a deal with the insurgents. It is a statement about the instability of the entire country and the inability of the government to do anything about it. It is the most glaring statement yet that the administration was completely wrong in its need to go to war and unequivocally wrong with the consequences of post-war Iraq.

There have been more U.S. casualties since the President's declaration of "mission accomplished" than during all the major combat operations. Now the world has become even more dangerous and no amount of denial will alter the images of the Iraq prison.

Why talk about this shame again? Because it is entirely possible that this administration continues to ignore the most fundamental international protection for every prisoner. Abu Ghraib showed the world that the Geneva Convention was something the administration left out of the Iraq war plan. After those revelations, the administration made sweeping statements about their support of the Geneva Convention. Yet just today, the International Red Cross said it fears this administration is secretly holding more prisoners around the world.

Quoting a Red Cross spokesperson, "Some of these people who have been reported to be arrested never showed up in any of the places of detention run by the U.S. where we visit."

How bad does it get before the administration follows international law? Who does the administration think benefits from its failures to protect prisoners and follow international law? The International Red Cross tried to work behind the scenes before the Abu Ghraib scandal. The administration ignored them. The Red Cross tried to act as a catalyst for positive change in the wake of the scandals. Today's news makes clear the administration still believes it can flaunt international law. There can be no peace without justice, Mr. President, not in Iraq or anywhere else.

Justice begins by treating prisoners we capture in the same way, with the same rights that we would expect to be extended to an American. Justice delayed is justice denied. Act now before another day goes by. Give the International Red Cross unrestricted access to every secret U.S. location where prisoners are being held. Prove once and for all that America stands for human rights and justice. Let the Red Cross see and the world know if America is true to its words. Let the Red