

Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Henger
Hersteth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo

Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross

Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeltan
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberti
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (PA)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Larson (CT)
Lewis (GA)
Millender-
McDonald
Payne
Smith (WA)
Wexler

□ 1805

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, personal business in my district prevents me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Tuesday, May 17, 2005. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 174, on ordering the previous question; "no" on rollcall No. 175, H. Res. 278, a resolution providing a rule for the consideration of H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006; "aye" on rollcall No. 176, an amendment offered by Rep. ROBERT MENENDEZ of New Jersey; "no" on rollcall No. 177, an amendment offered by Mr. TANCREDI of Colorado; "aye" on rollcall No. 178, an amendment offered by Mr. MEEKS of New York; "aye" on rollcall No. 179, an amendment offered by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; and "aye" on rollcall No. 180, final passage of H.R. 2360, The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the record and regret that I could not be present today, Tuesday, May 17, 2005, to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, and 180 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "No" on rollcall vote No. 174 on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 278, providing for consideration of H.R. 2360 making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; "No" on rollcall vote No. 175 on Agreeing to the Resolution as Amended on H. Res. 278, providing for consideration of H.R. 2360 making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 176 on an Amendment to H.R. 2360 to increase funding (by transfer) by \$50 million to State and local governments for the defense of chemical plants by first responders; "No" on rollcall vote No. 177 on an Amendment to H.R. 2360 to prevent the use of funds in contravention of a provision in the illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (PL 104-208) that prevents Federal, State or local government officials from prohibiting or restricting government agencies or officials from sending or receiving information to Federal immigration officials regarding an individual's immigration status; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 178 on an Amendment to H.R. 2360 to insert anew section at the end of the bill to prohibit the use of funds from being used to close any detention facility operated by or on behalf of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement that has been operational in 2005; "aye" on rollcall vote No. 179 on an Amendment to

H.R. 2360 to insert a new section at the end of the bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make grants to assist States in conforming with minimum drivers' license standards by appropriating \$100,000,000. For taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of \$1,000,000, the amount of tax reduction shall be reduced by 1.562 percent; and "aye" on rollcall vote No. 180 on final passage of H.R. 2360, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. No. 109-27)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, which states that the Burma emergency is to continue beyond May 20, 2005. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the *Federal Register* on May 19, 2004 (69 FR 29041).

The crisis between the United States and Burma arising from the actions and policies of the Government of Burma that led to the declaration of a national emergency on May 20, 1997, has not been resolved. These actions and policies, including its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma and maintain in force the sanctions against Burma to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2005.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 281) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAYS—1

Paul

H. RES. 281

Resolved, That the following Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Chocoma.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAFTA LESSONS FOR CAFTA

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, much like its elder cousin NAFTA, CAFTA has promised to raise the standard of living in its poorest member countries. But thanks to NAFTA, we already know how this story ends.

A typical Central American earns only a small fraction of an average American worker's wage. More than 40 percent of workers in the region labor for less than \$2 a day, placing them below the global poverty level.

Mexico now ranks as one of the world's 10 largest economies. Its overall wealth has increased since passing NAFTA, and, unfortunately, so has its poverty. It is said, "a rising tide lifts all boats." This is not the case for the poor in Mexico and will not be the case for the impoverished people in the Western hemisphere's poorest nations.

For this and other reasons, I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing CAFTA.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mrs. MCCARTHY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SMART SECURITY AND HOMELAND SECURITY VS IRAQ'S SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, minutes ago the House approved the fiscal year 2006 Homeland Security appropriation bill to the tune of, underwhelmingly, \$37 billion. In a vacuum, \$37 billion sounds like a lot of money, and it is, but when you consider that Congress has appropriated over \$100 billion on the security of Iraq this year alone,

and more than \$200 billion overall, \$37 billion sounds much less significant. In fact, the \$37 billion spending bill that was approved today represents less than 5 percent of the U.S. annual discretionary budget. Yet the Iraq war this year, this year alone, represents well over 10 percent of our annual discretionary budget.

Clearly, something is wrong with this picture. Spending on homeland security, while inadequate in its amount, focuses on the right things to protect America: First responders, border and port security, and cargo inspections. On the other hand, funding for the war in Iraq continues to focus on poorly planned military operations and irresponsible no-bid contracts to war profiteers like Halliburton and its subsidiary Kellogg, Brown & Root.

At the same time, the Iraq supplemental spending bill of over \$200 billion has neglected to provide adequate funds for body armor for the troops. This is a particularly egregious mistake in light of the 2004 study indicating as many as a quarter of all troop deaths could have been prevented if the most advanced body armor had been provided to every single soldier in Iraq.

It is important to note the irony in our funding priorities. The Homeland Security budget, which is vitally important towards ensuring the safety of the American people, is drastically underfunded. On the other hand, the Iraq war, which was a war of choice, not a war of necessity, is so overfunded that last year \$9 billion in reconstruction funds went missing. Nine billion dollars. That is more than a quarter of this year's homeland security budget.

And let us not forget another more recent report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq's reconstruction. This report states that another \$100 million for reconstruction projects in southern Iraq is also missing and cannot be accounted for.

Mr. Speaker, we need to focus our spending on programs and policies that will help ensure the safety of the American people. The war in Iraq will not make Americans safer, because this conflict is causing the United States to be perceived by the Muslim world as a colonial occupier, not as a liberating force. This perception, combined with our continued military presence in Iraq, has assisted radical Muslim terrorist groups like al Qaeda in their recruiting efforts. The result is that 3½ years after September 11 Americans are less safe.

Fortunately, there is a way to achieve sensible spending while also keeping America secure. Over the last 2 years, I have developed the SMART Security Strategy for the 21st Century. SMART is a sensible multilateral American response to terrorism. SMART Security urges a shifting of America's budget priorities to more effectively meet our national security needs. That means spending more money on port security, cargo inspec-

tions and airline security, and less money on warfare, outdated weapon systems, and new nuclear weapons.

□ 1815

Instead of funding continued military operations in Iraq, the SMART platform would encourage other nations to work with the United States and spend more money on peacekeeping, on reconstruction and developmental aid to ensure long-term peace and stability in the Middle East.

In fact, it has been proven when debt relief increases, terrorism and the conditions that give rise to terrorism tend to decrease. That is why the SMART platform encourages wealthy nations to provide debt relief and developmental aid for the world's poorest countries. After more than 2 years of fighting, it is clear that the war in Iraq cannot be won through military means. We need to be smarter. We need to be smarter than the terrorists, not just bigger and stronger.

The fight to secure our country must be fought on more than the battlefield. We must be smart in the way we prioritize our national spending by focusing on true security needs instead of superficial security needs. Homeland security is a true security need. Let us remember the next time President Bush asks for money for Iraq, which I understand will be sometime this summer, we need to know which is secure and which is not.

COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about the price of prescription drugs here in the United States compared to what consumers pay in other industrialized countries in the world.

I have some charts with me tonight because I want to point out some differences. There are several that I think are important. This is a chart, and some numbers are hard to read. These are 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. We have Nexium and Norvasc and Zyrtec and Zocor. I want to point out Zocor, we have a price, and these were all done just in the last few months. We have a price from the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany and a local pharmacy in Rochester, Minnesota.

If we total all of these drugs for a month's supply, in Frankfurt, Germany, they would cost \$455.57 in U.S. dollars. Also in U.S. dollars in the United States, the price of those same drugs, those same 10 best-selling prescription drugs would be \$1,040.04. Over the last year, the value of the dollar has declined by about 20 percent. We thought the differences we pay in the United States and what our German friends pay would have gotten less. We